

1 Healthiness of Foods and Beverages in Outdoor Advertisements in Xela, Guatemala: A
2 Commercial Determinants of Health Interpretation

3
4 Yulia E. Chuvileva¹, Aiken Chew², Omni Cassidy³, Sophía Dávila⁴, Arie Manangan⁵, George
5 Rutherford⁶, Joaquin Barnoya⁷, and Brigette Ulin¹

6
7 *Author Affiliations:* ¹Division of Adolescent and School Health (DASH), National Center for
8 Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion (NCCDPHP), Centers for Disease Control
9 and Prevention (CDC). ²Universidad del Valle de Guatemala, Guatemala City, Guatemala.

10 ³Department of Population Health, NYU Grossman School of Medicine, New York, New York,

11 USA. ⁴Independent researcher. ⁵Division of Environmental Health Science and Practice
12 (DEHSP), National Center for Environmental Health (NCEH), CDC, Atlanta, Georgia, USA.

13 ⁶University of California San Francisco (UCSF), San Francisco, California, USA. ⁷Unidad de
14 Cirugía Cardiovascular de Guatemala and Universidad Rafael Landivar, Guatemala City,
15 Guatemala.

16
17 *Disclaimer:* The findings and conclusions in this report are those of the author(s) and do not
18 necessarily represent the official position of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

Abstract

This study measured the spatial exposure to outdoor advertising of foods and beverages (and their healthiness) in central Xela, a Western Guatemalan city that is home to 181,000 people, 65% of whom are indigenous. We geotagged outdoor advertisements (ads) for foods and beverages in a square mile of Xela, coding for the modality of the advertisement, the types of items marketed, and their healthiness: “most healthy,” “middle healthy,” or “least healthy.” We observed 92 commercial-grade outdoor food and beverage ads across eight modalities, with vehicles (52%, 48/92), branded storefronts (25%, 23/92), and bus stops (13%, 12/92) the most prevalent. While all kinds of food and beverage businesses promoted their products on vehicles, branded storefronts were a modality almost exclusively used by soda companies, while bus stops were disproportionately used by fast food restaurants. We also identified 21 home-based ads, 86% (18/21) of which denoted households selling items they produce or make. Commercial-grade ads promoted largely least healthy foods and beverages, while home-based ads largely exposed people to most and middle healthy items. We interpret the results through the Commercial Determinants of Health Framework.

Keywords: Outdoor food advertising, food advertising, retail food environment, Commercial Determinants of Health, Guatemala

39 **Introduction**

40

41 ***Commercial Determinants of Health***

42 Globally, poor diets are responsible for more deaths than any other health risk factor (including
43 smoking), and improvements in unhealthy food and beverage consumption could prevent one in
44 five mortalities around the world [1]. The retail food environments that people rely on to buy
45 foods and drinks is one of five major social determinants of health [2]. Commerce, in turn, drives
46 food and beverage availability, pricing, and marketing.

47 The commercial determinants of health (CDoH) framework considers both positive and negative
48 impacts of commerce (e.g., business activities, products) on health, based on whether the
49 involved goods and practices are health promoting or health damaging [3]. CDoH scholars also
50 monitor businesses' political activities, especially in the food and beverage sector [4], to track
51 commercial influences on policy, policy gaps, and the intersections between commercial,
52 political, and social determinants of health [5, 6].

53 ***Outdoor Advertising of Foods and Beverages***

54 Marketing is a key commercial activity within CDoH. Advertisements (ads) drive purchasing
55 and consumption behaviors by priming people with cues to consume specific goods or brands
56 [7]. Different forms and levels of exposure to advertising have been shown to directly affect
57 individuals' food attitudes and food purchasing and lead to greater consumption of advertised
58 foods and overall calories, particularly by children [8].

59 Reliable estimates of food and beverage sector marketing expenditures and which groups it
60 reaches in non-higher-income countries are rare. Higher-income country data, thus, provides a
61 useful comparison. In the U.S., for example, food, beverage, and restaurant companies spend
62 U.S. \$14 billion per year on advertising (averaging over \$42 per person), 80% of which promotes
63 unhealthy items [9]. Food companies have been found to advertise more frequently using
64 specific media in lower-income and middle-income countries than in higher-income ones [10],
65 indicating that the food and beverage industry could be spending similar or higher *per capita*
66 amounts in other countries as in the U.S. Meanwhile, a 2021 review concluded that “children
67 from minority and socio-economically disadvantaged backgrounds are disproportionately
68 exposed to unhealthy food advertising” [11], a result based on available research on the topic,
69 which has, to date, only been done in higher-incomes countries of Australia, England, New
70 Zealand, and the U.S. This evidence suggests that people in different countries and from
71 different groups within countries experience differential levels of exposure to unhealthy food and
72 beverage marketing.

73 Compared with advertising research on viewing and listening platforms (e.g., film and television,
74 radio, social media), little evidence exists on the healthiness of foods and beverages advertised in
75 outdoor spaces[12]. Yet, outdoor ads are important to study because they spatially expose people
76 to marketing messaging as they go about their typical day. Indeed, studies from Ghana, South
77 Africa, and the U.S. show that outdoor food and beverage ads tend to be placed in high
78 (foot)traffic areas, such as billboards on roadways and posters at bus, metro, and train stations
79 [13-15]. In Australia, Canada, Mexico, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, and the U.S., ads for
80 unhealthy items have also been shown to disproportionately target lower income areas and

81 neighborhoods with a higher proportion of Black, Indigenous, and people of color, as well as
82 outdoor areas in and around places of study frequented by children and youths [11, 16-18].
83 Public health and applied geographical research has yielded important insights about the
84 distribution and concentration of outdoor ads across some modalities and some population sub-
85 groups in wealthy contexts. Of the 53 studies that exist, most focus on higher-income countries, a
86 single commercial-grade advertising modality (such as billboards or bus stop posters), a single
87 type of food or beverage (like soda), or a specific locational target, such as food and beverage ad
88 concentration around schools [8]. However, no studies have measured exposure to all outdoor
89 food and beverage advertising across multiple modalities in a single geographical area, and few
90 have looked at any modalities in less wealthy countries.

91 The paucity of research on outdoor food and beverage advertising as a CDoH may contribute to
92 the lack of effective policies on outdoor food marketing[19]. This leaves an actionable policy
93 gap since food and beverage industry self-regulation is often ineffective [20]. Meanwhile, a
94 substantial portion of outdoor food and beverage advertising happens in public areas that
95 governments can more easily regulate [21].

96

97 ***Case study: diet and health in Guatemala***

98 Over the last several decades, industrially produced and processed foods and beverages have
99 increasingly, but incompletely and unevenly throughout the population, replaced subsistence and
100 freshly prepared items in Guatemala [22]. The marketing and sale of food and beverage brands
101 have facilitated this nutrition transition, which is especially evident in the large and growing *per*
102 *capita* consumption of sodas and other sugar-sweetened beverages (SSBs) [23]. The nutrition

103 transition has also been facilitated by increased imports of unhealthy items following the
104 integration of Guatemala into regional and global markets through several rounds of trade
105 liberalization after the 1996 signing of the Peace Accords that officially ended the 36-year Civil
106 War [24].

107 Yet, the nutrition transition in Guatemala has not seen the accompanying epidemiological
108 transition seen in wealthier countries: from infectious diseases and malnutrition to chronic
109 diseases. Instead, the country has seen a compounding of infectious and chronic health problems
110 that disproportionately affect indigenous people. Indigenous children have a stunting prevalence
111 of 60%, compared with 36.4% among non-indigenous groups [25]. And while in 2016 the
112 national diabetes prevalence reached 7.5% [26], research around the same time in Mayan towns
113 of Lake Atitlán found 13.6% diabetes prevalence (and an additional 13.6% pre-diabetes
114 prevalence) [27]. Overall, poor diets are a risk factor for seven of the top ten causes of death in
115 Guatemala [28]: heart disease, diabetes, kidney disease, cirrhosis, stroke, stomach cancer, and
116 diarrheal diseases.

