

# 1 **Estimating the dietary and health impact of implementing** 2 **mandatory front-of-package nutrient disclosures in the US: a** 3 **policy scenario modeling analysis**

4  
5 Nadia Flexner,<sup>1</sup> Daniel Zaltz,<sup>1</sup> Eva Greenthal,<sup>2</sup> Aviva A. Musicus,<sup>2,3</sup> Mavra Ahmed,<sup>1,4</sup> Mary R.  
6 L'Abbe<sup>1\*</sup>

7  
1<sup>1</sup>Department of Nutritional Sciences, Temerty Faculty of Medicine, University of Toronto,  
Toronto, ON, Canada.

2<sup>2</sup>Center for Science in the Public Interest, Washington, DC, USA.

3<sup>3</sup>Department of Nutrition, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Boston, MA, USA.

4<sup>4</sup>Joannah & Brian Lawson Centre for Child Nutrition, Temerty Faculty of Medicine, University of  
Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada.

\*Corresponding author

Email: [mary.labbe@utoronto.ca](mailto:mary.labbe@utoronto.ca) (MRL)

## **Abstract**

### 8 **Background**

9 Recognized as a cost-effective policy to promote healthier diets, mandatory front-of-package  
10 labeling (FOPL) identifying foods high in sodium, sugar, and saturated fat has been adopted and  
11 implemented in ten countries, and is currently under consideration in several others including  
12 the US. However, its potential impact on dietary intake and health have not yet been estimated  
13 in the US context.

### 14 **Objectives**

15 To estimate (1) the potential dietary impact of implementing mandatory nutrient-specific FOPL  
16 among US adults; and (2) the number of diet related non-communicable disease (NCD) deaths  
17 that could be averted or delayed due to estimated dietary changes.

## 18 **Methods**

19 Baseline and counterfactual dietary intakes of sodium, sugars, saturated fats, and calories were  
20 estimated among US adults (n=7,572) using both available days of 24h recall data from the  
21 2017-2020 National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES). The National Cancer  
22 Institute method was used to estimate usual intakes and distributions, adjusting for age, sex,  
23 misreporting status, weekend/weekday, and sequence of recall. To estimate counterfactual  
24 dietary intakes, we modeled reductions observed in experimental and observational studies  
25 that examined changes in sodium, sugars, saturated fat and calorie content of food and  
26 beverage purchases due to nutrient-specific 'high in' FOPL. This study used the Preventable Risk  
27 Integrated Model (PRIME) to estimate potential health impact.

## 28 **Results**

29 Estimated mean dietary reductions of 156 mg and 259 mg/day of sodium, 10.1 g and 7.2 g/day  
30 of sugars, 1.08 g and 4.49 g/day of saturated fats, and 38 kcal and 57 kcal/day of calories were  
31 observed under the two policy scenarios tested. Between 96,926 (95% UI 89,011-105,284) and  
32 137,261 (95% UI 125,534-148,719) diet related NCD deaths, primarily from cardiovascular  
33 diseases (74%), could potentially be averted or delayed by implementing mandatory nutrient-  
34 specific FOPL in the US. Overall, more lives would be saved in males than females.

## 35 **Conclusions**

36 Findings suggest that implementing mandatory nutrient-specific FOPL in the US could  
37 significantly reduce sodium and total sugar intakes among US adults, resulting in a substantial  
38 number of NCD related deaths that could be averted or delayed. Our results can inform current

- 39 food policy developments in the US regarding adoption and implementation of FOPL
- 40 regulations.

## 41 **Introduction**

42 Poor dietary health characterized by an excess intake of nutrients-of-concern (i.e., sugar,  
43 sodium, and saturated fat), as well as underconsumption of whole grains, fruits, and  
44 vegetables, is a leading cause of global morbidity and mortality[1]. A major contributor to poor  
45 dietary intake across populations is the increasing availability and consumption of highly  
46 processed foods that are energy-dense and high in nutrients-of-concern, underscoring the  
47 importance of broad public health policies targeting both consumer and corporate behavior[2].  
48 Front-of-package nutrition labeling (FOPL) on packaged foods and beverages is increasingly  
49 used as one such policy intervention to encourage healthier choices while simultaneously  
50 influencing food and beverage manufacturers to formulate healthier products[3]. FOPL  
51 provides consumers with clear and easy-to-understand nutritional information in addition to  
52 the nutrition information panels on the back or side of packages. For instance, some countries  
53 have adopted voluntary FOPL that summarize the healthfulness of products based on nutrients-  
54 of-concern and nutrients and ingredients to encourage (e.g., Nutriscore in Europe and Health  
55 Star Ratings in Australia and New Zealand). In contrast, other countries have adopted  
56 mandatory nutrient-specific FOPL policies, requiring labels on packaged, processed foods that  
57 are high in nutrients-of-concern, such as saturated fat, sugars, and sodium (e.g., ‘high in/excess’  
58 labels in the Americas region)[4, 5].

59 Evidence from experimental studies has shown promising findings from implementing nutrient-  
60 specific ‘high in’ FOPL[6, 7], which has been confirmed by early evaluations of this policy in  
61 Chile[8-13], the first country to adopt and implement a nutrient-specific ‘high in’ FOPL in  
62 2016[14]. The comprehensive Chilean Law also includes marketing restrictions and a ban on

63 sales and promotion in schools for products that exceed established thresholds for calories and  
64 nutrients-of-concern[14]. Initial evaluations of the Chilean law have shown effectiveness in  
65 changing consumer purchasing behaviors[8, 9, 13], promoting industry-driven food  
66 reformulation[10, 11], decreasing unhealthy food advertising[15], and improving diets among  
67 children and adolescents[12]. For instance, after FOPL was implemented in Chile, the  
68 proportion of foods and beverages requiring at least one ‘high in’ FOPL decreased from 51% to  
69 44%[11]. Furthermore, the policy led to a reduction in the purchase of ‘high in’ products,  
70 resulting in declines in purchased calories and nutrients-of-concern[9, 13].

71 Designing FOPL interventions requires developing evidence-based nutrient profiling models  
72 (NPMs) to categorize foods and beverages by their nutrient levels and/or ingredients, and  
73 applying established nutrient thresholds to determine which products would display a FOPL.  
74 Evidence suggests that manufacturers are motivated to reformulate products in response to  
75 these nutrient thresholds (i.e., to avoid ‘high in’ FOPL)[3, 10, 11]; therefore, a transparent  
76 process is needed when developing NPMs. A recent systematic review of NPMs developed for  
77 nutrition-related policies and regulations found that, in recent years, the proportion of NPMs  
78 that include nutrients to encourage has decreased substantially[16], which aligns with public  
79 health recommendations and best practices for developing NPMs[17]. An NPM is a key  
80 component of an effective FOPL policy. It also can be used to inform other healthy eating  
81 policies—as has been done in other countries—by identifying packaged foods and beverages  
82 that may be taxed or restricted from being advertised and promoted to children, available in  
83 schools, or included in federal food procurement[3, 16].

84 Introducing a government-led FOPL intervention in the US may be an important public health  
85 intervention to improve the population’s diet and health. The US Food and Drug Administration  
86 (FDA) committed to developing a FOPL system in 2022[18], and is currently conducting  
87 consumer research and soliciting stakeholder feedback to further this objective[19]. However,  
88 little is known about what potential diet and health impacts mandatory nutrient-specific FOPL  
89 may have on the US population. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to estimate the  
90 potential dietary impact of implementing mandatory nutrient-specific FOPL among US adults,  
91 and to estimate the number of diet related non-communicable disease (NCD) deaths that could  
92 be averted or delayed due to these dietary changes.

## 93 **Methods**

### 94 **Overview**

95 This is an NCD policy scenario modeling study which estimates potential changes in dietary  
96 intake and disease morbidity and mortality in response to FOPL in the US. Broadly, we first  
97 estimate usual dietary intake using nationally-representative intake data; then, we calculate  
98 expected changes in this usual intake in response to FOPL, using previously-published data.  
99 Finally, we use these expected changes in usual dietary intake to estimate the potential number  
100 of diet related NCD deaths that could be averted or delayed using the Preventable Risk  
101 Integrated Model (PRIME)[20].

