

The estimated impact of mandatory front-of-pack nutrition labelling policies on adult obesity prevalence and cardiovascular mortality in England: a modelling study

Running Title: Mortality impact of nutrition labels in England

Rebecca Evans PhD¹, Prof Martin O'Flaherty PhD², I Gusti Ngurah Edi Putra PhD¹, Chris Kypridemos PhD², Prof Eric Robinson PhD¹, Zoé Colombet PhD²

1. Department of Psychology, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, United Kingdom.
2. Department of Public Health, Policy and Systems, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, United Kingdom.

Corresponding author: Rebecca Evans, Department of Psychology, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, United Kingdom

Email: R.K.Evans@liverpool.ac.uk

Word count: 4236 (including tables)

Abstract count: 294

Number of tables: 3

Number of figures: 2

Abstract

Objectives Since 2013, industry-endorsed front-of-pack traffic light labels have been implemented voluntarily on packaged food in the UK. The UK Government is now considering alternative labelling approaches which may be more effective, such as Chile's mandatory nutrient warning labels. The primary aim of this study was to model the likely impact of implementing mandatory front-of-pack nutrition labels in England on energy intake and consequent population-level obesity, and, secondarily, cardiovascular disease (CVD) mortality.

Design Microsimulation modelling analysis

Setting England

Model A microsimulation model (2024-2043) to estimate the impact of changing front-of-pack nutrition labels in England. The two main policy scenarios tested were mandatory implementation of (i) traffic light labels and (ii) nutrient warning labels. For each scenario, the impact of the policy through assumed changes in energy intake due to consumer behaviour change and reformulation was modelled.

Main outcome measures Change in obesity prevalence (%) and CVD deaths prevented or postponed.

Results Compared to the baseline scenario (current voluntary implementation of traffic light labelling), mandatory implementation of traffic light labelling was estimated to reduce obesity prevalence in England by 2.28% (95% UI -4.06 to -0.96) and prevent or postpone 17000 (95% UI 4700 to 48000) CVD deaths. Mandatory implementation of nutrient warning labelling was estimated to have a larger impact; a 3.68% (95% UI -9.94 to -0.18) reduction in

obesity prevalence and the prevention/postponement of 29000 (95% UI 1200 to 110000) CVD deaths.

Conclusions This work offers the first modelled estimation of the impact of introducing mandatory front-of-pack nutrition labels on health outcomes in the adult population in England. Findings suggest that mandatory implementation of nutrient warning labels would reduce rates of obesity and CVD deaths, compared to current voluntary or mandatory implementation of traffic light labelling, and should therefore be considered by the UK government.

Funding: European Research Council (Grant reference: PIDS, 8031940).

Keywords: microsimulation model; policy evaluation; inequalities; food labelling policies

Abbreviations

BMI: Body mass index

CVD: Cardiovascular disease

IMD: Index of Multiple Deprivation

NCD: Non-communicable diseases

1 **Introduction**

2 Diet-related disease is a major cause of poor population health and social inequalities in
3 health (1). Many pre-prepared foods and non-alcoholic beverages (hereafter: food) are high in
4 calories, added sugar, salt, and/or saturated fat (2,3). Excessive consumption of these nutrients
5 increases the risk of obesity and other associated non-communicable diseases (NCD) such as
6 cardiovascular disease (CVD), and NCD mortality (4).

7 In the UK, the average adult consumes an excess of 200-300 calories per day, and nearly two-
8 thirds of UK adults are living with overweight or obesity (5,6). Notably, the prevalence of
9 overweight and obesity is patterned by deprivation (14 percentage points higher in the most
10 relative to the least deprived areas), and education (12 percentage points higher for those with
11 no qualifications compared to those who are degree-level educated) (5). Therefore, there is a
12 need for equitable public health policies that improve dietary quality across the population.

13 Front-of-pack nutrition labels are an evidence-based policy tool used to help consumers make
14 healthier food choices and encourage industry to improve the nutritional profile of the
15 products they sell (7). In the UK, an industry-endorsed traffic light front-of-pack nutrition
16 label (see **Figure 1.A**) has been implemented voluntarily since 2013. This traffic light label
17 uses green, amber, and red colours to indicate whether a product contains low, moderate, or
18 high levels of nutrients of concern, alongside guideline daily amount (GDA) percentages for
19 each nutrient (typically per serving). However, UK consumers report that the traffic light
20 label is difficult to interpret, which may widen health inequalities (8). Additionally, less than
21 half of consumers use the label to determine product calorie content, and calorie content
22 specifically is not designated with a traffic light colour (9). It may be that simpler labels are

23 required, as most consumers typically spend no more than a few seconds examining labels
24 before making a food selection (10).

25 In July 2020, the UK Government launched a consultation considering an alternative front-of-
26 pack nutrition label to the traffic light (11). In the consultation, Chile's nutrient warning labels
27 were highlighted as a potential alternative, and the benefits of implementing mandatory front-
28 of-pack labelling were discussed.