117 ***Employment, educational, and informational context of Guatemala***

118 While Guatemala is an upper-middle-income country, is Central America's largest economy, and
119 is one of the strongest economies in Latin America, its resources are vastly unevenly distributed.
120 Contrasted to the 52% of the population who lives in poverty [29], the combined wealth of the
121 country's 260 millionaires amounts to 56% of the country's GDP [30]. A substantial portion of
122 the individual and corporate wealth has been amassed through the production, distribution,
123 marketing, and sale of industrial foods and beverages.

124 Outdoor food and beverage advertisements likely play a large CDoH role in Guatemala due to
125 the country's employment, linguistic, and technological context. At the national level, 65% of
126 the population's work is unregulated, including farming and small-scale indoor and outdoor
127 retail; a third of the population is employed (largely outdoors) in agriculture; and a fifth of the
128 population does not read or write [31-33]. When it comes to communication, Guatemalans speak
129 24 different languages, with multiple sub-variations of Mayan languages. While 79% use cell
130 phones, only 45% use computers, and 54% use the internet, with only half the population on
131 social media [34]. As a result, physical forms of advertising on billboards, posters, and signs,
132 especially outdoors, likely remain one of the more reliable ways that advertisers can reach many
133 Guatemalan consumers (with television and radio among the other important modalities).

134 Outdoor advertising may be especially important for reaching indigenous and peasant
135 communities within Guatemala who are over-represented in outdoor, unregulated work [31], but
136 under-represented in internet and digital media usage [35]. These inequities stem partly from
137 ongoing legacies of historic racism, discrimination, and marginalization of Guatemala's
138 indigenous and peasant people, including a brutal 1980s genocide against indigenous civilians
139 [36].

140 This context makes the indigenous-majority city of Xela [shey-lah], Guatemala, an important
141 case study. [Xela is the widely used shorthand for Xelajú [shey-lah-who], the pre-conquest Maya
142 K'iche' name for the city administratively named Quetzaltenango. We follow others [37] in
143 using the term Xela (instead of Quetzaltenango) to center Guatemalan people's lived experiences
144 in our writing]. Xela is an important case study because it is an exemplar of many parts of the
145 world where outdoor advertising on physical billboards, posters, and signs remain important
146 commercial strategies. That is, contexts where large proportions of the population: 1) rarely

147 access social media due to cost, literacy, or language barriers; 2) travel by public transport; and
148 3) work, especially informally, outdoors in agriculture or in ambulatory retail. Xela is thus
149 worthy of study as an important commercial center in Western Guatemala that is home to
150 181,000 people, 65% of whom are Mayan [38]. The city also draws workers and visitors from
151 the more than 600,000 residents of the department of Quetzaltenango, where 83.5% of the
152 population is informally employed and where 95% of commercial businesses focus their
153 activities on urban areas, especially the city of Xela [39].

154 Since the CDoH framework and available research evidence shows outdoor food and beverage
155 advertising to be a commercial activity that shapes environments and influences health behaviors
156 and outcomes, our study of Xela, Guatemala aimed to answer the following research questions:

- 157 1. What is the total exposure to outdoor food and beverage advertisements in central Xela?
- 158 2. What modalities of outdoor food and beverage advertisements exist in Xela?
- 159 3. Which entities, businesses, and brands advertise through outdoor modalities in Xela?
- 160 4. What is the healthiness of the items advertised outdoors in Xela?

161

162 **Materials and Methods**

163 The GIS mapping reported in this paper was one part of a larger, year-long, embedded,
164 ethnographic study that also entailed participant observation and over 120 in-depth interviews
165 with Xela's consumers, farmers, food retailers, and non-profit and government representatives
166 working to improve the city's food system. The present paper builds on our accompanying
167 publication detailing Xela's retail food environment [40].

168 In late summer 2017, starting with Xela’s Central Park, which anchors a busy residential,
169 commercial, and leisure center of the city, adjacent streets were surveyed on foot in an area of
170 1.702 km². GPS Kit (Garafa, LLC, Provo, UT) was used to geotag all forms of food and
171 beverage retail and advertising visible from the streets during the mapping periods over several
172 days. Every business, home, street-based advertising structure, and passing vehicle were
173 examined for food and beverage retail or advertising content. This excluded *in-store* point of sale
174 promotions, such as small posters or branded stickers on the insides of store doors or on store
175 equipment, that were visible when passing them by. Such in-store promotions were ubiquitous
176 across the 377 brick-and-mortar retailers and across a portion of the 175 outdoor vendors who
177 had a semi-permanent stall structure that our larger, geographical retail food environment study
178 reported in Xela [40]. The discussion outlines the implications of this methodological decision.
179 While vehicle-based promotions were added as data points, vehicle identifiers were not
180 collected. While the largest and busiest thoroughfares were all captured in the dataset, along with
181 many of the smaller roads, time and resource constraints prevented every single one of the
182 smallest residential streets and cul-de-sacs from being mapped.

183 Foods and drinks advertised outdoors were coded by: a) ad modality, using some categories
184 found in existing literature (e.g., billboard, bus stop, poster) and adding new ones that had not
185 been reported before (i.e., vehicle-based, large signs, hanging signs, and in-person promotions;
186 and b) the food or beverage items being advertised and/or the brand. All data points were
187 additionally coded for two types of advertisements that emerged from the data: 1) commercial-
188 based ads, defined as professionally designed and printed logos, images, and messaging on paid-
189 for outdoor media, like billboards and bus stops; or 2) home-based ads of hand-written or printed

190 signs hung in residential windows or on the outsides of doors to advertise items for sale in
191 homes.

192

193 To assess the healthiness of the food and beverage advertisements in a culturally responsive way,
194 we followed the expert rater methodology detailed in our accompanying manuscript [40]. Four
195 raters determined the advertised items' healthiness drawing on our database of 174 food and
196 drink items commonly available for sale in Xela. The 174-item list was generated by analyzing
197 data we collected on the consumable items available for sale from central Xela's indoor and
198 outdoor food retailers we surveyed as part of the larger study of the city's food environment [40].
199 While the list is not exhaustive, it represents the most common food categories available for sale
200 in the city, such as egg, bean, and tortilla meals, soups, burger meals, pastas, pupusas, ice-
201 creams, juices, chips, etc. The raters are experts on Guatemala's food systems and health,
202 including a U.S.-based food anthropologist with a 12-year track record of working in Guatemala
203 and three in-country Guatemalan researchers: an anthropologist of food, a nutritionist, and a
204 physician.

