

WHITE PAPER

A New Engine for Grocery Own-Brand Profitability

SHARE OF WALLET

Decisioning Among Cooperative, Competitive, and Complementary Solutions

Food for Health® is not another food scanner, product score, nutrition tracker, filtering engine, personalized shopping application, wellness program, or artificial-intelligence assistant. Food for Health® is the Clinical Nutrition Operating System®. Its patented Efficacy Engine® evaluates independently peer-reviewed clinical evidence and converts that evidence into Personalized Food Outcome Calculations™ for specific foods and specific people.

The distinction is architectural. Conventional systems generally describe a product, classify it, score it, filter it, or recommend it according to a fixed rule, a population standard, a dietary profile, a preference, or a narrow physiological measure. The Efficacy Engine® determines the expected efficacy of the ingredients in the food for each relevant health condition and wellness objective, then reconciles those findings across the person's complete health context.

Food for Health® may also grade nutritional content, processing, ingredient safety, ethical considerations, planetary considerations, certifications, affordability, or other attributes. It may filter results by religion, diet, taste, culture, region, brand, price, calories, macronutrients, micronutrients, availability, certification, allergy, or any other defined requirement. Those capabilities are useful, but they are not efficacy. They are applied after the Efficacy Engine® determines what the food is expected to do for the person.

The competitive landscape must therefore be understood in layers. Some companies compete directly for consumer and enterprise share of wallet at the food-selection decision. Some supply product grading, dietary matching, food access, coaching, or single-axis metabolic prediction. Retailers operate their own or licensed nutrition systems. Each may influence the same purchase and consume the same budget, attention, trust, data, and behavioral commitment. None should be described as a direct efficacy competitor unless the company demonstrates the complete evidence-graded, ingredient-level, multi-condition, interaction-aware determination performed by Food for Health®.

1. THE EFFICACY ENGINE®

The Efficacy Engine® begins with the clinical evidence, not with a consumer preference, a nutrient threshold, a population label, or a product marketing claim. It evaluates each relevant ingredient for each specific condition or wellness objective using independently peer-reviewed clinical studies.

The evidence grade incorporates factors including:

- Study cohort size
- Study duration
- Double-blind or triple-blind design
- Identity and qualifications of the investigators and institutions
- Source of research funding and sponsorship
- Study methodology and controls
- Statistical and clinical outcomes
- Strength, consistency, and relevance of the findings

The output is not one universal grade assigned permanently to an ingredient. The ingredient is graded relative to a specific condition or objective. The same ingredient may be beneficial for one condition, neutral for another, adverse for another, or materially different when combined with another ingredient, food, prescription drug, or over-the-counter product.

1.1 Ingredient-Condition Evidence Grading

Every relevant ingredient can carry multiple condition-specific grades. A product containing five graded ingredients for one condition does not simply receive the arithmetic average of five independent numbers. The weight and direction of the evidence for those ingredients must be synthesized within that condition and then reconciled against the evidence applicable to the person's other conditions and goals.

This creates a dynamic calculation in which:

- An ingredient may be favorable for one condition and unfavorable for another.
- Two ingredients may reinforce one another.
- One ingredient may offset or diminish the expected effect of another.
- An ingredient may act as an adjuvant that increases or supports another effect.
- An ingredient may contribute to a depletion relevant to another condition or therapy.
- A product ingredient may be contraindicated by another ingredient, another food, a prescription drug, or an over-the-counter product.
- The combined product-level outcome may differ materially from the apparent attributes of any single ingredient.

1.2 Multi-Condition and Multi-Goal Reconciliation

The calculation becomes dynamically and exponentially complex as ingredients, conditions, wellness objectives, contraindications, adjuvants, depletions, foods,

medications, and other relationships increase. Food for Health® is designed to reconcile that complexity rather than reduce it to a universal food score.

The Efficacy Engine® therefore evaluates:

- Multiple health conditions at the same time
- Multiple wellness objectives at the same time
- Positive, negative, neutral, and conflicting ingredient effects
- Contraindications within the product
- Adjuvant relationships within the product
- Depletions associated with ingredients or therapies
- Food-to-food interactions
- Food-to-prescription-drug interactions
- Food-to-over-the-counter-product interactions
- Other clinically relevant relationships supported by the evidence architecture

The resulting Personalized Food Outcome Calculation™ answers a fundamentally different question from a product grade or filter: “What is this food expected to do for this person when the relevant evidence and interacting health factors are evaluated together?”