29 In 2016, Chile implemented a mandatory policy requiring packaged foods containing 'high'
30 amounts (as defined by thresholds set by the Ministry of Health) of calories, added sugar,
31 sodium, and/or saturated fat to display nutrient warning labels (12) (see **Figure 1.B**). Very
32 similar policies have since been implemented in other South American countries, including
33 Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Mexico, Peru, and Uruguay (13,14). Mandatory nutrient
34 warnings have also been implemented further afield in Canada and Israel, and policy
35 development is under consideration in several other countries, including the US, India, and
36 South Africa (15). Evidence indicates that implementation in Chile has reduced the purchase
37 of energy (a relative 8.3% decrease, 95% CI: [5.0, 11.6]) and nutrients of concern (ranging
38 from -9.6% for saturated fat to -20.2% for sugar) (16), and has led to product reformulation
39 across all food groups, leading to reductions in energy content (-3.9%), and other labelled
40 nutrients of concern (ranging from -1.5% for saturated fat to -15% for sugar) (17).

41 Furthermore, evidence from a meta-analysis of over 100 randomised controlled trials (RCTs)
42 and quasi-experimental studies suggests that nutrient warning labels may perform better than
43 traffic light labels in terms of reducing consumers' purchase of energy (an additional 6.4%
44 (95% CI: [0.4; 12.5] reduction) and nutrients of concern, and probability of choosing less
45 healthy products (7). Therefore, it is important to examine the potential impact of their

46 implementation in the UK on health outcomes such as adult obesity prevalence, to inform
47 policy decision-making.

48 The present study aimed to estimate the likely long-term impacts of implementing (i)
49 mandatory nutrient warning labels and (ii) mandatory traffic light labels on packaged in-store
50 foods, relative to the current voluntary implementation of traffic light labels, on energy intake
51 and consequent population-level obesity prevalence and cardiovascular mortality due to
52 change in BMI in England.

53 **Methods**

54 Model overview

55 We built a dynamic, discrete-time, stochastic, open-cohort microsimulation model to quantify
56 the estimated effects of implementing front-of-pack nutrition labels in England; an adaptation
57 of the IMPACT NCD Model based on the IMPACT Food Policy Model (18). The model
58 simulates the life-course of individuals and their counterfactuals under alternative policy
59 scenarios. This enables the detailed simulation of diet policies and their impact on relevant
60 exposures, subsequent disease epidemiology, and mortality in a competing risk framework
61 that accounts for different lag-times between exposures and outcomes. In this case, we
62 simulated the effects of implementing mandatory front-of-pack nutrition labels (nutrient
63 warning and traffic light) on daily energy intake from packaged food, and subsequent
64 population-level obesity prevalence and CVD mortality due to change in BMI. We modelled
65 the population of England, aged 30 to 89 years, over 20 years (2024 to 2043) using a synthetic
66 population stratified by age, sex and Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) that captures the
67 real demographics, energy intakes, and disease epidemiology of the actual population of
68 England using available national data sources (see below and in Appendix section “Creation
69 of our synthetic population”).

70 We evaluated two main policy scenarios:

- 71 1. Traffic light labels are implemented as a mandatory policy
- 72 2. Nutrient warning labels are implemented as a mandatory policy

73 We compared each scenario with a counterfactual “no intervention” (baseline) scenario,
74 which corresponds to the current England legislation: continued voluntary implementation of
75 traffic light labels.

76 We did not model the impact of Nutri-Score, an alternative front-of-pack label which uses a
77 colour spectrum and letter grades to summarise product healthiness, as a main scenario (19),
78 This is because meta-analytic evidence suggests that it does not perform significantly
79 differently to the traffic light label in terms of reducing energy purchased (7). Instead, results
80 for Nutri-Score are presented in the Appendix (see **Appendix Table 4**).

81 Front-of-pack nutrition labels

82 Front-of-pack nutrition labels impact diet through (1) consumer behaviour change, and (2)
83 industry response, i.e., reformulation of the products by industry (see **Figure 2**).

84 Effect on consumer behaviour change

85 We assumed that the traffic light labels and nutrient warning labels would reduce energy
86 purchased from packaged food by 6.5% (95% CI: [2.0; 11.0]), 12.9% (95% CI: [8.0; 18.0]),
87 and 6% (95% CI: [1.0; 11.0]) respectively, compared to no label, based on the estimates from
88 Song et al.’s review and network meta-analysis (7). Based on the same meta-analysis, we
89 assume that nutrient warning labels will outperform traffic light labels in reducing the total
90 amount of energy purchased by 6.4% (95% CI: [0.4; 12.5]). Based on existing literature, we
91 assumed no differential policy effects by sex, age or socioeconomic position (7,20). Due to an
92 absence of evidence, we assumed both labels have a consistent effect on consumer behaviour
93 over time.

94 Effect on energy content reformulation

95 For nutrient warning labels, we assumed a 3.9% (95% CI: [12.5; 4.95]) reduction in energy
96 content of labelled packaged foods, based on evidence from Chile post-implementation (17).
97 While there is no available data specifically in relation to traffic light labelling and product
98 reformulation, evidence suggests that a small amount of reformulation does occur in response
99 to food labelling, particularly when it is implemented mandatorily (21–23). Therefore, we
100 also assumed the same 3.9% reduction in energy content of packaged foods in response to
101 mandatory traffic light labelling.