205 To assess healthiness, the raters first followed prior food retailer healthiness research in
206 Guatemala to code all items either as healthy or unhealthy [41]. However, the raters were unable
207 to complete the task because the foods and drinks sold in Xela did not fit a healthy/unhealthy
208 binary. They then attempted to code the data with a more expansive, three-point relative scale of
209 least, middle, or most healthy, but found it difficult to apply to all 174 items in a single list since
210 many of the foods and drinks are functionally inequivalent. For example, it was difficult to
211 compare the healthiness of raw chicken destined for meal preparation with a freshly-prepared
212 horchata, which are items that people consume under different circumstances and rarely attempt

213 to choose between. To overcome the challenges, the items were separated into two functional
214 categories: 1) “ready-to-consume” (pertaining to the grazing environment) with several sub-
215 categories (snacks, desserts, drinks, meals [breakfasts, lunches, and dinners], and meal
216 accompaniments [e.g., tortillas]) and 2) ingredients (pertaining to the grocery environment),
217 which are items people purchase for preparing meals at home [42]. Each functional category
218 included various variations of available foods or beverages sold in Xela, e.g., the category of
219 desserts included four types of frozen treats, branded industrially produced ice-cream, artisanal
220 ice-cream, chocolate-covered frozen fruit (like *chocobananos*), and frozen yogurts. The four
221 raters then independently rated each of the 174 foods and drinks on a three-point scale of “least,”
222 “middle,” or “most” healthy within their functional categories and sub-categories (see Appendix
223 A), finding the approach feasible due to its contextual relevance (i.e., being based on locally-
224 available food options) and basis in real-world dietary behavior (i.e., how people make food
225 decisions). The advantages of this methodological innovation are discussed in detail in our
226 accompanying manuscript [40]. Each food item’s healthiness rating was then decided by full or
227 majority agreement or resolved by discussion. Most food items (85%, 148/174) received
228 agreement either from all four (53%, 93/174) or three of the four (32%, 55/174) raters, validating
229 the measure as a strong fit for the task. Outdoor ads were then rated for healthiness depending on
230 the foods or beverages they promoted.

231

232 **Results**

233 This study found central Xela’s total geographical exposure to outdoor food and beverage ads to
234 be 113 in an area of 1.702 km². A high concentration of ads was located on the main northeastern

235 road into the city from the Pan-American Highway (Figure 1). The busy thoroughfare is a main
236 route for much of the public (buses and microbuses) and private transport through the city.

237 **Figure 1: Distribution of Food and Beverage Advertisements in Xela**

238 [INSERT FIGURE 1]

239 **Figure 1 Caption:** A total of 113 outdoor ads were found in the mapped area of central Xela (1.702
240 km²). A high concentration of ads was located on the main northeastern road into the city from the Pan-
241 American Highway. The busy thoroughfare is a main route for much of the public and private transport
242 through the city.

243
244 One modality of home-based ads was found: printed or hand-made signs hung in residential
245 doors or windows. Eight modalities of commercial-grade ads were identified: vehicles
246 (promotional or delivery), branded storefronts, bus stop posters, billboards, large signs (printed
247 canvas banners promoting a product or brand), hanging signs (branded smaller signs), in-person
248 promotions (people dressed in branded clothing promoting brands with flyers and/or mascots),
249 and fixtures (referring to a large, branded, plastic three-dimensional pizza box perched on top of
250 a tall supporting pole).

251

252 **Commercial-grade ads**

253 Ninety-two commercial-grade outdoor advertisements in central Xela were observed across eight
254 modalities, with vehicles (52%, 48/92), branded storefronts (25%, 23/92), and bus stops (13%,
255 12/92) being the most prevalent.

256 All but one of the vehicles were delivery trucks, vans, or mopeds, with the exception being a
257 promotional vehicle dedicated to visual and audio announcements to advertise products. Almost
258 a third (29%, 14/48) of the vehicles promoted drinks, namely Coca-Cola and Pepsi soda (17%,

259 8/48), the leading national beer brand, Gallo beer (8%, 4/48), and Salvavidas bottled water (4%,
260 2/48), a Coca-Cola subsidiary. Almost a quarter (23%, 11/48) of the vehicle-based ads promoted
261 ultra-processed food (UPF) snack brands, such as Frito Lay, Cheetos, and Tortrix, the nation's
262 leading chip brand. Another quarter (23%, 11/48) promoted ingredients like Lala dairy and
263 Chimex and Perry processed meats. Nineteen percent (9/48) marketed desserts, including Sarita
264 and Pali Deli ice-cream brands and Gimesa cookies. The smallest category of vehicle-based ads
265 (6%, 3/48) was for fast-food meals at the nation's leading fast chicken brand, Pollo Campero,
266 and Western Guatemala's regional friend chicken takeout, restaurant, and grocery chain,
267 Albamar.

268 Of the 23 storefronts, 22 (96%) were branded by SSB companies, namely the soda brands Pepsi,
269 Coca-Cola, Super Cola, and Crush; the exception was Gallo beer.

270 Of the bus stop ads, 67% (8/12) were for fast-food restaurant meals, consisting of two
271 international chains, Taco Bell and Dominos, and two Guatemalan chains, Pollo Campero and
272 Albamar. The other third (4/12) of bus stop ads were for Maggi consommé packets, a Nestlé
273 brand.

274 Of the large sign, hanging sign, fixture, and billboard ads: 50% (4/8) were for fast-food
275 restaurants (Pizza Hut, Dominos, and Pollo Campero); 25% (2/8) for ice-cream brands (POPS
276 and Sarita); and 25% (2/8) for alcohol brands (Gallo and Venado).

277 In addition, there was one in-person promotion that included a mascot, uniformed staff members,
278 and women wearing *Xela traje* (Mayan clothing whose design, patterns, and colors vary by
279 community) promoting the country's leading fried chicken takeout brand, Pinulito, a cousin
280 company of Pollo Campero.

281 In terms of functional food and beverage categories, across commercial-grade ad delivery
282 modalities, 42% (39/92) of the ads were for drinks (non-alcoholic and alcoholic beverages), 17%
283 (16/92) for meals, 16% (15/92) for ingredients (grocery) items, 12% (11/92) for snacks, and 12%
284 (11/92) for desserts (Figure 2). In terms of healthiness, 83% of all commercial-grade outdoor ads
285 (76/92) exposed people to least healthy items, 11% (10/92) to middle healthy items, and 7%
286 (6/92) to most healthy items. Of the least healthy advertised foods and beverages, 89% (68/76)
287 were for highly processed items offered by global and national companies, of which 54% (37/68)
288 were sugar-sweetened and alcoholic beverages, 24% (16/68) were fast-food restaurant meals,
289 and 22% (15/68) were snacks and desserts. While two-thirds (32/48) of vehicle modality ads
290 were for least healthy items, painted storefronts and bus stops advertised exclusively least
291 healthy foods and beverages.

292 **Figure 2: Distribution of Commercial-Grade Advertisements across Functional Food and**
293 **Beverage Groups and Healthiness**

294 [INSERT FIGURE 2]

295 **Figure 2 Caption:** Across commercial-grade ad delivery modalities, 42% (39/92) of the ads were for non-
296 alcoholic and alcoholic beverages, 17% (16/92) for meals, 16% (15/92) for grocery items, 12% (11/92)
297 for snacks, and 12% (11/92) for desserts. In addition, 83% of all commercial-grade outdoor ads (76/92)
298 exposed people to least healthy items, 11% (10/92) to middle healthy items, and 7% (6/92) to most
299 healthy items.

300

301 ***Home-based ads***

302 Twenty-one home-based ads were observed. Eighty-six percent (18/21) of the signs denoted
303 households selling items they produce or make: ice cream (n=5), chocolate (n=3), *tortillas* (n=2),
304 coffee (n=2), eggs (n=2), *tamales* and *paches* (n=1), honey (n=1), maize (n=1), and *guisquiles* (a
305 native green, pear-shaped squash) (n=1). Fourteen percent (3/21) of the ads were for items being

306 sold on behalf of businesses: alcohol for the national liquor brand, Quetzalteca, (n=1), dairy for
307 the regional business of Lacteos de Patulul (n=1), and donuts on behalf of the brand, American
308 Donuts (n=1). The foods and drinks in home-based ads fell into the following functional
309 categories: desserts 43% (9/21), grocery items 29% (6/21), meal accompaniments 14% (3/21),
310 and drinks 14% (3/21). No snacks or meals were promoted in home-based ads.