1.3 Filters Follow Efficacy

After the Efficacy Engine® produces the clinical determination, Food for Health® can apply filters and ranking criteria to determine which efficacious options should be displayed, excluded, prioritized, substituted, or made available within a particular consumer or enterprise experience.

Potential filters and overlays include:

- Religion
- Diet
- Taste and flavor preferences
- Allergies and avoidances
- Certifications
- Calories
- Macronutrients
- Micronutrients
- Geography and region
- Culture
- Brand
- Price and affordability
- Retail availability
- Ethical considerations

- Sustainability and planetary considerations
- Processing
- Ingredient exclusions
- Retailer assortment
- Consumer preferences

Filtering determines whether a product satisfies a rule or preference. Product grading characterizes the product under a rubric. Neither generates the efficacy determination. Food for Health® can perform both functions, but both sit downstream from the Efficacy Engine®.

2. THE MARKET CONFUSES FILTERING, SCORING, PERSONALIZATION, AND EFFICACY

Consumers see a crowded market of apparently similar promises: eat better, avoid harmful ingredients, choose healthier products, find foods that fit a diet, manage a condition, receive personalized recommendations, improve metabolic health, or understand labels. Those promises can appear interchangeable even when the underlying systems operate in fundamentally different ways.

The market distinction is summarized below.

Capability	Question Answered	Typical Inputs or Outputs	Relationship to FFH
Filtering	Is the product permitted under a selected rule?	Diet, religion, allergy, certification, price, brand, nutrient threshold	Downstream constraint or presentation layer
Population product grading	How does the product compare under a universal rubric?	Nutrient density, additives, processing, organic status, climate impact	Optional product-characterization overlay
Preference personalization	Does the product match what the person says the person wants?	Taste, diet, brand, culture, lifestyle	Optional downstream personalization layer
Single-condition matching	Does the product comply with a rule set for a condition?	Diabetes-friendly, renal diet, low FODMAP, GLP-1-oriented	Narrow compatibility function
Single-biomarker prediction	What response may occur on one measurable axis?	Predicted glucose or triglyceride response	Narrow physiological-response model

FFH efficacy determination	What is the food expected to do for this person across the interacting health context?	Evidence-graded ingredient effects reconciled across conditions, goals, contraindications, adjuvants, depletions, foods, Rx and OTC products	Defining Efficacy Engine® function
----------------------------	--	--	------------------------------------

The Efficacy Engine® is analogous to a Harrier aircraft capability rather than a superior version of a conventional runway-dependent aircraft. Food scores and filters define runway conditions, permissions, preferences, and available routes. The Efficacy Engine® determines whether and how the aircraft can take off and land under the complete interacting conditions. A Harrier can use a conventional runway, but runway use does not define the aircraft. Food for Health® can incorporate conventional grades and filters, but those functions do not define the Clinical Nutrition Operating System®.

3. THE DIRECT-COMPETITOR STANDARD

A company should be classified as a direct FFH efficacy competitor only if the company can demonstrate that its system performs all of the following:

- Grades individual ingredients against independently peer-reviewed clinical evidence for specific conditions or wellness objectives.
- Grades the evidence itself using research-quality factors such as cohort size, duration, blinding, investigators, funding, methodology, and outcomes.
- Produces condition-specific ingredient determinations rather than universal ingredient descriptions.
- Reconciles multiple graded ingredients within a product.
- Reconciles multiple health conditions and wellness objectives simultaneously.
- Resolves positive, negative, neutral, and conflicting effects across those conditions and objectives.
- Accounts for contraindications, adjuvants, and depletions.
- Accounts for relevant food, prescription-drug, and over-the-counter-product interactions.
- Produces a product-level determination specific to the person.
- Separates the efficacy calculation from downstream filters, preferences, scores, and presentation rules.

No company reviewed in the current competitive analysis has been established as performing the complete FFH efficacy process. That conclusion does not mean the companies are commercially irrelevant. It means they should be categorized accurately according to the decision each system actually produces.

4. SHARE-OF-WALLET FOOD-DECISION COMPETITORS

The companies in this group influence food selection and can therefore compete for the same consumer or enterprise spending, attention, trust, data, and behavioral commitment. Their offerings are relevant alternatives at the point of purchase even though the retrieved company materials do not establish full FFH-equivalent efficacy determination.