102 Label coverage

103 We assumed that all packaged products (100%) would feature a traffic light label, as under
104 mandatory implementation, this would be required by law (16). Under current voluntary
105 implementation, it is estimated that 75% of packaged products feature the label (24), so
106 mandatory implementation would yield an additional 25% coverage. For nutrient warning
107 labels, based on evidence on the proportion of products featuring a “high in” warning in
108 Chile, we assumed that 51% (95% CI: [49.0; 52.0]) of packaged foods in England would
109 feature the label (i.e., will be above threshold for warning) (25). The nutritional quality of
110 packaged food in Chile is relatively similar to the UK; the average Health Star Rating for
111 packaged food is 2.44 compared to 2.83 (scores range from 0.5 to 5, with a higher score
112 indicating better nutritional quality) (26). Moreover, an analysis of food items from the UK
113 NDNS indicated that approximately 40% of UK food items meet requirements for a red traffic
114 light label, and this figure does not include items that would be labelled due to being high in
115 energy (27). Research suggests that 32% of UK supermarket snack foods alone exceed adult
116 energy intake recommendations (3) and therefore it is reasonable to estimate that this would
117 amount to at least an additional 10% of products being labelled, consistent with the 51%
118 figure derived from Chile.

119 Estimating model uncertainty

120 We used the Monte Carlo approach (100 iterations) to estimate the uncertainty of model
121 parameters. The sources of uncertainty we considered were the uncertainty of the relative risk
122 of coronary heart disease (CHD) and stroke based on BMI, the uncertainty of mortality
123 forecasts, and the uncertainty of the policy (label) effect. We summarised the output
124 distributions by reporting the medians and 95% uncertainty intervals (UIs).

125 One-way sensitivity analyses on key parameters

126 Change in nutrient warning labels coverage

127 Evidence from Chile suggests that approximately one year after initial implementation of the
128 nutrient warning label policy, reformulation resulted in a decrease in the proportion of
129 products featuring a label from 51% to 44% (95% CI: [42.0 - 45.0]) (25). Reformulation to
130 reduce nutrients of concern is consistently observed in response to the introduction of front-
131 of-pack nutrition labelling policies in various countries, including Australia, Canada, the
132 Netherlands, and New Zealand, to avoid a “negative” label (e.g., a low health rating) or the
133 absence of a “positive” label (e.g., a healthy choice indicator) (28). Therefore, in this
134 sensitivity analysis we assume that coverage is 51% for the first-year post-implementation,
135 and coverage then drops to 44% thereafter.

136 Chile’s black octagon specifically (as opposed to nutrient warning labels more generally)

137 In this sensitivity analysis, we test based on evidence from Chile specifically, post-
138 implementation (as opposed to meta-analytic data on nutrient warning labels in general from
139 experimental studies), which suggests an overall 8.8% (95% CI: [-7.1 to -10.5]) reduction in
140 energy purchased (16). Notably, nutrient warning labels were introduced in Chile as part of a

141 set of policies, including restrictions on food marketing to children, and therefore this
 142 reduction in energy purchase may not be wholly attributable to nutrient warning label
 143 implementation.

144 Lower reformulation due to traffic light labels

145 It is possible that reformulation of energy content may be lower in response to traffic light
 146 labelling relative to nutrient warning labelling. This is because calories are not colour-coded
 147 in traffic light labels and therefore food companies may be less inclined to reformulate energy
 148 content of products. We assumed there would be a smaller 0.9% (95% CI [-3.1, 4.9])
 149 reduction in energy content, based on a meta-analysis of food labelling effects on product
 150 energy reformulation (23).

151 Table 1: Summary of key model assumptions

	Traffic light label	Nutrient warning label
<i>Main assumptions</i>		
Effect on energy intake	-6.5% [-11%; -2%] (7)	-12.9% [-18%; -8%] (outperforms the traffic light label by 6.4% [0.4; 12.5] (7)
Effect on reformulation in terms of energy content	-3.9% [-12.5; 4.95] (17)	-3.9% [-12.5; 4.95] (17)
Label coverage on packaged products	100% (currently 75% under voluntary implementation) (24)	51% [49%; 52%] (25)
<i>Sensitivity assumptions</i>		
Changes in label coverage over time due to reformulation	-	Drops to 44% [42.0; 45.0] 4 years post-implementation (25)
Chile's black octagon nutrient warning label effectiveness on energy intake from labelled products	-	-8.8% [7.1.; -10.5] (16)
Effect on reformulation in terms of energy content	-0.9% [-3.1, 4.9] (23)	-

152 A further detailed description of the model, input sources, and key assumptions are provided
153 in the **Appendix**.

154 Model engine

155 Front-of-pack nutrition labels are hypothesised to reduce energy intake, which will
156 subsequently impact the body weight of the population (i.e., BMI), and, in turn, change CVD
157 mortality risk. This pathway is described in **Figure 2** and detail in **Appendix** (section
158 “Estimating the effect of change in energy intake upon obesity prevalence and CVD
159 mortality”). In short, the change in energy intake is calculated by subtracting intake post-
160 intervention from baseline intake for each year. Changes in energy intake are then converted
161 into changes in body weight, based on principles of energy conservation, using the
162 Christiansen & Garby prediction formula (29) (detail in **Appendix** section “Estimating the
163 effect of change in energy intake on BMI”). The estimated change in BMI is then calculated
164 based on the estimated change in body weight, which allows us to estimate the change in
165 obesity prevalence. Next, these changes in BMI are used to estimate changes in CVD
166 mortality risk, with a 6-year lag time (30) (see details in **Appendix** section “Estimating the
167 effect of change in BMI upon CVD mortality”). Using this information, new mortality rates
168 and, consequently, the number of deaths projected can be estimated.

