

# 1 Comparing the Canadian front-of-pack labeling regulations 2 with other mandatory approaches in the Americas and their 3 ability to identify ultra-processed products

4  
5 Nadia Flexner,<sup>1,2</sup> Fabio S. Gomes<sup>3</sup>, Christine Mulligan<sup>1</sup>, Mavra Ahmed<sup>1,4</sup>, Laura Vergeer<sup>1,5</sup>,  
6 Jennifer J. Lee<sup>1</sup>, Hayun Jeong<sup>1</sup>, \*Mary R. L'Abbe<sup>1</sup>

7  
8 <sup>1</sup>Department of Nutritional Sciences, Temerty Faculty of Medicine, University of Toronto,  
9 Toronto, ON M5S 1A8, Canada.

10 <sup>2</sup>Global Health Advocacy Incubator, Washington, DC 20005, USA.

11 <sup>3</sup>Pan American Health Organization/World Health Organization, Washington, DC 20037, USA.

12 <sup>4</sup>Joannah & Brian Lawson Centre for Child Nutrition, Temerty Faculty of Medicine, University of  
13 Toronto, Toronto, ON M5S 1A8, Canada.

14 <sup>5</sup>School of Epidemiology and Public Health, Faculty of Medicine, University of Ottawa, Ottawa,  
15 ON K1G 5Z3, Canada.

16  
17 \*Corresponding author: [mary.labbe@utoronto.ca](mailto:mary.labbe@utoronto.ca)

18  
19 **Keywords:** Front-of-pack labeling, FOPL, nutrient profiling, ultra processed products, packaged  
20 food supply, food policy.

## 22 ABSTRACT

### 23 Background

24 Front-of-pack labeling (FOPL) has been implemented in several countries in the Americas, with  
25 Chile being the first to introduce a mandatory 'high in' warning FOPL in 2016. The Pan American  
26 Health Organization (PAHO) food classification criteria, considered a best practice for FOPL  
27 regulations, has been adopted by Mexico, Argentina, and Colombia. Canada's FOPL regulations  
28 were recently approved and will take effect in January 2026, but it is unknown how these  
29 regulations compare to FOPL regulations that have already been implemented in other parts of  
30 the region.

## 31 **Objectives**

32 To compare the Canadian criteria for FOPL regulations with other FOPL criteria implemented in  
33 the Americas, and to determine their ability to identify ultra-processed products (UPPs).

## 34 **Methods**

35 Packaged foods and beverages (n=17,094) from the University of Toronto's Food Label  
36 Information and Price (FLIP) 2017 database were analyzed using three FOPL criteria (Canadian,  
37 Chilean and PAHO criteria) and the NOVA classification system. The proportions of products  
38 that would be subject to displaying a 'high in/excess' FOPL and UPPs that would not be subject  
39 to FOPL regulations were examined under each system's criteria. Agreement patterns were  
40 modeled using a nested sequence of hierarchical Poisson log-linear models. The Wald statistics  
41 for homogeneity were used to test whether proportional distributions differ significantly.

## 42 **Results**

43 Under the Canadian, Chilean and PAHO criteria, 54.4%, 68.4%, and 81.3% of packaged products  
44 would be required to display a 'high in/excess' FOPL, respectively. Disagreements between the  
45 Chilean and the Canadian criteria with PAHO's were significant, but the greatest disagreement  
46 was between the Canadian and PAHO criteria. According to the Canadian, Chilean, and PAHO  
47 criteria, 33.4%, 18.4%, 2.3% of UPPs would not be subject to FOPL regulations, respectively.

## 48 **Conclusions**

49 A significant proportion of products that should be subject to FOPL regulations according to the  
50 PAHO criteria would not be regulated under Chilean and Canadian criteria, resulting in high  
51 proportion of UPPs that would not be subject to FOPL regulations. The Canadian FOPL criteria  
52 are the most lenient, with the highest proportion of UPPs that would not display a FOPL.  
53 Results can inform improvements for FOPL regulations in Canada, Chile and other countries.

## 54 Introduction

55 The burden of noncommunicable diseases (NCDs) has steadily increased in recent decades,  
56 accounting for the most deaths worldwide and in Canada[1, 2]. Unhealthy diet is a major  
57 preventable risk factor for NCDs, responsible for 11 million deaths and 255 million disability-  
58 adjusted life-years (DALYs) globally[3, 4]. The availability and overconsumption of ultra-  
59 processed food products (UPPs), usually high in nutrients-of-concern (i.e., sodium, sugars, and  
60 saturated fats), has increased in recent decades. Furthermore, a growing body of evidence  
61 associates high consumption of UPPs with poor diet quality and mental wellbeing, excess body  
62 weight, and diet related NCDs[5-9]. Governments have taken different measures, either on a  
63 voluntary or mandatory basis, to improve food environments and diets in order to prevent  
64 NCDs[10]. These include the implementation of: front-of-pack labeling (FOPL); sodium and  
65 sugar reduction targets for key food categories; restrictions on food marketing to children;  
66 menu labeling; bans on industrially produced *trans* fatty acids; and sugar-sweetened beverage  
67 (SSB) taxes, among others[10].

68 Nutrient profiling is defined as *'the science of classifying or ranking foods according to their*  
69 *nutritional composition for reasons related to preventing disease and promoting health'*[11].

70 However, the increasing inclusion of food components, such as additives, or the consideration  
71 of nutrients to encourage, such as calcium, into nutrient profiling algorithms indicates that it  
72 might be more appropriate to refer to them as 'food classification systems' (hereinafter also  
73 referred to as 'criteria')[12]. Adopting a robust, evidence-based food classification system is  
74 essential for two key purposes within FOPL regulations. First, to determine which products will

75 be subject to the regulations, and second, to establish the criteria to be adopted to interpret  
76 nutrient content data in order to provide clear and easy to interpret nutritional information to  
77 consumers[13].

78 FOPL provides consumers with clear and easy-to-interpret nutritional information in a visual  
79 form on the front of the package. Mandatory FOPL, a cost-effective policy to promote healthy  
80 diets[14], has been implemented in several countries, mostly in the region of the Americas[15].  
81 In 2016, Chile became the first country in the region to implement a mandatory warning FOPL  
82 system, as part of the comprehensive Chilean Nutritional Food Composition and Advertising  
83 Law – Law 20.606[16]. This Law also restricts the availability of food and beverage products  
84 displaying ‘high in’ warning FOPL in schools, and the advertising and marketing of these  
85 products to children (<14 years)[17]. Other countries have followed similar mandatory ‘high in’  
86 or ‘excess’ FOPL approaches, including Argentina[18], Brazil[19], Canada[20], Colombia[21],  
87 Israel[22], Mexico[23], Peru[24], Uruguay[25], and Venezuela[26], and many other countries  
88 around the world are currently considering its implementation[15, 27-30].

89 Mandatory ‘high in’ FOPL systems, such as that in Chile, have proven to be effective in  
90 prompting consumers to purchase healthier products[31, 32], encouraging food industry  
91 reformulation to lower the sugars and sodium content of products[33, 34], and improving diet  
92 quality[35]. Initial evaluations of other countries adopting a mandatory ‘high in’ or ‘excess’  
93 FOPL approach show a decrease in the proportion of foods displaying a FOPL following  
94 implementation[36], a decrease in purchases of unhealthy food categories[37], and that  
95 consumers use and understand the FOPL [22, 25, 38-40]. In contrast, a recent evaluation of the

96 voluntary Health Star Rating (HSR) system, implemented in Australia and New Zealand in 2014,  
97 found no effect of the HSR on consumer purchasing behavior[41]. This is consistent with  
98 previous evidence from experimental studies[42, 43]. Additionally, low levels of HSR label  
99 adoption were observed (25.2%), and HSR-labelled products were more likely to display a 4.0-  
100 5.0 rating (healthier alternatives)[41]. This highlights the effectiveness of mandatory versus  
101 voluntary approaches and the key differences between nutrient-specific (i.e., ‘high in’ or  
102 ‘excess’ FOPL) and summary indicator (i.e., HSR) FOPL systems.

103 UPPs are defined within the NOVA food classification system[44]. NOVA categorizes foods  
104 according to the nature, extent, and purpose of industrial processing. NOVA classifies foods into  
105 four primary categories, namely: NOVA 1, unprocessed or minimally processed foods; NOVA 2,  
106 processed culinary ingredients; NOVA 3, processed foods; and NOVA 4, UPPs[44]. UPPs, in  
107 particular, are recognized for their hyper-palatability, affordability, immediate consumption  
108 readiness, long shelf life, and packaging[44]. Food classification systems, such as the one  
109 developed by the Pan American Health Organization (PAHO), evaluate foods that fall under  
110 NOVA 3 (processed foods) and NOVA 4 (UPPs) due to the association between  
111 overconsumption of these products, specifically UPPs, and negative health outcomes[5-9]. The  
112 PAHO food classification system is based on robust scientific evidence that informed the World  
113 Health Organization (WHO) Population Nutrient Intake Goals to Prevent Obesity and Related  
114 NCDs[45]. The PAHO food classification system has been considered a ‘best practice’ for FOPL  
115 regulations and has been adopted in Mexico, Argentina, and Colombia[15, 46], and is currently  
116 being considered in other countries[15].