Company	What It Does	Relationship to Efficacy	Strategic Position
Sifter Solutions, (acquired Attane Health)	Sifter provides product search, Scan By Diet™, recipes, store assortment, product scoring data, dietary filters, medical-need matching, prescription-medication interaction screening, alternatives, and APIs. In May 2026 Sifter and Attane Health announced a merger; the combined business operates under Sifter Solutions and retains the Attane brand. Attane contributes health-plan programs, food access, clinical credibility, and outcomes reporting.	Closest platform-level share-of-wallet comparator. The described logic is dietary matching, compliance, interaction screening, access, education, and program delivery. Full evidence-graded multi-condition efficacy determination is not established.	Potential customer, integration partner, enterprise channel, and serious comparator.
FoodHealth Company	FoodHealth owns the FoodHealth Score and currently markets a consumer application focused on GLP-1 food shopping. The application scores products, identifies what to buy or swap, and emphasizes protein, fiber, added sugar, ingredient quality, and nutrient density. FoodHealth also supplies the current FoodHealth Score used in Kroger OptUP.	Condition-oriented product scoring and recommendation. Multi-condition ingredient-efficacy reconciliation is not established.	Share-of-wallet competitor, scoring provider, retailer technology provider, and possible integration partner.

Company	What It Does	Relationship to Efficacy	Strategic Position
GreenChoice, PBC	GreenChoice provides nutrition, processing, ingredient-safety, and climate scores, plus filters for diets, allergies, intolerances, and values. It recommends alternatives and supplies data and scores to retailers, healthcare organizations, and technology companies.	Sophisticated product grading plus filters. The score characterizes products and the filters match products to selected requirements. Full efficacy determination is not established.	Share-of-wallet competitor, data provider, and possible distribution or integration partner.
Food Is Good, Inc. / FIG	FIG builds a user profile from diets, allergies, intolerances, and ingredients to avoid, then checks whether products are compatible and identifies matching foods across stores and restaurants.	Multi-filter food compatibility. FIG determines whether the product fits selected restrictions; it does not establish an ingredient-level evidence synthesis across interacting conditions.	Share-of-wallet competitor for allergy, intolerance, and restriction use cases; potential downstream channel.
Yuka SAS	Yuka assigns a universal product score based on nutritional quality, additives, and organic status, provides product explanations, and recommends healthier alternatives. Premium preference detection can identify selected attributes such as gluten, lactose, or palm oil.	Population-oriented product grading with limited filtering. The score is not a person-specific clinical efficacy determination.	High-visibility share-of-wallet and consumer-perception competitor; possible complementary grading layer.

5. PERSONALIZED-RESPONSE AND NUTRITION-PROGRAM COMPARATORS

Some companies are scientifically or clinically closer to Food for Health® than a universal product grader because they use biological, metabolic, clinical, behavioral, or microbiome information. Their retrieved materials nevertheless describe narrower

prediction or service models rather than the complete FFH efficacy architecture.

Company	Documented Model	Correct Classification
ZOE Ltd.	Food and meal scoring, processed-food risk information, microbiome-oriented nutrition, food logging, personalized guidance, and predicted glucose and blood-fat responses.	Advanced personalized-response comparator. The current materials do not establish product-level reconciliation across multiple interacting conditions, goals, contraindications, adjuvants, depletions, foods, Rx, and OTC products.
January, Inc. / January AI	Food logging, sensor-free glucose prediction, medication-, laboratory-, and history-aware AI guidance, adaptive goals, and meal or product comparisons.	Advanced metabolic and clinical-context comparator. The current materials do not establish the complete FFH multi-condition ingredient-efficacy process.
DayTwo	Historically associated with algorithm-guided personalized glycemic-response recommendations using clinical and microbiome information.	Historical predictive-nutrition comparator. Current operating status should be verified before present-tense publication, and the model should not be presented as full FFH-equivalent efficacy.
Foodsmart	Nutrition assessment, registered-dietitian counseling, recommendations, meal planning, grocery lists, price comparison, deals, delivery, and marketplace access.	Care-delivery and grocery-enablement competitor. Primary value is coaching, access, and program administration rather than established product-level efficacy calculation.