169 Model outputs

170 The model produced the change in obesity prevalence and the total number of deaths
171 prevented or postponed (DPPs) for each scenario. The equity impact of the intervention was
172 examined by calculating the ratio between the most and least deprived quintile groups (using
173 the IMD). Results are presented for English adults aged 30 to 89 years from 2024 to 2043,

174 rounded to 2 significant figures for mortality and rounded to 2 decimal places for obesity
175 prevalence.

176 Data sources

177 We constructed a synthetic population of England to simulate the population-level impact of
178 the policy scenarios. This is described in the Appendix section “Data sources used in our
179 model” and **Appendix Table 1**. The England population projections were derived from the
180 Office for National Statistics (ONS), and mortality trend projections were based on the CVD
181 deaths observed in England from 1981 to 2016.

182 We used generalised additive models for location, shape and scale (GAMLSS) to estimate (i)
183 BMI and (ii) energy intake distributions dependent on age, sex, and IMD. GAMLSS can
184 handle complex relationships between the response variable and its predictors and numerous
185 types of distributions (31). Trends in energy intake daily energy intakes and BMI were
186 obtained from the nationally representative National Diet and Nutrition Survey (NDNS)
187 2009-2019. These trends in energy intake and BMI observed in the last 10 years in England
188 were assumed to continue in the future. To obtain the daily energy from packaged food
189 bought from grocery retail stores, we assumed that 55% of all food and beverage expenditure
190 (including alcoholic beverages) was for at-home consumption (vs. 45% spent on restaurants
191 and other out-of-home food services) (32) and that 80% of the products purchased are
192 packaged (vs. 20% fresh) (8) (see details in **Appendix** section “Modelling approach and
193 scenarios”).

194 R (version 4.3.0) was used to conduct all data management and statistical analyses. We used
195 the “demography” package (33) for forecasting mortality and the “gamlss” package to fit the
196 distribution (34). For code, see https://github.com/zoecolombet/FoPLabels_code

197

198 **Results**

199 Maintaining current voluntary traffic light labelling would result in obesity prevalence of
200 28.03% (95% UI 27.74 - 28.30) by 2043.

201 The implementation of mandatory traffic light labelling in England was estimated to reduce
202 obesity prevalence by 1.49 percentage points (absolute; 95% UI -2.44 to -0.76; **Table 2**) in
203 the next 20 years when only considering consumer behaviour change (i.e., change in energy
204 intake). Reformulation of the energy content of the packaged products sold was estimated to
205 lower obesity prevalence by 0.66 percentage points (95% UI -2.79 to 0.00; **Table 2**).

206 Combining these factors would result in a decrease of 2.28 percentage points in obesity
207 prevalence among adults (95% UI -4.06 to -0.96; **Table 2**).

208 Implementing mandatory nutrient warning labels on packaged products was estimated to have
209 a larger impact and reduce obesity prevalence by 2.31 percentage points (95% UI -6.79 to -
210 0.02; **Table 2**) when only considering consumer behaviour change. Reformulation of the
211 energy content of the packaged products sold was estimated to lower obesity prevalence by
212 0.96 percentage points (95% UI -6.10 to 0; **Table 2**). Combining these factors would result in
213 a decrease of 3.68 percentage points in obesity prevalence among adults (95% UI -9.94 to -
214 0.18; **Table 2**).

215 Maintaining current voluntary implementation of traffic light labelling in England, the current
216 cardiovascular mortality trends were estimated to result in approximately 1,900,000 deaths
217 (95% UI 1,100,000 – 3,300,000) in English adults by 2043.

218

219 Implementing traffic light labelling mandatorily would prevent or postpone approximately
220 7300 deaths (95% UI 2500 to 21000; **Table 2**) attributable to BMI-related CVD, based on
221 consumer behaviour change alone. Reformulation was estimated to avert 2500 deaths (95%
222 UI 0 to 17000; **Table 2**). Combined, this would result in 17000 deaths (95% UI 4700 to
223 48000; **Table 2**) prevented or postponed.

224 Again, implementing mandatory nutrient warning labels was estimated to have a larger
225 impact, resulting in the prevention or postponement of an estimated 14300 (95% UI 240 to
226 54000) deaths based on consumer behaviour change, 4300 deaths (95% UI 0 to 42000; **Table**
227 **2**) based on reformulation, and 29000 deaths (95% UI 1200 to 110000; **Table 2**) based on the
228 two combined.

229

230

231

232

233

234

235

236

237 Table 2: Estimated change in obesity prevalence and CVD mortality due to change in BMI in
 238 adults in England (2024–43), according to different front-of-pack labelling implementation
 239 scenarios

	Change in prevalence of obesity (%)	CVD deaths prevented or postponed*
Consumer behaviour change		
Traffic light labelling (mandatory)	-1.49 (- 2.44, -0.76)	7300 (2500, 21000)
Nutrient warning labelling (mandatory)	-2.31 (-6.79, -0.02)	14300 (240, 54000)
Reformulation		
Traffic light labelling (mandatory)	-0.66 (-2.79, 0)	2500 (0, 17000)
Nutrient warning labelling (mandatory)	-0.96 (-6.10, 0)	4300 (0, 42000)
Combined		
Traffic light labelling (mandatory)	-2.28 (-4.06, -0.96)	17000 (4700, 48000)
Nutrient warning labelling (mandatory)	-3.68 (-9.94, -0.18)	29000 (1200, 110000)

240 *Results from 2024 to 2043.

