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**Table S1.** Prevalence of claims used in advertising (%), their functionality (%) and description used (*n*) and comparison of frequency of claims between feed materials and feed additives

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Feed Categories | Prevalence of these claims (%) | χ²(*p* value) | Functionality mentioned in claim (%) | Description used (*n*)(See table 5 for explanation) |
| Favourably affect the characteristics of the feed | 11.1 | 1.2 | Stability (51.2) | Increase (34), For (23), Good (18), Maintain (17), Decrease (2) |
|  | Nutrient absorption (13.1) |
|  | Hygiene (9.5) |
|  | Effectiveness (3.6) |
|  | Acidification (2.4)Better silage (9.5) |
|  | Binding, Consistency, Hygroscopy, Pelleting, Flowability (1.2) |
| Favourably affect the characteristics of animal products (*i.e.* meat/milk/eggs) | 6.3 | 0.7  | Reference to food (type not specified) (22.9) | Improve (25), For (12), Healthy (3), Claim specific [*e.g*. management (3) Consistent (1), Preserve (1)], Decrease (2), Good (1),  |
|  | Meat (3.3) |
|  | Eggs (10.4) |
|  | Milk (6.3) |
|  | Food safety (10.4) |
|  | Pigmentation (2.1) |
|  |  |
| Satisfy the nutritional needs of animals | 9.4 | 3.3  | Minerals (36.1) | Claim specific [*e.g.* Contains (36), High/ rich in (10), Source of (8), Secures, (4)] Increases (2)] |
|  | Fibre (16.7) |
|  | Butyrate (13.9) |
|  | L-carnitine (13.9) |
|  | Acids other (8.3) |
|  | Amino acids (5.6) |
|  | Vitamins (2.8) |
|  | Multiple (2.8) |
| Favourably affect the environmental consequences of animal production | 7.4 | 0.8  | General (30.4) | Decrease (26), Claim specific [*e.g*. Friendly (17), Improve (14)]  |
|  | Litter quality (23.2) |
|  | Ammonia (19.6) |
|  | Waste (16.1) |
|  | Air quality (1.6) |
| Favourably affect animal welfare | 6.6 | 0.1  | General (42.0) | Increase (30), For (9), Good (5), Claim specific [*e.g.* Healing (3), Healthy (2)], Decrease (1) |
|  | Target site mentioned (hoof/leg/frame) (22.0) |
|  | Comfort (18.0) |
|  | Specific disease (*e.g.* lameness) (12.0) |
|  | Stress (6.0) |
| Favourably affect animal production or performance | 52.1 | 7.4\*\* | Use word “performance” (21.5) | Increase (97), Maintain (28), Good (19) |
|  | Yield (13.0) | Increases (107), Yield specific markers (39)  |
|  | Growth (10.9) | Increases (62), Claim specific [*e.g.* faster (16)], For (3), Good (1) |
|  | Feed conversion (9.1)\* | Increases (69) |
|  | Feed intake (8.6) | Increases (65), Good (2) |
|  | General performance claim (4.0)\*\*\* | Better functioning birds, soup is good feed, proven benefits, unlimited opportunities (30) |
|  | Morbidity/mortality (2.5) | Decreases (19) |
|  | Fertility (2.1) | Increases (16) |
|  | Carcass condemnation (1.5) | Decreases (11) |
|  | Strength (1.6) | Increases (12) |
|  | Selection rate (2.0) | Increases (15) |
|  | Weight loss (1.5) | Decreases (11) |
|  | Appetite (0.9) | Increases (8), Maintains (1) |
|  | Uniformity (0.9) | Increased (7) |
| Affect gastrointestinal flora or digestibility of feedingstuffs | 19.6 | 18.8\*\*\*  | Feed conversion (30.8) | For (106), Increase (87), Maintain (36), Decrease (24), Good (6) Claim specific [*e.g.* Complements (7), Efficient (5)] |
|  | Nutrient digestibility/ absorption (2.6) |
|  | Gut microflora (17.9) |
|  | Defence against pathogens/ microbial balance (12.1) |
|  | Gut health (7.6) |
|  | Digestive enzymes (2.7) |
|  | Rumen function (1.3) |
| Maintain function of gastro-intestinal tract\* | 12.3 | 4.6\*  | Gut health/development/ function (53.8) | Decrease (27), Increase (21), Maintain (17), For (12), Good (9), Healthy (6)  |
|  | Defence against pathogens/ promote microflora (31.2) |
|  | Multiple claims (6.5) |
|  | For (3.2) |
|  | Stabilise rumen microflora (3.2) |
|  | Acidification (1.1) |
|  | Structure/integrity/morphology of gut (1.1) |
| Immunity/stress resistance | 13.2 | 0.1  | Robustness (1) | Increase (40), Decrease (20), Maintain (20), For (7), Claim specific [*e.g.* Multiple (6), Modulates (2), Recovery (2)] |
|  | Healing (3.1) |
|  | Resistance (6.1) |
|  | Vitality (6.1) |
|  | Oxidative stress (8.2) |
|  | Specific disease (10.2) |
|  | Stress (16.3)Immunity (48.0) |
| Mycotoxins and moulds | 12.9 | 4.0\*  | Mycotoxins (100) | Claim specific: [Risk management (23), Binds (21), Broad spectrum activity (11), Adsorbs (10), Alleviate feed refusal (9), Against/ fights (7), Absorbs (7), Protects against/prevents (3), Sequesters (1), Relief from (1), Reduces impact of (2), Deactivates (1)] |

Significantly different in feed materials and feed additives as compared with Pearson Chi-Square at: \*\*\* < 0.001, \*\*significant at < 0.01, \*significant at < 0.05