Nat. Volatiles & Essent. Oils, 2022; 09 (3): 149-156

Leveraged Buyouts in the Food and Nutrition Industry: A Literature Review and Restructuring Analysis

Gurdeep Singh*
*Guest Lecturer, University of Delhi, Independent Researcher

ABSTRACT

This paper explores the role of leveraged buyouts (LBOs) in the food and nutrition industry, focusing on literature published until 2021. By reviewing academic research and industry case studies, it highlights the financial and operational restructuring impacts of private equity-led LBOs. A SWOT analysis is developed to evaluate the strategic strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats of LBOs in this sector. Additionally, pre- and post-restructuring comparisons of key companies, such as Kraft Heinz, Atkins Nutritionals, Post Holdings, and Hostess Brands, are presented. Findings suggest that while LBOs drive efficiency and financial performance, they often compromise long-term innovation and sustainability. The paper concludes by emphasizing the need for ESG-oriented approaches to align LBO restructuring with sustainable food and nutrition goals.

Keywords- Leveraged Buyouts, Food and Nutrition Industry, Private Equity, Restructuring, Financial Performance, Operational Efficiency, SWOT Analysis, Trade Sales, IPO, Secondary Buyouts, Recapitalization, Spacs, Kraft Heinz, Atkins Nutritionals, Post Holdings, Hostess Brands, Innovation, Sustainability, ESG, Long-Term Value, Corporate Governance.

I.INTRODUCTION

Leveraged buyouts (LBOs) have played a transformative role in the global mergers and acquisitions (M&A) landscape for several decades, shaping the ownership and operational strategies of companies across diverse industries. At the heart of an LBO lies a financial strategy in which private equity (PE) firms or investment groups acquire a company by financing a significant portion of the purchase price with borrowed capital. The acquired company's future cash flows and assets are then typically used as collateral for repaying the debt, allowing investors to amplify returns while minimizing equity commitments (Kaplan & Strömberg, 2009). This debt-driven structure has made LBOs a distinctive and often controversial mechanism in corporate finance. While leveraged buyouts are widely used across different sectors, their application within the food and nutrition industry has attracted particular attention due to the sector's resilience and strategic significance.

The food and nutrition industry occupies a central position in the global economy because of its direct connection to consumer well-being and its role in fulfilling basic human needs. Unlike industries that are more cyclical in nature, demand for food products tends to remain stable even during economic downturns, making the sector relatively recession-proof (PwC, 2019). Furthermore, strong consumer loyalty toward trusted food brands contributes to predictable revenue streams and reduced investment risks (Euromonitor International, 2020). These characteristics make the industry an attractive target for private equity firms seeking stable cash flows to support debt repayment in LBO structures. Over the past two decades, consolidation within the sector has accelerated, driven by shifting consumer preferences toward health-conscious products, the globalization of supply chains, and competitive pressures (Deloitte, 2018). Within this evolving landscape, LBOs have been instrumental in enabling large-scale acquisitions, cost restructuring, and expansion into new markets.

Despite the apparent attractiveness of LBOs in the food and nutrition sector, their outcomes extend beyond financial performance. Academic literature suggests that LBOs can drive operational efficiency, reduce agency costs, and foster strategic innovation, often leading to stronger and more competitive firms (Acharya, Gottschalg, Hahn, & Kehoe, 2013). For instance, PE ownership can streamline decision-making and align management incentives with value creation. However, the heavy reliance on debt financing also raises concerns about long-term sustainability, employment stability, and vulnerability during market shocks (Gilligan & Wright, 2020). Some case studies in the food sector have highlighted the risks of aggressive cost-cutting under LBO ownership, which can undermine brand equity and consumer trust if not carefully managed. This tension between efficiency-driven restructuring and long-term resilience has become a subject of ongoing debate among scholars, practitioners, and policymakers.

This literature review builds on existing research and industry reports to explore the role of LBOs in the food and nutrition industry up until 2021. Specifically, it pursues three objectives: first, to examine the theoretical and empirical foundations of leveraged buyouts, tracing their evolution and identifying the mechanisms driving their outcomes (Kaplan & Strömberg, 2009); second, to conduct a SWOT analysis of LBOs in the food and nutrition industry, drawing insights from both strengths such as stable demand and weaknesses such as high leverage exposure (PwC, 2019; Euromonitor International, 2020); and third, to analyze pre- and post-restructuring outcomes through selected case studies, highlighting both successful transformations and problematic instances (Acharya et al., 2013; Gilligan & Wright, 2020). By synthesizing academic evidence with industry perspectives, this review aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of how leveraged buyouts intersect with the dynamics of the food and nutrition sector. Ultimately, it underscores the importance of balancing financial innovation with sustainable business practices in a sector that has profound implications for global health, nutrition, and consumer trust.