241

242

243

244

245

246

247 Table 3: Estimated change in obesity prevalence and CVD mortality due to change in BMI in
 248 adults in England (2024–43), according to IMD quintile groups and different front-of-pack
 249 labelling implementation scenarios

	Prevalence of obesity, percentage points	CVD deaths
	Predicted obesity prevalence	CVD deaths predicted
Current voluntary traffic light labelling		
<i>Q1 (most deprived)</i>	32.53 (32.00, 33.04)	470,000 (270,000 – 830,000)
<i>Q5 (least deprived)</i>	24.29 (23.55, 24.85)	290,000 (170,000 – 500,000)
	Predicted change in obesity prevalence	CVD deaths prevented or postponed
Mandatory traffic light labelling – consumer behaviour change		
<i>Q1</i>	-1.46 (-2.24, -0.71)	2000 (240, 5500)
<i>Q5</i>	-1.48 (-2.46, -0.75)	1000 (0, 4500)
Mandatory traffic light labelling - reformulation		
<i>Q1</i>	-0.66 (-2.85, 0)	500 (0, 6500)
<i>Q5</i>	-0.65 (-2.73, 0)	250 (0, 2000)
Mandatory traffic light labelling - combined		
<i>Q1</i>	-2.14 (-3.96, -0.91)	4000 (740, 14000)
<i>Q5</i>	-2.28 (-4.08, -0.93)	2500 (500, 8000)
Mandatory nutrient warning labelling – consumer behaviour change		
<i>Q1</i>	-2.25 (-6.25, -0.01)	3500 (0, 13000)
<i>Q5</i>	-2.31 (-6.81, -0.03)	2000 (0, 8800)
Mandatory nutrient warning labelling - reformulation		
<i>Q1</i>	-0.90 (-5.58, 0)	1000 (0, 12000)
<i>Q5</i>	-1.05 (-6.20, 0)	500 (0, 5500)
Mandatory nutrient warning labelling - combined		
<i>Q1</i>	-3.61 (-9.58, -0.19)	7500 (0, 30000)
<i>Q5</i>	-3.59 (-9.80, -0.20)	4500 (0, 18000)

251 The introduction of either front-of-package label as a mandatory policy is estimated to reduce
252 obesity prevalence and relative CVD deaths to a similar extent across socioeconomic
253 deprivation levels (see **Table 3**).

254 See **Appendix Table 3** for sensitivity analysis results relating to nutrient warning label
255 coverage, Chile’s nutrient warning label specifically, and traffic light label reformulation.
256 Briefly, nutrient warning labels with reduced coverage, and Chile’s warning label specifically
257 still outperformed traffic light labels. Traffic light labels saw a notable decrease in
258 performance using the more conservative reformulation estimate. See **Appendix Table 4** for
259 results relating to Nutri Score. As expected, results for Nutri Score were very similar to those
260 for traffic light labelling.

261

262

263

264

265

266

267

268

269

270 **Discussion**

271 This work offers the first modelled estimation of the impact of changing front-of-pack
272 nutrition label policy on obesity prevalence and CVD mortality in the adult population in
273 England. Our findings indicate that, in place of current voluntary traffic light labelling, the
274 introduction of mandatory nutrient warning labels would reduce obesity prevalence and CVD
275 deaths substantially more than making traffic light labels mandatory, with no differential
276 effects on health inequalities.

277 Our findings are largely consistent with the existing limited evidence in this area. One
278 previous study modelled the impact of nutrient warning labels in Mexico (35). The study
279 estimated a mean caloric reduction of 36.8 kcal/day/person, and, 5 years post-implementation,
280 1.3 million fewer cases of obesity (5% reduction). A handful of studies have modelled the
281 impact of traffic light labelling on NCD mortality. One study modelling impact in Canada
282 (36) estimated that 11715 deaths per year due to diet-related NCDs, and 10490 deaths per
283 year due to energy intake alone would be prevented. However, this was contingent on
284 Canadians using the traffic light labelling to avoid foods labelled with red lights. Another
285 study estimated the impact of Nutri-Couleurs (traffic light label) across 27 EU nations and
286 found no significant effect on NCD mortality (37). However, the effect estimate for change in
287 energy intake was derived from a large-scale randomised controlled trial in French
288 supermarkets which only covered four product types (bread, ready meals, fresh catering, and
289 pastries) (38), as opposed to the use of meta-analytic evidence in the present research.

290 Although the current research provides important insights into the likely impact of changing
291 front-of-pack nutrition label policy in England, there are limitations to be acknowledged. We
292 assumed that reductions in energy intake would be in response to labelled products, which

293 may be an overestimate for traffic light labels as not all products would feature a “red”
294 indicator. We also assumed that energy intake trends from NDNS will continue, but it is
295 possible that COVID-19 and/or the cost-of-living crisis may result in long-term changes. Our
296 results will also underestimate total policy benefits as we did not include changes in
297 childhood obesity in our model.