311 Overall, 90% (19/21) of home-based ads promoted the sale of most or middle healthy foods and
312 beverages and 10% (2/21) of least healthy items, with most healthy items appearing in grocery,
313 meal accompaniment, and drinks categories (Figure 3). The smaller sample size of home-based
314 ads (n=21) compared to commercial-grade ads (n=92) prevents any firm conclusions to be made
315 about relative healthiness of items promoted by the two modalities. However, it is noteworthy
316 that the two home-based ads for least healthy foods were those reselling commercial brands of
317 donuts and liquor. Home-based advertisements for foods and drinks that people grew and/or
318 prepared themselves were all in the middle and most healthy categories as determined by expert
319 ratings.

320

321 **Figure 3: Distribution of Home-Based Advertisements across Functional Food and**
322 **Beverage Groups and Healthiness**

323 [INSERT FIGURE 3]

324 **Figure 3 Caption:** Home-based ads promoted desserts 43% (9/21), grocery items 29% (6/21), meal
325 accompaniments 14% (3/21), and drinks 14% (3/21). No snacks or meals were promoted in home-based
326 ads. Overall, 90% (19/21) of home-based ads promoted the sale of most or middle healthy foods and
327 beverages and 10% (2/21) of least healthy items, with most healthy items appearing in grocery, meal
328 accompaniment, and drinks categories.

329

330 **Discussion**

331 This study documented the modalities of outdoor food and beverage advertisements in central
332 Xela; whether people or brands advertise through those modalities; and the healthiness of the
333 items they promote. We identified eight modalities of commercial-grade outdoor ads, including
334 two that are unreported or under-reported in the literature: vehicle-based product promotion and
335 branded storefronts. Together, branded vehicles and storefronts accounted for almost four out of
336 five commercial-grade outdoor food and beverage ads in central Xela. Different businesses
337 dominated different modalities of outdoor ads, with soda companies over-represented in branded
338 storefronts and fast-food restaurants and consommé brands in bus stops, while all kinds of
339 global, national, and regional businesses advertised on vehicles.

340 In addition, the study identified a second, previously unreported type of advertisements: home-
341 based ads. Home-based ads were dominated not by global and national businesses, but by small-
342 scale, unregulated, non-commercial-grade retail of consumable items, although two of them did
343 resell foods and beverages on behalf of businesses. While making up a fifth of the total observed
344 food and beverage ads, home-based ads tended to be for healthier items than commercial-grade
345 ads. We interpret our findings through the CDoH framework that indicates that retailers engage
346 in both commercial and political activities to increase sales of their products and that CDoH can
347 have both negative and positive impacts on public health nutrition [43].

348

349 ***Marketing through vehicle delivery***

350 Vehicles were the largest source of exposure to commercial-grade food and beverage
351 advertisements in central Xela, accounting for more ads than all the other commercial-grade
352 modalities combined. Mobile ads were captured from delivery trucks, cars, and mopeds, and via

353 a specialized advertising vehicle. To the best of our knowledge, vehicles as ad modalities have
354 not been previously reported in public health literature that studies food and beverage
355 advertising. This is surprising since such mobile advertising has a long history, with soda
356 companies advertising through branded delivery crates since at least the 1930s [44]. Today,
357 vehicle-based advertising, aka “moving billboards”, is a popular marketing strategy that yields
358 almost 16 million Google results when searching for “publicidad movil Guatemala” (“mobile
359 advertising Guatemala) in Spanish and 83 million results when searching for “branded vehicles
360 for advertising” in English, with many pages in both languages offering vehicle branding
361 services or tips.

362 The strategy of “making your vehicle fleet work for you” may be attractive to businesses because
363 it is relatively low-cost compared to ads of a similar size, such as billboards. It also may expose
364 many more people to its content since delivery vehicles cover a lot of distance in a targeted way
365 to populations who live close to locations of product retail, and the ads are eye-catching,
366 especially for people walking past or driving through slow or standstill traffic, which is typical of
367 Xela. Mobile ads may constitute an important part of retail food environments that needs further
368 study in terms of levels and effects of exposure, as well as possible public health policy and
369 practice solutions aiming to prevent, reduce, or eliminate any negative impacts.

370

371 ***Branded storefronts***

372 An additional striking feature of the visual landscape of Xela is entire storefronts and other kinds
373 of buildings painted in brand logos and colors. In some cases, we have observed these branded
374 storefronts inundate the visual sphere of portions of neighborhoods. In the Xela sample, all but

375 one of the painted storefronts advertised soda brands. In this study, painted storefronts (mainly in
376 soda brand colors and logos) were the second largest delivery mode for commercial-grade food
377 and beverage advertising, accounting for more than a quarter of all observed ads in the category.
378 Yet, this advertising modality has been scantily reported in the literature. SSB-company
379 sponsored kiosks have been noted in Guatemala's schools [45] and Mayan communities [23], but
380 not systematically mapped in terms of exposure.

381 Painted storefronts may provide for larger levels of exposure due to both the size of the
382 advertisement relative to other marketing tactics, like posters and signs, and due to their
383 permanence, given that stores stay painted with company logos and colors for years when
384 compared to more rapidly changing bus stop and billboard ads and moving vehicles. Branded
385 storefronts provide a large point-of-sale promotion since the stores bearing the brand's colors
386 and logos sell the company's products on-site. The retailers also sell competitor sodas and other
387 beverages, so painted storefronts may act as a priming device to nudge customers to choose the
388 visible brand both at the time of buying drinks and during later purchasing decision-making.

389 The sort of visibility that painted storefronts afford in prime urban and rural locations would be
390 worth thousands of dollars per month to building owners in countries like the United States.

391 Some Guatemalan corner store owners have reported that the soda company whose brand their
392 storefronts carried provided only the materials and labor involved in painting the buildings
393 without additionally paying for ad space (personal communication with three store owners).

394 More research is needed to confirm how widespread this lack of payment is, but the strategy
395 does align with predatory practices that the UPF and SSB industry has been reported to employ
396 *vis-a-vis* corner store owners in Guatemala [46].

397

398 ***Home-based advertisements***

399 Another previously unreported feature of the food environment we identify in Xela is ads for
400 home-based sale of foods and beverages, which made up a fifth of all observed advertisements.
401 Most modalities of commercial-grade advertisements raise brand awareness that, if acted on,
402 may lead people to visit specific places to purchase foods and drinks, like fast-food restaurants,
403 or select a specific brand when, at a later time, choosing from a selection of alternatives, such as
404 in grocery stores and corner stores (*tiendas*). Home-based ads are more localized and serve the
405 purpose of indicating specific items for sale in a particular location. They have lower potential to
406 reach visitors to the city and other passersby than commercial-grade ads because they are
407 typically placed in less busy thoroughfares and are smaller in size than commercial-grade ads.
408 However, these types of less formal marketing are important to study in other locations from a
409 public health policy and practice standpoint because they may supply city residents in specific
410 neighborhoods, reaching the hyper-local community in which they are located (and possibly
411 further afield by word of mouth).

412 Home-based sale and advertising of foods, most of which people produce or prepare themselves,
413 also underscores the continued importance of individual exchange of foodstuffs in many
414 contexts. In Guatemala, a third of the population is employed in agriculture, while a much bigger
415 proportion of the population, especially indigenous women, produces food for personal
416 consumption and for sale from land they cultivate, animals they rear, and backyard patio
417 production systems they maintain. This study has served as a starting point for estimating the
418 contribution of home-based food and beverage advertising to the healthiness of retail food
419 environments where non-corporate food provision from homes, eateries, and wet markets
420 remains the norm, not an aberration [47].