II.LITERATURE REVIEW

General private equity and leveraged buyout (LBO) effects have been studied extensively in both academic and policy-oriented research, offering a nuanced understanding of how these transactions influence firm performance, labor outcomes, and broader market structures. One of the most examined aspects is the impact on employment and productivity. Large-scale census-based studies in the U.S. (Davis et al., 2014; Davis et al., 2021 working paper; NBER, 2019/2020 revisions) reveal that while PE-backed firms typically experience modest net job losses compared to their peers, there is substantial gross job reallocation. This means that although total headcount may not decline significantly, the composition of the workforce often shifts, with some roles eliminated and others created. Importantly, these studies also highlight that productivity gains vary significantly across industries and deal types, with stronger performance improvements observed in contexts where private equity investors actively engage in operational restructuring. Alongside labor market impacts, a classic strand of scholarship emphasizes that the fundamental drivers of value in LBOs stem from enhanced operational discipline and governance. Kaplan and Strömberg (2009) underline how debt obligations impose financial discipline, managerial incentives are realigned with shareholder value creation, and active ownership ensures closer monitoring of performance. However, not all consequences are uniformly positive. Appelbaum and Batt (2014), drawing on detailed case evidence, stress the risks associated with labor outcomes, including wage suppression, job cuts, and the uneven distribution of value between investors and employees. Such findings underscore that while PE ownership may foster efficiency and profitability, it can also shift risks and costs onto certain stakeholders, particularly workers.

When narrowing the focus to consumer-packaged goods (CPG) and food and nutrition (F&N) firms, sector-specific factors shape how private equity strategies play out. One reason for the attractiveness of these firms is their recurring and relatively predictable revenue streams, which make them well-suited for leveraged capital structures. Compared to cyclical or capital-intensive sectors, F&N companies' stable cash flows provide greater capacity to service debt, a fact emphasized in earlier LBO literature (Kaplan & Strömberg, 2009). At the same time, cost-cutting strategies became a defining feature of PE involvement in large CPG firms during the 2010s. Notably, the adoption of "zero-based budgeting" (ZBB) programs, which require managers to justify expenses from scratch each year, was promoted as a way to enhance efficiency and lift margins. Reports from Fortune (2019) and BCG (2019) highlight that while these measures successfully improved short-term profitability, they often came at the expense of brand investment, marketing, and innovation pipelines. For companies in the F&N space—where brand equity and consumer trust are critical—this trade-off can undermine long-term competitiveness.

In addition to operational and strategic concerns, the sector faces significant external risks from price and commodity volatility. Food companies remain highly exposed to fluctuations in agricultural input costs such as grain, dairy, and edible oils. For example, the Food and Agriculture Organization's (FAO) Food Price Index reported a sharp 30.8% year-on-year increase by April 2021 (FAO/AMIS, 2021), highlighting the sensitivity of margins to global market conditions. These dynamics are particularly relevant under leveraged ownership, where tight debt covenants leave less room to absorb shocks, raising the risk of distressed exits or constrained investment during downturns. Finally, demand-side shifts further complicate the picture. Since the late 2010s, consumer preferences have increasingly been shaped by health consciousness and sustainability concerns. Plant-based alternatives, functional nutrition, and organic products gained significant traction, with Euromonitor (2021) reporting that health-driven motives were a primary factor in consumer purchasing decisions globally. For PE-backed food companies, these shifts present both risks and opportunities: firms that underinvest in innovation or ignore ESG alignment risk value erosion, while those that adapt to evolving consumer priorities can strengthen long-term brand value and exit prospects.

Together, this evidence suggests that while private equity ownership in the food and nutrition sector benefits from the stability of recurring revenues, its success is contingent on balancing financial discipline with sustained investment in brand equity, innovation, and adaptability to consumer and commodity market dynamics.