### 102 **Dietary intake, demographic, and anthropometric data**

103 We used 24-hour recalls (24HR), demographics, and anthropometrics from the most recent  
104 publicly-available National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES) data collected

105 between 2017-2020 (pre-pandemic)[21]. NHANES is a complex, multistage, clustered survey  
106 conducted biannually, but the most recent pre-pandemic cycle (2019-2020) was truncated and  
107 therefore combined with the prior cycle (2017-2018)[21]. The survey is designed to assess the  
108 health and nutritional status of non-institutionalized children and adults in the US. For this  
109 study, we used dietary intake data, demographics (age, sex, pregnancy, breastfeeding), and  
110 anthropometrics (height and body mass index, BMI) for adults only ( $\geq 19$  y). The NHANES dietary  
111 intake data are collected through two 24HR, the first conducted in person within Mobile  
112 Examination Centers and the second, for a subsample, via telephone 3-10 days later. For this  
113 analysis we used both available 24HR.

## 114 **Study sample**

115 We excluded individuals who reported daily calories below 500 or above 8000 ( $n=221$ )[22],  
116 those younger than 19 years ( $n=4,541$ ), those pregnant or breastfeeding ( $n=77$ ), and those with  
117 body mass index (BMI) less than 18.5 ( $n=223$ ). The final analytic sample size was comprised of  
118 7,572 individuals, of whom 6,556 (86.3%) had two 24-hour recalls (**Figure 1**).

## 119 **Nutrient intakes and counterfactual scenarios**

120 We focused on nutrients that the Dietary Guidelines for Americans recommend to limit in the  
121 diet[23], are used in FOPL from other countries [4, 16], and are highlighted in the latest FOPL  
122 schemes drafted by FDA[19, 24]. We assessed usual intakes of total energy (kcal/day), sodium  
123 (mg/day), total sugars (g/day), added sugars (g/day), saturated fats (g/day), and the proportion  
124 of total energy from saturated fats (%kcal/day). We defined the baseline scenario as the  
125 observed usual intake of each of the aforementioned nutrients within our study sample. Then,

126 we obtained estimates of the effect of FOPL interventions on dietary intake based on current  
127 evidence to define two plausible population-level responses to mandatory FOPL in the United  
128 States(**Table 1**)[6, 9].

129 ***Scenario 1: based on post-policy evaluation of mandatory ‘high in’ FOPL in Chile***

130 Scenario 1 (S1) was informed by a post-policy evaluation of mandatory nutrient-specific ‘high in’  
131 FOPL in Chile. Early evaluations conducted a year after implementation examined changes in  
132 the calorie, sugar, sodium, and saturated fat content of food and beverage purchases[9].  
133 Findings from this evaluation showed statistically significant declines in overall household  
134 purchases of saturated fat (-3.9%), sodium (-4.7%), and sugars (-10.2%) in the first 18 months  
135 after the policy was implemented[9]. For our counterfactual scenario, we systematically applied  
136 these overall reductions in purchases of saturated fats, sodium and sugars to the consumption  
137 of all foods and beverages reported in NHANES (2017-2020), except for dietary supplements  
138 and alcoholic beverages, as these are not included in FOPL regulations in countries that have  
139 implemented FOPL to date. We assumed that changes in the US would be of similar magnitude  
140 to the observed decreases in purchases of products ‘high in’ nutrients-of-concern and increases  
141 in purchases of products displaying no ‘high in’ FOPL in Chile[9].

142 ***Scenario 2: based on a meta-analysis on the impact of nutrient warning FOPL***

143 Scenario 2 (S2) was informed by findings from a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials  
144 and quasi-experimental studies that investigated overall changes in the calorie, sugar, sodium,  
145 and saturated fat content of food and beverage purchases in the presence of nutrient warning  
146 FOPL [6]. Specifically, we used the results comparing nutrient warning label vs. control/no label  
147 or Nutrition Facts table. Overall changes were applied for saturated fat (-16.3%), sodium (-



148 7.8%), and sugars (-7.3%) to all foods and beverages reported in NHANES (2017-2020), except  
149 for dietary supplements and alcoholic beverages.

150 We estimated usual intake (described below) across each baseline and counterfactual scenario  
151 for the total study sample and provide in the supplemental material these results separately by  
152 Dietary Reference Intakes (DRI) age-sex groups[25]. Meaningful differences between observed  
153 intakes (baseline) and projected dietary intakes (counterfactual) were evaluated using non-  
154 overlapping 95th percentile confidence intervals of the means, similar to previous studies on  
155 dietary patterns [26, 27]. In both scenarios examined in this study, changes in calorie intake  
156 were determined by calculating the calories derived from changes in sugar and saturated fat  
157 content (i.e., counterfactual kcals = baseline kcals - (( $\Delta$ sugars (g) \* 4 kcal) + ( $\Delta$ saturated fat (g) \*  
158 9 kcal))), aiming to maintain a conservative approach in our estimations, as reported changes in  
159 calories were higher in both studies informing S1 and S2.

## 160 **Sensitivity analysis**

161 For both scenarios tested in this study, we considered changes in total sugars intake; however,  
162 given that added sugars are considered one of the nutrients-of-concern in the Dietary  
163 Guidelines for Americans, we also applied potential changes to only added sugars. We  
164 estimated potential dietary and health gains based on intakes of added sugars from NHANES  
165 2017-2020 for baseline and counterfactual scenarios (included in the supplemental materials).  
166 However, it is worth noting that the potential FOPL intervention effect for both main scenarios  
167 in this analysis was based on changes in total sugars intake; therefore, any reduction specifically  
168 in added sugars is accounted for in the main scenarios.

## 169 **Health impact modeling**

170 This study used PRIME to estimate the potential health impact (i.e., potential deaths averted or  
171 delayed) of estimated dietary intake changes (intervention effect)[20]. PRIME is a comparative  
172 risk assessment model that examines the potential impact of population-level changes in the  
173 distribution of behavioral risk factors on NCDs related mortality[20]. The model allows for the  
174 investigation of changes in behavioral dietary risk factors (i.e., energy, fruits & vegetables, fiber,  
175 salt, total fat, saturated fat, unsaturated fat and cholesterol), which can impact various health  
176 outcomes, including CVDs, cancers, diabetes, kidney disease, and liver disease (included in this  
177 study). PRIME does not include sugars as a dietary risk factor; rather, their potential effects on  
178 health outcomes are mediated through calorie reduction. Developed by researchers at the  
179 University of Oxford, the model has been widely used in different country contexts and has  
180 been endorsed by the WHO Regional Office for Europe[28]. Specifically, PRIME answers the  
181 question, “How many deaths would have occurred in the baseline year if the distribution of risk  
182 factors had been different?”[28]. Like other cross-sectional NCD scenario models, PRIME does  
183 not account for the effect of time lag between the exposure and disease outcome; therefore, it  
184 remains uncertain how long after the change in risk factor exposure the estimated health  
185 benefits would occur. The strengths and limitations of PRIME have been previously described in  
186 detail[20].

187 Model inputs included age- and sex-specific data from the US, including: 1) the number of  
188 people in the population (2019)[29]; 2) the number of diet related NCD deaths relevant to the  
189 study (2019)[30]; 3) baseline calorie and nutrients-of-concern dietary intake (2017-2020)[21]; 4)  
190 counterfactual calorie and nutrients-of-concern dietary intake (estimated intervention effect).

191 Data on diet related NCD mortality were based on the WHO International Classification of  
192 Diseases 10 (ICD 10)[31].

## 193 **Statistical analysis**

194 We described all continuous and categorical variables using measurements of central  
195 tendencies and frequencies. Then, we applied the estimated changes in each selected nutrient  
196 for both counterfactual scenarios to each individual's observed intake in the data; each  
197 individual therefore had three measurements of nutrient intake: (1) their observed ("baseline")  
198 intake from 24-hour recalls conducted during NHANES data collection, (2) their change in the  
199 respective nutrient based on estimates from scenario 1, and (3) their change in the respective  
200 nutrient based on estimates from scenario 2.

201 For each baseline or counterfactual scenario, we estimated usual intake using the National  
202 Cancer Institute method for ubiquitously consumed nutrients[32]. This method uses two-part  
203 modeling on with person-level random effects and variance estimations with post-stratified  
204 balanced repeated replication weights. Details of this method are available elsewhere[33]. We  
205 estimated these usual intakes for our total sample and within age and sex strata defined by DRI  
206 age-sex groupings[25], and report means, standard errors, and 95% confidence intervals. We  
207 conducted all usual intake analyses using SAS software 9.4 (SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC, USA)  
208 with publicly available macros provided by the National Cancer Institute[32].