421

422 ***Public Health Implications***

423 Through political activities, businesses in Guatemala have been documented to resist specific
424 health-promoting food and beverage marketing policy reforms [48], which may contribute to the
425 country's very low ranking on nutrition policy implementation [49]. This is partly due to the
426 revolving door between business leaders and political offices and the power the private sector
427 wields in Guatemalan politics [50], which makes pro-public health regulation of commerce
428 against the financial interests of the individuals and companies involved. This includes the
429 country's largest food and beverages companies and brands controlled by a handful of the
430 wealthiest oligarchic families, including Pepsi bottling facilities, Embotelladora La Mariposa,
431 and the national beer company, Gallo, both owned by the Castillo family; and the vertically-
432 integrated fresh and fast chicken brands of Pollo Campero, Pinulito, and Pollo Rey that belong to
433 Guatemala's largest (family-owned) conglomerate, Corporación Multi Inversiones (CMI) owned
434 by the Bosch-Gutiérrez family. However, the policy route to advancing public health nutrition in
435 Guatemala is not completely closed as various domestic and transnational research groups have
436 built the evidence base for introducing bills on labeling and food marketing [48]. As some note:
437 “[f]or governments to act on unhealthy food advertising in outdoor spaces or on publicly owned
438 assets, they must be equipped with the latest international evidence to support the need for policy
439 and the technical design of regulation” [51]. This study contributes to such evidence-base
440 building by measuring the total exposure to outdoor food and beverage ads in a busy area of an
441 indigenous-majority city and evaluating the healthiness of the items being advertised.

442 Our Xela findings mark a starting point for building the evidence base for types and levels of
443 exposure to outdoor food and beverage advertising. Future research in Guatemala could examine

444 effects of outdoor advertising on diet preferences, food purchasing behavior, and health
445 outcomes. It could also analyze policy options for reducing exposure to and any harmful effects
446 of outdoor food and beverage advertising, and addressing predatory relationships between store
447 owners and food and beverage industries.

448 This study also points the way to potential health-promoting actions. Practitioners could, for
449 example, consider working with store owners to paint alternative storefront murals with
450 messaging and visuals that promote public health nutrition. Public health marketers could
451 consider counter-balancing the least healthy outdoor advertising messages with regular and
452 visible promotions of more nutritious foods and drinks and the local retailers who provide them.
453 Educators may also choose to educate the Guatemalan public about their outdoor food
454 advertising environment to raise critical awareness of the kinds of messages they and their
455 children are being exposed to.

456 Finally, these findings help counteract the negative imbalance of CDoH scholarship and the
457 public health nutrition policy and practice implications arising from it. Despite calls to recognize
458 both harms and benefits of commercial activities, existing research skews heavily towards
459 negative CDoH by describing commerce's "adverse health effects" and commercial activities as
460 "drivers of ill-health" or "drivers of non-communicable diseases" [3, 6, 43]. The finding that
461 none of the home-based ads for products that people grew or prepared themselves were rated as
462 least healthy adds to the literature highlighting unregulated food and beverage enterprises as
463 nutritional bright spots that contribute healthy options to retail food environments [52, 53].

464

465 ***Strengths and Limitations***

466 Contemporary food environments promote consumption of highly processed and energy-dense
467 foods and drinks, encouraging deviation from traditional cuisines, particularly in less wealthy
468 countries [54]. Studying outdoor food and beverage advertising as a CDoH in a demographic,
469 educational, labor, and communications context like Xela's sheds light on important drivers of
470 and potential solutions to nutritional and epidemiological transitions around the world, especially
471 among indigenous people. While one line of research has documented food and beverage
472 marketing aimed at Guatemalan children [45, 55], one of this study's strength lies in being the
473 first to report on outdoor advertising of foods and beverages in an area affecting the general
474 population. While most previous outdoor advertising research has considered a single modality, a
475 single type of food or beverage, or a target location, such as schools, this paper estimated
476 exposure from all food and beverage advertising across existing modalities in a given
477 geographical space.

478 The present study's results and conclusions are limited by the relatively small sample size of
479 home-based and commercial-grade ads on the roads and streets that were mapped by a single
480 researcher across multiple days before the COVID-19 pandemic. Further studies could
481 systematically map all the streets in a given geographical area, expand the mapped area and
482 compare across areas in order to increase the sample size, and conduct the mapping in a single
483 day with multiple researchers to reduce possibility of measurement errors. Additional studies
484 could determine whether the post-pandemic context has seen an increase or decrease in exposure
485 to outdoor food and beverage advertisements of different healthiness in Xela.

486 Additionally, we did not survey all the residential streets and alleys in the mapped area. As a
487 result, we likely under-sampled home-based advertising of foods and beverages, which were
488 found more frequently on smaller residential streets and cul-de-sacs compared to commercial-

489 grade ads that were concentrated on main thoroughfares. More research is needed to better
490 estimate home-based ads' contribution to the exposure to most healthy, middle healthy, and least
491 healthy advertising people face in a given area in Guatemala and in other countries.

492 Our study did not take into account multiple in-store point of sale promotions that are visible
493 from the street when passing by as some protocols do [56]. If it had, this kind of promotion
494 would have likely counted upward of 450 additional food and beverage advertisements, most for
495 unhealthy items or brands, fourfold outnumbering the 113 ads reported by this study. Future
496 studies would need to consider whether or not to include point-of-sale promotional materials in
497 corner stores that are visible from the street as part of outdoor food and beverage advertising.

498 Finally, since our study did not collect vehicle identifiers (like license plates), it is possible that
499 some vehicles ads were double counted in our sample if the vehicles were observed more than
500 once on different roads throughout the mapping period. While this double counting would inflate
501 the number of unique vehicle-based ads in the study, it would not inflate the reported level of
502 exposure to such ads from the viewpoint of a pedestrian on the street, which is what this study
503 sought to measure. Future research would need to consider whether or not to include vehicle
504 identifiers, depending on what the studies seek to monitor.

505

506 **Conclusions**

507 Xela offers insights into some of the commercial activities contributing to the healthiness of
508 retail food environments. This study's findings widened the CDoH frame to consider unregulated
509 food retail by individuals from their homes. The results also highlighted previously unreported
510 business tactics to reach consumers through vehicle-based promotions and storefront branding in

511 a context of deep employment, literacy, digital, and health inequities faced by indigenous people,
512 especially women. The article has demonstrated that outdoor advertising is an important CDoH
513 of central Xela's retail food environment, with promotion of many least healthy items (a negative
514 commercial determinant) but also promotion of some most healthy items (a positive commercial
515 determinant). Future research and public health action might examine outdoor advertising's links
516 to diets and health outcomes, evaluate policy options for addressing predatory retail strategies,
517 and consider public health initiatives that support nutritional bright spots.

518

519 **Acknowledgements**

520 We thank the numerous in-country collaborators who were integral to the larger project that gave
521 rise to this manuscript, including but not limited to representatives of organizations belonging to
522 the El Colectivo Regional de Occidente (CORO), like Servicios Jurídicos y Sociales (SERJUS),
523 Las Hojitas, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ,) and Ministerio de
524 Agricultura, Ganadería y Alimentación (MAGA). Paper writeup was made possible by the
525 CDC's inaugural Health Equity Science Manuscript Development Fellowship (henceforth, the
526 Fellowship). We extend eternal gratitude to the fellows, UCSF faculty, and CDC staff involved
527 in the Fellowship, who asked critical questions, made useful suggestions, and provided technical
528 assistance during the conceptualization phase of the article. We are also grateful to CDC's
529 Prevention Research and Translation Branch (PRTB), especially to Brigette Ulin, Garry Lowry,
530 and the rest of the Evaluation Team, for supporting the lead author with time release to
531 participate in the Fellowship. Finally, this work benefited from critical reviews of related
532 conceptual documents and early manuscript drafts by CDC's Evelyn Twentyman, Stephanie
533 Miedema, and Stephen Onufrak.