117 Given that the food classification system chosen for FOPL regulation purposes plays a crucial  
118 role in determining which products will be subject to regulations, it is important to have a clear  
119 understanding of both the scope and distinctions between the chosen criteria and other well-  
120 established food classification systems. Additionally, it is important to assess the ability of these  
121 food classification systems in identifying and regulating UPPs, as they are significant sources of  
122 nutrients-of-concern, and their high consumption has been linked to several NCDs[9].

123 To the best of our knowledge, no study has previously compared the recently approved  
124 Canadian FOPL regulations to similar mandatory approaches adopted or implemented in other  
125 countries. Therefore, the objectives of this study were to compare the Canadian criteria for  
126 FOPL regulations with other mandatory approaches implemented in the region of the Americas  
127 (i.e., the Chilean criteria and the PAHO criteria adopted by Mexico, Argentina, and Colombia),  
128 and to determine the ability of each system's criteria to identify UPPs.

## 129 **Methods**

### 130 **University of Toronto's Food Label Information and Price (FLIP)** 131 **database**

132 A descriptive cross-sectional study was conducted using the University of Toronto's Food Label  
133 Information and Price (FLIP) 2017 database. FLIP 2017 is a nationally representative,  
134 comprehensive food composition database that includes information on Nutrition Facts table  
135 (NfT), universal product codes (UPC), company, brand, product price, list of ingredients,

136 container size, sampling date, and photos of all sides of the package of branded food and  
137 beverage products available in the Canadian food supply (n=17,671 unique products). Data  
138 collection was carried out in the Greater Toronto Area between July and September 2017. Data  
139 were collected from the three leading Canadian grocery retailers (i.e., Loblaws, Sobeys, and  
140 Metro), which represented approximately 70% of the Canadian grocery retail market share. The  
141 FLIP 2017 database does not include fresh or unpackaged food products. FLIP is comprised of a  
142 web-based software and database and a mobile data collector app that facilitates data  
143 collection, storing, and analyses of photos of food packages and labels; detailed methods have  
144 been previously published[47].

145 All food products were classified according to Health Canada's Table of Reference Amounts  
146 (TRA) for Food categories[48]. Food products with missing ingredient information and those  
147 that would not be subject to FOPL regulations (e.g., alcoholic beverages, meal replacements  
148 and nutritional supplements) were excluded. After exclusions, 17,094 food products were  
149 included in this analysis.

## 150 **Food classification systems for FOPL regulations**

151 Food and beverage products included in this analysis were evaluated under the final FOPL  
152 regulations published in *Canada Gazette II*[20], the Chilean thresholds for FOPL regulations  
153 (Phase 3)[49], the PAHO food classification system[45] (hereinafter referred to as Canadian,  
154 Chilean, and PAHO criteria), and the NOVA food classification system[44]. Details on the criteria  
155 used for each of these FOPL regulations are described in **Supplementary Tables S1-3**.



156 Co-authors of this study have previously published details on steps undertaken for applying the  
157 Canadian criteria for FOPL regulations[50]. In brief, the initial step involved assessing food  
158 products against established exemption criteria. There are three types of exemption criteria in  
159 the FOPL regulations: (a) technical exemptions for food products exempted from displaying a  
160 NfT (e.g., raw single-ingredient meats, fresh fruits and vegetables), (b) health-related  
161 exemptions for food products that provide health protective effects (e.g., milk, eggs, fruits and  
162 vegetables, vegetable oils), and (c) practical exemptions for foods where the ‘high in’ FOPL  
163 would be redundant (e.g., honey, butter, salt, syrup). Then, food products that did not meet  
164 any of the exemption criteria were assessed for their levels of the targeted nutrients-of-concern  
165 (i.e., saturated fat, sodium, and total sugars) (**Supplementary Table S1**). Recently, Health  
166 Canada expanded the exemption criteria for FOPL regulations for dairy-related products by  
167 lowering the calcium threshold[51]; however, this expansion occurred after these analyses  
168 were conducted and are not included in this study.

169 Under the Chilean criteria, food products were assessed for their content of energy and  
170 targeted nutrients-of-concern (i.e., saturated fat, sodium, and total sugars), by 100 g or mL of  
171 product. Thresholds have been established for solid and liquid products, separately. Thus, as a  
172 first step, we identified solid and liquid food products according to the definition in the Chilean  
173 FOPL regulations. In the Chilean criteria all food products that have any added fat, sodium or  
174 sugars are subject to FOPL regulations. However, there are some exemptions, which include:  
175 foods sold in bulk; infant formulas; infant foods with no added sugars; food supplements; and  
176 non-caloric sweeteners (**Supplementary Table S2**).

177 All food products included in this analysis were categorized under the NOVA food classification  
178 system, following the steps previously published by the developers of the NOVA system[44, 52].  
179 NOVA categories were assigned to food products manually by analyzing information from the  
180 list of ingredients. This process was initially conducted by a trained researcher (LV), and then a  
181 second trained researcher validated the entire dataset (NF). Any discrepancies were discussed  
182 with co-authors (FG and MA), and consensus was reached.

183 Food products categorized as processed (NOVA 3) or UPPs (NOVA 4) were then evaluated under  
184 the PAHO criteria. The PAHO criteria evaluate the excessive content of saturated fat, total fat,  
185 sodium, and free sugars, as well as the presence of trans fat or sweeteners in food products  
186 (**Supplementary Table S3**). Free sugar information is not available in Canadian food labels;  
187 therefore, we used previously published free-sugar estimations from our research group,  
188 applying the University of Toronto's Free Sugar Algorithm, a step-by-step methodology[53, 54].

## 189 **Statistical analyses**

190 The proportion of products that would be subject to displaying a FOPL was examined under  
191 each FOPL system's criteria. Log-linear models proposed by Tanner & Young[55] were adjusted  
192 to examine how the classification of products required to display a FOPL for sodium, sugars  
193 and/or saturated fats according to the Canadian and Chilean criteria agree with the 'best  
194 practice' for the region of the Americas (PAHO criteria[45]). Agreement patterns were modeled  
195 using a nested sequence of hierarchical Poisson log-linear models to examine whether the  
196 Chilean and the Canadian criteria agree with the PAHO criteria, considering all parameters of  
197 each system's criteria (i.e., saturated fat, sodium, and total sugars for Canada; saturated fat,

198 sodium, total sugars, and energy for Chile; and saturated fat, sodium, free sugars, trans fat,  
199 total fat, and other sweeteners for PAHO), and whether they have different levels of  
200 agreement/disagreement with the PAHO criteria when considering only nutrients common to  
201 all FOPL criteria (i.e., saturated fat, sodium, and sugars).

202 The Wald statistics for homogeneity were used to test the hypothesis of whether the  
203 distributions of products by categories of classification (e.g., exempted; excessive in sodium,  
204 sugars, and/or saturated fats; not excessive in any of these three nutrients) according to the  
205 different FOPL criteria were equal. The same statistics were used to examine whether the  
206 proportional distribution of products, based on the number of nutrients of concern identified as  
207 'high in/excess' for sodium, sugars, and/or saturated fats (0 to 3 nutrients) according to each  
208 system's criteria, was equal.

209 We estimated the proportions of products that were excessive in sodium, sugars, or saturated  
210 fats according to the PAHO criteria, but would not display a FOPL for such nutrients under the  
211 Canadian and Chilean criteria, with their respective 95% confidence interval. Prevalence ratios  
212 and their respective 95% confidence intervals were estimated to verify whether requiring a  
213 product to display a FOPL when applying the Canadian and Chilean criteria differed significantly  
214 from the PAHO criteria, and to examine the magnitude of such differences if that was the case,  
215 considering nutrients common to all criteria and all parameters of each system.

216 Lastly, we examined whether the proportion of UPPs that would be subject to FOPL regulations  
217 (i.e., required to display at least one 'high in/excess' FOPL) according to the three different  
218 system's criteria was equal or not. Finally, the odds of a UPP that would be subject to FOPL

219 regulations by each FOPL criteria were estimated and compared considering only nutrients  
220 common to all criteria, all nutrient-related parameters of each FOPL criteria, and all parameters  
221 of each system's criteria.