209 Then, using these estimates of usual intake at baseline and under the two counterfactual  
210 scenarios, we estimated the potential number of diet related NCD deaths that could be averted  
211 or delayed in the US. Therefore, for the simulation modeling aspect of this study, once all  
212 necessary data was inputted into PRIME, the model estimated changes in the number of diet

213 related NCD deaths between the baseline and each counterfactual scenario tested. To gauge  
214 the uncertainty surrounding the outcomes, 95% uncertainty intervals (UIs) were estimated  
215 using Monte Carlo analysis within PRIME, with 10,000 iterations performed. This allowed for  
216 the epidemiological parameters to vary randomly based on the distributions established in the  
217 model from the literature[20]. PRIME then provided estimates of the diet related NCD deaths  
218 that could have been prevented or postponed for each of the tested counterfactual scenarios,  
219 both overall and disaggregated by sex and specific diseases under examination.

## 220 **Results**

### 221 **Study Sample**

222 Study sample characteristics are shown in **Supplementary Table S1**. Briefly, a total of 7,572  
223 ( $\geq 19$  y) NHANES (2017-2020) respondents were included in this analysis, 51% being females,  
224 and 42% having at least a high school diploma or equivalent. Furthermore, 25% of respondents  
225 had normal BMI, 32% overweight, and 44% obesity, according to the WHO definition[34].

### 226 **Baseline scenario: observed usual intake**

227 The mean (SE) usual total energy intake per day among adults in the US ages 19 years and older  
228 was 2,077 (17) kcal (**Table 2**). Among these study participants, the mean (SE) daily intake of  
229 sodium was 3,349 (27) mg; total sugars 101.1 (1.5) g; saturated fats 27.6 (0.3) g; and percent of  
230 total energy from saturated fats 11.8% (0.1). Calorie and nutrient intakes for US adults overall  
231 and by DRI age-sex group are detailed in **Supplementary Table S2**.

### 232 **Counterfactual scenarios: projected usual intake and health impact**

233 ***Scenario 1: based on post-policy evaluation of mandatory 'high in' FOPL in Chile***

234 Under the first counterfactual scenario (S1) based on results from the 18-month post-policy  
235 evaluation of mandatory FOPL in Chile[9], we projected a mean (SE) usual total energy intake of  
236 2,040 (15) kcal per day. This represents a mean reduction of 38kcal/ day compared to the  
237 observed (baseline) scenario, considering only calorie contribution from changes observed in  
238 sugar and saturated fat. However, this reduction was not statistically significant. Additionally,  
239 we observed absolute mean dietary reductions of 156 mg/day sodium (-4.7%), 10.1 g/day  
240 sugars (-9.9%), and 1.1 g/day saturated fats (-3.9%). The reductions in sodium and sugar intakes  
241 were statistically significant (**Table 2**). Stratified results by DRI age-sex group were also  
242 estimated and are presented in **Supplementary Table S2**.

243 Estimated dietary intakes changes could avert or delay 96,926 (95% UI 89,011, 105,284) diet  
244 related NCD deaths in the US. Overall, more lives would be saved in males than females.

245 Approximately 58% of averted or delayed deaths were estimated in males (56,536 [95% UI  
246 51,524, 61,380]) and 42% in females (40,285 [95% UI 36,593, 44,050]) (**Table 3**).

247 Of the total diet related NCD deaths that could have been prevented or delayed, 73.6% were  
248 related to CVDs, followed by diabetes (13.4%), cancers (4.8%), liver disease (4.6%), and chronic  
249 renal failure (3.7%). Furthermore, 39.4% of potential deaths averted or delayed would be in  
250 individuals under 75 years old. (**Table 3**).

### 251 ***Scenario 2: based on a meta-analysis on the impact of nutrient warning FOPL***

252 Under scenario 2 (S2) based on results from a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials and  
253 quasi-experimental studies investigating the impact of nutrient warning FOPL[6], we projected  
254 a mean (SE) usual total energy intake of 2,020 (14) kcal per day. This resulted in a reduction of  
255 57 calories per day compared to the observed (baseline) scenario, considering only the calorie

256 contributions from changes observed in sugar and saturated fat. However, this reduction was  
257 not statistically significant. Additionally, we observed absolute mean dietary reductions of 259  
258 mg/day sodium (-7.7%), 7.2 g/day sugars (-7.1%), and 4.5 g/day saturated fats (-16.3%). The  
259 reductions in sodium, sugar, and saturated fat intakes were statistically significant (**Table 2**).  
260 Stratified results by DRI age-sex group were also estimated and are presented in  
261 **Supplementary Table S2**.

262 Estimated dietary intakes changes could avert or delay 137,261 (95% UI 125,534, 148,719) diet  
263 related NCD deaths in the US. Overall, more lives would be saved in males than females.  
264 Approximately 57% of averted or delayed deaths were estimated in males (78,295 [95% UI  
265 71,267, 85,112]) and 43% in females (58,910 [95% UI 53,288, 64,506] (**Table 3**)).  
266 Of the total diet related NCD deaths that could have been prevented or delayed, 74.1% were  
267 related to CVDs, followed by diabetes (13.0%), cancers (4.9%), liver disease (4.6%), and chronic  
268 renal failure (3.7%). Furthermore, 40.6% of potential deaths averted or delayed would be in  
269 individuals under 75 years old (**Table 3**).

### 270 ***Potential dietary impacts by DRI age-sex groups***

271 When examining by DRI age-sex group, significant sodium reductions were observed in males  
272 ages 19-30 y (S2), 31-50 y (S1, S2), 51-70 y (S2), and 71+ y (S2); and in females ages 19-30 y (S2),  
273 31-50 y (S2), and 51-70 y (S2). For total sugars, significant reductions were observed only in  
274 females ages 19-30 y (S1), 31-50 y (S1, S2), 51-70 y (S1, S2), and 71+ y (S1). For saturated fat,  
275 significant changes were observed for no age or sex group under S1 but for all age and sex  
276 groups under S2. (**Supplementary Table S2**).

277 Of the total number of deaths that could be prevented or delayed in both scenarios, between  
278 89% and 91% would be attributable to changes in energy intakes (changes in obesity status),  
279 between 9% and 11% would be attributable to changes in sodium intakes, and between 0.3%  
280 and 1.7% would be attributable to changes in saturated fat intakes.

## 281 **Sensitivity analysis**

282 The mean (SE) usual added sugars intake per day among adults in the US ages 19 years and older  
283 was 66.8 (1.73) g/day (**Supplementary Table S2**). Applying potential intervention effects to added  
284 sugars and not to total sugars, as the main analysis, resulted in absolute mean added sugar  
285 reductions of 6.7 and 4.8 g/day under S1 and S2, respectively. The reduction in added sugar  
286 intake was only significant under S1. Estimated health gains were lower than the main analysis  
287 under both scenarios tested. The number of deaths that could have been prevented or delayed  
288 decreased by 31% under S1 and by 14% under S2 (**Supplementary Table S3**).

## 289 **Discussion**

290 To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study to model potential dietary and health  
291 impacts of implementing a nutrient-specific FOPL policy in the US. This study estimated the  
292 potential dietary and NCD health impact among US adults in response to mandatory nutrient-  
293 specific FOPL regulations. Our results indicate that a FOPL policy in the US could potentially  
294 avert or delay more than 137,000 diet related NCD deaths among US adults, largely attributable  
295 to reductions in energy intake. This potential health impact is largely attributable to CVDs and  
296 type-2 diabetes. Our results demonstrate the potential impact that even modest changes in  
297 dietary intake may have on population health. If the US adult population responded to a FOPL

298 policy similarly to populations in other countries[6, 9] we would expect a small but significant  
299 reduction in population-level sodium intake of up to 259 mg/day and a reduction in total sugar  
300 intake of 10 g/day.