298 It is also important to acknowledge that the present research underestimates the impact of the
299 labelling policies on total CVD mortality as due to model design we do not model effects of
300 policies due to changes in intake of nutrients of concern (salt, sugar, saturated fat) and instead
301 model change via energy intake and reductions to BMI. Excess intake of salt, sugar, and
302 saturated fat is associated with CVD risk (39). Evidence suggests that labelling policies
303 decrease the purchase of nutrients of concern, especially nutrient warning labels relative to
304 traffic light labels, so impacts on CVD mortality are likely to be particularly underestimated
305 for nutrient warning labels (7,20).

306 We did not model a scenario where nutrient warning labels are implemented voluntarily, as
307 there are no examples of such implementation. Moreover, the current evidence suggest that
308 voluntary, industry-endorsed initiatives in the context of front-of-package labelling are likely
309 to be ineffective for several reasons, such as industry manipulation of label design,
310 noncompliance (particularly as nutrient warning labels are known to deter purchase of
311 labelled products), and a lack of independent target setting, monitoring, and enforcement
312 (40,41) Finally, while nutrient warning labels appear effective in reducing purchase and intake
313 of energy and nutrients of concern, it may be that alternative/additional labels are required to
314 encourage consumers to select health protective food options (i.e., those that contain nutrients
315 that the population do not consume enough of, e.g., fiber, vitamin D).

316 Several assumptions in our model were constrained by a lack of available evidence and these
317 areas might benefit from further research. Firstly, there was no available data on how the
318 effect of the label on consumer behaviour change may change over time. Theoretically, if
319 people become habituated to front of pack labels, then the effect may decrease, or conversely,
320 if nutrient literacy and awareness strengthen over time then the effect may increase (8).
321 Secondly, there was no available data on compensatory effects from intake of fresh food in
322 place of packaged food, or intake from out-of-home eating. Thirdly, although there is some
323 self-report evidence to suggest that age, education, and ethnicity may impact understanding
324 of, and therefore response to traffic light labels (8), there was no consistent evidence that
325 demographic factors moderate the effect of labels on product choice (7,20).

326 The World Health Organization (WHO) does not at present recommend the use of any
327 specific labelling scheme but encourages research institutions and member states to continue
328 analysing information to inform decisions (42). This new modelled evidence supports the use
329 of nutrient warning labels to reduce population-level obesity. While such labels are gaining
330 global popularity, the UK and Europe are yet to adopt this policy approach. It is
331 recommended that the UK Government replaces its current voluntary traffic light labelling
332 system with mandatory nutrient warning labelling to reduce rates of obesity and related CVD
333 deaths.

334 **Conclusion**

335 Mandatory implementation of nutrient warning labels appears to be the most favorable policy
336 option for the UK government to substantially reduce rates of obesity, compared to current
337 voluntary or mandatory implementation of traffic light labelling.

Declarations

Data sharing

ONS and NDNS data are available online. The “demography” package for R software has been used for forecasting mortality and the “gamlss” package has been used to fit the distribution. Syntax for the generation of derived variables and for the analysis used in this study are available publicly: https://github.com/zoecolombet/FoPLabels_code

Funding

Salaries for ZC and ER were fully and part-funded, respectively, by the European Research Council under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (Grant reference: PIDS, 803194). ER and RE are funded by the National Institute for Health and Care Research (NIHR) Oxford Health Biomedical Research Centre (BRC) (Grant reference: NIHR203316).

Role of the funding source

The funder played no role in the study design, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation, writing of the paper, or the decision to submit this work for publication.

Competing interest statement

All authors have completed the Unified Competing Interest Form and declare: no support from any organisation for the submitted work; no financial relationships with any organisations that might have an interest in the submitted work in the previous three years; no other relationships or activities that could appear to have influenced the submitted work.

Transparency declaration

The lead author (R.E) affirms that the manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent account of the study being reported; that no important aspects of the study have been omitted; and that any discrepancies from the study as planned have been explained.

Copyright statement

The Corresponding Author (R.E.) has the right to grant on behalf of all authors and does grant on behalf of all authors, an exclusive licence on a worldwide basis to the BMJ Publishing Group Ltd to permit this article to be published in BMJ editions and any other BMJPGJL products and sublicences such use and exploit all subsidiary rights, as set out in our licence.

Ethical approval

Ethical approval was not required for this study.

Authors' contributions

ZC, RE, ER, MO'F, and EP designed the study. ZC and RE directly accessed and verified the underlying data reported in this article. ZC and RE developed the model. CK, MO'F, and ER supervised ZC and RE. RE and ZC did the analysis and drafted the manuscript. All authors contributed to the data interpretation and revised each draft for important intellectual content. All authors had final responsibility for the decision to submit for publication.

