*Supplementary file 2: Indicators with calibration score for each policy*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Policy case  | Industry engagement | Strict regulatory design  | Best practice instrument designa  | Comprehensive monitoring  | Comprehensive enforcement  |
| Australian Health Star rating  | Calibrate as .66Industry involved in governance of the initiative and at implementation | Calibrate as .33One out of three indicators for the involvement of government in quasi-regulation | Calibrate as .33 Nutrient criteria developed by an independent body But there are challenges with design – it requires interpretation, monochrome and food companies can choose design.  | Calibrate as 1Existence of a monitoring system independent monitoring done by an NGO Public and frequent reports on the performance of the scheme  | Calibrate as .33There is a complaints handling mechanism but no sanctions except listed on HSR website |
| Australian Food Marketing codes  | Calibrated as 1 Industry-led policy  | calibrate as 0None of the indicators – the policy is pure self-regulation | Calibrate as 0No indicators for design- no independent criteria , no aim to reduce exposure, Only for children under 12. | Calibrate as .33 One indicator for comprehensive monitoring - existence of monitoring system but its complaints based, no independent body , no baseline | Calibrate as 0not enforced |
| Australian Food & health dialogue  | Calibrate as .66 Industry involved in governance & at implementation  | Calibrate as .33One out of three indicators for the involvement of government in quasi-regulation  | Calibrate as .33One indicator of best practice design - having targets.   | Calibrate as .33Monitoring mentioned but not specific No baseline data No independent third party  | Calibrate as 0not enforced  |
| Berkeley SSB tax  |  Calibrate as 0Industry involved at implementation, no reported impact on design or implementation.  | Calibrate as 1All three indicators are present - Mandatory policy, led by government policyUnderpinned by legislation  | Calibrate as .66Two indicators of best practice design, Excises tax, earmarked, content based, does not result in 20% increase | Calibrate as 1Three indicators of comprehensive monitoring. There is a monitoring system, Annual verification, independent stakeholder by city manager, independent from industry  | Calibrate as 1Three indicators present. Existence of an enforcement system, independent enforcement body and availability of sanctions. |
| Brazil sodium reformulation  | Calibrate as .66Industry involved in governance of the public private partnership with the ministry of health | Calibrate as .33One out of three indicators for the involvement of government in quasi-regulation | Calibrate as 1Three indicators of good practice designPopulation intake goal Time-based targets Evidence-based baseline measures  | Calibrate as 1Three indicators Existence of a monitoring system, Independent3rd party/government monitoring Baseline data  | Calibrate as 0not enforced |
| Canada sodium reformulation  | Calibrate as .66Industry involved in governance as they constituted about one-quarter of the Health Canada Sodium working group.  | Calibrate as .33One out of three indicators for the involvement of government in quasi-regulation | Calibrate as 1Three indicators of good practice designPopulation intake goal Time-based targets Evidence-based baseline measures | Calibrate as 1Three indicators Existence of a monitoring system, Independent3rd party/government monitoring Baseline data | Calibrate as 0not enforced |
| Canadian Food marketing codes  | Calibrated as 1 Industry-led policy | calibrate as 0None of the indicators – the policy is pure self-regulation |  Calibrate as 0Industry nutrient criteria, do not aim to reduce exposure, goals Industry criteria Doesn’t cover all forms of marketing | Calibrate as .33 One indicator for existence of monitoring system but its complaints based, no independent body , no baseline | Calibrate as 0not enforced |
| Chile Food Labelling and Advertising law  | Calibrate as 0Industry involved as an external stakeholder in implementation, no reported changes to the policy.  | Calibrate as 1All three indicators are present - Mandatory policy, led by government policyUnderpinned by legislation  | Calibrate as 1 Three indicators of best practice design Independent nutrient criteria, label design, non-interpretive, covers various platforms  | Calibrate as 1 Existence of a monitoring system monitoring system, government  | Calibrate as 1Three indicators present. Existence of an enforcement system, independent enforcement body and availability of sanctions. |