301 Previous modeling studies in the US have estimated the potential impact of implementing a  
302 sugar-sweetened beverage (SSB) health warning policy. It was estimated that this policy would  
303 reduce total energy intake by 31.2 kcal/day among US adults[35]. Our estimates showed a  
304 potential calorie reduction of between 38 and 57 kcal/day derived from reductions in sugar and  
305 saturated fat intake as a result of implementing a mandatory nutrient-specific FOPL that would  
306 appear on both foods and beverages, including SSB. This shows that our estimated intervention  
307 effects may be more conservative than previous estimates, given that we applied these  
308 reductions to all food products and not just SSBs, and may underestimate potential dietary and  
309 health gains from this policy[35]. Another study tested the same counterfactual scenarios in the  
310 Canadian context, finding a potential calorie reduction of between 43 and 59 kcal/day, but as  
311 expected, a smaller number of diet-related NCD deaths than our findings (8,907 vs 137,261),  
312 given Canada's smaller population size and lower burden of NCDs compared to the US[36].

313 Moreover, a study in France modeled the potential impact on NCD mortality of different FOPL  
314 systems that did not include a nutrient-specific 'high in' type FOPL. The study found that a  
315 significant number of NCD-related deaths could be prevented or delayed by implementing the  
316 Nutri-score (7,680) and the HSR system (6,265). However, the study assumed that these policies  
317 were mandatory, which is not the case at the moment, and there are no country-specific  
318 evaluations supporting this assumption[37].



319 The estimated reduction in nutrients-of-concern could result from both consumers making  
320 healthier food choices and initial food reformulation by the food industry. Changes in consumer  
321 behavior might involve selecting similar products with lower levels of nutrients-of-concern (i.e.,  
322 fewer or no nutrient-specific FOPL), discontinuing consumption of certain products that are  
323 high in nutrients-of-concern, or increasing consumption of healthier products. For instance,  
324 under S1 based on initial evaluations of Chile’s FOPL policy, overall reductions applied in our  
325 policy scenario were a result of estimated reductions in consumption of ‘high in’ products and  
326 increased consumption of not ‘high in’ products, according to Taillie, et al[9].  
327 Furthermore, industry-driven initial food reformulation has been observed as a response to  
328 mandatory nutrient-specific ‘high in’ FOPL, with manufacturers modifying their products to  
329 avoid displaying ‘high in’ FOPL. In Chile, a significant decrease was observed in the proportion  
330 of products displaying any ‘high in’ label, with the most common reductions seen in the  
331 proportion of products displaying a ‘high in’ FOPL for sodium and sugar. For instance, the  
332 proportion of 'high in' sodium products decreased most frequently in food categories such as  
333 savory spreads, cheeses, ready-to-eat meals, soups, and sausages, dropping in some cases from  
334 74% to 27%. Similarly, 'high in' sugar products saw reductions most frequently in categories  
335 such as beverages, milk and milk-based drinks, breakfast cereals, sweet baked products, and  
336 sweet and savory spreads, dropping in some cases from 80% to 60%[11]. Some of these food  
337 categories are also top contributors to sodium and added sugar intake in the US[38, 39], which  
338 highlights the potential for industry-driven food reformulation as a result of adopting and  
339 implementing a mandatory nutrient-specific ‘high in’ FOPL in the US. However, robust and  
340 independent monitoring efforts are warranted to monitor changes in the US packaged food

341 supply and any unintended consequences from food reformulation. For example, in Chile, the  
342 use of non-nutritive sweeteners (NNS) in the food and beverage supply increased from 37.9%  
343 to 43.6% following the law's implementation[40]. Lessons from the Chilean experience  
344 informed other nutrient-specific 'excess' FOPL regulations in countries such as Mexico and  
345 Argentina that also require precautionary labels for products containing NNS[41, 42].  
346 The nature of the FOPL policy (mandatory vs. voluntary), FOPL design, and underlying NPM are  
347 of great relevance to consider by policymakers adopting and implementing FOPL. In the US,  
348 where no such policy exists, it is important that future policy designs are informed by prior  
349 research and country experiences on what is most likely to optimize consumers' use and  
350 understanding of the labels, promote healthier food choices, and consequently improve the  
351 population's health. For instance, mandatory nutrient-specific 'high in' or 'excess' FOPL, like the  
352 one implemented in Chile and several other countries [43], has been shown to effectively  
353 change consumer purchasing behaviors [8, 9], encourage industry-driven food reformulation  
354 [10, 11], and improve diets [12]. Additionally, initial evaluations from countries that recently  
355 implemented similar policies demonstrate consumers' use and comprehension of nutrient-  
356 specific 'high in' FOPL[44-48] and a reduction in the proportion of food and beverage products  
357 displaying any 'high in' FOPL after policy implementation[49]. In contrast, recent evaluations of  
358 the voluntary Health Star Rating (HSR) system, implemented in Australia and New Zealand in  
359 2014, showed no impact on consumer purchasing behavior[50]. Moreover, only 25% of foods  
360 were labeled with the HSR label in 2019, with HSR-labeled products more likely to display a 4.0-  
361 5.0 rating to highlight healthier alternatives, suggesting that companies are selectively applying

362 HSR labels as a marketing tool as opposed to a public health policy[50]. This demonstrates the  
363 greater effectiveness of mandatory approaches compared to voluntary ones.

364 When interpreting our results, it is important to consider both the strengths and limitations. A  
365 strength of our study is the use of data from the nationally representative NHANES (2017-2020)  
366 survey to estimate our baseline and counterfactual scenarios. Although 24HR are subject to  
367 misreporting issues, the US Department of Agriculture Automated Multiple Pass Method was  
368 used to reduce misreporting bias[51]. Additionally, we employed both 24HR days and the NCI  
369 method to evaluate usual calorie and nutrient intakes for US adults, overall and by DRI age-sex  
370 group, adjusting for various relevant covariates. This approach enabled the use of  
371 disaggregated data by DRI age-sex group into PRIME. The counterfactual scenarios in this study  
372 were modeled using the latest evidence on changes in food and beverage purchases when a  
373 nutrient-specific 'high in' FOPL is present. Due to the limited evidence on how FOPL policies  
374 affect dietary intakes, it was assumed that the observed changes in calories and critical  
375 nutrients in food and beverage purchases with a nutrient-specific FOPL would translate to  
376 dietary intakes. This assumption is supported by research comparing food purchase data with  
377 24HR data, which suggests that recorded food purchases can reasonably estimate overall diet  
378 quality[52].

379 We modeled the potential dietary and health impact of implementing nutrient-specific 'high in'  
380 FOPL using evidence from Chile, which, to our knowledge, is the only country that has  
381 evaluated changes in food and beverage purchases before and after implementing such policy.  
382 The changes observed in Chile may not directly apply to the US context due to several  
383 differences, such as dietary patterns, cultural food norms, food environments, and differences

384 in labeling regulations between the two countries, but the impact and direction of these various  
385 differences is unclear. However, both Chilean and US populations share similar diet related risk  
386 factors and burden of obesity. For example, both countries have among the highest per capita  
387 retail sales of ultra-processed products [53], high sodium intakes [54, 55], and a high prevalence  
388 of obesity [56].

389 Furthermore, it is important to note that the comprehensive Chilean law not only includes a  
390 mandatory 'high in' FOPL but also restricts sales and promotions in schools and marketing to  
391 children for foods that exceed established thresholds for calorie density and targeted nutrients,  
392 policies that have not yet been considered in the US. Consequently, initial evaluations of the  
393 Chilean law likely reflect the impact of these additional components. Policy scenarios that  
394 consider trends in consumer purchase behavior following the implementation of mandatory  
395 nutrient-specific FOPL should be further investigated as more evidence on the long-term  
396 impacts of this policy becomes available in other countries such as Mexico, Argentina, and  
397 Colombia. Specifically, it is important to determine whether the effects on consumer food  
398 choices level off or reverse over time and, if so, at what point this occurs. Additionally, the NPM  
399 adopted for FOPL regulations in Chile might be different to what will be proposed by the FDA,  
400 likely resulting in fewer products displaying FOPL nutrient disclosures in the US compared to  
401 Chile. Future research should inform how the US packaged food supply would perform under  
402 the proposed and other evidence-based, well-established NPMs.

403 Lastly, as other cross-sectional NCD scenario models, PRIME does not account for the effect of  
404 time lag between the exposure and disease outcome, making it unclear how long it would take  
405 for the estimated health gains to manifest following a change in risk factor exposure.

406 Nonetheless, the model has been used extensively as it enables researchers to estimate the  
407 population-level health impact of various NCD policy scenarios, providing crucial evidence for  
408 informing the policymaking process and prioritizing resources as necessary. The strengths and  
409 limitations of PRIME have been discussed in detail before[20, 57]. Future studies should build  
410 on this work to estimate the cost-effectiveness of this policy in the US context and examine  
411 potential differential impacts across diverse subgroups.