534
535

APPENDIX A: Expert Rated Healthiness of Food and Beverage Items in the Functional Categories

Groceries	Meal Accompaniments	Meals: Breakfasts	Meals: Lunches	Meals: Dinners	Snacks	Desserts	Drinks
<i>Most Healthy</i>	<i>Most Healthy</i>	<i>Most Healthy</i>	<i>Most Healthy</i>	<i>Most Healthy</i>	<i>Most Healthy</i>	<i>Most Healthy</i>	<i>Most Healthy</i>
Corn flour	Tamalitos	Bean Sandwich	Caldo de Gallina Criolla (creole chicken soup)	Burrito Bowl	Havas (Roasted Beans)	Cut Fruit	Atoles (unsweetened)
Eggs	Tortillas	Burrito Breakfast (eggs, frijoles, etc)	Caldo de Marisco (seafood soup)	Chicken Mole	Nuts	Fruit Cocktail	Coconut Juice
Fresh fruit		Chuchitos	Caldo de Res (beef stew)	Chicken Salad	Seeds		Coffee (unsweetened)
Fresh herbs		Desayuno Tipico/Chapin	Ceviche	Chuchitos			Fresco Rosa de Jamaica (unsweetened)
Fresh meats (beef, pork, chicken)		Egg Sandwich	Chicken Pasta	Encheladas			Freshly Squeezed Orange Juice
Fresh vegetables		Eggs with Tortillas	Chicken Salad	Grilled Chicken with Potatoes			Goat Milk
Milk (cow)		Fruit with Yogurt	Guisado	Paches			Licuaados/Smoothie (unsweetened)
Milk (goat)		Eggs (any style)	Jocom	Spaghetti Bolognaise			Sparkling water
Spices		Omlette	Pepian	Steak Dinner			Tea (hot and unsweetened)
		Rice and Beans	Vegetable Soup and Salad	Sushi			Water
		Tamalitos		Tamales			
		Yogurt (Unsweetened)		Tortillas with eggs and beans			
<i>Middle Healthy</i>	<i>MiddleHealthy</i>	<i>MiddleHealthy</i>	<i>MiddleHealthy</i>	<i>MiddleHealthy</i>	<i>MiddleHealthy</i>	<i>MiddleHealthy</i>	<i>MiddleHealthy</i>
Cheese	Bread (white)	Bagel with Eggs and Bacon	Burrito	Burrito	Chicharron (Pork Rinds)	Arroz con Leche (sweetened milky rice)	Atol de Elote (sweetened)
Honey		Chicharron en Frijol	Campero Grilled Chicken Meal	Chicken Chow Mein	Soda Cookies	Candied Peanuts	Atol de Hava with Sugar
Pasta		Chicken Sandwich	Chile Relleno	Elote Loco	Shaved Ice (Savory)	Chocofruit	Atol de Masa (sweetened)
Rice		Chile Relleno	Choripan	Fried Plantain	Japanese Peanuts	Chocolates	Atol de Platano (sweetened)
Wheat flour		Empanadas	Chuchitos	Pupusas	Plantain Chips	Cookies (Fresh Baked)	Coffee (sweetened)
		Granola, Yogurt, Fruta	Churasco	Tacos de Res	Popcorn (Salted)	Dulces Tipicos - Fruit	Fresco de Tamarindo (sweetened)
		McD Desayuno Tipico	Empanadas	Tortas Mexicanas		Icecream - Artisanal	Fresco Rosa de Jamaica (sweetened)
		Yogurt (Sweetened)	Estufado de Res (beef stew)	Tostadas		Icecream - Frozen Yogurt (Chogurt)	Horchata (sweetened)
			Flautas			Caramelized Apple	Hot Chocolate (sweetened)
			Pollo Adobado (chicken with sauce)			Nuts/Seeds (candied)	Incaparina (sweetened)
			Pollo Asado (grilled chicken) with tortillas and guacamole			Popcorn (sweet)	Licuaados/Smoothie (sweetened)
			Quesadillas			Rellenitos (sweet bean-stuffed plantains)	Limonada (sweetened)
			Spinach Wrap with Chicken				Tea (hot and sweetened)
			Tortas Mexicanas				
<i>Least Healthy</i>	<i>Least Healthy</i>	<i>Least Healthy</i>	<i>Least Healthy</i>	<i>Least Healthy</i>	<i>Least Healthy</i>	<i>Least Healthy</i>	<i>Least Healthy</i>
Ham (processed meats)		Pancakes with Honey	Burger and Fries	Cheveres	Dorito Chips	Baked Cheesecake	Cerveza
Sausage (processed meats)		Sugared Cereal with Milk	Pollo Campero Fried Chicken Meal	Loaded Nachos	Pringles Chips	Buñuelos	Coke Zero
Seasoning packets		Waffles with Honey	Dobladas	McDonald's Burger with Fries	Tortrix Chips	Candy Floss (Algodones Asucarados)	Coke/Pepsi
Sugar			Garnachas de Res	Pizza Slice		Chocolate Cake	Diet Coke/Diet Pepsi
			Instant Soup Cup	Fried Chicken with Fries		Churros	Energy Drinks - Red Bull
			Longanizas			Donuts	Quetzalteca
			McDonald's Burger, Fries and Soda			Dulces Tipicos - Canitas de Leches	Sprite/SevenUp
			Pizza Hut Pizza			Frozen Yogurt (industrial)	Tampico
						Cookies (Packaged)	Cold Tea - Lipton
						Granizadas - Dulce	
						Hard Candy	
						Icecream - (industrial chain, like Sarita)	
						Lollypops	
						Pan dulce (sweet breads)	
						Tres Leches Cake	