III.METHODOLOGY

The methodology for this research adopts a qualitative and structured approach that integrates a comprehensive literature review, SWOT analysis, and comparative analysis to evaluate exit strategies and their long-term value implications within the food and nutrition industry. The literature review forms the foundation of the study by systematically synthesizing insights from academic research, working papers, and industry reports, with a focus on private equity exits, leveraged buyouts (LBOs), and their sector-specific outcomes. Sources such as Kaplan & Strömberg (2009), Davis et al. (2014), and Dong (2020), alongside case-driven evidence from Bain & Company, Moody's, and Euromonitor, provide a robust empirical and theoretical base for understanding how exit mechanisms shape post-exit performance in terms of governance, capital structure, and market adaptation. Building on this, a SWOT analysis is conducted to critically assess the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats inherent in applying private equity strategies to the food and nutrition sector. For instance, stable consumer demand and brand resilience are identified as strengths supporting high leverage capacity, while risks such as commodity price volatility and underinvestment in innovation emerge as weaknesses and threats. Opportunities related to ESG-driven growth and health-conscious consumer trends are highlighted as strategic avenues for long-term value creation. In parallel, a comparative analysis evaluates the relative advantages and limitations of different exit routes—trade sales, IPOs, secondary buyouts, recapitalizations, and SPACs—linking each to long-term performance outcomes such as financial resilience, operational efficiency, and stakeholder alignment. This triangulated methodological design ensures a balanced perspective, allowing the study not only to draw from theoretical and empirical insights but also to contextualize them within industry-specific realities. Ultimately, this approach provides a nuanced understanding of how exit strategies influence long-term value creation, sustainability, and competitiveness in the food and nutrition industry.

IV.SWOT ANALYSIS OF LBOS IN THE FOOD AND NUTRITION INDUSTRY

Category	Analysis	Key References
Strengths	• Stable demand & brand resilience: Food and nutrition companies operate in a non-cyclical sector where consumption remains steady even during downturns, enabling higher leverage and predictable deleveraging. Well-known brands provide pricing power and consumer loyalty.• Operational discipline & efficiency gains: Private equity (PE) sponsors apply financial and operational toolkits, including zero-based budgeting (ZBB), SG&A rationalization, and working capital optimization, which expand EBITDA margins quickly.• Strategic portfolio focus: LBOs often lead to carve-outs and divestitures of non-core brands or SKUs, allowing sharper investment in high-growth or premium categories such as organic, plant-based, or functional nutrition products.	Kaplan & Strömberg (2009); BCG (2019); Fortune (2019)
Weaknesses	• High leverage risk: Significant debt loads create vulnerability to commodity price spikes and retailer bargaining power. This makes firms more exposed to macroeconomic shocks, particularly when debt covenants are tight.• Innovation underinvestment: A focus on cost-cutting often crowds out R&D spending and brand marketing, eroding long-term competitiveness in health-driven and sustainability-conscious segments.• Labor relations and reputational risks: Restructurings linked to LBOs frequently involve layoffs, plant closures, or wage pressures, creating reputational challenges and strained employee relations.	FAO/AMIS (2021); Appelbaum & Batt (2014); Fortune (2019)
Opportunities	• Health & wellness trends: Rising demand for "better-for-you" products (plant-based, functional, low-sugar, sustainable foods) creates strong thematic buyout opportunities and potential for bolt-on acquisitions.• ESG-driven value creation: Integration of environmental, social, and governance (ESG) strategies—including sustainable packaging, waste reduction, and nutrition goals—enhances firm value and attractiveness to acquirers and IPO investors.• Pipeline of carve-outs: Global conglomerates are increasingly divesting non-core assets, offering PE sponsors a steady flow of targets that can be repositioned with focused 100-day value-creation plans.	Euromonitor (2021); ERM (2020); Kaplan & Strömberg (2009)
Threats	• Commodity price volatility: Input cost shocks (grains, dairy, proteins) compress margins and can push leveraged firms into covenant breaches, triggering distressed exits.• Retailer consolidation: Increasing dominance of large retail chains reduces the bargaining power of mid-sized food brands, pressuring pricing and promotional strategies.• Execution risks of ZBB: Overly aggressive cost-cutting via ZBB can harm innovation pipelines, weaken brand equity, and reduce long-term consumer engagement.• Regulatory & ESG compliance pressures: Evolving food safety, labeling, and sustainability requirements add compliance costs and may limit flexibility in exit strategies.	FAO/AMIS (2021); Fortune (2019 – Kraft Heinz case); Appelbaum & Batt (2014)

Interpretation:
The SWOT reveals that while LBOs in the F&N sector benefit from resilient demand, brand strength, and cost-efficiency opportunities, they are also highly exposed to risks of over-leverage, commodity shocks, and

reputational challenges. The strongest opportunities lie in aligning strategies with consumer health trends and ESG imperatives, while the greatest threats stem from external market volatility and overly aggressive short-termism.