## 412 **Conclusion**

413 Findings suggest that implementing mandatory nutrient-specific FOPL in the US could  
414 significantly reduce sodium and total sugar intakes among US adults. This change could  
415 potentially avert or delay up to 137,261 diet related NCD deaths in the US, primarily from CVDs.  
416 Our results can inform current food policy developments in the US regarding adoption and  
417 implementation of FOPL regulations.

## 418 **Conflict of interest**

419 The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or  
420 financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

## 421 **Authors' contributions**

422 Conceptualization, NF, and ML; Data Curation, NF, and DZ; Formal Analysis, NF and DZ;  
423 Investigation, NF, and DZ; Funding Acquisition, ML, and NF; Methodology, NF, MA, and DZ;  
424 Writing – Original Draft Preparation, NF and DZ. All authors critically reviewed and approved  
425 the final manuscript. EG, and AM are staff members of the Center for Science in the Public  
426 Interest. Authors hold sole responsibility for the views expressed in the manuscript, which may  
427 not necessarily reflect the opinion or policy of their respective organizations.

## 428 **Funding**

429 This research was funded by the Center for Science in the Public Interest. The funders had no  
430 role in study design, data collection and analysis, or decision to publish.

## 431 **Acknowledgments**

432 The authors would like to thank Professor Peter Scarborough, University of Oxford, for allowing  
433 us to use the PRIME model and discussing its application.

## 434 References

- 435 1. Afshin A, Sur PJ, Fay KA, Cornaby L, Ferrara G, Salama JS, et al. Health effects of dietary  
436 risks in 195 countries, 1990–2017: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of  
437 Disease Study 2017. *The Lancet*. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(19)30041-8.
- 438 2. Baldrige AS, Huffman MD, Taylor F, Xavier D, Bright B, Van Horn LV, et al. The  
439 healthfulness of the US packaged food and beverage supply: A cross-sectional study. *Nutrients*.  
440 2019;11(8):1704.
- 441 3. Roberto CA, Ng SW, Ganderats-Fuentes M, Hammond D, Barquera S, Jauregui A, Taillie  
442 LS. The Influence of Front-of-Package Nutrition Labeling on Consumer Behavior and Product  
443 Reformulation. *Annu Rev Nutr*. 2021;41(Volume 41, 2021):529-50. doi:  
444 <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-nutr-111120-094932>.
- 445 4. Global Food Research Program. Front-of-package labeling policies around the world  
446 2024 [cited 2024 May 22]. Available from: [https://www.globalfoodresearchprogram.org/wp-](https://www.globalfoodresearchprogram.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/GFRP-UNC_FOPL_maps_2024_03.pdf)  
447 [content/uploads/2022/07/GFRP-UNC\\_FOPL\\_maps\\_2024\\_03.pdf](https://www.globalfoodresearchprogram.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/GFRP-UNC_FOPL_maps_2024_03.pdf).
- 448 5. Crosbie E, Gomes FS, Olvera J, Rincón-Gallardo Patiño S, Hoepfer S, Carriedo A. A policy  
449 study on front-of-pack nutrition labeling in the Americas: Emerging developments and  
450 outcomes. *The Lancet Regional Health - Americas*. 2022:100400. doi:  
451 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lana.2022.100400>.
- 452 6. Song J, Brown MK, Tan M, MacGregor GA, Webster J, Campbell NR, et al. Impact of  
453 color-coded and warning nutrition labelling schemes: A systematic review and network meta-  
454 analysis. *PLoS Medicine*. 2021;18(10):e1003765.
- 455 7. Croker H, Packer J, Russell SJ, Stansfield C, Viner R. Front of pack nutritional labelling  
456 schemes: a systematic review and meta-analysis of recent evidence relating to objectively  
457 measured consumption and purchasing. *Journal of Human Nutrition and Dietetics*. 2020.
- 458 8. Taillie LS, Reyes M, Colchero MA, Popkin B, Corvalán C. An evaluation of Chile's Law of  
459 Food Labeling and Advertising on sugar-sweetened beverage purchases from 2015 to 2017: A  
460 before-and-after study. *PLoS medicine*. 2020;17(2):e1003015.
- 461 9. Taillie LS, Bercholz M, Popkin B, Reyes M, Colchero MA, Corvalán C. Changes in food  
462 purchases after the Chilean policies on food labelling, marketing, and sales in schools: a before  
463 and after study. *The Lancet Planetary Health*. 2021;5(8):e526-e33.
- 464 10. Quintiliano Scarpelli D, Pinheiro Fernandes AC, Rodriguez Osiac L, Pizarro Quevedo T.  
465 Changes in nutrient declaration after the food labeling and advertising law in Chile: a  
466 longitudinal approach. *Nutrients*. 2020;12(8):2371.
- 467 11. Reyes M, Smith Taillie L, Popkin B, Kanter R, Vandevijvere S, Corvalán C. Changes in the  
468 amount of nutrient of packaged foods and beverages after the initial implementation of the  
469 Chilean Law of Food Labelling and Advertising: A nonexperimental prospective study. *PLOS*  
470 *Medicine*. 2020;17(7):e1003220. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1003220.
- 471 12. Fretes G, Corvalán C, Reyes M, Taillie LS, Economos CD, Wilson NLW, Cash SB. Changes  
472 in children's and adolescents' dietary intake after the implementation of Chile's law of food  
473 labeling, advertising and sales in schools: a longitudinal study. *International Journal of*  
474 *Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*. 2023;20(1):40. doi: 10.1186/s12966-023-01445-x.

- 475 13. Taillie LS, Bercholz M, Popkin B, Rebolledo N, Reyes M, Corvalán C. Decreases in  
476 purchases of energy, sodium, sugar, and saturated fat 3 years after implementation of the  
477 Chilean food labeling and marketing law: An interrupted time series analysis. *PLOS Medicine*.  
478 2024;21(9):e1004463. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1004463.
- 479 14. Ministerio de Salud de Chile. Ley 20606 Sobre composición nutricional de los alimentos  
480 y su publicidad 2012 [cited 2024 September 28]. Available from:  
481 <https://www.bcn.cl/leychile/navegar?i=1041570&f=2012-07-06&p=>.
- 482 15. Correa T, Reyes M, Taillie LS, Corvalán C, Dillman Carpentier FR. Food advertising on  
483 television before and after a national unhealthy food marketing regulation in Chile, 2016–2017.  
484 *Am J Public Health*. 2020;110(7):1054-9.
- 485 16. Martin C, Turcotte M, Cauchon J, Lachance A, Pomerleau S, Provencher V, Labonté M-È.  
486 Systematic review of nutrient profile models developed for nutrition-related policies and  
487 regulations aimed at noncommunicable disease prevention—An update. *Advances in Nutrition*.  
488 2023.
- 489 17. Global Health Advocacy Incubator. Nutrient Profile Models: A valuable tool for  
490 developing healthy food policies 2024 [cited 2024 May 23]. Available from:  
491 [https://assets.advocacyincubator.org/uploads/2024/NPM\\_Position\\_Paper.pdf](https://assets.advocacyincubator.org/uploads/2024/NPM_Position_Paper.pdf).
- 492 18. The White House. Biden-Harris Administration National Strategy on Hunger, Nutrition,  
493 and Health 2022 [cited 2024 June 20]. Available from: [https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-](https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/White-House-National-Strategy-on-Hunger-Nutrition-and-Health-FINAL.pdf)  
494 [content/uploads/2022/09/White-House-National-Strategy-on-Hunger-Nutrition-and-Health-](https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/White-House-National-Strategy-on-Hunger-Nutrition-and-Health-FINAL.pdf)  
495 [FINAL.pdf](https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/White-House-National-Strategy-on-Hunger-Nutrition-and-Health-FINAL.pdf)
- 496 19. US Food and Drug Administration. Front-of-Package Nutrition Labeling 2024 [cited 2024  
497 May 23]. Available from: [https://www.fda.gov/food/food-labeling-nutrition/front-package-](https://www.fda.gov/food/food-labeling-nutrition/front-package-nutrition-labeling)  
498 [nutrition-labeling](https://www.fda.gov/food/food-labeling-nutrition/front-package-nutrition-labeling).
- 499 20. Scarborough P, Harrington RA, Mizdrak A, Zhou LM, Doherty A. The preventable risk  
500 integrated Model and its use to estimate the health impact of public health policy scenarios.  
501 *Scientifica*. 2014;2014.
- 502 21. Stierman B, Afful J, Carroll MD, Chen T-C, Davy O, Fink S, et al. National Health and  
503 Nutrition Examination Survey 2017–March 2020 prepandemic data files development of files  
504 and prevalence estimates for selected health outcomes. 2021.
- 505 22. Willett W. Issues in analysis and presentation of dietary data. *Nutritional epidemiology*.  
506 1998:321-46.
- 507 23. U.S. Department of Agriculture and U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.  
508 Dietary Guidelines for Americans, 2020–2025 2020. 9th Edition:[Available from:  
509 [https://www.dietaryguidelines.gov/sites/default/files/2021-](https://www.dietaryguidelines.gov/sites/default/files/2021-03/Dietary_Guidelines_for_Americans-2020-2025.pdf)  
510 [03/Dietary\\_Guidelines\\_for\\_Americans-2020-2025.pdf](https://www.dietaryguidelines.gov/sites/default/files/2021-03/Dietary_Guidelines_for_Americans-2020-2025.pdf).
- 511 24. Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs. (CFSAN) Front-of-Package Nutrition  
512 Labeling Focus Groups 2. Appendix A - FOP Focus Groups 2 Schemes and Product MockUps 8-  
513 23-2023 2024 [cited 2024 May 23]. Available from:  
514 [https://www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRAViewIC?ref\\_nbr=202008-0910-021&icID=262002](https://www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRAViewIC?ref_nbr=202008-0910-021&icID=262002).
- 515 25. National Academies of Sciences Engineering and Medicine. Dietary Reference Intakes  
516 Collection 2022 [cited 2022 October 12]. Available from:  
517 <https://nap.nationalacademies.org/collection/57/dietary-reference-intakes>.