536

537 **References**

- 538 1. Afshin A, Sur PJ, Fay KA, Cornaby L, Ferrara G, Salama JS, et al. Health effects of dietary risks in
539 195 countries: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2017. *The Lancet*.
540 2019;393(10184):1958-72. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(19)30041-8.
- 541 2. Hill-Briggs F, Adler NE, Berkowitz SA, Chin MH, Gary-Webb TL, Navas-Acien A, et al. Social
542 Determinants of Health and Diabetes: A Scientific Review. *Diabetes Care*. 2021;44(1):258-79. doi:
543 10.2337/dci20-0053.
- 544 3. Maani N, Collin J, Friel S, Gilmore AB, McCambridge J, Robertson L, Petticrew MP. Bringing the
545 commercial determinants of health out of the shadows: a review of how the commercial determinants
546 are represented in conceptual frameworks. *European Journal of Public Health*. 2020/08/01;30(4). doi:
547 10.1093/eurpub/ckz197.
- 548 4. Mialon M, Swinburn B, Sacks G. A proposed approach to systematically identify and monitor the
549 corporate political activity of the food industry with respect to public health using publicly available
550 information. *Obesity Reviews*. 2015/07/01;16(7). doi: 10.1111/obr.12289.
- 551 5. Rochford C, Tenneti N, Moodie R. Reframing the impact of business on health: the interface of
552 corporate, commercial, political and social determinants of health. *BMJ Global Health*. 2019-08-01;4(4).
553 doi: 10.1136/bmjgh-2019-001510.
- 554 6. Freudenberg N, Freudenberg N. Integrating Social, Political and Commercial Determinants of
555 Health Frameworks to Advance Public Health in the twenty-first Century. *International Journal of Social*
556 *Determinants of Health and Health Services*. 2022-09-15;53(1). doi: 10.1177/00207314221125151.
- 557 7. Boyland E, Nolan S, Kelly B, Tudur-Smith C, Jones A, Cg Halford J, Robinson E. Advertising as a
558 cue to consume: a systematic review and meta-analysis of the effects of acute exposure to unhealthy
559 food and nonalcoholic beverage advertising on intake in children and adults - PubMed. *The American*
560 *journal of clinical nutrition*. 2016 Feb;103(2). doi: 10.3945/ajcn.115.120022.
- 561 8. Boyland E, McGale L. Food marketing exposure and power and their associations with food-
562 related attitudes, beliefs and behaviours: A narrative review. Geneva: World Health Organization
563 (WHO), 2022 Contract No.: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO.
- 564 9. Harris JL, Frazier III W, Kumanyika S, Ramirez AG. Increasing disparities in unhealthy food
565 advertising targeted to Hispanic and Black youth. 2019.
- 566 10. Cassidy O, Shin HW, Song E, Jiang E, Harri R, Cano C, et al. Comparing McDonald's food
567 marketing practices on official Instagram accounts across 15 countries. *BMJ Nutrition, Prevention &*
568 *Health*. 2021;4(2). doi: 10.1136/bmjnp-2021-000229.
- 569 11. Backholer K, Gupta A, Zorbas C, Bennett R, Huse O, Chung A, et al. Differential exposure to, and
570 potential impact of, unhealthy advertising to children by socio-economic and ethnic groups: A
571 systematic review of the evidence. *Obesity Reviews*. 2021/03/01;22(3). doi: 10.1111/obr.13144.
- 572 12. Finlay A, Robinson E, Jones A, Maden M, Cerny C, Muc M, et al. A scoping review of outdoor
573 food marketing: exposure, power and impacts on eating behaviour and health. *BMC Public Health* 2022
574 22:1. 2022-07-27;22(1). doi: 10.1186/s12889-022-13784-8.
- 575 13. Bragg MA, Hardoby T, Pandit NG, Raji YR, Ogedegbe G. A content analysis of outdoor non-
576 alcoholic beverage advertisements in Ghana. *BMJ Open*. 2017-05-01;7(5). doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2016-
577 012313.
- 578 14. Moodley G, Christofides N, Norris SA, Achia T, Hofman KJ. Peer Reviewed: Obesogenic
579 Environments: Access to and Advertising of Sugar-Sweetened Beverages in Soweto, South Africa, 2013.
580 *Preventing Chronic Disease*. 2015;12. doi: 10.5888/pcd12.140559.
- 581 15. Lucan SC, Maroko AR, Sanon OC, Schechter CB, Lucan SC, Maroko AR, et al. Unhealthy Food-
582 and-Beverage Advertising in Subway Stations: Targeted Marketing, Vulnerable Groups, Dietary Intake,

- 583 and Poor Health. *Journal of Urban Health* 2017 94:2. 2017-03-07;94(2). doi: 10.1007/s11524-016-0127-
584 9.
- 585 16. Nieto C, Jáuregui A, Contreras-Manzano A, Potvin Kent M, Sacks G, White CM, et al. Adults'
586 Exposure to Unhealthy Food and Beverage Marketing: A Multi-Country Study in Australia, Canada,
587 Mexico, the United Kingdom, and the United States. *The Journal of Nutrition*.
588 06/13/2022;152(Supplement 1). doi: 10.1093/jn/nxab449.
- 589 17. Tomaino Fraser K, Ilieva RT, Johnson James C, Peter Chong V, Shapiro S, Willingham C, et al. Use
590 of environmental scan to assess density, content, and variation of predatory food and beverage
591 marketing in New York City. *Health & Place*. 2022/07/01;76. doi: 10.1016/j.healthplace.2022.102843.
- 592 18. Milan CC, Singh KR, Burac A, Janak AP, Gu Y, Bragg MA. Comparisons of Culturally Targeted Food
593 and Beverage Advertisements in Caribbean-American Neighborhood and Non-Latinx White
594 Neighborhood in New York City. *Health Equity*. 2022-02-01;6(1). doi: 10.1089/heq.2021.0039.
- 595 19. Dia OEW, Løvhaug AL, Rukundo PM, Torheim LE, Dia OEW, Løvhaug AL, et al. Mapping of
596 outdoor food and beverage advertising around primary and secondary schools in Kampala city, Uganda.
597 *BMC Public Health* 2021 21:1. 2021-04-12;21(1). doi: 10.1186/s12889-021-10661-8.
- 598 20. Chambers SA, Freeman R, Anderson AS, MacGillivray S. Reducing the volume, exposure and
599 negative impacts of advertising for foods high in fat, sugar and salt to children: A systematic review of
600 the evidence from statutory and self-regulatory actions and educational measures. *Preventive Medicine*.
601 2015;75:32-43. doi: 10.1016/j.ypmed.2015.02.011.
- 602 21. Signal LN, Stanley J, Smith M, Barr MB, Chambers TJ, Zhou J, et al. Children's everyday exposure
603 to food marketing: an objective analysis using wearable cameras. *International Journal of Behavioral
604 Nutrition and Physical Activity* 2017 14:1. 2017-10-08;14(1). doi: 10.1186/s12966-017-0570-3.
- 605 22. Bermudez OI, Hernandez L, Mazariegos M, Solomons NW, Odilia I. Bermudez LH, Manolo
606 Mazariegos, Noel W. Solomons. Secular Trends in Food Patterns of Guatemalan Consumers: New Foods
607 for Old. *Food and Nutrition Bulletin*. 2008-12-15;29(4). doi: 10.1177/156482650802900404.
- 608 23. Nagata JM, Barg FK, Valeggia CR, Bream KDW. Coca-Colonization and Hybridization of Diets
609 among the Tz'utujil Maya. *Ecology of Food and Nutrition*. 2011;50(4):297-318. doi:
610 10.1080/03670244.2011.568911.
- 611 24. Hawkes CT, Anne Marie. Implications of the Central America Dominican Republic-Free Trade
612 Agreement
613 for the nutrition transition in Central America. *Revista Panamericana de Salud Pública*. 2008;24(5):345-
614 60.
- 615 25. Mazariegos M, Kroker-Lobos MF, Ramírez-Zea M. Socio-economic and ethnic disparities of
616 malnutrition in all its forms in Guatemala | *Public Health Nutrition* | Cambridge Core. *Public Health
617 Nutrition*. 2020/08;23(S1). doi: 10.1017/S1368980019002738.
- 618 26. WHO. Diabetes Country Profiles: Guatemala. World Health Organization, 2016 05/31/2024.
619 Report No.
- 620 27. Bream KDW, Breyre A, Garcia K, Calgua E, Chuc JM, Taylor L. Diabetes prevalence in rural
621 Indigenous Guatemala: A geographic-randomized cross-sectional analysis of risk. *PLOS ONE*. Aug 9,
622 2018;13(8). doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0200434.
- 623 28. Vos T, Lim SS, Abbafati C, Abbas KM, Abbasi M, Abbasifard M, et al. Global burden of 369
624 diseases and injuries in 204 countries and territories, 1990–2019: a systematic analysis for the Global
625 Burden of Disease Study 2019. *The Lancet*. 2020/10/17;396(10258). doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30925-
626 9.
- 627 29. WB. The World Bank in Guatemala. The World Bank, 2022 Contract No.: 11/15/2022.
- 628 30. Rodas R. El capital de 260 guatemaltecos equivale al 56% del PIB. *Nómada*. 2015 04/07/2015.