222 The analyses were conducted in R language and environment for statistical computing version  
223 4.0.1[56].

## 224 **Results**

### 225 **Comparing nutrients common to all FOPL criteria**

226 When restricting the analyses solely to the three nutrient-of-concern (i.e., sodium, sugars, and  
227 saturated fats) that are common to the three FOPL system's criteria, 54.4%, 66.1%, and 77.9%  
228 of products would be excessive in at least one nutrient-of-concern under the Canadian, Chilean,  
229 and PAHO FOPL criteria, respectively (**Table 1**). Comparing by nutrient-of-concern, the  
230 Canadian, Chilean, and PAHO FOPL criteria would identify, respectively, 28.0%, 39.2%, and  
231 48.9% of products as excessive in sodium; 24.3%, 34.0%, and 38.6% as excessive in sugars; and  
232 19.9%, 19.5%, and 32.3% as excessive in saturated fats (**Table 1 and Figure 1**). The proportion  
233 of products rated as excessive, not excessive or that are exempted by the criteria for sodium,  
234 sugars, or saturated fats, differed significantly between the different systems ( $p < 0.05$ ) (**Figure**  
235 **1**).

236 The proportions of products that would be subject to 0, 1, 2 or 3 FOPL also differed significantly  
237 between the three system's criteria. The Canadian criteria resulted in the greatest proportion of

238 products that would not display a FOPL for these three nutrients, followed by Chile and PAHO's  
239 criteria (**Figure 2**). **Table 2** shows that 31% and 16% of products that are excessive in sodium,  
240 sugars, or saturated fats according to the PAHO criteria would not display a 'high in/excess'  
241 label under the Canadian and Chilean criteria, respectively. Although both the Canadian and the  
242 Chilean criteria result in significant number of products not being subject to FOPL regulations,  
243 this is significantly higher under the Canadian criteria than under the Chilean criteria (except for  
244 saturated fats, for which the proportion of products not being regulated under the Canadian  
245 and Chilean criteria are similar) (**Table 2**).

246 Results from the modelling of agreement/disagreement patterns showed that there was an  
247 association (null hypothesis of independence rejected by the statistics of deviance) between  
248 the Chilean, Canadian, and PAHO FOPL criteria ( $p < 0.001$ ). However, there was no significant  
249 agreement in rating products as excessive in sodium, sugars and/or saturated fats, when  
250 comparing the Chilean and the Canadian criteria against the PAHO criteria (null hypothesis of  
251 agreement was rejected by the statistics of deviance) ( $p < 0.001$ ). In addition, the analyses also  
252 demonstrated that the levels of disagreement for the Chilean and the Canadian criteria with the  
253 PAHO criteria were not uniform (null hypothesis of homogeneous agreement was rejected by  
254 the statistics of deviance) ( $p < 0.001$ ). There was less disagreement between the Chilean and  
255 PAHO criteria than between the Canadian and PAHO criteria (null hypothesis of  
256 nonhomogeneous agreement was rejected by the statistics of deviance) ( $p < 0.001$ ). This was  
257 indicated by the log of coefficients  $\delta_{\text{Canada}} = 1.73$  and  $\delta_{\text{Chile}} = 2.44$  in the nonhomogeneous  
258 model (data not shown in **Table 3**), which serves to rank the levels of disagreement and  
259 indicate that the lower the coefficient the higher the disagreement. The analyses of the

260 agreement/disagreement patterns using all parameters of each system's criteria showed similar  
261 patterns (**Table 3**).

262 Results by Health Canada's TRA food category are presented in **Supplementary Figure S4**.

### 263 **Comparing all parameters of each FOPL system's criteria**

264 When assessing which products would be regulated (i.e., required to display at least one 'high  
265 in/excess' FOPL) according to all parameters in the Canadian (sodium, total sugars, saturated  
266 fats), Chilean (sodium, total sugars, saturated fats, calories) and PAHO criteria (sodium, free  
267 sugars, saturated fats, trans fats, total fats, other sweeteners), 34% and 17% of products  
268 required to be regulated by the PAHO criteria would not be regulated by the Canadian and  
269 Chilean criteria, respectively (**Table 2**).

### 270 **The extent of each FOPL system's criteria on identifying UPPs**

271 Of the total sample of packaged food products, 72.6% (n=12,414) were classified as UPPs. Using  
272 all parameters of the Canadian, Chilean, and PAHO FOPL criteria, 33.4%, 18.4%, and 2.3% of  
273 UPPs would not be regulated, respectively. PAHO criteria, even when restricted solely to the  
274 three nutrients common to the three systems, left the smallest proportion of UPPs that would  
275 not display a FOPL and be restricted by other corresponding regulatory policies. The greatest  
276 proportions of UPPs not being regulated were found when the Canadian criteria were applied,  
277 followed by the Chilean criteria (**Table 4**). **Table 4** also shows that the inclusion of 'other

278 sweeteners' in addition to the nutrient parameters in the PAHO criteria significantly increased  
279 the proportion of UPPs captured by this system's criteria ( $p < 0.05$ ).

280 The results of the binomial logistic regression models showed that the odds of a UPP being  
281 regulated under FOPL regulations by the Canadian and Chilean criteria were 21.3 (OR 0.05; 95%  
282 CI 0.00, 0.17) and 9.6 (OR 0.10; 95% CI 0.00, 0.23) times lower, respectively, compared to the  
283 PAHO criteria. Additionally, the odds of the Canadian criteria regulating UPPs were 2.2 (OR  
284 0.45; 95% CI 0.39, 0.51) times lower than the Chilean criteria (data not shown).

## 285 **Discussion**

286 This study aimed to compare the recently published Canadian criteria for FOPL regulations  
287 against other criteria implemented in the region of the Americas: the Chilean (Phase 3), the first  
288 country to implement a 'high in' FOPL system; and the PAHO criteria (adopted by Mexico,  
289 Argentina, and Colombia), considered a 'best practice' for FOPL regulations. Additionally, we  
290 determined the ability of each system's criteria to regulate UPPs. Our findings indicate that,  
291 overall, the Canadian criteria regulate less products than the Chilean and PAHO criteria. The  
292 Canadian criteria leave the highest proportion of UPPs unregulated, followed by the Chilean  
293 system. When comparing agreement between FOPL criteria, we found more agreement  
294 between the Chilean and PAHO criteria than between the Canadian and PAHO criteria.

295 Furthermore, when looking at individual nutrients-of-concern, our results showed that the  
296 Chilean and the Canadian criteria rate fewer products as excessive in sodium, sugars, and  
297 saturated fats than the PAHO criteria. Comparisons between the Chilean and Canadian criteria

298 revealed that the Chilean criteria rate more products as excessive in sodium and sugars than  
299 the Canadian criteria, with both systems rating similar proportions of products as excessive in  
300 saturated fats. This analysis demonstrates that the Canadian thresholds for the nutrients-of-  
301 concern are more lenient compared to the Chilean and PAHO criteria. These findings are  
302 meaningful given that dietary intakes of nutrients-of-concern among Canadians remain at high  
303 levels[57-59], and FOPL regulations have the potential to significantly reduce intakes of  
304 targeted nutrients and prevent or delay an important number of diet-related NCD deaths[60].  
305 For instance, *'bakery products'* and *'combination dishes'* are the top two contributors of sodium  
306 intake in the Canadian diet[61]. Our findings show that an important proportion of these  
307 products would not be subject to FOPL regulations under the Canadian criteria, in contrast to  
308 the PAHO criteria (**Supplementary Figure S4**). Therefore, to effectively identify products high in  
309 nutrients-of-concern, the Canadian criteria for FOPL regulations will need to be informed by a  
310 criteria that consider the WHO Population Nutrient Intake Goals to Prevent Obesity and Related  
311 NCDs, such as the PAHO criteria, which other countries have adopted, and several others are  
312 considering[15, 27-30].

313 Chile was one of the first countries to establish its own food classification criteria for use in a  
314 variety of mandatory policies that promote healthy food choices, as part of its comprehensive  
315 Chilean Food Labeling and Advertising Law – Law 20.606[16]. This initiative was in response to  
316 the high rates of obesity in Chile, particularly among children, and the high consumption per  
317 capita of UPPs[17, 62], a situation similar to that in Canada[62-64]. To date, most post-  
318 implementation evidence on mandatory FOPL policies comes from Chile, showing promising  
319 initial results[31-35]. Based on the results of this study, which show that the Canadian criteria



320 are less stringent than the Chilean criteria, and considering the comprehensiveness of the  
321 Chilean Law in addressing other aspects of the food environment, such as restricting the  
322 availability of products with warning labels in schools and limiting food marketing to children  
323 (both aspects not implemented in Canada), we can infer that the impact of this policy in Canada  
324 may not be of the same magnitude as in Chile. Therefore, monitoring and evaluation of the  
325 recently promulgated Canadian FOPL regulations are warranted to measure the impact of the  
326 policy.

