

1 **Title:** Decreases in purchases of energy, sodium, sugar, and saturated fat three years after
2 implementation of the Chilean Food Labelling and Marketing Law

3 **Short Title:** Nutrient Purchases after Chile's Food Labeling and Marketing Law

4 **Authors:**

5 Lindsey Smith Taillie, PhD,^a Maxime Bercholz, MS,^a Barry Popkin, PhD,^a Natalia Rebolledo, PhD^b

6 Marcela Reyes, MPH, MD,^b M. Camila Corvalán, MD, PhD^{b*}

7 ^a University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Carolina Population Center and Gillings School of

8 Global Public Health, Department of Nutrition

9 123 W Franklin St, CB #8120, Chapel Hill, NC 27514 USA

10 ^b Institute of Nutrition and Food Technology, University of Chile

11 Instituto de Nutrición y Tecnología de los Alimentos, El Líbano 5524, Macul, Chile 7830490

12 * Corresponding author: Camila Corvalán, (56) 229781506, ccorval@gmail.com

13 **Abstract**

14 **Background:** In 2016, Chile implemented a multi-phase set of policies that mandated warning labels, restricted food
15 marketing to children, and banned school sales of unhealthy foods and beverages. Chile's law, particularly the warning
16 label component, set the precedent for a rapid global proliferation of similar policies. While our initial evaluation
17 showed policy-linked decreases in purchases of products carrying the warning label, a longer-term evaluation is needed,
18 particularly as later phases of Chile's law included stricter nutrient thresholds and introduced a daytime ban on
19 advertising of labeled foods for all audiences. The objective is to evaluate changes in purchases of energy, sugar, sodium,
20 and saturated fat purchased after Phase 2 implementation of the Chilean policies.

21 **Methods and Findings:** This before- and after- study used longitudinal data on monthly food and beverage purchases
22 from 2,844 Chilean households (138,391 household-months) from July 1, 2013 until June 30, 2019. Nutrition facts panel
23 data from food and beverage packages were linked at the product level and reviewed by nutritionists. Products were
24 considered to carry the warning label if they contained added sugar, sodium, or saturated fat, and exceeded the final
25 phase nutrient or calorie thresholds (thus would carry the warning label). Using correlated random-effects models and
26 an interrupted time series design, we estimated the nutrient content of food and beverage purchases associated with
27 Phase 1 and Phase 2 compared to a counterfactual scenario based on pre-policy trends. Compared to the
28 counterfactual, we observed significant decreases in purchases of foods and beverages carrying the warning label during
29 Phase 2, including a relative 36.8% reduction in sugar (-30.3 calories, 95% CI -34.5, -26.3), a 23.0% relative reduction in
30 energy (-51.6 calories, 95% CI -60.7, -42.6), a 21.9% relative reduction in sodium (-85.8 mg, 95% CI -105.0, -66.7) and a
31 15.7% relative reduction in saturated fat (-6.4 calories, 95% CI -8.4, -4.3). Decreases were partially offset by increases in
32 non-labeled purchases, but the net effect shows a significant decrease in total nutrients of concern purchased during
33 Phase 2. Reductions in sugar and energy were driven by beverage purchases, whereas reductions in sodium and
34 saturated fat were driven by foods. The pattern of declines in purchases was similar for households of lower vs. higher
35 socioeconomic status. A key limitation of this study is that the data include only a portion of what Chilean households
36 purchase that, while including important categories impacted by the law, do not cover an entire diet.

37 **Conclusions:** The Chilean policies on food labeling, marketing, and school food sales led to declines in nutrients of
38 concern during a more complete phase of implementation, particularly from foods and drinks carrying the warning label.