References

1. Gilmore AB, Fabbri A, Baum F, Bertscher A, Bondy K, Chang HJ, et al. Defining and conceptualising the commercial determinants of health. *The Lancet*. 2023 Apr;401(10383):1194–213.
2. Huang Y, Burgoine T, Essman M, Theis DRZ, Bishop TRP, Adams J. Monitoring the Nutrient Composition of Food Prepared Out-of-Home in the United Kingdom: Database Development and Case Study. *JMIR Public Health Surveill*. 2022 Sep 8;8(9):e39033.
3. Marty L, Evans R, Sheen F, Humphreys G, Jones A, Boyland E, et al. The energy and nutritional content of snacks sold at supermarkets and coffee shops in the UK. *J Human Nutrition Diet*. 2021 Dec;34(6):1035–41.
4. Anand SS, Hawkes C, De Souza RJ, Mente A, Dehghan M, Nugent R, et al. Food Consumption and its Impact on Cardiovascular Disease: Importance of Solutions Focused on the Globalized Food System. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology*. 2015 Oct;66(14):1590–614.
5. Baker C. Research Briefing - Obesity statistics [Internet]. House of Commons Librar; 2023 [cited 2024 Apr 17]. Available from: <https://researchbriefings.files.parliament.uk/documents/SN03336/SN03336.pdf>
6. Tedstone A, Targett V, Mackinlay B, Owtram G, Coulton V, Morgan K, et al. Calorie reduction: The scope and ambition for action [Internet]. Public Health England; 2018 [cited 2024 Apr 17]. Available from: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/800675/Calories_Evidence_Document.pdf
7. Song J, Brown MK, Tan M, MacGregor GA, Webster J, Campbell NRC, et al. Impact of color-coded and warning nutrition labelling schemes: A systematic review and network meta-analysis. Ares G, editor. *PLoS Med*. 2021 Oct 5;18(10):e1003765.
8. Osman M, Jenkins S. Consumer responses to food labelling: A rapid evidence review [Internet]. Food Standards Agency; 2021 [cited 2024 Apr 17]. Available from: <https://www.food.gov.uk/research/consumer-responses-to-food-labelling-a-rapid-evidence-review>
9. Food Standards Agency. Eating Well Choosing Better Tracker Survey Wave 8 2022 [Internet]. 2022. Available from: <https://www.food.gov.uk/research/ewcb-2022-results>
10. Sanjari SS, Jahn S, Boztug Y. Dual-process theory and consumer response to front-of-package nutrition label formats. *Nutrition Reviews*. 2017 Nov 1;75(11):871–82.
11. GOV.UK. Front-of-pack nutrition labelling in the UK: building on success [Internet]. 2020. Available from: <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/front-of-pack-nutrition-labelling-i-n-the-uk-building-on-success>

12. Reyes M, Garmendia ML, Olivares S, Aqueveque C, Zacarías I, Corvalán C. Development of the Chilean front-of-package food warning label. *BMC Public Health*. 2019 Dec;19(1):906.
13. Taillie LS, Hall MG, Gómez LF, Higgins I, Bercholz M, Murukutla N, et al. Designing an Effective Front-of-Package Warning Label for Food and Drinks High in Added Sugar, Sodium, or Saturated Fat in Colombia: An Online Experiment. *Nutrients*. 2020 Oct 13;12(10):3124.
14. White M, Barquera S. Mexico Adopts Food Warning Labels, Why Now? *Health Systems & Reform*. 2020 Dec;6(1):e1752063.
15. UNC Global Food Research Program. Front-of-Package (FOP) Food Labelling: Empowering consumers and promoting healthy diets [Internet]. Available from: https://www.globalfoodresearchprogram.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/10/FOP_Factsheet_HSR_update.pdf
16. Taillie LS, Bercholz M, Popkin B, Rebolledo N, Reyes M, Corvalán MC. Decreases in purchases of energy, sodium, sugar, and saturated fat 3 years after implementation of the Chilean food labeling and marketing law: An interrupted time series analysis. *PLOS Medicine*. 2024 Sep 27;21(9):e1004463.
17. Quintiliano Scarpelli D, Pinheiro Fernandes AC, Rodriguez Osiac L, Pizarro Quevedo T. Changes in Nutrient Declaration after the Food Labeling and Advertising Law in Chile: A Longitudinal Approach. *Nutrients*. 2020 Aug 8;12(8):2371.
18. Pearson-Stuttard J, Bandosz P, Rehm CD, Penalvo J, Whitsel L, Gaziano T, et al. Reducing US cardiovascular disease burden and disparities through national and targeted dietary policies: A modelling study. *PLoS Med*. 2017 Jun;14(6):e1002311.
19. Santé publique France. NUTRI-SCORE Questions & Answers English version [Internet]. 2024. Available from: https://www.santepubliquefrance.fr/content/download/150263/file/QR_scientifique_technique_EN_12052020.pdf
20. Croker H, Packer J, Russell SJ, Stansfield C, Viner RM. Front of pack nutritional labelling schemes: a systematic review and meta-analysis of recent evidence relating to objectively measured consumption and purchasing. *J Human Nutrition Diet*. 2020 Aug;33(4):518–37.
21. Ganderats-Fuentes M, Morgan S. Front-of-Package Nutrition Labeling and Its Impact on Food Industry Practices: A Systematic Review of the Evidence. *Nutrients*. 2023 Jun 5;15(11):2630.
22. Vandevijvere S, Vanderlee L. Effect of Formulation, Labelling, and Taxation Policies on the Nutritional Quality of the Food Supply. *Curr Nutr Rep*. 2019 Sep;8(3):240–9.
23. Shangguan S, Afshin A, Shulkin M, Ma W, Marsden D, Smith J, et al. A Meta-Analysis of Food Labeling Effects on Consumer Diet Behaviors and Industry Practices. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*. 2019 Feb;56(2):300–14.