327 The PAHO criteria have been adopted and implemented in several countries in the Americas  
328 region[46], and is being considered in other countries around the world. For instance, Mexico  
329 implemented FOPL regulations in 2020, adopting ‘excess’ octagon warning labels for products  
330 exceeding thresholds for calories, sugars, sodium, saturated fats, and trans fats, as well as  
331 warning rectangles with the legend ‘avoid/not recommended in children’ for products  
332 containing caffeine and non-nutritive sweeteners[65]. The Mexican food classification system is  
333 based on the PAHO criteria, with some additional parameters to cover other national public  
334 health concerns. These include thresholds for calories and warnings for caffeine given the high  
335 consumption of SSBs among Mexicans, including children[65]. Additionally, Mexico added extra  
336 thresholds for sodium and did not include thresholds for total fat. Despite these modifications,  
337 a recent study assessing the agreement of different food classification criteria applied to  
338 packaged products available in the Mexican food supply found almost perfect agreement  
339 between the PAHO and Mexican criteria. Additionally, the study identified that 19.9% and  
340 33.4% of packaged foods would be exempted or not required to display a FOPL according to the  
341 PAHO and Chilean criteria, respectively. These proportions closely align with our findings (PAHO

342 criteria, 19.9%; Chilean criteria, 31.6%). Our study diverges from the study conducted in  
343 Mexico[65] regarding the agreement between PAHO and Chilean criteria, as our findings  
344 showed no significant agreement in rating products as excessive in sodium, sugars and/or  
345 saturated fats, between these two criteria, most likely due to differences in methodological  
346 approaches. Most previous studies comparing food classification criteria[65-67] have used  
347 kappa measures which are known to be insensitive to differences between observed and  
348 expected patterns of agreement, and they also could not meet necessary assumptions to  
349 conduct multiple raters comparisons[55]. We used a nested sequence of hierarchical Poisson  
350 log-linear models[55] to avoid these limitations.

351 The PAHO food classification criteria have been extensively tested to identify food and  
352 beverage products excessive in nutrients and ingredients of concern[65, 67-71], and have  
353 proven their ability to identify more products excessive in nutrients-of-concern than other FOPL  
354 criteria[65, 67-71]. The PAHO system's novel combination of food processing and nutrient  
355 profiling metrics has also been shown to translate outcomes from products to dietary intake  
356 levels, facilitating populations' achievement of WHO healthy diet recommendations[72-75]. It  
357 has been recognized as the Americas' best practice to identify food and beverage products with  
358 excessive amounts of nutrients and ingredients of concern[15]. Our results regarding the  
359 proportion of products exceeding nutrients-of-concern under the PAHO criteria align with  
360 findings from previous studies in other contexts[65, 67-71]. The PAHO system is the only WHO  
361 endorsed food classification criteria that also includes 'other sweeteners' among the  
362 criteria[45], which is a typical marker of UPPs. Our results are consistent with those of Canella  
363 et al.[76] on the identification of UPPs using the PAHO criteria. In both studied markets (i.e.,

364 Brazil and Canada) approximately 97% of UPPs were identified by the PAHO criteria when using  
365 solely the parameters for nutrients in excess, and that proportion rises even closer to 100%  
366 when cosmetic additives, including other sweeteners considered by the PAHO criteria, are  
367 taken into account[76].

368 This study has both strengths and limitations that need to be considered when interpreting our  
369 findings. We used a nationally representative, branded food composition database to compare  
370 Canadian criteria for FOPL regulations against other well-established FOPL criteria. This study  
371 used a nested sequence of hierarchical Poisson log-linear approach[55] for testing agreement  
372 between the criteria instead of other approaches, such as the kappa index, which are  
373 insensitive to differences between observed and expected patterns of  
374 agreement/disagreement[55]. Moreover, we analyzed the agreement between food  
375 classification criteria by comparing common nutrients and all parameters of each system's  
376 criteria. This comprehensive approach is essential to assess the overall level of disagreement or  
377 agreement between criteria, ensuring that various parameters are considered, rather than  
378 relying on a few specific parameters. A limitation of our study is that we relied on information  
379 reported on the NFt, which allows a permissible margin of  $\pm 20\%$  tolerance when reporting  
380 nutrient values[77]. Our analysis assessed mainly packaged food products in the Canadian food  
381 supply; thus, proportion of products that would not be subject to FOPL regulations (i.e., fresh  
382 products) are underrepresented.

383 Overall, our findings show that the Canadian and Chilean criteria for FOPL regulations are less  
384 stringent and allow significantly more UPPs to omit 'high in/excess' labels than the PAHO

385 criteria, with the Canadian criteria showing the most leniency. These findings highlight the  
386 importance of implementing robust and independent monitoring mechanisms to assess the  
387 effectiveness of the recently published Canadian regulations and suggest that improving the  
388 stringency and comprehensiveness of the Canadian FOPL regulations may be warranted to  
389 provide the population with the best available policy tools for protecting public health. This  
390 study suggests this could be achieved via three modifications to Canada’s FOPL regulations[20]:  
391 1) maintaining the same three nutrients-of-concern used in the current regulations but applying  
392 PAHO thresholds for these nutrients, which would reduce to one sixth the proportion of UPPs  
393 not subject to FOPL regulations; 2) expanding the criteria to include other nutrients-of-concern,  
394 such as total fats, in addition to the existing ones, and using PAHO thresholds, which would  
395 reduce to one tenth the proportion of UPPs not subject to FOPL regulations; and finally, 3) full  
396 adoption of PAHO criteria, which would reduce to less than one fourteenth the proportion of  
397 UPPs not subject to FOPL regulations.

398 Lastly, supplementary measures may be needed to assist consumers with making healthier food  
399 choices and to prompt improvements in the nutritional quality of the Canadian food supply.  
400 These measures could include imposing restrictions on the marketing of foods ‘high in’  
401 nutrients-of-concern and the sale of such products in schools, implementing mandatory sodium  
402 and sugar reduction targets for key food categories, introducing mandatory calorie labeling on  
403 restaurant menus, and aligning FOPL regulations with Canadian Dietary Guidelines  
404 recommendations[78].

## 405 **Conclusions**

406 The results of this study show that the Canadian criteria for FOPL regulations, followed by that  
407 of Chile, are less stringent than the PAHO criteria, and would leave higher proportions of UPPs  
408 that would not be subject to FOPL regulations. Neither the Canadian nor the Chilean criteria  
409 significantly agree with PAHO's criteria, but there is greater disagreement between the  
410 Canadian criteria and the PAHO criteria than between the Chilean and the PAHO criteria. Our  
411 results suggest that Canada's and Chile's FOPL regulations could be improved to identify more  
412 UPPs and products high in nutrients-of-concern, as has been done by other countries in the  
413 Americas. These results can inform future policy decisions in other countries and evaluations of  
414 Canadian and Chilean FOPL regulations.

## 415 **Conflict of interest**

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

## 418 **Authors' contributions**

419 Conceptualization, NF, FSG, and ML; Data Curation, NF, and FSG; Formal Analysis, NF and FSG;  
420 Investigation, NF, CM, MA, LV, JLL, and HJ; Funding Acquisition, ML; Writing – Original Draft  
421 Preparation, NF and FSG. All authors critically reviewed and approved the final manuscript. NF  
422 is a staff member of the Global Health Advocacy Incubator. FSG is a staff member of the Pan  
423 American Health Organization (PAHO). The authors alone are responsible for the views  
424 expressed in this article and they do not necessarily represent the views, decisions, or policies  
425 of the institutions with which they are affiliated.

## 426 **Funding**

427 This research was funded by Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR) operating grants  
428 (PJT-165858; SA2-152805; Healthy Cities Training Award). <https://cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/193.html>.  
429 The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or  
430 preparation of the manuscript.

## 431 **Acknowledgments**

432 The authors would like to thank Alyssa Schermel for her work on managing the Food Label  
433 Information and Price (FLIP) database, as well as current and past students who collaborated in  
434 different tasks to produce the FLIP database, especially Madyson V. Weippert and Jodi T.  
435 Bernstein who worked and published data on free-sugars estimations for the FLIP 2017  
436 database.