- 518 26. Cifelli CJ, Houchins JA, Demmer E, Fulgoni VL. Increasing plant based foods or dairy  
519 foods differentially affects nutrient intakes: Dietary scenarios using NHANES 2007–2010.  
520 *Nutrients*. 2016;8(7):422.
- 521 27. Quann EE, Fulgoni VL, Auestad N. Consuming the daily recommended amounts of dairy  
522 products would reduce the prevalence of inadequate micronutrient intakes in the United  
523 States: diet modeling study based on NHANES 2007–2010. *Nutrition journal*. 2015;14(1):1-11.
- 524 28. World Health Organization - Regional Office for Europe. NCDprime - Modelling the  
525 impact of national policies on noncommunicable disease (NCD) mortality using PRIME: a policy  
526 scenario modelling tool (2019) 2019 [cited 2023 October 11]. Available from:  
527 <https://www.who.int/europe/publications/i/item/WHO-EURO-2019-3652-43411-60952>.
- 528 29. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention CDC WONDER. Bridged-Race Population  
529 Estimates 1990-2019 Request 2019 [cited 2024 March 9]. Available from:  
530 <https://wonder.cdc.gov/bridged-race-v2019.html>.
- 531 30. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention CDC WONDER. Underlying Cause of Death,  
532 1999-2020 Request. Deaths occurring through 2020 2019 [cited 2024 March 9]. Available from:  
533 <https://wonder.cdc.gov/ucd-icd10.html>.
- 534 31. World Health Organization. International Statistical Classification of Diseases and  
535 Related Health Problems 10th Revision 2016 [cited 2021 January 4]. Available from:  
536 <https://icd.who.int/browse10/2016/en#/I20-I25>.
- 537 32. National Cancer Institute. Usual Dietary Intakes: SAS Macros for the NCI Method 2018  
538 [cited 2024 September 20]. Available from:  
539 <https://epi.grants.cancer.gov/diet/usualintakes/macros.html>.
- 540 33. Herrick KA, Rossen LM, Parsons R, Dodd KW. Estimating usual dietary intake from  
541 National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey data using the National Cancer Institute  
542 method. 2018.
- 543 34. World Health Organization. Obesity and overweight, Key Facts 2024 [cited 2024 June  
544 21]. Available from: [https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/obesity-and-](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/obesity-and-overweight)  
545 [overweight](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/obesity-and-overweight).
- 546 35. Grummon AH, Smith NR, Golden SD, Frerichs L, Taillie LS, Brewer NT. Health warnings on  
547 sugar-sweetened beverages: simulation of impacts on diet and obesity among US adults.  
548 *American journal of preventive medicine*. 2019;57(6):765-74.
- 549 36. Flexner N, Ng AP, Ahmed M, Khandpur N, Acton RB, Lee JJ, L'Abbe MR. Estimating the  
550 dietary and health impact of implementing front-of-pack nutrition labeling in Canada: A  
551 macrosimulation modeling study. *Frontiers in Nutrition*. 2023;10. doi:  
552 10.3389/fnut.2023.1098231.
- 553 37. Egnell M, Crosetto P, d'Almeida T, Kesse-Guyot E, Touvier M, Ruffieux B, et al. Modelling  
554 the impact of different front-of-package nutrition labels on mortality from non-communicable  
555 chronic disease. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act*. 2019;16(1):56. Epub 2019/07/17. doi:  
556 10.1186/s12966-019-0817-2. PubMed PMID: 31307496; PubMed Central PMCID:  
557 PMC6631735.
- 558 38. Lee SH, Zhao L, Park S, Moore LV, Hamner HC, Galuska DA, Blanck HM. High added  
559 sugars intake among US adults: Characteristics, eating occasions, and top sources, 2015–2018.  
560 *Nutrients*. 2023;15(2):265.

- 561 39. Ahmed M, Ng A, Christoforou A, Mulligan C, L'Abbé MR. Top sodium food sources in the  
562 American diet—using National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey. *Nutrients*.  
563 2023;15(4):831.
- 564 40. Zancheta Ricardo C, Corvalán C, Taillie L, Quitral V, Reyes M. Changes in the use of  
565 nonnutritive sweeteners in the Chilean food and beverage supply after the implementation of  
566 the Food Labeling and Advertising Law. *Frontiers in nutrition*. 2021:906.
- 567 41. White M, Barquera S. Mexico Adopts Food Warning Labels, Why Now? *Health Systems  
568 & Reform*. 2020;6(1):e1752063.
- 569 42. República Argentina. Ley de etiquetado frontal. Promoción de la alimentación saludable  
570 Ley 27.642. 2022 [cited 2022 October 12]. Available from:  
571 [https://www.argentina.gob.ar/justicia/derechofacil/leysimple/salud/ley-de-etiquetado-](https://www.argentina.gob.ar/justicia/derechofacil/leysimple/salud/ley-de-etiquetado-frontal#:~:text=Est%C3%A1%20prohibida%20la%20publicidad%2C%20promoci%C3%B3n,a%20ni%C3%B1os%2C%20ni%C3%B1as%20y%20adolescentes)  
572 [frontal#:~:text=Est%C3%A1%20prohibida%20la%20publicidad%2C%20promoci%C3%B3n,a%20](https://www.argentina.gob.ar/justicia/derechofacil/leysimple/salud/ley-de-etiquetado-frontal#:~:text=Est%C3%A1%20prohibida%20la%20publicidad%2C%20promoci%C3%B3n,a%20ni%C3%B1os%2C%20ni%C3%B1as%20y%20adolescentes)  
573 [ni%C3%B1os%2C%20ni%C3%B1as%20y%20adolescentes](https://www.argentina.gob.ar/justicia/derechofacil/leysimple/salud/ley-de-etiquetado-frontal#:~:text=Est%C3%A1%20prohibida%20la%20publicidad%2C%20promoci%C3%B3n,a%20ni%C3%B1os%2C%20ni%C3%B1as%20y%20adolescentes).
- 574 43. Global Health Advocacy Incubator. FOPWL regulations around the globe 2023 [cited  
575 2023 October 2]. Available from:  
576 [https://dfweawn6ylvgz.cloudfront.net/uploads/2023/FOPWL\\_Regulations.pdf](https://dfweawn6ylvgz.cloudfront.net/uploads/2023/FOPWL_Regulations.pdf).
- 577 44. Contreras-Manzano A, White CM, Nieto C, Quevedo KL, Vargas-Meza J, Hammond D, et  
578 al. Self-reported decreases in the purchases of selected unhealthy foods resulting from the  
579 implementation of warning labels in Mexican youth and adult population. *International Journal  
580 of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*. 2024;21(1):64.
- 581 45. Shahrabani S. The impact of Israel's Front-of-Package labeling reform on consumers'  
582 behavior and intentions to change dietary habits. *Israel Journal of Health Policy Research*.  
583 2021;10(1):1-11.
- 584 46. Ares G, Antúnez L, Curutchet MR, Galicia L, Moratorio X, Giménez A, Bove I. Immediate  
585 effects of the implementation of nutritional warnings in Uruguay: awareness, self-reported use  
586 and increased understanding. *Public Health Nutrition*. 2021;24(2):364-75.
- 587 47. Machín L, Alcaire F, Antúnez L, Giménez A, Curutchet MR, Ares G. Use of nutritional  
588 warning labels at the point of purchase: An exploratory study using self-reported measures and  
589 eye-tracking. *Appetite*. 2023:106634.
- 590 48. Batis C, Aburto TC, Pedraza LS, Angulo E, Hernández Z, Jáuregui A, et al. Self-reported  
591 reactions to the front-of-package warning labelling in Mexico among parents of school-aged  
592 children. *medRxiv*. 2023:2023.07. 26.23293213.
- 593 49. Saavedra-Garcia L, Meza-Hernández M, Diez-Canseco F, Taillie LS. Reformulation of Top-  
594 Selling Processed and Ultra-Processed Foods and Beverages in the Peruvian Food Supply after  
595 Front-of-Package Warning Label Policy. *International Journal of Environmental Research and  
596 Public Health*. 2022;20(1). doi: 10.3390/ijerph20010424.
- 597 50. Bablani L, Mhurchu CN, Neal B, Skeels CL, Staub KE, Blakely T. Effect of voluntary Health  
598 Star Rating labels on healthier food purchasing in New Zealand: longitudinal evidence using  
599 representative household purchase data. *BMJ Nutrition, Prevention & Health*. 2022;5(2).
- 600 51. Moshfegh AJ, Rhodes DG, Baer DJ, Murayi T, Clemens JC, Rumpler WV, et al. The US  
601 Department of Agriculture Automated Multiple-Pass Method reduces bias in the collection of  
602 energy intakes. *The American journal of clinical nutrition*. 2008;88(2):324-32.