- 629 31. ILO. Employment and Migration: Guatemala 2021. International Labour Organization (ILO),
630 2022.
- 631 32. UNESCO. Guatemala: UNESCO Institute for Statistics; [11/15/2022]. Available from:
632 <https://uis.unesco.org/en/country/gt>.
- 633 33. (IACHR) I-ACoHR. Situation of Human Rights in Guatemala. The Organization of American States
634 (OAS), 2017 12/31/2017. Report No.
- 635 34. Kemp S. Digital 2021: Guatemala. Data Reportal, 2021 02/11/2021. Report No.
- 636 35. Gutiérrez Valdizán A. Mapping Digital Media: Guatemala. Open Society Foundations, 2014
637 11/10/2013. Report No.
- 638 36. Caumartin C. Racism, Violence, and Inequality: An Overview of the Guatemalan Case. Centre for
639 Research on Inequality, Human Security and Ethnicity (CRISE), University of Oxford, 2005.
- 640 37. Yates-Doerr E. The Weight of Obesity: Hunger and Global Health in Postwar Guatemala.
641 Available Worldwide: University of California Press; 2015.
- 642 38. MINECO. Departamento de Quetzaltenango. Gobierno de Guatemala, 2017.
- 643 39. Diagnóstico sobre la implementación de la nueva metodología para estimar la informalidad en el
644 departamento de Quetzaltenango. Gobierno de Guatemala, Ministerio de Trabajo y Previsión Social,
645 Observatorio del Mercado Laboral, 2020.
- 646 40. Chuvileva YE, Manangan A, Chew A, Rutherford G, Barillas-Basterrechea M, Barnoya J, et al.
647 What North American retail food environment indices miss in Guatemala: Cultural considerations for the
648 study of place and health. *Applied Geography*. 2024;164. doi: 10.1016/j.apgeog.2024.103204.
- 649 41. Chew A, Moran A, Barnoya J. Peer Reviewed: Food Swamps Surrounding Schools in Three Areas
650 of Guatemala. *Preventing Chronic Disease*. 2020;17. doi: 10.5888/pcd17.200029.
- 651 42. Lucan SC, Maroko AR, Seitchik JL, Yoon D, Sperry LE, Schechter CB, et al. Sources of Foods That
652 Are Ready-to-Consume ('Grazing Environments') Versus Requiring Additional Preparation ('Grocery
653 Environments'): Implications for Food-Environment Research and Community Health. *Journal of
654 Community Health* 2018 43:5. 2018-03-14;43(5). doi: 10.1007/s10900-018-0498-9.
- 655 43. Freudenberg N, Lee K, Buse K, Collin J, Crosbie E, Friel S, et al. Defining Priorities for Action and
656 Research on the Commercial Determinants of Health: A Conceptual Review.
657 <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH2021306491>. 2021-12-08;111(12). doi: 10.2105/AJPH.2021.306491.
- 658 44. Gobé M. Let's Brandjam to Humanize Our Brands. *Design Management Review*.
659 2007/01/01;18(1). doi: 10.1111/j.1948-7169.2007.tb00074.x.
- 660 45. Godin KM, Chacón V, Barnoya J, Leatherdale ST. The school environment and sugar-sweetened
661 beverage consumption among Guatemalan adolescents | *Public Health Nutrition* | Cambridge Core.
662 *Public Health Nutrition*. 2017/11;20(16). doi: 10.1017/S1368980017001926.
- 663 46. Chew A, Mus S, Rohloff P, Barnoya J. The Relationship between Corner Stores and the Ultra-
664 processed Food and Beverage Industry in Guatemala: Stocking, Advertising, and Trust. *Journal of Hunger
665 & Environmental Nutrition*. 2022;1-16. doi: 10.1080/19320248.2021.2002748.
- 666 47. Chuvileva YE, Rissing A, King HB. From wet markets to Wal-Marts: tracing alimentary xenophobia
667 in the time of COVID-19. *Social Anthropology*. 2020/05/01;28(2). doi: 10.1111/1469-8676.12840.
- 668 48. Kroker-Lobos MF, Morales LA, Ramírez-Zea M, Vandevijvere S, Champagne B, Mialon M. Two
669 countries, similar practices: the political practices of the food industry influencing the adoption of key
670 public health nutrition policies in Guatemala and Panama | *Public Health Nutrition* | Cambridge Core.
671 *Public Health Nutrition*. 2022/11;25(11). doi: 10.1017/S1368980022001811.
- 672 49. Vandevijvere S, Swinburn B. The Healthy Food Environment Policy Index: Comparing nutrition
673 policy implementation in 10 countries. *European Journal of Public Health*. 2018/11/01;28(suppl_4). doi:
674 10.1093/eurpub/cky213.303.


- 675 50. Gustavo H. El CACIF es más influyente que los partidos en el Congreso. Plaza Pública [Internet].
676 2012 06.07.2024. Available from: [https://www.plazapublica.com.gt/content/el-cacif-es-mas-influyente-](https://www.plazapublica.com.gt/content/el-cacif-es-mas-influyente-que-los-partidos-en-el-congreso)
677 [que-los-partidos-en-el-congreso](https://www.plazapublica.com.gt/content/el-cacif-es-mas-influyente-que-los-partidos-en-el-congreso).
- 678 51. Chung A, Zorbas C, Riesenbergs D, Sartori A, Kennington K, Ananthapavan J, Backholer K. Policies
679 to restrict unhealthy food and beverage advertising in outdoor spaces and on publicly owned assets: A
680 scoping review of the literature. *Obesity Reviews*. 2022/02/01;23(2). doi: 10.1111/obr.13386.
- 681 52. Khojasteh M. Unplanned food access contribution of immigrant food entrepreneurs to
682 community wellbeing in a suburban township. *Journal of the American Planning Association*.
683 2023;89(2):210-24. doi: 10.1080/01944363.2022.2094450.
- 684 53. Ambikapathi R, Shively G, Leyna G, Mosha D, Mangara A, Patil CL, et al. Informal food
685 environment is associated with household vegetable purchase patterns and dietary intake in the DECIDE
686 study: Empirical evidence from food vendor mapping in peri-urban Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. *Global Food*
687 *Security*. 2021;28. doi: 10.1016/j.gfs.2020.100474.
- 688 54. Swinburn BA, Kraak VI, Allender S, Atkins VJ, Baker PI, Bogard JR, et al. The Global Syndemic of
689 Obesity, Undernutrition, and Climate Change: The Lancet Commission report. *The Lancet*.
690 2019/02/23;393(10173). doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(18)32822-8.
- 691 55. Letona P, Chacon V, Roberto C, Barnoya J, Letona P, Chacon V, et al. Effects of licensed
692 characters on children's taste and snack preferences in Guatemala, a low/middle income country.
693 *International Journal of Obesity* 2014 38:11. 2014-03-03;38(11). doi: 10.1038/ijo.2014.38.
- 694 56. Mackay S, Molloy J, Vandevijvere S. INFORMAS Protocol: Outdoor advertising (school
695 zones). 2016 06.07.2024. Available from:
696 [https://auckland.figshare.com/articles/journal_contribution/INFORMAS_protocol_Outdoor_advertising](https://auckland.figshare.com/articles/journal_contribution/INFORMAS_protocol_Outdoor_advertising_school_zones_/5701102/2)
697 [_school_zones_/5701102/2](https://auckland.figshare.com/articles/journal_contribution/INFORMAS_protocol_Outdoor_advertising_school_zones_/5701102/2).

698

699 **Supporting Information**

700 **Supporting File 1: Data**


Commercial-Grade Ads (n=92)



	Drinks	Desserts	Meal Accompaniments	Meals	Snacks	Grocery
■ Least Healthy	37	9	0	16	8	6
■ Middle Healthy	0	2	0	0	3	5
■ Most Healthy	2	0	0	0	0	4

Figure 2

Home-Based Ads (n=21)



	Drinks	Desserts	Meal Accompaniments	Meals	Snacks	Grocery
■ Least Healthy	1	1	0	0	0	0
■ Middle Healthy	0	8	0	0	0	1
■ Most Healthy	2	0	3	0	0	5

Figure 3




Figure 1