6. RETAILER-OWNED AND RETAILER-DEPLOYED DECISION SYSTEMS

Retail systems should be attributed to the retailer, the technology provider, and the underlying decision method. A retailer may have built the surrounding experience while licensing or adopting a third-party score. A retailer may also represent both a share-of-wallet competitor and a prospective FFH customer.

Retailer / System	Current Structure and Function	FFH Classification
The Kroger Co. / OptUP	Kroger originally developed OptUP internally with Kroger personnel, 84.51° teams, and Kroger dietitians. Kroger's current OptUP materials state that the FoodHealth Score was developed with FoodHealth Company and evaluates ingredient quality and nutrient density. The program also analyzes household purchases and offers better-nutrition choices and dietitian support.	Retail decision system currently using a third-party scoring layer. Not efficacy. High-value FFH integration target.
Ahold Delhaize USA / Guiding Stars Licensing Company	Guiding Stars reads nutrition labels and applies established nutrition criteria to award one, two, or three stars. Ratings are used on shelf tags, store-brand packaging, prepared foods, and online. Ahold Delhaize USA is identified as the parent company.	Retailer-owned nutritional rating infrastructure. Population product scoring, not person-specific efficacy.
Albertsons Companies / Sincerely Health	Analyzes purchasing patterns using MyPlate-oriented guidance, household information, preferences, recommendations, recipes, swaps, activity tracking, pharmacy functions, and rewards. Albertsons has also described more tailored diabetes and obesity guidance.	Retailer-owned behavior and personalized-nutrition platform. More than a static score, but full multi-condition efficacy is not established. Strong FFH insertion point.
Walmart Inc. / Great For You	Walmart's icon identifies products that meet Walmart nutrition criteria using foods-to-encourage principles and limits involving saturated fat, trans fat, sodium, and added sugar.	Retailer-owned nutrition qualification label. Not personalization or efficacy.
Retailers deploying Sifter	Sifter offers retailer-facing APIs and experiences for food search, product matching, Scan By Diet™, recipes, medical and dietary filters, medication interactions, alternatives, and retailer assortment.	Third-party retailer technology. Close share-of-wallet comparator and enterprise channel, but full efficacy is not established.

The current primary-source review did not establish comparable universal product-scoring engines for H-E-B or Whole Foods Market. H-E-B materials establish nutrition and dietitian services. Whole Foods materials establish product standards and dietary-

preference filters. Neither should be assigned an unsupported proprietary scoring system.

7. SCORING AND CLASSIFICATION METHODOLOGIES

Methodologies should not be listed as companies. The organization that owns, develops, licenses, or deploys the methodology should be identified separately. These systems may compete at the decision-method level and may also be optional FFH overlays.

System	Owner / Developer	Function	Correct Treatment
Food Compass	Tufts-associated research methodology	Multi-domain nutrient profiling and product scoring	Methodology, not a company; potential optional comparative score.
Nutri-Score	Public-health nutrient-profile labeling system used in multiple countries	Population-level front-of-pack nutritional grade	Methodology, not efficacy.
NOVA	Academic food-processing classification framework	Classifies foods by degree and purpose of processing	Processing classification, not efficacy.
Healthy Eating Index	USDA and National Cancer Institute	Measures conformance to dietary guidance	Population dietary-quality metric, not product-level efficacy.
FoodHealth Score	FoodHealth Company	Ingredient-quality and nutrient-density score used in FoodHealth products and current Kroger OptUP materials	Company-owned scoring system; not efficacy.
GreenScore®	GreenChoice, PBC	Nutrition, processing, ingredient-safety, and climate scoring	Company-owned multi-attribute score; not efficacy.
Guiding Stars	Guiding Stars Licensing Company / Ahold Delhaize USA	One-to-three-star nutrition rating	Retailer-owned/licensed nutrition rating; not efficacy.
Great For You	Walmart Inc.	Qualifying nutrition icon	Retailer-owned label; not efficacy.

8. WHY SHARE OF WALLET REMAINS REAL

Functional non-equivalence does not eliminate commercial competition. Consumers and enterprise buyers have limited budgets, time, attention, data-sharing tolerance, trust, and willingness to change behavior. A buyer may purchase a scoring application, filtering tool, nutrition program, metabolic-response service, dietitian platform, or retailer wellness experience instead of Food for Health® even when the alternative does not provide efficacy determination.