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57 Introduction

58 In the last decade, many countries across the globe have taken action to halt increases in obesity prevalence and non-
59 communicable disease risk by implementing policies designed to reduce consumption of unhealthy packaged foods and
60 sugar-sweetened beverages¹. In the years since Chile first began implementing its landmark policies on front-of-package
61 labeling, restricted marketing, and ban of school sales of food and drinks high in calories, added sugar, sodium, and
62 saturated fat (“high-in” foods), many countries around the globe have followed suit. Chile’s policy requiring mandatory
63 warning labels on the front of “high-in” foods has seen particularly rapid momentum, with the majority of countries in
64 South and North America now having implemented or in the process of implementing similar policies. Even in the United
65 States, where policy progress has been slower, the 2022 National White House Conference on Hunger and Health
66 recommended clearer front-of-package labels as an important strategy for improving public health nutrition, and the US
67 Food and Drug Administration is now researching design options for a simple, interpretive front-of-package food label,
68 including a version of warning labels.

69 The Chilean regulations were implemented in three phases (2016, 2018, and 2019). Initial evaluations of the Chilean
70 policy after the first phase found that it was associated with changes in the food environment, including reductions of
71 nutrients of concern in the food supply (e.g., energy, sugar, sodium, and saturated fat)² and reductions in children’s
72 exposure to unhealthy food advertising and marketing³⁻⁷, improvements in mothers’ understanding of unhealthy foods
73 and use of the warning labels⁸, reductions in purchases of foods and drinks carrying the warning label⁹⁻¹¹, improvements
74 in the nutritional quality of foods available in schools¹², and improvement in children’s dietary intake¹³.

75 However, much less is known about policy-linked changes in dietary behavior over a longer time period. Evaluations of
76 beverage taxes have shown sustained effects two years after policy implementation¹⁴⁻¹⁶, but to our knowledge, there
77 have been no longer-term evaluations of a multi-component non-fiscal policy such as Chile’s. One concern is that the
78 impact of certain parts of the law like the warning labels might wear off over time as consumers became accustomed to
79 seeing the labels on packages, reducing the effect on food purchases. On the other hand, the second phase of Chile’s
80 law, implemented in July 2018, included important changes to the regulations that could have increased the law’s
81 impact on food purchases. Nutrient thresholds (particularly for foods) became stricter, meaning that more foods and

82 beverages were affected by the regulations (i.e., more foods carried warning labels). In addition, the marketing
83 restriction expanded to include the first-ever daytime ban on television advertising of **all** products carrying the warning
84 labels to all audiences, not just those using child-directed appeals or appearing on children’s programs. While a recently
85 published study found a 63% reduction in high-in food advertisements on television during Phase 2¹⁷, changes in food
86 purchasing during this period are currently unclear.

87 Other questions relate to how the policy influenced specific product types. For example, it is unclear which food or
88 beverage groups were most affected by the law, which is important for understanding nutrient changes and ultimately,
89 dietary patterns. In addition, it is unclear the extent to which the policy shifted purchases from products with multiple
90 warning labels to products with one warning label or no warning labels. This data is relevant to inform front-of-package
91 labeling policies in other countries, who are grappling with the ideal number of warning labels to put on products in
92 order to nudge consumers to healthier choices.

93 Finally, it is also important to understand whether the policies differentially influenced food purchases for households
94 with low socioeconomic status (SES). A recent review of interpretive front-of-package labels found that while such labels
95 are better understood than back-of-package nutrition information, relative to high-SES individuals, low-SES individuals
96 are less likely to understand and use front-of-package labels and also less likely to shift purchasing intentions as a result
97 of label exposure.¹⁸ In addition, food prices are a major driver of food choices in low-SES households¹⁹, potentially
98 making them less likely to respond to non-fiscal policies like labeling and marketing policies. Understanding policy-linked
99 purchasing changes among low-SES households is critical for ensuring future policies promote healthier diets for the
100 entire population.

101 The objective of this study is to examine the pre-post association of the Chilean Law of Food Labeling and Advertising
102 with food purchases during Phase 2 of implementation of the law. A secondary objective is to explore whether changes
103 in purchases over time differed by household SES and by number of warning labels.