V.PRE- AND POST-RESTRUCTURING COMPARISONS EVIDENCE FROM NOTABLE F&N LBOs

Case A: Kraft Heinz (Heinz buyout 2013; Kraft–Heinz merger 2015, sponsor influence via 3G Capital)

- Pre-: Large, mature brand portfolio; early post-merger margins lifted through ZBB and SG&A cuts (2015–2017). Investor communications emphasized ZBB delivered "efficiency" and margin gains.
- Post-: By 2019, \$15.4bn in brand impairments; analysts tied stalled innovation and eroding brand power to over-emphasis on cost cutting; stock drawdown followed (2019).
- Comparison takeaway: Short-run margin expansion vs. medium-run brand equity pressure when ZBB crowds out growth investment (2015–2019).

Case B: Atkins Nutritionals (2003 LBO; 2005 Chapter 11)

- Pre-: High growth during low-carb diet boom; strong brand pull.
- Post-: Overleverage + demand normalization → bankruptcy (2005); obtained \$25m DIP financing to operate (2005).
- Comparison takeaway: Category fad risk + leverage can be destabilizing when growth reverts.

Case C: Post Holdings (serial leveraged deals, 2013–2019)

- Pre-: Legacy cereal-heavy portfolio with moderate growth.
- Post-: Active buy-and-build into active nutrition/foodservice; 2018–2019 reports show net leverage reduced from 5.7× → 5.4× → 4.8× after portfolio moves (8th Avenue JV, IPO proceeds), indicating capacity to de-risk even with dealmaking.
- Comparison takeaway: Serial acquirers can manage leverage down via asset rotation and equity monetization, but headline leverage remained elevated vs. staples peers.

Case D: Hostess Brands (assets acquired 2013 by Apollo & Metropoulos; public via SPAC 2016)

- Pre-: Second bankruptcy (2012), heavy legacy costs/footprint.
- Post-: New owners invested in automation, redesigned distribution, extended shelf life; business returned to public markets within three years.
- Comparison takeaway: Operational reinvention + focused capex can restore economics when the entry price is distressed and cost structure is reset (albeit with labor-relations controversy).

Case studies provide valuable insights into the consequences of LBOs in the food and nutrition industry. The following table summarizes pre- and post-restructuring outcomes of selected cases.

Company	Pre-LBO/Acquisition	Post-LBO/Restructuring
Kraft Heinz (2015)	Strong brands, consistent R&D, steady revenue growth.	Margins improved via cost-cutting, but brand equity declined and \$15.4bn impairment followed (Forbes, 2019).
Atkins Nutritionals (2003)	High growth due to low-carb trend.	Overleveraged; bankruptcy by 2005 as demand collapsed (WSJ, 2005).
Post Holdings (2010s)	Focused on cereals, moderate growth.	Diversified into protein snacks, revenues up, but debt >6x EBITDA (Moody's, 2018).
Hostess Brands (2013)	Bankruptcy and operational inefficiencies.	Streamlined operations, automation, relisted via SPAC in 2016 (Fortune, 2016).

VI.PRE-RESTRUCTURING SCENARIO (2015–2017)

Prior to significant private equity interventions, the firm operated with a large and mature brand portfolio, encompassing both flagship products and numerous legacy SKUs acquired over decades. This breadth of offerings provided wide market coverage and brand recognition across multiple consumer segments but also introduced operational complexity and cost inefficiencies. Managing such a diversified portfolio required extensive coordination across supply chains, marketing channels, and production facilities, often resulting in overlapping costs, redundant SKUs, and diluted investment in high-potential products. Profit margins, while stable, reflected the legacy structures and were constrained by higher fixed costs, limited productivity optimization, and relatively slow response to changing consumer preferences.

In the immediate post-merger period (2015–2017), private equity sponsors prioritized margin enhancement and operational efficiency, employing structured tools such as zero-based budgeting (ZBB) and SG&A rationalization. ZBB required managers to justify every expense annually, creating discipline in cost allocation, eliminating redundant spending, and aligning budgets with strategic priorities. SG&A cuts targeted non-essential administrative overhead, marketing duplication, and underperforming brand support, freeing resources for higher-value activities. These measures produced early, visible improvements in EBITDA and operational margins, which were frequently highlighted in investor communications as evidence of enhanced efficiency and financial discipline.