The share-of-wallet competitive set therefore includes organizations that:

- Influence food selection at or near the point of purchase
- Charge for consumer subscriptions or enterprise access
- Collect health, shopping, preference, or behavioral data
- Provide scores, matches, exclusions, substitutions, or recommendations
- Operate condition-oriented nutrition programs
- Embed nutrition decisioning within retailer or payer workflows
- Create persistent consumer engagement around food and health

That competition is economic, behavioral, and perceptual. It is not evidence of technology equality. The strategic task is to teach buyers that a universal grade, compatibility result, recommendation, or single-biomarker prediction is not the same as a Personalized Food Outcome Calculation™.

9. BUYER EDUCATION: INFORMATION IS NOT OUTCOME CALCULATION

The consumer must understand the following distinctions:

- Knowing what is in a food is not the same as knowing what the food is expected to do for the individual.
- Avoiding an ingredient is not the same as evaluating the remaining ingredients.
- A universally assigned food score cannot resolve the fact that the same ingredient may be favorable for one condition and unfavorable for another.
- Population-level nutrition guidance does not reconcile multiple health conditions and wellness objectives.
- Tracking behavior does not establish the expected result of the behavior.
- Personalization based on preferences, demographics, purchase history, or stated goals is not equivalent to evidence-based efficacy determination.
- Single-biomarker prediction does not establish total clinical relevance across the person's other conditions, objectives, medications, or interactions.
- Artificial intelligence can improve access and presentation, but access and presentation do not establish evidence quality or calculation integrity.
- A product recommendation becomes clinically meaningful only when the basis of the determination can be explained in relation to the person and the evidence.

Food for Health® changes the consumer question from “Is this food healthy?” to “What is this food expected to do for me?”

That is not an incremental improvement to food scoring. It is a different operating model for nutrition.

10. FOOD FOR HEALTH® AS THE MISSING INTELLIGENCE LAYER

Many share-of-wallet competitors and retailer systems already possess assets that Food for Health® does not need to replace: consumer relationships, trusted brands, retail distribution, product catalogs, transaction data, loyalty histories, coaching workflows, health-plan relationships, biometric data, digital audiences, subscriptions, and point-of-purchase access.

The Efficacy Engine® can operate behind retailer applications, food-scoring systems, wellness platforms, healthcare portals, payer programs, employer benefits, food-brand experiences, digital marketplaces, and artificial-intelligence interfaces. The partner can retain the consumer relationship, interface, workflow, transaction, and brand while adding the clinical nutrition intelligence needed to answer: “What should this person choose, what is the food expected to do for the person, and why?”

This produces four possible relationships with the same organization:

- Share-of-wallet competitor: the organization competes for the same spending, attention, trust, data, or engagement.
- Capability-extension customer: the organization licenses FFH to add efficacy determination to its existing experience.
- Integration partner: the organization combines its scoring, filtering, access, coaching, commerce, or data assets with the Efficacy Engine®.
- Distribution channel: the organization delivers Personalized Food Outcome Calculations™ through an established consumer or enterprise interface.

These relationships are not contradictory. They are the natural structure of an operating-system market.

11. THE COMPETITIVE STANDARD

The market will increasingly distinguish among systems that merely describe food, systems that filter food, systems that score food, systems that personalize a narrow response, and systems that calculate expected effects across the individual's interacting health context.

Competitive Dimension	Conventional or Adjacent Systems	Food for Health®
Scientific source	Guidelines, labels, selected research, editorial standards, or proprietary rules	Independently peer-reviewed clinical evidence evaluated for quality and relevance
Unit of analysis	Product, nutrient, ingredient, diet rule, population, or single biomarker	Ingredient-condition evidence synthesized into a person-specific product determination
Evidence grading	Often undisclosed or fixed by methodology	Cohort size, duration, blinding, investigators, funding, methodology, and outcomes
Multiple conditions	Often separate filters or separate programs	Simultaneous reconciliation across conditions and wellness objectives
Conflicting effects	Usually not addressed or handled as static exclusions	Dynamic reconciliation of favorable, adverse, neutral, and competing effects
Interactions	Selected allergy, ingredient, or drug-interaction checks	Contraindications, adjuvants, depletions, food, Rx, OTC, and other relevant relationships
Output	Score, star, match, warning, exclusion, prediction, or recommendation	Personalized Food Outcome Calculation™
Filters	Often the core decision logic	Applied after efficacy to organize or constrain the results
Optional grades	Nutrition, processing, ethical, environmental, or other fixed dimensions	Can be incorporated without replacing the efficacy determination
Dosing	Generally outside scope	Encompassed by FFH patents; currently not activated due to insurance restrictions
Enterprise role	Application, program, scoring provider, retailer feature, or service	Underlying Clinical Nutrition Operating System® and intelligence layer