106 **Methods**

107 This study was exempt from review by the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill Institutional Review Board (IRB) as it
108 used secondary, de-identified data. The study was approved by the University of Chile IRB.

109 **Study design and participants**

110 We used longitudinal data on household food purchases from Kantar WorldPanel Chile from July 1, 2013 to June 25,
111 2019. Data were aggregated at the household-monthly level.

112 Households were excluded if they were missing demographic information for a given year. We also excluded all
113 purchases in bulk (no quantity), purchases with a price or quantity of zero, baby food and formula, Kantar categories and
114 subcategories that were introduced or discontinued during the study period as determined by changes in the number of
115 purchases in these categories and subcategories over time (condensed milk, snacks, cereal bars, and minced meat), and
116 household-month observations with total energy of zero. We also excluded household-month observations from new
117 panelists before their first full month in the panel. We did so because Kantar Worldpanel began integrating new
118 panelists around the last week of each month in February 2017, resulting in systematic measurement error in their first
119 monthly totals. The final analytical sample included 2,844 unique households (median follow up, 64 months; 138,391
120 household-month observations) from cities (population > 20,000) across 13 of Chile's 16 regions. The Kantar sample is
121 weighted to be representative of these regions' urban populations in terms of key demographics, and it is
122 demographically similar to the overall Chilean population¹⁰.

123 Data on household purchases included the volume (ml) or weight (g), barcode, date, price, retail outlet, brand, and
124 package size. Data were then linked at the product level to nutrition data, which was collected and updated annually
125 from 2015 to 2019.

126 Data also included household characteristics, including size, composition (age and gender of each member), assets
127 (number of rooms, bathrooms, and cars), geographical region, age of main shopper, head of household (primary earner)
128 educational attainment, and socioeconomic status (SES). SES was defined by the market and public opinion research

129 association Asociacion de Investigadores de Mercado y Opinion Publica de Chile and calculated based on household
130 assets, head of household education, and access to goods and services¹⁰.

131 We further linked the data to the quarterly regional unemployment rate²⁰ (downloaded from Chile's statistics office's
132 website in September 2022) and public holiday data from the Python package 'holidays' (version 0.19, with minor
133 corrections).

134 For main analyses, the pre-policy period was defined as July 1, 2013 to June 30, 2016, Phase 1 was defined as July 1,
135 2016 to June 30, 2018, and Phase 2 was defined as July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019. Because Chile experienced national
136 civil unrest in October 2019 followed by the Covid-19 pandemic in Feb-March of 2020, we were unable to include Phase
137 3 in this study (beginning July 1, 2019) due to the food supply disruptions.

138 **The Chilean regulation**

139 Chile's law requires that packaged foods and beverages containing added sugar, added sodium, or added saturated and
140 exceeding thresholds for these nutrients or overall calories carry front-of-package warning labels. The labels consist of
141 black octagon(s) with the text that it is high in sugar, sodium, saturated fat, and/or calories. The products are also
142 subject to marketing restrictions (disallowed to use child-directed marketing techniques or air on platforms targeting
143 children). The products are also banned from sales or promotion in schools and nurseries. The policy was implemented
144 in phases with increasingly strict nutrient thresholds implemented in July 2016 (Phase 1); July 2018 (Phase 2); and July
145 2019 (Phase 3) (**Supplementary Table 1**). The main difference between the Phase 1 and Phase 2 regulations was that for
146 foods, the thresholds became much stricter for sodium (800 mg/100g to 500 mg/100g) and total sugars (22.5g to 15
147 g/100g), with smaller reductions for calories (350 calories to 300 calories per 100g) and saturated fat (6g/100g to
148 5g/100g). For beverages, changes in the thresholds were smaller and affected only calories (from 100 calories/100ml to
149 80 calories/100ml) and sugar (from 6 g/100ml to 5g/100ml). The other key difference between Phase 1 and Phase 2 is
150 Phase 2 expanded the marketing restrictions to include a ban on advertising of products with the warning labels on
151 daytime television from 6am to 10pm, regardless of audience (in other words, it was no longer just limited to children's
152 programming).