At the same time, sponsors emphasized narratives of operational transformation to reassure investors and stakeholders. Communications stressed that ZBB and cost optimization programs were not merely financial engineering but foundational to long-term value creation. The emphasis was on demonstrating that early margin gains would provide the financial headroom necessary for strategic initiatives, such as targeted product innovation, marketing investment in growth categories, and eventual portfolio rationalization. While these initiatives improved short-term profitability, they also set the stage for more comprehensive restructuring, including potential divestment of non-core SKUs, reallocation of resources to high-margin brands, and alignment of the firm’s strategic positioning with emerging consumer trends such as health, wellness, and sustainability.

Overall, the pre-restructuring phase established the baseline operational and financial profile of the company: a historically strong but complex portfolio with latent efficiency potential, where early cost discipline delivered measurable margin improvement and laid the groundwork for subsequent restructuring efforts and long-term strategic value creation.

VII.POST-RESTRUCTURING SCENARIO (2018–2021)

Following the initial operational improvements achieved through zero-based budgeting (ZBB) and SG&A rationalization, the company entered a more strategic phase of post-restructuring transformation between 2018 and 2021. During this period, private equity sponsors shifted their focus from short-term margin gains to long-term value creation, leveraging both portfolio rationalization and targeted growth initiatives. Non-core or underperforming SKUs were divested or discontinued, allowing management to concentrate investment on high-margin, high-potential brands, including emerging categories aligned with health and wellness trends, such as plant-based, low-sugar, and functional nutrition products. These strategic realignments not only improved profitability but also strengthened the firm’s market positioning and brand equity, making it more attractive for eventual exit through trade sales or IPO channels.

Operationally, post-restructuring efforts emphasized innovation, R&D, and marketing investment, reversing some of the short-term underinvestment that had occurred during the early cost-cutting phase. Dedicated resources were allocated to product development, packaging sustainability, and consumer engagement initiatives, which enhanced brand differentiation and responsiveness to shifting consumer preferences. Supply chain and production efficiencies continued to be optimized, but with a balanced approach that avoided undermining quality or innovation capabilities. The firm also implemented enhanced ESG frameworks, including waste reduction, energy efficiency programs, and nutrition-focused product labeling, in response to increasing regulatory requirements and investor emphasis on sustainable business practices.

Financially, the post-restructuring period demonstrated sustainable EBITDA growth and improved cash flow predictability, with lower volatility relative to pre-restructuring performance. Debt servicing remained

disciplined, and the firm achieved a stronger balance between leverage efficiency and operational resilience, reducing exposure to commodity price shocks and retailer bargaining pressures. The combination of strategic portfolio focus, renewed innovation investment, and ESG alignment positioned the company for successful exit scenarios, whether via trade sale to a strategic acquirer, secondary buyout, or potential public offering.
Overall, the post-restructuring phase reflects a transition from operational stabilization to strategic growth and long-term value creation, demonstrating how targeted PE interventions can transform a mature, complex food and nutrition business into a more focused, efficient, and innovation-driven enterprise.

VIII.Table: Pre- vs Post-Restructuring Comparison in Food & Nutrition LBO

Dimension	Pre-Restructuring (2015–2017)	Post-Restructuring (2018–2021)
Portfolio	Large, mature brand portfolio with multiple legacy SKUs; broad market coverage but operational complexity and overlap.	Streamlined portfolio; divestment of non-core SKUs; focus on high-margin, growth-oriented brands, including plant-based and functional nutrition.
Operational Strategy	Early cost-cutting via ZBB and SG&A rationalization; emphasis on efficiency and margin improvement; working capital and supply chain optimization.	Balanced approach combining ongoing operational efficiency with renewed investment in R&D, marketing, and innovation; strategic supply chain optimization to preserve quality and flexibility.
Financial Performance	Early margin gains driven primarily by cost reductions; EBITDA improved but investment in growth limited; debt service manageable but sensitive to input shocks.	Sustainable EBITDA growth supported by strategic brand focus and operational discipline; improved cash flow predictability; debt leveraged efficiently with reduced vulnerability to commodity price spikes.
Innovation & R&D	Underinvestment due to focus on short-term margin improvements; limited new product launches.	Increased investment in product development and innovation; brand differentiation strengthened through health- and sustainability-focused offerings.
ESG & Sustainability	Minimal formal ESG programs; focus primarily on operational efficiency and cost reduction.	ESG initiatives integrated into strategy: sustainable packaging, energy efficiency, waste reduction, nutrition labeling; aligns with investor and consumer expectations.
Stakeholder Relations	Labor reallocation and efficiency programs led to workforce adjustments; potential reputational and employee morale risks.	More balanced stakeholder management; workforce stability improved, cultural alignment emphasized; consumer engagement enhanced through health- and sustainability-driven products.
Strategic Positioning	Short-term financial focus; preparing for eventual exit but primarily through early margin improvement narratives.	Long-term value creation prioritized; enhanced market positioning, brand equity, and innovation capability improve attractiveness for exit via trade sale, secondary buyout, or IPO.

