**Supplemental Materials**

**Comparison of schools that provided versus did not provide canteen menu**

Characteristics of schools that participated in either NaSSDA survey wave and that did (versus did not) provide a copy of their school canteen menu are summarised in Table S1. Of the 56 schools that did not provide a menu, the majority (*n* = 48) were from 2012-2013 and 14 schools did not have a school canteen. Schools that provided versus did not provide a canteen menu varied according to state and education sector (both *p* <.01 for ꭓ2 test of association with menu provision). Canteen menus were not provided for any NSW government schools in 2012-13, which accounted for these differences. There were no other significant differences in school characteristics.

Table S1.

Characteristics of schools included in menu analysis and those that participated in NaSSDA but did not provide a canteen menu.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Menu provided  N schools (%) | No available menu  N schools (%) |
| *Total* | 244 | 56 |
| *School size*  *N* enrolments: *m(sd*) | 944.1 (497.9) | 852.3 (440.6) |
| Small | 77 (31.6) | 22 (39.3) |
| Medium | 82 (33.6) | 17 (30.4) |
| Large | 85 (34.8) | 17 (30.4) |
| *Education sector* |  |  |
| Government | 143 (58.6) | 39 (69.6) |
| Independent | 47 (19.3) | 15 (26.8) |
| Catholic | 54 (22.1) | 2 (3.6) |
| *Location* |  |  |
| Metropolitan | 139 (57.0) | 36 (64.3) |
| Regional/remote | 105 (43.0) | 20 (35.7) |
| *Socioeconomic position* |  |  |
| Low | 65 (26.6) | 19 (33.9) |
| Medium | 79 (32.4) | 20 (35.7) |
| High | 100 (41.0) | 17 (30.4) |
| *State* |  |  |
| New South Wales | 41 (16.8) | 31 (55.4) |
| Victoria | 40 (16.4) | 5 (8.9) |
| Queensland | 52 (21.3) | 5 (8.9) |
| Western Australia | 33 (13.5) | 2 (3.6) |
| South Australia | 27 (11.1) | 2 (3.6) |
| Tasmania | 23 (9.4) | 3 (5.4) |
| Australian Capital Territory | 12 (4.9) | 2 (3.6) |
| Northern Territory | 16 (6.6) | 6 (10.7) |

**Sensitivity analysis: ‘inconclusive’ traffic light classification assumed lower nutritional quality**

Item-level characteristics when classing inconclusive ‘green-amber’ and ‘amber-red’ items as being of lower nutritional quality (amber and red, respectively) are reported in Table S2. Compared to primary results (where ‘inconclusive’ items are assumed to be of higher nutritional quality) the largest change was observed in the proportion of items classed as ‘green’ or ‘amber’, where a majority were classed as ‘amber’ when lower nutritional quality was assumed.

Table S2.

Characteristics of items on school canteen menus: ‘inconclusive’ items classed assumed lower nutritional quality.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Green  Row % weighted  (unweighted) | Amber  Row % weighted  (unweighted) | Red  Row % weighted  (unweighted) |
| Overall | 16.9 (16.9) | 59.8 (59.5) | 23.3 (23.6) |
| *Survey wave* |  |  |  |
| 2012-2013 | 16.2 (16.7) | 59.0 (59.1) | 24.8 (24.2) |
| 2018 | 17.5 (17.1) | 60.5 (60.2) | 22.1 (22.7) |
| *Product sector* |  |  |  |
| Meal foods (hot) | 5.5 (5.3) | 74.8 (74.7) | 19.7 (20.0) |
| Meal foods (cold) | 26.2 (26.4) | 73.5 (73.3) | 0.3 (0.3) |
| Snacks | 16.2 (15.5) | 21.3 (22.0) | 62.5 (62.5) |
| Drinks | 17.7 (17.8) | 36.4 (34.1) | 45.9 (48.0) |
| Breakfast | 16.1 (14.4) | 67.8 (68.8) | 16.1 (16.8) |
| *Promoted items* | 28.2 (28.4) | 65.9 (65.0) | 5.9 (6.6) |
| *Price* (*m*)  Unweighted (*m*[*sd*]) | $3.08  3.06 (1.46) | $3.56  3.52 (1.34) | $2.47  2.48 (1.15) |