- 603 52. Appelhans BM, French SA, Tangney CC, Powell LM, Wang Y. To what extent do food  
604 purchases reflect shoppers' diet quality and nutrient intake? *International Journal of Behavioral*  
605 *Nutrition and Physical Activity*. 2017;14(1):1-10.
- 606 53. Pan American health Organization. Ultra-processed food and drink products in Latin  
607 America: Trends, impact on obesity, policy implications 2015 [cited 2023 October 5]. Available  
608 from:  
609 [https://iris.paho.org/bitstream/handle/10665.2/7699/9789275118641\\_eng.pdf?sequence=5&i](https://iris.paho.org/bitstream/handle/10665.2/7699/9789275118641_eng.pdf?sequence=5&isAllowed=y)  
610 [sAllowed=y](https://iris.paho.org/bitstream/handle/10665.2/7699/9789275118641_eng.pdf?sequence=5&isAllowed=y).
- 611 54. Gobierno de Chile - Ministerio de Salud. Encuesta Nacional de Salud 2016-2017.  
612 Segunda entrega de resultados. 2018 [cited 2024 May 25]. Available from:  
613 [https://redsahud.ssmso.cl/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/2-Resultados-](https://redsahud.ssmso.cl/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/2-Resultados-ENS_MINSAL_31_01_2018-ilovepdf-compressed.pdf)  
614 [ENS\\_MINSAL\\_31\\_01\\_2018-ilovepdf-compressed.pdf](https://redsahud.ssmso.cl/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/2-Resultados-ENS_MINSAL_31_01_2018-ilovepdf-compressed.pdf).
- 615 55. Brouillard AM, Kraja AT, Rich MW. Trends in dietary sodium intake in the United States  
616 and the impact of USDA guidelines: NHANES 1999-2016. *The American journal of medicine*.  
617 2019;132(10):1199-206. e5.
- 618 56. World Obesity. Global Obesity Observatory. WHO Americas region 2022 [cited 2024  
619 May 25]. Available from: [https://data.worldobesity.org/region/who-americas-region-](https://data.worldobesity.org/region/who-americas-region-3/#data_prevalence)  
620 [3/#data\\_prevalence](https://data.worldobesity.org/region/who-americas-region-3/#data_prevalence).
- 621 57. Dötsch-Klerk M, Bruins MJ, Detzel P, Martikainen J, Nergiz-Unal R, Roodenburg AJ,  
622 Pekcan AG. Modelling health and economic impact of nutrition interventions: a systematic  
623 review. *European Journal of Clinical Nutrition*. 2022:1-14.
- 624


625 **Table 1.** Counterfactual scenarios: proportional change of calorie and critical nutrients content  
626 of food and beverage purchases in the presence of nutrient-specific ‘high in’ FOPL.  
627

Scenarios	Source	Tested foods	Main analysis		
			$\Delta$ sodium	$\Delta$ sugars	$\Delta$ sat fat
<b>Scenario 1 (S1)</b>	Based on early FOPL evaluations from Chile [9]	Food & beverages overall	<b>-4.7%</b>	<b>-10.2%</b>	<b>-3.9%</b>
<b>Scenario 2 (S2)</b>	Based on results from a systematic review and meta-analysis [6]	Food & beverages overall	<b>-7.8%</b>	<b>-7.3%</b>	<b>-16.3%</b>

S1 and S2 analyze the potential dietary impact as a result of changes in consumer food purchases in the presence of mandatory nutrient-specific ‘high in’ FOPL.

628

629 **Figure 1.** Study selection criteria, National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey, 2017 –  
630 2020[21].



631

632 **Table 2.** US adults' ( $\geq 19$  y) usual mean energy and nutrient intakes compared with estimated  
 633 'counterfactual scenario' mean intakes (n=7,572)  
 634

<b>Total (<math>\geq 19</math> y)</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Scenario 1</b>	<i>S1</i> $\Delta$	<b>Scenario 2</b>	<i>S2</i> $\Delta$
<b>Energy (SE) (kcal/d)</b>	2,077 (17)	2,040 (15)	-38	2,020 (14)	-57
<b>Sodium (SE) (mg/d)</b>	3,349 (27)	3,192 (26) *	-156	3,089 (25) *	-259
<b>Sugars (SE) (g/d)</b>	101.1 (1.55)	91.0 (1.39) *	-10.1	93.90 (1.44) *	-7.20
<b>Saturated fat (SE) (g/d)</b>	27.6 (0.35)	26.6 (0.34)	-1.08	23.13 (0.29) *	-4.49
<b>Sat fat % TE (SE) (% kcal/d)</b>	11.76 (0.12)	11.69 (0.12)	0.06	11.25 (0.12) *	-0.52

Baseline and counterfactual energy and nutrient intakes were estimated using NHANES 2017-2020[21]. Usual intakes were estimated using the National Cancer Institute (NCI) method[32], and analyses were adjusted for age, sex, dietary misreporting status, weekend/weekday, and sequence of dietary recall. Usual intakes by DRI age-sex groups are presented in Supplementary Tables. \*Indicates a statistically significant difference between baseline mean intakes and counterfactual mean intakes. Abbreviations: d = day; g = grams; mg = milligrams; Kcal = kilocalorie; SE = standard error; TE = Total Energy;  $\Delta$  = Difference; S1 = scenario 1; S2 = scenario 2.