Interpretation: The comparison shows a clear evolution from operational stabilization and short-term margin focus in the pre-restructuring phase to strategic growth, innovation, and long-term value creation in the post-restructuring phase. Cost efficiency remains a foundation, but post-restructuring initiatives emphasize brand, product innovation, ESG alignment, and resilience against market volatility—critical factors for successful exit strategies.

IX.STATEMENT AND DECLARATION

The reviewed literature and case studies highlight the dual outcomes of LBOs in the food and nutrition industry. On one hand, private equity-led restructuring often improves operational efficiency and financial performance. On the other, aggressive cost-cutting and high leverage may undermine brand equity, innovation, and long-term growth potential. Industry-specific risks such as commodity volatility and shifting consumer preferences further complicate restructuring outcomes. The evidence suggests that future LBO strategies must balance financial engineering with sustainable business practices, particularly given increasing emphasis on ESG factors.

X.CONCLUSION

LBOs IN THE FOOD AND NUTRITION INDUSTRY REPRESENT BOTH OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES. WHILE PREDICTABLE CASH FLOWS AND STRONG BRANDS MAKE THE SECTOR ATTRACTIVE TO PRIVATE EQUITY, THE RISKS OF OVERLEVERAGING AND UNDER-INVESTMENT IN INNOVATION REMAIN SIGNIFICANT. CASE STUDIES SUCH AS KRAFT HEINZ AND ATKINS NUTRITIONALS DEMONSTRATE THE DANGERS OF EXCESSIVE FINANCIAL ENGINEERING, WHILE POST HOLDINGS AND HOSTESS BRANDS ILLUSTRATE POTENTIAL PATHWAYS TO VALUE CREATION. FUTURE RESEARCH SHOULD FOCUS ON ESG-INTEGRATED LBO MODELS TO ALIGN FINANCIAL RESTRUCTURING WITH SUSTAINABLE NUTRITION AND CONSUMER HEALTH OUTCOMES.

REFERENCES

1. Andrade, G., & Kaplan, S. N. (1998). How costly is financial (not economic) distress? Evidence from highly leveraged transactions. Review of Financial Studies, 12(1), 43–80.
2. Appelbaum, E., & Batt, R. (2014). Private equity at work: When Wall Street manages Main Street. Russell Sage Foundation.
3. BCG. (2020). The future of healthy food: How consumer preferences are reshaping the industry. Boston Consulting Group.
4. Davis, S. J., Haltiwanger, J., Jarmin, R. S., Lerner, J., & Miranda, J. (2014). Private equity, jobs, and productivity. American Economic Review, 104(12), 3956–3990.
5. Davis, S. J., Haltiwanger, J., Handley, K., Jarmin, R. S., Lerner, J., & Miranda, J. (2020). The economic effects of private equity buyouts. NBER Working Paper No. 26371.
6. Euromonitor International. (2021). Plant-based eating and the future of nutrition.
7. ERM. (2020). Private equity and ESG: Managing risks and opportunities.
8. FAO. (2021). The state of agricultural commodity markets 2021. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.
9. Forbes. (2019). The rise and struggles of Kraft Heinz.
10. Fortune. (2016). Hostess relisted: From bankruptcy to Wall Street.
11. IMF. (2021). World Economic Outlook: Recovery during a pandemic.
12. Jensen, M. C. (1989). The eclipse of the public corporation. Harvard Business Review, 67(5), 61–74.
13. Kaplan, S. N., & Strömberg, P. (2009). Leveraged buyouts and private equity. Journal of Economic Perspectives, 23(1), 121–146.
14. McKinsey & Company. (2019). Private equity and consumer packaged goods: Creating long-term value.
15. Moody's. (2018). Post Holdings credit rating report.
16. PwC. (2021). Global M&A industry trends in consumer markets.
17. The Wall Street Journal. (2005). Atkins Nutritionals files for bankruptcy protection.
18. U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC). (2020). Private equity and leveraged lending: Regulatory perspectives.