| Danish wholegrain logo  | Calibrate as .66Industry involved in governance & at implementation |  Calibrate as .33One out of three indicators for the involvement of government in quasi-regulation | Calibrate as 1Three best practice design indicators  Logo type on healthy food, doesn’t require interpretation, government nutrient criteria. | Calibrate as .66 Two indicators There is a Monitoring system, multiple methods are used, not independent of industry | Calibrate as 0not enforced |
| Danish trans-fat ban  | Calibrate as .33Industry involved as an external stakeholder before implementation.  | Calibrate as 1All three indicators are present - Mandatory policy, led by government policyUnderpinned by legislation  |  Calibrate as 1Three indicators of best practice design - Maximum limits, Applies to all food stuffsBaseline measures | Calibrate as 1Three indicators present. Existence of a monitoring system, independent monitoring Consistent measuring of population trans-fat intake | Calibrate as 1Three indicators present. Existence of an enforcement system, independent enforcement body and availability of sanctions.  |
| Dutch choices logo  | Calibrate as .66Industry policy that was later approved by government  | Calibrate as .33One out of three indicators for the involvement of government in quasi-regulation | Calibrate as 1Three best practices design indicators present  Logo type on healthy food, doesn’t require interpretation, WHO criteria | Calibrate as 1Three indicators for comprehensive monitoring Existence of a monitoring system, Monitored by an independent scientific committee & reviewed every four years | Calibrate as 0not enforced |
| The Broadcasting Authority of Ireland (BAI) code | Calibrate as 0 Industry involved at implementation, no reported impact on design or implementation. | calibrate as 1All three indicators are present - Mandatory policy, led by government policyUnderpinned by legislation  | Calibrate as .1Goal to reduce exposure , applies to children under 18, independent nutrient criteria -  | Calibrate as 1 existence of a monitoring system, done by an external body or government | Calibrate as 1 Three indicators of comprehensive enforcement - there is an enforcement system, independent from the industry and there are sanctions for noncompliance. |
| King County Calorie Labelling  | Calibrate as 0 Industry involved at implementation, no reported impact on design or implementation. | Calibrate as 1All three indicators are present - Mandatory policy, led by government policyUnderpinned by legislation  | Calibrate as .66 specifies the outlets the regulations apply to, includes drive through, and specifies the nutrients, criteria up to the establishment | Calibrate as 1 Existence of a monitoring system, done by an external body or government | Calibrate as .66Two indicators Enforced by department of health but no specific sanctions/fines |
| New South Wales calorie labelling  | Calibrate as 0 Industry involved at implementation, no reported impact on design or implementation. | calibrate as 1All three indicators are present - Mandatory policy, led by government policyUnderpinned by legislation  | Calibrate as .66Two indicators Specifies the outlets affected, challenges with legibility and display.  | Calibrate as 1existence of a monitoring system, done by an external body or government | Calibrate as .66Two indicators of comprehensive enforcement - there is an enforcement system but it’ s weak (written notice and assistance with implementation) |
| New York City Trans-fat Ban  | Calibrate as .33Industry involved as an external stakeholder prior to implementation. Timelines were adjusted based on these consultations.  | Calibrate as 1All three indicators are present - Mandatory policy, led by government policyUnderpinned by legislation  | Calibrate as .66Two indicators for having upper limits and articulated policy goals but only applies to restaurants and does not include packaged food  | Calibrate as 1Three indicators there is an existence of a monitoring system, done by an external body or government, measured against baseline  | Calibrate as 1Three indicators present. Existence of an enforcement system, independent enforcement body and availability of sanctions. |
| New York City Calorie labelling  | Calibrate as .33Industry involved as an external stakeholder in implementation. Policy amended after a court ruling.  | Calibrate as 1All three indicators are present - Mandatory policy, led by government policyUnderpinned by legislation  | Calibrate as 1. Three indicators for best practice design - Prominent, Readable, expression of daily intakes | Calibrate as 1 Three indicators Independent Monitoring system Monitoring by DOH | Calibrate as 1 Three indicators of comprehensive enforcement - there is an enforcement system, independent from the industry and there are sanctions for noncompliance.  |