437 **Table 1.** Summary of products that would or would not display a ‘high in/excess’ FOPL  
 438 according to the Canadian, Chilean and PAHO criteria for FOPL regulations – considering all  
 439 parameters of each system’s criteria<sup>#</sup>, nutrients common to all criteria<sup>†</sup>, and individual nutrient-  
 440 of-concern (n=17,094)

Parameters	FOPL criteria n (%)		
	Canadian <sup>‡</sup>	Chilean <sup>Ω</sup>	PAHO
<b>All parameters of each system’s criteria<sup>‡</sup></b>			
At least 1 FOPL	9,295 (54.4%)	11,685 (68.4%)	13,902 (81.3%)
1 FOPL	6,406 (37.5%)	4,162 (24.4%)	4,925 (28.8%)
2 FOPL	2,727 (15.9%)	3,699 (21.6%)	3,863 (22.6%)
3 FOPL	162 (1.0%)	3,457 (20.2%)	3,313 (19.4%)
4 FOPL	NA	367 (2.2%)	1,711 (10.0%)
5 FOPL	NA	NA	90 (0.5%)
<set thresholds	6,409 (37.5%)	2,125 (12.4%)	704 (4.1%)
Exempted	1,390 (8.1%)	3,284 (19.2%)	2,488 (14.6%)
<b>Nutrients common to all criteria<sup>†</sup></b>			
At least 1 FOPL	9,295 (54.4%)	11,302 (66.1%)	13,317 (77.9%)
1 FOPL	6,406 (37.5%)	7,130 (41.7%)	6,565 (38.4%)
2 FOPL	2,727 (16.0%)	3,802 (22.2%)	6,338 (37.1%)
3 FOPL	162 (1.0%)	370 (2.2%)	414 (2.4%)
<set thresholds	6,409 (37.5%)	2,508 (14.7%)	1,289 (7.5%)
Exempted	1,390 (8.1%)	3,284 (19.2%)	2,488 (14.6%)
<b>Individual nutrient-of-concern</b>			
Sodium	4,788 (28.0%)	6,709 (39.2%)	8,365 (48.9%)
Sugars <sup>#</sup>	4,151 (24.3%)	5,807 (34.0%)	6,595 (38.6%)
Saturated fats	3,407 (19.9%)	3,328 (19.5%)	5,523 (32.3%)
Energy	NA	7,555 (44.2%)	NA
Trans fats	NA	NA	1,658 (9.7%)
Total fats	NA	NA	7,056 (41.3%)
Sweeteners <sup>*</sup>	NA	NA	687 (4.0%)

441 <sup>‡</sup>Recently, Health Canada expanded the exemption criteria for FOPL regulations for dairy-related products by  
 442 lowering the calcium threshold[51]; however, this expansion occurred after these analyses were conducted and  
 443 are not included in this study.

444 <sup>Ω</sup>Phase 3 of Chilean thresholds for FOPL regulations.

445 <sup>‡</sup>All parameters of each system’s criteria: Canada (sodium, total sugars, saturated fats); Chile (sodium, total sugars,  
 446 saturated fats, and calories); and PAHO (sodium, free sugars, saturated fats, trans fats, total fat, and other  
 447 sweeteners).

448 <sup>†</sup>Nutrients common to all FOPL system’s criteria: sodium, sugars, saturated fats.

449 <sup>#</sup> The Canadian and Chilean system’s criteria consider total sugars, while the PAHO criteria consider free sugars.

450 <sup>\*</sup>Only the PAHO system considers other sweeteners as part of its criteria for FOPL regulations.

451 Abbreviations: FOPL, front-of-pack labeling; NA, not applicable.



452 **Figure 1.** Proportional distribution of products that would or would not display a ‘high  
453 in/excess’ FOPL for sodium, sugars<sup>#</sup>, or saturated fats, according to the Canadian, Chilean and  
454 PAHO criteria for FOPL regulations (n=17,094)

455

456

457 <sup>#</sup>The Canadian and Chilean system’s criteria consider total sugars, while the PAHO criteria consider free sugars.

458 \* Wald statistics for homogeneity indicating when the proportional distributions differ significantly (p<0.05).

459 **Figure 2.** Proportional distribution of products based on the number of nutrients-of-concern  
460 identified as ‘high in/excess’ for sodium, sugars<sup>#</sup>, and/or saturated fats according to the  
461 Canadian, Chilean and PAHO criteria for FOPL regulations (n=17,094)

462

463 <sup>#</sup>The Canadian and Chilean system’s criteria consider total sugars, while the PAHO criteria consider free sugars.

464 \* Wald statistics for homogeneity indicating when the proportional distributions differ significantly (p<0.05).

465

466

467 **Table 2.** Prevalence ratios of products that are required to display a ‘high in/excess’ FOPL for  
468 sodium, sugars<sup>#</sup>, or saturated fats, or be regulated<sup>Ω</sup> by the Canadian and the Chilean criteria  
469 compared to the PAHO criteria (n=17,094)

	PR (95%CI)	
	Canada	Chile
Excessive in SODIUM	0.57 (0.56; 0.58) <sup>†a</sup>	0.79 (0.78; 0.80) <sup>†b</sup>
Excessive in SUGARS <sup>#</sup>	0.61 (0.60; 0.63) <sup>†a</sup>	0.88 (0.87; 0.89) <sup>†b</sup>
Excessive in SATURATED FATS	0.62 (0.60; 0.63) <sup>†</sup>	0.60 (0.59; 0.62) <sup>†</sup>
Excessive in SODIUM, SUGARS <sup>#</sup> , OR SATURATED FATS	0.69 (0.68; 0.70) <sup>†a</sup>	0.84 (0.83; 0.85) <sup>†b</sup>
Regulated <sup>Ω</sup> according to all parameters of each criteria	0.66 (0.65; 0.67) <sup>†a</sup>	0.83 (0.82; 0.84) <sup>†b</sup>

470 Different superscript letters within a row in the comparison between columns (Canadian vs. Chilean criteria)

471 indicate significant differences (p≤0.05).

472 <sup>†</sup>Significantly different from 1 (p≤0.05).

473 <sup>Ω</sup>Required to display at least one ‘high in/excess’ FOPL according to each system’s criteria for FOPL regulations.

474 <sup>#</sup>The Canadian and Chilean system’s criteria consider total sugars, while the PAHO criteria consider free sugars.

475 Abbreviations: PR, Prevalence Ratio; 95%CI, 95% Confidence Interval.

476 **Table 3.** Analysis of deviance of nested models for agreement on classification of products  
 477 based on nutrients common to the Canadian, Chilean and PAHO criteria for FOPL regulations,  
 478 and on all parameters of each system’s criteria (n=17,094)

Model	G <sup>2</sup>	DF	p-value <sup>ε</sup>
<b>Nutrients common to all criteria<sup>†</sup></b>			
Baseline model $\log(m_{ij}) = u + uPAHO + uCanada + uChile + uCanada * uChile$ (independence)	40874.8	640	<0.001
Model of agreement of the Canadian and Chilean criteria with the PAHO criteria $\log(m_{ij}) = u + uPAHO + uCanada + uChile + uCanada * uChile + \delta_{ij..l}$	28717.7	639	<0.001
Model of homogeneous agreement of the Canadian and Chilean criteria with the PAHO criteria $\log(m_{ij}) = u + uPAHO + uCanada + uChile + uCanada * uChile + \delta_{ij..l}$	16397.6	638	<0.001
Model of nonhomogeneous agreement of the Canadian and Chilean criteria with the PAHO criteria $\log(m_{ij}) = u + uPAHO + uCanada + uChile + uCanada * uChile + \delta_{ij..l}$	14862.8	638	<0.001
<b>All parameters of each system’s criteria<sup>‡</sup></b>			
Baseline model $\log(m_{ij}) = u + uPAHO + uCanada + uChile + uCanada * uChile$ (independence)	8455.4	3	<0.001
Model of agreement of the Canadian and Chilean criteria with the PAHO criteria $\log(m_{ij}) = u + uPAHO + uCanada + uChile + uCanada * uChile + \delta_{ij..l}$	114.3	2	<0.001
Model of homogeneous agreement of the Canadian and Chilean criteria with the PAHO criteria $\log(m_{ij}) = u + uPAHO + uCanada + uChile + uCanada * uChile + \delta_{ij..l}$	4.9	1	<0.05
Model of nonhomogeneous agreement of the Canadian and Chilean criteria with the PAHO criteria $\log(m_{ij}) = u + uPAHO + uCanada + uChile + uCanada * uChile + \delta_{ij..l}$	4.9	1	<0.05

479 <sup>ε</sup>Significant evidence to reject the model is correctly specified when p-value is ≤0.05.

480 <sup>†</sup>Nutrients common to all FOPL system’s criteria: sodium, sugars, saturated fats.

481 <sup>‡</sup>All parameters of each system’s criteria: Canada (sodium, total sugars, saturated fats); Chile (sodium, total sugars,  
 482 saturated fats, and calories); and PAHO (sodium, free sugars, saturated fats, trans fats, total fat, and other  
 483 sweeteners).

484 Abbreviations: DF, Degrees of Freedom; G<sup>2</sup>, Deviance.

485 **Table 4.** Proportion of ultra processed products that would not be regulated<sup>#</sup> by the Canadian,  
486 Chilean and PAHO criteria for FOPL regulations, and respective 95% confidence intervals  
487 (n=17,094)

	% (95%CI)		
	Canada	Chile	PAHO
Considering only nutrients common to all system's criteria <sup>†</sup>	33.4 (32.6; 34.2) <sup>a</sup>	20.5 (19.8; 21.2) <sup>b</sup>	5.2 (4.8; 5.6) <sup>c</sup>
Considering all nutrient related parameters of each system's criteria <sup>‡</sup>	33.4 (32.6; 34.2) <sup>a</sup>	18.4 (17.7; 19.0) <sup>b</sup>	3.3 (3.0; 3.6) <sup>c</sup>
Considering all parameters of each system's criteria <sup>§</sup>	33.4 (32.6; 34.2) <sup>a</sup>	18.4 (17.7; 19.0) <sup>b</sup>	2.3 (2.0; 2.6) <sup>c</sup>

488 <sup>#</sup>Ultra processed products that would not be required to display a 'high in/excess' FOPL according to each system's  
489 criteria for FOPL regulations.