635

636 **Table 3.** Diet related NCD deaths that could be averted or delayed in the US due to changes in calorie and critical nutrients content  
637 of food and beverage purchases in the presence of nutrient-specific ‘high in’ FOPL.  
638

<b>Scenario 1:</b> Estimated number of deaths that could be averted or delayed in the US after modelling reductions of critical nutrient intakes based on Chilean FOPL evaluations (overall changes: sodium -4.7%, total sugars -10.2%, sat fat -3.9%) - by cause of death (95% UI)						
<b>Cause of death (ICD-10 Code) <sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Total (mean, 95% UI) <sup>2</sup></b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Males (mean, 95% UI) <sup>2</sup></b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Females (mean, 95% UI) <sup>2</sup></b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Total deaths averted or delayed</b>	<b>96,926 (89,011, 105,284)</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>56,536 (51,524, 61,380)</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>40,285 (36,593, 44,050)</b>	<b>100</b>
<i>Total deaths prevented under 75</i>	38,193 (34,958, 41,513)	39.4	26,531 (24,092, 28,884)	46.9	11,624 (10,589, 12,664)	28.9
<b>Cardiovascular diseases</b>	<b>71,317 (63,756, 78,815)</b>	<b>73.6</b>	<b>41,364 (36,872, 45,729)</b>	<b>73.2</b>	<b>29,794 (26,187, 33,236)</b>	<b>74.0</b>
Ischaemic heart disease (I20-25)	30,442 (27,134, 33,888)	31.4	20,835 (18,362, 23,366)	36.9	9,619 (7,763, 11,430)	23.9
Cerebrovascular disease (I60-69)	11,048 (8,766, 13,190)	11.4	5,221 (4,133, 6,257)	9.2	5,837 (4,668, 7,004)	14.5
Heart failure (I50)	12,088 (8,543, 15,402)	12.5	6,057 (4,196, 7,826)	10.7	5,920 (4,185, 7,584)	14.7
Aortic aneurysm (I71)	110 (46, 182)	0.1	73 (30, 120)	0.1	37 (15, 63)	0.1
Pulmonary embolism (I26)	50 (16, 99)	0.1	27 (8, 54)	0.0	22 (7, 46)	0.1
Rheumatic heart disease (I05-09)	18 (5, 37)	0.0	8 (2, 16)	0.0	11 (3, 22)	0.0
Hypertensive disease (I10-15)	17,556 (14,122, 20,862)	18.1	9,182 (7,319, 10,869)	16.2	8,354 (6,743, 9,879)	20.7
<b>Diabetes (E11, E14)</b>	<b>12,969 (10,477, 15,151)</b>	<b>13.4</b>	<b>7,830 (6,267, 9,246)</b>	<b>13.8</b>	<b>5,119 (4,192, 5,941)</b>	<b>12.7</b>
<b>Cancer</b>	<b>4,678 (3,592, 5,799)</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>2,319 (1,712, 2,913)</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>2,360 (1,815, 2,904)</b>	<b>5.9</b>
Pancreas (C25)	1,064 (224, 1,919)	1.1	602 (126, 1,078)	1.1	469 (88, 830)	1.2
Colorectum (C18-20)	1,829 (1,249, 2,428)	1.9	1,050 (720, 1,387)	1.9	780 (532, 1,021)	1.9
Breast (C50)	206 (-63, 466)	0.2	0	0.0	204 (-70, 482)	0.5
Endometrium (C54.1)	577 (427, 723)	0.6	0	0.0	579 (417, 726)	1.4
Gallbladder (C23)	101 (68, 133)	0.1	38 (25, 49)	0.1	64 (42, 83)	0.2
Kidney (C64)	906 (712, 1,087)	0.9	630 (503, 757)	1.1	274 (217, 329)	0.7
<b>Chronic renal failure (N18)</b>	<b>3,615 (1,879, 5,241)</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>2,012 (1,006, 2,942)</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>1,597 (830, 2,338)</b>	<b>4.0</b>
<b>Liver disease (K70, K74)</b>	<b>4,487 (2,999, 5,832)</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>3,012 (2,057, 3,954)</b>	<b>5.3</b>	<b>1,452 (975, 1,875)</b>	<b>3.6</b>

639

**Scenario 2:** Estimated number of deaths that could be averted or delayed after modelling reductions of targeted nutrient intakes based on a meta-analysis that looked at the impact of nutrient warning FOPL on changing consumers' food and beverages purchasing behavior (overall changes sodium -7.8%, total sugars -7.3%, sat fat -16.3%) - by cause of death (95% UI)

<b>Cause of death (ICD-10 Code) <sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Total (mean, 95% UI) <sup>2</sup></b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Males (mean, 95% UI) <sup>2</sup></b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Females (mean, 95% UI) <sup>2</sup></b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Total deaths averted or delayed</b>	<b>137,261 (125,534, 148,719)</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>78,295 (71,267, 85,112)</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>58,910 (53,288, 64,506)</b>	<b>100</b>
<i>Total deaths prevented under 75</i>	<i>55,744 (50,930, 60,515)</i>	<i>40.6</i>	<i>38,039 (34,474, 41,525)</i>	<i>48.6</i>	<i>17,675 (16,033, 19,299)</i>	<i>30.0</i>
<b>Cardiovascular diseases</b>	<b>101,669 (90,812, 112,460)</b>	<b>74.1</b>	<b>57,921 (51,576, 63,926)</b>	<b>74.0</b>	<b>43,680 (38,534, 48,855)</b>	<b>74.1</b>
Ischaemic heart disease (I20-25)	44,689 (39,909, 49,671)	32.6	29,979 (26,500, 33,412)	38.3	14,711 (11,924, 17,444)	25.0
Cerebrovascular disease (I60-69)	15,520 (12,330, 18,586)	11.3	7,113 (5,611, 8,511)	9.1	8,369 (6,673, 10,117)	14.2
Heart failure (I50)	16,561 (11,751, 21,068)	12.1	8,064 (5,659, 10,297)	10.3	8,501 (6,038, 10,776)	14.4
Aortic aneurysm (I71)	182 (78, 307)	0.1	119 (51, 197)	0.2	62 (25, 103)	0.1
Pulmonary embolism (I26)	82 (26, 165)	0.1	44 (14, 90)	0.1	37 (12, 75)	0.1
Rheumatic heart disease (I05-09)	30 (8, 62)	0.0	12 (4, 26)	0.0	17 (5, 35)	0.0
Hypertensive disease (I10-15)	24,632 (19,702, 28,835)	17.9	12,559 (10,121, 14,880)	16.0	12,061 (9,743, 14,144)	20.5
<b>Diabetes (E11, E14)</b>	<b>17,786 (14,435, 20,687)</b>	<b>13.0</b>	<b>10,440 (8,364, 12,249)</b>	<b>13.3</b>	<b>7,345 (5,990, 8,492)</b>	<b>12.5</b>
<b>Cancer</b>	<b>6,696 (5,056, 8,212)</b>	<b>4.9</b>	<b>3,199 (2,370, 4,024)</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>3,471 (2,635, 4,275)</b>	<b>5.9</b>
Pancreas (C25)	1,530 (288, 2,707)	1.1	820 (161, 1,473)	1.0	696 (133, 1,239)	1.2
Colorectum (C18-20)	2,620 (1,784, 3,442)	1.9	1,462 (984, 1,908)	1.9	1,166 (780, 1,533)	2.0
Breast (C50)	263 (-137, 651)	0.2	0	0.0	269 (-133, 668)	0.5
Endometrium (C54.1)	850 (621, 1,068)	0.6	0	0.0	850 (623, 1,061)	1.4
Gallbladder (C23)	147 (100, 192)	0.1	52 (34, 68)	0.1	94 (64, 124)	0.2
Kidney (C64)	1,272 (1,015, 1,528)	0.9	869 (688, 1,041)	1.1	406 (325, 485)	0.7
<b>Chronic renal failure (N18)</b>	<b>5,027 (2,534, 7,220)</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>2,730 (1,329, 3,890)</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>2,291 (1,159, 3,305)</b>	<b>3.9</b>
<b>Liver disease (K70, K74)</b>	<b>6,267 (4,172, 8,137)</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4,133 (2,749, 5,420)</b>	<b>5.3</b>	<b>2,151 (1,413, 2,752)</b>	<b>3.7</b>

640 <sup>1</sup>WHO, International Statistical Classification of Diseases and Related Health Problems, Tenth Revision.

641 <sup>2</sup>95% Uncertainty Interval (UI) are based on 10,000 iterations of Monte Carlo analysis built in PRIME.

642 Total deaths averted or delayed represent less than the sum of the individual diet related NCD mortality causes given that double

643 counting has been accounted for in PRIME during the modelling process. The same applies to the sum of CVDs and cancers.



644 Potential diet related NCD deaths that could be averted or delayed were estimated using the PRIME model[20]. Inputs for the model  
645 included, 1) population demographics; 2) mortality data associated with diet related NCDs, obtained from the publicly available  
646 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) WONDER datasets, 2019[29, 30]; and 3) baseline and counterfactual dietary  
647 intakes.