| New Zealand food marketing self-regulation  | Calibrate as 1 Industry-led policy  | Calibrate as 0None of the indicators – the policy is pure self-regulation  | Calibrate as .33One indicator of design best practices -nutrient criteria, no goals to reduce exposure, Doesn’t cover all media  | Calibrate as .33 One indicator for existence of monitoring system but its complaints based, no independent body , no baseline  | Calibrate as 0 not enforced |
| Philadelphia SSB tax  | Calibrate as 0Industry involved as an external stakeholder in implementation. There was a court case but it did not lead to changes in the design of the policy.  | Calibrate as 1All three indicators are present - Mandatory policy, led by government policyUnderpinned by legislation  | Calibrate as 1Three indicators of good tax design Excise tax, if passed through it will result in a 20% increase, earmarked | Calibrate as 1 Three indicators of good monitoring Monitored through tax returns, there is a system, independent from industry  | Calibrate as 1Three indicators present. Existence of an enforcement system, independent enforcement body and availability of sanctions. |
| Quebec | Calibrate as 0 Industry involved at implementation, no reported impact on design or implementation. | Calibrate as 1All three indicators are present - Mandatory policy, led by government policyUnderpinned by legislation  | Calibrate as .33One indicator of best practice design Seeks to protect from all exposure commercial marketing, but excludes some platforms, only shows that target children under 13.  | Calibrate as .33There is a monitoring system but it is complaints based, no routine measurement of the impact of food advertising on children.  | Calibrate as .66Two indicators present There is an enforcement system Independent from industry There is a range of enforcement options but they are not used  |
| South Africa sodium reformulation  | Calibrate as .33 Industry engaged before implementation which led to changes in some of the targets.  | Calibrate as 1Three indicators are present Mandatory policy, led by government policyUnderpinned by legislation  | Calibrate as 1Three indicators of good practice designPopulation intake goal Time-based targets Evidence-based baseline measures | Calibrate as 1Existence of a monitoring system, Independent monitoringPlan to measure population salt intake and content analyses  | Calibrate as 1Three indicators present. Existence of an enforcement system, independent enforcement body and availability of sanctions. |
| South Korean Special Act on Safety Management of Children’s Dietary Life (Food advertising) | Calibrate as 0 Industry involved at implementation, no reported impact on design or implementation. | calibrate as 1All three indicators are present - Mandatory policy, led by government policyUnderpinned by legislation  | Calibrate as .66 Two indicators of best practice design – there is goal to reduce exposure to unhealthy food advertising, Independent nutrient criteria but doesn’t cover all platforms.  | Calibrate as 1 existence of a monitoring system, done by an external body or government | Calibrate as 1 Three indicators of comprehensive enforcement - there is an enforcement system, independent from the industry and there are sanctions for noncompliance. |
| Spanish voluntary codes for food marketing  | Calibrate as .66Aspects of the policy are sanctioned by the ministry of health  | calibrate as 0None of the indicators – the policy is pure self-regulation | Calibrate as 0No goal to reduce exposure, limited to 15 years, no nutrient standards for what should be advertised, does not cover all forms of marketing  | Calibrate as 1Three indicators for comprehensive monitoring present. There is an apriori system where ads are screened before advertisements – there is a monitoring commission | Calibrate as .66There is an enforcement system and fines but these only apply to organizations that are part of the pledge.  |
| Sweden food marketing regulations  | Calibrate as 0 Industry involved at implementation, no reported impact on design or implementation. | Calibrate as 1All three indicators are present - Mandatory policy, led by government policyUnderpinned by legislation  | Calibrate as .33Only one indicator - aims to reduce exposure to all marketing but only goes till the age of 12, broadcasting laws don’t apply to non-broadcast media | Calibrate as 0No indicator of comprehensive monitoring- No systematic monitoring related to unhealthy food or exposure to food marketing | Calibrate as .66Two out of three indicators present There is an enforcement system Independent from industry There is a range of enforcement options but they are not used |