490 <sup>†</sup>Nutrients common to all FOPL system's criteria: sodium, sugars, saturated fats. Assessed using the thresholds for  
491 each system's criteria.

492 <sup>‡</sup>Nutrient related parameters of each system's criteria: Canada (sodium, total sugars, saturated fats); Chile  
493 (sodium, total sugars, saturated fats, and calories); and PAHO (sodium, free sugars, saturated fats, trans fats, and  
494 total fat).

495 <sup>§</sup>All parameters of each system's criteria: Canada (sodium, total sugars, saturated fats); Chile (sodium, total sugars,  
496 saturated fats, and calories); and PAHO (sodium, free sugars, saturated fats, trans fats, total fat, and other  
497 sweeteners).

498 Different superscript letters within a row in the comparison between columns indicate significant differences  
499 ( $p \leq 0.05$ ).

## 500 References

- 501 1. World Health Organization. Noncommunicable Diseases, Key Facts 2021 [cited 2023 September  
502 13]. Available from: <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/noncommunicable-diseases>.
- 503 2. World Health Organization. Noncommunicable diseases country profiles 2018 2018 [cited 2023  
504 September 13]. Available from: <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/274512>.
- 505 3. Afshin A, Sur PJ, Fay KA, Cornaby L, Ferrara G, Salama JS, et al. Health effects of dietary risks in  
506 195 countries, 1990–2017: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2017. *The*  
507 *Lancet*. 2019;393(10184):1958-72.
- 508 4. Stanaway JD, Afshin A, Gakidou E, Lim SS, Abate D, Abate KH, et al. Global, regional, and national  
509 comparative risk assessment of 84 behavioural, environmental and occupational, and metabolic risks or  
510 clusters of risks for 195 countries and territories, 1990–2017: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden  
511 of Disease Study 2017. *The lancet*. 2018;392(10159):1923-94.
- 512 5. Pagliai G, Dinu M, Madarena MP, Bonaccio M, Iacoviello L, Sofi F. Consumption of ultra-  
513 processed foods and health status: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Br J Nutr*. 2021;125(3):308-  
514 18. Epub 2020/08/15. doi: 10.1017/s0007114520002688. PubMed PMID: 32792031; PubMed Central  
515 PMCID: PMC7844609.
- 516 6. Lane MM, Gamage E, Travica N, Dissanayaka T, Ashtree DN, Gauci S, et al. Ultra-processed food  
517 consumption and mental health: A systematic review and meta-analysis of observational studies.  
518 *Nutrients*. 2022;14(13):2568.
- 519 7. Askari M, Heshmati J, Shahinfar H, Tripathi N, Daneshzad E. Ultra-processed food and the risk of  
520 overweight and obesity: a systematic review and meta-analysis of observational studies. *International*  
521 *Journal of Obesity*. 2020:1-12.
- 522 8. Lane MM, Davis JA, Beattie S, Gómez-Donoso C, Loughman A, O'Neil A, et al. Ultraprocessed  
523 food and chronic noncommunicable diseases: A systematic review and meta-analysis of 43 observational  
524 studies. *Obesity Reviews*. 2020.
- 525 9. Lane MM, Gamage E, Du S, Ashtree DN, McGuinness AJ, Gauci S, et al. Ultra-processed food  
526 exposure and adverse health outcomes: umbrella review of epidemiological meta-analyses. *bmj*.  
527 2024;384.
- 528 10. World Cancer Research Fund International. NOURISHING database: Improve nutritional quality  
529 of the whole food supply 2023 [cited 2023 October 20]. Available from:  
530 [https://policydatabase.wcrf.org/level\\_one?page=nourishing-level-one#step2=4](https://policydatabase.wcrf.org/level_one?page=nourishing-level-one#step2=4).
- 531 11. World Health Organization Regional Office for Europe. Use of nutrient profile models for  
532 nutrition and health policies: meeting report on the use of nutrient profile models in the WHO European  
533 Region, September 2021 2022 [cited 2023 October 18]. Available from:  
534 <https://www.who.int/europe/publications/i/item/WHO-EURO-2022-6201-45966-66383>.
- 535 12. Martin C, Turcotte M, Cauchon J, Lachance A, Pomerleau S, Provencher V, Labonté M-È.  
536 Systematic review of nutrient profile models developed for nutrition-related policies and regulations  
537 aimed at noncommunicable disease prevention—An update. *Advances in Nutrition*. 2023.
- 538 13. Pan American Health Organization. Front-of-package labeling as a policy tool for the prevention  
539 of noncommunicable diseases in the Americas 2020 [cited 2023 September 3]. Available from:  
540 <https://iris.paho.org/handle/10665.2/52740>.
- 541 14. World Health Organization. Tackling NCDs: 'best buys' and other recommended interventions  
542 for the prevention and control of noncommunicable diseases 2017 [cited 2023 October 2]. Available  
543 from: <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/259232>.

- 544 15. Crosbie E, Gomes FS, Olvera J, Rincón-Gallardo Patiño S, Hoepfer S, Carriedo A. A policy study on  
545 front-of-pack nutrition labeling in the Americas: Emerging developments and outcomes. *The Lancet*  
546 *Regional Health - Americas*. 2022;100400. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lana.2022.100400>.
- 547 16. Ministerio de Salud de Chile. Ley 20.606 - Sobre composición nutricional de los alimentos y su  
548 publicidad 2012 [cited 2023 January 12]. Available from:  
549 [https://extranet.who.int/ncdccs/Data/CHL\\_B15\\_LEY-20606\\_06-JUL-2012.pdf](https://extranet.who.int/ncdccs/Data/CHL_B15_LEY-20606_06-JUL-2012.pdf).
- 550 17. Reyes M, Garmendia ML, Olivares S, Aqueveque C, Zacarías I, Corvalán C. Development of the  
551 Chilean front-of-package food warning label. *BMC public health*. 2019;19(1):906.
- 552 18. República Argentina. Ley de etiquetado frontal. Promoción de la alimentación saludable Ley  
553 27.642. 2022 [cited 2022 October 12]. Available from:  
554 [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)  
555 [frontal#:~:text=Est%C3%A1%20prohibida%20la%20publicidad%2C%20promoci%C3%B3n,a%20ni%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).
- 556 19. Mialon M, Khandpur N, Mais LA, Martins APB. Arguments used by trade associations during the  
557 early development of a new front-of-pack nutrition labelling system in Brazil. *Public Health Nutrition*.  
558 2021;24(4):766-74.
- 559 20. Government of Canada. Regulations Amending the Food and Drug Regulations (Nutrition  
560 Symbols, Other Labelling Provisions, Vitamin D and Hydrogenated Fats or Oils): SOR/2022-168 2022  
561 [cited 2022 July 28]. Available from: [https://canadagazette.gc.ca/rp-pr/p2/2022/2022-07-20/html/sor-](https://canadagazette.gc.ca/rp-pr/p2/2022/2022-07-20/html/sor-dors168-eng.html)  
562 [dors168-eng.html](https://canadagazette.gc.ca/rp-pr/p2/2022/2022-07-20/html/sor-dors168-eng.html).
- 563 21. El Congreso de Colombia. Ley No 2120. 2021. [cited 2022 October 5]. Available from:  
564 <https://www.andi.com.co/Uploads/LEY%202120%20DEL%2030%20DE%20JULIO%20DE%202021.pdf>.
- 565 22. Shahrabani S. The impact of Israel's Front-of-Package labeling reform on consumers' behavior  
566 and intentions to change dietary habits. *Israel Journal of Health Policy Research*. 2021;10(1):1-11.
- 567 23. White M, Barquera S. Mexico Adopts Food Warning Labels, Why Now? *Health Systems &*  
568 *Reform*. 2020;6(1):e1752063.
- 569 24. Diez-Canseco F, Cavero V, Alvarez Cano J, Saavedra-García L, Taillie LS, Dillman Carpentier FR,  
570 Miranda JJ. Design and approval of the nutritional warnings' policy in Peru: Milestones, key  
571 stakeholders, and policy drivers for its approval. *PLOS Global Public Health*. 2023;3(6):e0001121. doi:  
572 10.1371/journal.pgph.0001121.
- 573 25. Ares G, Antúnez L, Curutchet MR, Galicia L, Moratorio X, Giménez A, Bove I. Immediate effects  
574 of the implementation of nutritional warnings in Uruguay: awareness, self-reported use and increased  
575 understanding. *Public Health Nutrition*. 2021;24(2):364-75.
- 576 26. FAO, OPS, UNICEF. Etiquetado Nutricional en la Parte Frontal del Envase en América Latina y el  
577 Caribe. Nota Orientadora. 2022 [cited 2022 November 4]. Available from:  
578 [https://iris.paho.org/bitstream/handle/10665.2/56520/9789251367537\\_spa.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowe](https://iris.paho.org/bitstream/handle/10665.2/56520/9789251367537_spa.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y)  
579 [d=y](https://iris.paho.org/bitstream/handle/10665.2/56520/9789251367537_spa.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y).
- 580 27. Pettigrew S, Coyle D, McKenzie B, Vu D, Lim SC, Berasi K, et al. A review of front-of-pack  
581 nutrition labelling in Southeast Asia: Industry interference, lessons learned, and future directions. *The*  
582 *Lancet Regional Health-Southeast Asia*. 2022.
- 583 28. Kroker-Lobos MF, Morales-Juárez A, Pérez W, Kanda T, Gomes FS, Ramírez-Zea M, Siu-Bermúdez  
584 C. Efficacy of front-of-pack warning label system versus guideline for daily amount on healthfulness  
585 perception, purchase intention and objective understanding of nutrient content of food products in  
586 Guatemala: a cross-over cluster randomized controlled experiment. *Archives of Public Health*.  
587 2023;81(1):108.
- 588 29. White-Barrow V, Gomes FS, Eyre S, Ares G, Morris A, Caines D, Finlay D. Effects of front-of-  
589 package nutrition labelling systems on understanding and purchase intention in Jamaica: results from a  
590 multiarm randomised controlled trial. *BMJ open*. 2023;13(4):e065620.
- 591