12. THE STRATEGIC CHOICE

Organizations competing for the nutrition and wellness wallet have three choices. They can attempt to build the clinical evidence infrastructure, evidence-quality grading, ingredient-condition architecture, multi-condition reconciliation, interaction logic, product intelligence, governance, and enterprise delivery capabilities required to produce individualized efficacy determinations. They can continue providing generalized grades, filters, guidance, or predictions and accept the limits of those models. Or they can integrate Food for Health®.

The third path allows a retailer, health plan, provider, employer, technology company, food brand, consumer application, scoring company, or marketplace to preserve what it already does well while adding the intelligence needed to make the proposition clinically grounded, individually relevant, explainable, and actionable.

Food for Health® is not simply another destination for wellness spending. It is the Clinical Nutrition Operating System® that can make the existing wellness and food-commerce ecosystem more effective.

13. TURN COMPETITION INTO CAPABILITY

The organization already has consumers, data, products, transactions, a scoring methodology, a shopping experience, a coaching program, or a trusted relationship. Food for Health® supplies the clinical nutrition intelligence that those assets generally do not provide.

Integrate the Efficacy Engine® to deliver evidence-graded, ingredient-level, multi-condition Personalized Food Outcome Calculations™ through the experience consumers already use.

Compete without Food for Health® and face every organization that adopts it. Integrate Food for Health® and transform an existing consumer proposition into an individualized, science-backed food-efficacy solution.

14. REFERENCES

- Food for Health® Efficacy Engine®, patent scope, evidence-grading methodology, interaction logic, dosing status, and filtering hierarchy: Food for Health® proprietary materials and management representations. <https://ffh.app>
- Sifter Solutions / Attane Health merger and combined platform: <https://www.siftersolutions.com/blog/sifter-solutions-and-attane-health-join-to-build-the-nations-most-complete-food-is-medicine-platform>
- Sifter platform, Open Health Score Index, APIs, product discovery, filters, medication interactions, and retailer capabilities: <https://www.siftersolutions.com/>

; <https://www.siftersolutions.com/grocery> ; <https://www.siftersolutions.com/scan-by-diet>

- FIG / Food Is Good, Inc. product scanner and dietary compatibility: <https://foodisgood.com/>; <https://foodisgood.com/app/>
- FoodHealth Company GLP-1 shopping coach and FoodHealth Score: <https://www.foodhealth.co/>
- GreenChoice product scoring, filters, nutrition, processing, ingredient safety, and climate methodology: <https://about.greenchoicenow.com/>; <https://about.greenchoicenow.com/greenscore> ; <https://www.greenchoicenow.com/store>
- Yuka product scoring, independence, alternatives, and preference detection: <https://yuka.io/en/>; <https://yuka.io/en/app/>; <https://help.yuka.io/l/en/article/ijzgfv1jq-how-are-food-products-scored>
- Kroger OptUP history and current FoodHealth Score relationship: <https://www.thekrogerco.com/the-evolution-of-optup/>; <https://www.kroger.com/health/nutrition/optup>; <https://www.kroger.com/blog/health/opt-up>
- Guiding Stars ownership and methodology: <https://guidingstars.com/> ; <https://guidingstars.com/about/>; <https://www.ahealthieramerica.org/our-partners/guiding-stars-442>
- Walmart Great For You: <https://corporate.walmart.com/purpose/hunger-nutrition/great-for-you>
- Albertsons Companies Sincerely Health: <https://www.albertsons.com/health.html> ; <https://www.albertsons.com/health/nutrition.html>
- ZOE personalized nutrition and food-scanning model: <https://zoe.com/en-us/app> ; <https://zoe.com/learn/zoe-2-0-science-made-simple>
- January AI personalized metabolic guidance: <https://january.ai/app>
- Foodsmart nutrition program and grocery enablement: <https://foodsmart.com/members/resources/mobile-app>