| United Kingdom food marketing  | Calibrate as 0Industry involved as an external stakeholder in implementation.  | calibrate as 1All three indicators are present - Mandatory policy, led by government policyUnderpinned by legislation  | Calibrate as 1 Goal to reduce exposure, includes multiple platforms, independent nutrient criteria to evaluate foods that can be marketed  | Calibrate as .66Two indicators present There is systematic monitoring Done by an independent body No impact assessments of food advertising  | Calibrate as 1Three indicators present. Existence of an enforcement system, independent enforcement body and availability of sanctions. |
| United Kingdom Soft drinks levy  | Calibrate as 0 Industry involved at implementation, no reported impact on design or implementation. | Calibrate as 1All three indicators are present - Mandatory policy, led by government policyUnderpinned by legislation  | Calibrate as .66Two-Tiered based on content, levied on manufacturer, not an excise tax | Calibrate as 1 Three indicators present Existence of a monitoring system, Independent3rd party/government | Calibrate as 1Three out of three indicators present. Existence of an enforcement system, independent enforcement body and availability of sanctions. |
| United Kingdom sodium reformulation (Food Standards Agency)  | Calibrate as .33 Led by an independent Food Standards Agency with industry consulted as an external stakeholder.  | Calibrate as .33One out of three indicators for the involvement of government in quasi-regulation |  Calibrate as 1Three indicators of good practice designPopulation intake goal Time-based targets Population intake goal | Calibrate as 1 Three indicators present Existence of a monitoring system, Independent3rd party/government24-hr urine samples to measure population intake  | Calibrate as 0 not enforced |
| United Kingdom sodium reformulation (public health responsibility deal)  | Calibrate as .66Industry involved in the governance of the partnership.  | Calibrate as .33One out of three indicators for the involvement of government in quasi-regulation | Calibrate as .66One indicator of best practice design. Targets not consistent and reported to be low.  | Calibrate as .33One indicator for existence of a monitoring system. It is not independent. Self-reports by the industry, not consistent   | Calibrate as 0 not enforced |
| United States National Sodium Initiative | Calibrate as .33Led by the New York City Department of health and mental Hygiene with other state governments and local authorities. Industry was consulted as an external stakeholder. | calibrate as .33One out of three indicators for the involvement of government in quasi-regulation | Calibrate as 1Three indicators of good practice designPopulation intake goal Time-based targets Population intake goal | Calibrate as 1Three indicators there is an existence of a monitoring system, done by an external body or government,  | Calibrate as 0 not enforced |
| United States Children’s Food and Beverage Advertising Initiative | Calibrated as 1 Industry-led policy | calibrate as 0None of the indicators – the policy is pure self-regulation | Calibrate as 0Industry nutrient criteria, do not aim to reduce exposure, goals Industry criteria Doesn’t cover all forms of marketing  | Calibrate as .33 One indicator for existence of monitoring system but its complaints based, no independent body , no baseline | Calibrate as 0 not enforced |

**aBest practices**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Sodium reformulation**  | **Front of pack labels**  | **Menu labels** | **Food marketing**  | **Taxes**  |
| Time based targets for reduction  | Independent nutrient criteria  | Specifies they type of outlets the policy applies to | Goal to reduce exposure  | Excises tax on distribution/retail  |
| Baseline measures before the initiative starts  | Label placed on one category of food either healthy/unhealthy | Includes energy statement  | Covers all media – broadcast, non-broadcast  | Must result in a 20% increase  |
| Population intake goal  | Label stands out  | Specifies font and location  | Independent nutrient criteria  | Earmarked for health  |
| Independent third party involved in target setting  | Doesn’t require interpretation  | Specifies calories per portion not 100g  | Definition of children  | Based on content  |