- 592 30. da Silva Gomes F, Ríos-Castillo I, Correa LRL, Cruzado B, Ares G, Rojas CFU, et al. Effects of front-  
593 of-package nutrition labelling systems on objective understanding and purchase intention in Panama:  
594 results from a multi-arm parallel-group randomised controlled trial. *Public Health Nutrition*.1-22.
- 595 31. Taillie LS, Bercholz M, Popkin B, Reyes M, Colchero MA, Corvalán C. Changes in food purchases  
596 after the Chilean policies on food labelling, marketing, and sales in schools: a before and after study. *The*  
597 *Lancet Planetary Health*. 2021;5(8):e526-e33.
- 598 32. Taillie LS, Reyes M, Colchero MA, Popkin B, Corvalán C. An evaluation of Chile's Law of Food  
599 Labeling and Advertising on sugar-sweetened beverage purchases from 2015 to 2017: A before-and-  
600 after study. *PLoS medicine*. 2020;17(2):e1003015.
- 601 33. Reyes M, Smith Taillie L, Popkin B, Kanter R, Vandevijvere S, Corvalán C. Changes in the amount  
602 of nutrient of packaged foods and beverages after the initial implementation of the Chilean Law of Food  
603 Labelling and Advertising: A nonexperimental prospective study. *PLOS Medicine*. 2020;17(7):e1003220.  
604 doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1003220.
- 605 34. Quintiliano Scarpelli D, Pinheiro Fernandes AC, Rodriguez Osias L, Pizarro Quevedo T. Changes in  
606 nutrient declaration after the food labeling and advertising law in Chile: a longitudinal approach.  
607 *Nutrients*. 2020;12(8):2371.
- 608 35. Fretes G, Corvalán C, Reyes M, Taillie LS, Economos CD, Wilson NLW, Cash SB. Changes in  
609 children's and adolescents' dietary intake after the implementation of Chile's law of food labeling,  
610 advertising and sales in schools: a longitudinal study. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and*  
611 *Physical Activity*. 2023;20(1):40. doi: 10.1186/s12966-023-01445-x.
- 612 36. Saavedra-García L, Meza-Hernández M, Díez-Canseco F, Taillie LS. Reformulation of Top-Selling  
613 Processed and Ultra-Processed Foods and Beverages in the Peruvian Food Supply after Front-of-Package  
614 Warning Label Policy. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*. 2022;20(1).  
615 doi: 10.3390/ijerph20010424.
- 616 37. Contreras-Manzano A, White CM, Nieto C, Quevedo KL, Vargas-Meza J, Hammond D, et al. Self-  
617 reported decreases in the purchases of selected unhealthy foods resulting from the implementation of  
618 warning labels in Mexican youth and adult population. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and*  
619 *Physical Activity*. 2024;21(1):64.
- 620 38. Machín L, Alcaire F, Antúnez L, Giménez A, Curutchet MR, Ares G. Use of nutritional warning  
621 labels at the point of purchase: An exploratory study using self-reported measures and eye-tracking.  
622 *Appetite*. 2023:106634.
- 623 39. Batis C, Aburto TC, Pedraza LS, Angulo E, Hernández Z, Jáuregui A, et al. Self-reported reactions  
624 to the front-of-package warning labelling in Mexico among parents of school-aged children. *medRxiv*.  
625 2023:2023.07. 26.23293213.
- 626 40. Arellano-Gómez LP, Jáuregui A, Nieto C, Contreras-Manzano A, Quevedo KL, White CM, et al.  
627 Effects of front-of-package caffeine and sweetener disclaimers in Mexico: Cross-sectional results from  
628 the 2020 International Food Policy Study. *Public Health Nutrition*. 2023:1-30.
- 629 41. Bablani L, Mhurchu CN, Neal B, Skeels CL, Staub KE, Blakely T. Effect of voluntary Health Star  
630 Rating labels on healthier food purchasing in New Zealand: longitudinal evidence using representative  
631 household purchase data. *BMJ Nutrition, Prevention & Health*. 2022;5(2).
- 632 42. Neal B, Crino M, Dunford E, Gao A, Greenland R, Li N, et al. Effects of different types of front-of-  
633 pack labelling information on the healthiness of food purchases—a randomised controlled trial.  
634 *Nutrients*. 2017;9(12):1284.
- 635 43. Ni Mhurchu C, Volkova E, Jiang Y, Eyles H, Michie J, Neal B, et al. Effects of interpretive nutrition  
636 labels on consumer food purchases: the Starlight randomized controlled trial. *The American journal of*  
637 *clinical nutrition*. 2017;105(3):695-704.
- 638 44. Monteiro CA, Cannon G, Levy RB, Moubarac J-C, Louzada ML, Rauber F, et al. Ultra-processed  
639 foods: what they are and how to identify them. *Public health nutrition*. 2019;22(5):936-41.

- 640 45. Pan American Health Organization. Pan American Health Organization Nutrient Profile Model  
641 2017 [cited 2023 October 12]. Available from: <https://iris.paho.org/handle/10665.2/18621>.
- 642 46. Global Health Advocacy Incubator. FOPWL regulations around the globe 2023 [cited 2023  
643 October 2]. Available from:  
644 [https://dfweawn6ylvgz.cloudfront.net/uploads/2023/FOPWL\\_Regulations.pdf](https://dfweawn6ylvgz.cloudfront.net/uploads/2023/FOPWL_Regulations.pdf).
- 645 47. Ahmed M, Schermel A, Lee J, Weippert M, Franco-Arellano B, L'Abbé M. Development of the  
646 Food Label Information Program: A Comprehensive Canadian Branded Food Composition Database.  
647 *Frontiers in Nutrition*. 2022;13:19.
- 648 48. Health Canada. Table of Reference Amounts for Food 2016 [cited 2021 January 6]. Available  
649 from: <https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/technical-documents-labelling-requirements/table-reference-amounts-food.html>.
- 650  
651 49. Ministerio de Salud de Chile. Decreto 13, Modifica decreto supremo nº 977, de 1996,  
652 reglamento sanitario de los alimentos 2015 [cited 2023 October 5]. Available from:  
653 <https://extranet.who.int/nutrition/gina/sites/default/filesstore/CHL%202015%20Decreto%2013%2C%20Modifica%20decreto%20supremo%20n%C2%BA%20977%2C%20de%201996%2C%20reglamento%20sanitario%20de%20los%20alimentos.pdf>.
- 654  
655  
656 50. Lee JJ, Ahmed M, Ng A, Mulligan C, Flexner N, L'Abbé MR. Nutrient intakes and top food  
657 categories contributing to intakes of energy and nutrients-of-concern consumed by Canadian adults that  
658 would require a 'high-in' front-of-pack symbol according to Canadian labelling regulations. *PLOS ONE*.  
659 2023;18(5):e0285095. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0285095.
- 660 51. Government of Canada. Marketing Authorization to Permit a Lower Calcium Threshold for  
661 Exemptions from the Requirement for Prepackaged Products to Carry a Nutrition Symbol in the Case of  
662 Cheese, Yogurt, Kefir and Buttermilk: SOR/2024-89 2024 [cited 2024 November 02]. Available from:  
663 <https://canadagazette.gc.ca/rp-pr/p2/2024/2024-06-05/html/sor-dors89-eng.html>.
- 664 52. Martinez-Steele E, Khandpur N, Batis C, Bes-Rastrollo M, Bonaccio M, Cediél G, et al. Best  
665 practices for applying the Nova food classification system. *Nature Food*. 2023;1-4.
- 666 53. Bernstein JT, Schermel A, Mills CM, L'Abbé MR. Total and free sugar content of Canadian  
667 prepackaged foods and beverages. *Nutrients*. 2016;8(9):582.
- 668 54. Weippert MV. Free Sugars in the Canadian Food Supply: Changes from 2013 to 2017 and  
669 Modelling the Impact of Sugars Reformulation on the Nutritional Composition of Prepackaged Foods  
670 and Beverages: University of Toronto; 2020 [cited 2023 March 8]. Available from:  
671 <https://hdl.handle.net/1807/121465>.
- 672 55. Tanner MA, Young MA. Modeling agreement among raters. *Journal of the American Statistical*  
673 *Association*. 1985;80(389):175-80.
- 674 56. R Core Team. The R Project for Statistical Computing 2023 [cited 2023 January 8]. Available  
675 from: <https://www.r-project.org/>.
- 676 57. Flexner N, Christoforou AK, Bernstein JT, Ng AP, Yang Y, Fernandes Nilson EA, et al. Estimating  
677 Canadian sodium intakes and the health impact of meeting national and WHO recommended sodium  
678 intake levels: A macrosimulation modelling study. *PLOS ONE*. 2023;18(5):e0284733. doi:  
679 10.1371/journal.pone.0284733.
- 680 58. Bernstein JT, Christoforou AK, Ng A, Weippert M, Mulligan C, Flexner N, L'Abbe MR. Canadian  
681 Free Sugar Intake and Modelling of a Reformulation Scenario. *Foods*. 2023;12(9):1771.
- 682 59. Flexner N, Ahmed M, Mulligan C, Bernstein JT, Christoforou AK, Lee JJ, et al. The estimated  
683 dietary and health impact of implementing the recently approved 'high in' front-of-package nutrition  
684 symbol in Canada: a food substitution scenario modeling study. *Frontiers in Nutrition*. 2023;10. doi:  
685 10.3389/fnut.2023.1158498.