24. House of Commons Health Committee. Childhood obesity— brave and bold action [Internet]. 2015. Available from: <https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201516/cmselect/cmhealth/465/465.pdf>
25. Reyes M, Smith Taillie L, Popkin B, Kanter R, Vandevijvere S, Corvalán C. Changes in the amount of nutrient of packaged foods and beverages after the initial implementation of the Chilean Law of Food Labelling and Advertising: A nonexperimental prospective study. Wareham NJ, editor. *PLoS Med*. 2020 Jul 28;17(7):e1003220.
26. Dunford EK, Ni Mhurchu C, Huang L, Vandevijvere S, Swinburn B, Pravst I, et al. A comparison of the healthiness of packaged foods and beverages from 12 countries using the Health Star Rating nutrient profiling system, 2013–2018. *Obesity Reviews*. 2019 Nov;20(S2):107–15.
27. Dicken SJ, Batterham RL, Brown A. Nutrients or processing? An analysis of food and drink items from the UK National Diet and Nutrition Survey based on nutrient content, the NOVA classification and front of package traffic light labelling. *Br J Nutr*. 2024 May 14;131(9):1619–32.
28. Roberto CA, Ng SW, Ganderats-Fuentes M, Hammond D, Barquera S, Jauregui A, et al. The Influence of Front-of-Package Nutrition Labeling on Consumer Behavior and Product Reformulation. *Annu Rev Nutr*. 2021 Oct 11;41(1):529–50.
29. Christiansen E, Garby L. Prediction of body weight changes caused by changes in energy balance. *Eur J Clin Invest*. 2002 Nov;32(11):826–30.
30. Emerging Risk Factors Collaboration, Wormser D, Kaptoge S, Di Angelantonio E, Wood AM, Pennells L, et al. Separate and combined associations of body-mass index and abdominal adiposity with cardiovascular disease: collaborative analysis of 58 prospective studies. *Lancet*. 2011 Mar 26;377(9771):1085–95.
31. Stasinopoulos MD, Rigby RA, Heller GZ, Voudouris V, Bastiani FD. Flexible Regression and Smoothing: Using GAMLSS in R. New York: Chapman and Hall/CRC; 2017. 571 p.
32. Statista. Share of household food and drink expenditure in the United Kingdom (UK) from 2000 to 1st quarter 2020, by at-home and out-of-home consumption. Available from: <https://www.statista.com/statistics/941699/in-home-versus-out-of-home-food-and-drink-spending-united-kingdom-uk/>
33. Hyndman R, Booth H, Tickle L, Maindonald J. Package ‘demography’ for R [Internet]. [cited 2022 Nov 9]. Available from: <https://github.com/robjhyndman/demography>
34. Stasinopoulos M, Rigby R, Voudouris V, Akantziliotou C, Enea M, Kiose D, et al. Package ‘gamLss’: Generalized Additive Models for Location Scale and Shape [Internet]. 2024 [cited 2024 Apr 24]. Available from: <https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/gamLss/gamLss.pdf>
35. Basto-Abreu A, Torres-Alvarez R, Reyes-Sánchez F, González-Morales R, Canto-Osorio F, Colchero MA, et al. Predicting obesity reduction after implementing warning labels in Mexico: A modeling study. Clément K, editor. *PLoS Med*. 2020 Jul 28;17(7):e1003221.

36. Labonté ME, Emrich TE, Scarborough P, Rayner M, L'Abbé MR. Traffic light labelling could prevent mortality from noncommunicable diseases in Canada: A scenario modelling study. Vadiveloo MK, editor. PLoS ONE. 2019 Dec 27;14(12):e0226975.
37. Devaux M, Aldea A, Lerouge A, Vuik S, Cecchini M. Establishing an EU-wide front-of-pack nutrition label: Review of options and model-based evaluation. *Obesity Reviews*. 2024 Jun;25(6):e13719.
38. Allais O, Albuquerque P, Bonnet C, Dubois P. Évaluation Expérimentation Logos Nutritionnels Rapport pour le FFAS [Internet]. 2017. Available from: https://sante.gouv.fr/IMG/pdf/rapport_final_groupe_traitement_evaluation_logos.pdf
39. Bowen KJ, Sullivan VK, Kris-Etherton PM, Petersen KS. Nutrition and Cardiovascular Disease—an Update. *Curr Atheroscler Rep*. 2018 Jan 30;20(2):8.
40. Lavery AA, Kyridemos C, Seferidi P, Vamos EP, Pearson-Stuttard J, Collins B, et al. Quantifying the impact of the Public Health Responsibility Deal on salt intake, cardiovascular disease and gastric cancer burdens: interrupted time series and microsimulation study. *J Epidemiol Community Health*. 2019 Sep;73(9):881–7.
41. Knai C, Petticrew M, Douglas N, Durand MA, Eastmure E, Nolte E, et al. The Public Health Responsibility Deal: Using a Systems-Level Analysis to Understand the Lack of Impact on Alcohol, Food, Physical Activity, and Workplace Health Sub-Systems. *IJERPH*. 2018 Dec 17;15(12):2895.
42. World Health Organisation. Guiding principles and framework manual for front-of-pack labelling for promoting healthy diets [Internet]. 2019 [cited 2024 Jul 15]. Available from: <https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/guidingprinciples-labelling-promoting-healthydiet>

Figure 1. Front-of-pack nutrition labels examples




Figure 2. Logic diagram of the impact of front-of-pack labelling on obesity prevalence and cardiovascular disease (CVD) mortality. Abbreviation: BMI: Body Mass Index