- 686 60. Flexner N, Ng AP, Ahmed M, Khandpur N, Acton RB, Lee JJ, L'Abbe MR. Estimating the dietary  
687 and health impact of implementing front-of-pack nutrition labeling in Canada: A macrosimulation  
688 modeling study. *Frontiers in Nutrition*. 2023;10. doi: 10.3389/fnut.2023.1098231.
- 689 61. Health Canada. Sodium Intake of Canadians in 2017 2018 [cited 2023 October 12]. Available  
690 from: [https://www.canada.ca/content/dam/hc-sc/documents/services/publications/food-](https://www.canada.ca/content/dam/hc-sc/documents/services/publications/food-nutrition/sodium-intake-canadians-2017/2017-sodium-intakes-report-eng.pdf)  
691 [nutrition/sodium-intake-canadians-2017/2017-sodium-intakes-report-eng.pdf](https://www.canada.ca/content/dam/hc-sc/documents/services/publications/food-nutrition/sodium-intake-canadians-2017/2017-sodium-intakes-report-eng.pdf).
- 692 62. Pan American health Organization. Ultra-processed food and drink products in Latin America:  
693 Trends, impact on obesity, policy implications 2015 [cited 2023 October 5]. Available from:  
694 [https://iris.paho.org/bitstream/handle/10665.2/7699/9789275118641](https://iris.paho.org/bitstream/handle/10665.2/7699/9789275118641_eng.pdf?sequence=5&isAllowed=y)  
695 [eng.pdf?sequence=5&isAllowed](https://iris.paho.org/bitstream/handle/10665.2/7699/9789275118641_eng.pdf?sequence=5&isAllowed=y)  
696 [=y](https://iris.paho.org/bitstream/handle/10665.2/7699/9789275118641_eng.pdf?sequence=5&isAllowed=y).
- 697 63. Statistics Canada. Health Fact Sheets - Overweight and obese adults, 2018 2019 [cited 2023  
698 September 13]. Available from: [https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/82-625-](https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/82-625-x/2019001/article/00005-eng.htm)  
699 [x/2019001/article/00005-eng.htm](https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/82-625-x/2019001/article/00005-eng.htm).
- 700 64. Polsky JY, Moubarac J-C, Garriguet D. Consumption of ultra-processed foods in Canada. *Health*  
701 *Rep*. 2020;31(11):3-15.
- 702 65. Contreras-Manzano A, Cruz-Casarrubias C, Munguia A, Jauregui A, Vargas-Meza J, Nieto C, et al.  
703 Evaluation of the Mexican warning label nutrient profile on food products marketed in Mexico in 2016  
704 and 2017: A cross-sectional analysis. *PLoS Med*. 2022;19(4):e1003968. Epub 2022/04/21. doi:  
705 10.1371/journal.pmed.1003968. PubMed PMID: 35442949; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC9067899.
- 706 66. Borges CA, Khandpur N, Neri D, Duran AC. Comparing Latin American nutrient profile models  
707 using data from packaged foods with child-directed marketing within the Brazilian food supply. *Frontiers*  
708 *in Nutrition*. 2022;9. doi: 10.3389/fnut.2022.920710.
- 709 67. Duran AC, Ricardo CZ, Mais LA, Martins APB. Role of different nutrient profiling models in  
710 identifying targeted foods for front-of-package food labelling in Brazil. *Public Health Nutrition*.  
711 2021;24(6):1514-25.
- 712 68. Dickie S, Woods J, Machado P, Lawrence M. Nutrition Classification Schemes for Informing  
713 Nutrition Policy in Australia: Nutrient-Based, Food-Based, or Dietary-Based? *Current Developments in*  
714 *Nutrition*. 2022;6(8):nzac112.
- 715 69. Mora-Plazas M, Gómez LF, Miles DR, Parra DC, Taillie L. Nutrition quality of packaged foods in  
716 Bogotá, Colombia: A comparison of two nutrient profile models. *Nutrients*. 2019;11(5):1011.
- 717 70. Soares-Wynter S, Aiken-Hemming S-A, Hollingsworth B, Miles DR, Ng SW. Applying nutrient  
718 profiling systems to packaged foods and drinks sold in Jamaica. *Foods*. 2020;9(1):65.
- 719 71. Tiscornia MV, Castronuovo L, Guarnieri L, Martins E, Allemandi L. Evaluación de los sistemas de  
720 perfiles nutricionales para la definición de una política de etiquetado frontal en Argentina. *Revista*  
721 *Argentina de Salud Pública*. 2020;12:17-.
- 722 72. Machado P, Cediel G, Woods J, Baker P, Dickie S, Gomes FS, et al. Evaluating intake levels of  
723 nutrients linked to non-communicable diseases in Australia using the novel combination of food  
724 processing and nutrient profiling metrics of the PAHO Nutrient Profile Model. *European Journal of*  
725 *Nutrition*. 2022:1-12.
- 726 73. Köncke F, Toledo C, Berón C, Klaczko I, Carriquiry A, Cediel G, Gomes FS. Estimation of Intake of  
727 Critical Nutrients Associated with Noncommunicable Diseases According to the PAHO/WHO Criteria in  
728 the Diet of School-Age Children in Montevideo, Uruguay. *Nutrients*. 2022;14(3):528.
- 729 74. Berón C, Toledo C, Köncke F, Klaczko I, Carriquiry A, Cediel G, Gomes FS. Productos procesados y  
730 ultraprocesados y su relación con la calidad de la dieta en niños. *Revista Panamericana de Salud Pública*.  
731 2023;46:e67.
- 732 75. Organization PAH. Consumption of Ultra-processed and Processed Foods with Excessive  
733 Nutrients Associated with Noncommunicable Chronic Diseases and Unhealthy Diets in the Americas.  
2024 [cited 2024 January 8]. Available from: <https://iris.paho.org/handle/10665.2/58887>.

- 734 76. Canella DS, Pereira Montera VdS, Oliveira N, Mais LA, Andrade GC, Martins APB. Food additives  
735 and PAHO's nutrient profile model as contributors' elements to the identification of ultra-processed  
736 food products. *Scientific Reports*. 2023;13(1):13698.
- 737 77. Government of Canada. Nutrition labelling compliance test 2024 [cited 2024 August 28]. Available  
738 from: [https://inspection.canada.ca/en/food-labels/labelling/industry/nutrition-labelling/additional-](https://inspection.canada.ca/en/food-labels/labelling/industry/nutrition-labelling/additional-information/compliance-test)  
739 [information/compliance-test](https://inspection.canada.ca/en/food-labels/labelling/industry/nutrition-labelling/additional-information/compliance-test).
- 740 78. Health Canada. Canada's Dietary Guidelines for Health Professionals and Policy Makers 2019  
741 [cited 2023 September 18]. Available from: <https://food-guide.canada.ca/en/guidelines/>.
- 742

### SODIUM

### SUGARS

### SATURATED FATS




Figure 1




Figure2