Nutritional data and categorizations by food group and regulation status

As previously described, household purchases were linked at the product level to nutrition facts panel (NFP) data from food packages, Mintel Latin America, and other NFP resources using barcode, brand, and product description^{21,22}. For the pre-policy period, purchases were linked to NFP data collected in the first quarters of 2015 and 2016; for Phase 1, purchases were linked to NFP data collected in the first quarters of 2017 and 2018; and for Phase 2, purchases were linked to NFP data collected in the first quarter of 2019.

Because the warning label serves as the visual signal as to whether the product is high in critical nutrients according to the Chilean regulation, we classified products as labeled or non-labeled based on their nutritional profile. Specifically, nutritionists reviewed each product for nutritional accuracy and, for consistency across all policy periods, applied the Phase 3 thresholds to categorize each product as subject to carry the warning label if it contained added sugar, sodium, or saturated fat and exceeded nutrient or calorie thresholds and thus was subject to the labeling, marketing, and school regulations.²³ In other words, foods were classified as to whether they should receive the warning label under Chilean law, not whether they actually did (though compliance with the warning labels in Chile is >97%, so these are functionally the same). Foods were categorized as non-labeled if they did not exceed thresholds. Nutritionists also categorized foods into nutritionally and behaviorally relevant groups (**Supplemental Table 2**). Some groups were excluded from analysis because they were not affected by the regulation (e.g., plain teas, sweeteners, vegetable oils, formulas and supplements).

Outcomes

All outcomes were estimated as per capita per day. As in our previous evaluation, the main outcome was total energy (calories), which was selected as the primary outcome due to its relevance for obesity prevention, one of the main goals of the law. We also examined total sugar (calories), saturated fat (calories), and sodium (mg). For all nutrients, we conducted analyses of overall purchases and for labeled and non-labeled purchases. Consistent with our first-phase evaluation⁹, we also examined food (all four outcomes) and beverage (energy and sugar) purchases separately and by subgroup (restricting our attention to subgroups accounting for at least 5% of aggregate food or beverage expenditure and with a relatively high proportion of high-in products).

178 **Statistical analysis**

179 We used an interrupted time series design to estimate the changes in the nutritional content of food and beverage
180 purchases associated with the first and second phases of the law. We assumed that each phase was associated with
181 immediate proportionate changes and that these changes may have increased or decreased over time. These
182 assumptions reflect both the nature of the intervention and the way we linked the purchase and nutrition data.

183 First, changes in amounts of energy, saturated fat, sodium, and sugar were likely proportional to their baseline levels
184 rather than constant across all households. Second, because we linked the first 12 months of the first and second phases
185 to nutrition data collected in the first quarter of 2017 and 2019, respectively, products that were reformulated in the
186 first six to nine months of each phase are treated as if reformulation had been immediate. Third, we did not find
187 evidence of widespread early or late adoption of the regulations before and after the law took effect. Finally, we allowed
188 for changes in the impact of the law over time, albeit at a constant rate, for more flexibility.

189 We used correlated random-effects Poisson models together with the quasi-likelihood Poisson estimator with standard
190 errors clustered at the household level to estimate the parameters of interest. The impact model took the form of a
191 continuous variable for time (at monthly intervals), pre-post indicator variables for the first and second phases, and
192 interactions with time. We controlled for seasonality by including indicator variables for each month of the year
193 (reference: January), number of household members by age and sex (children aged 0 to 1 year, 2 to 5 years, and 6 to 13
194 years, females aged 14 to 18 years and 19 years or over, and males aged 14 to 18 years and 19 years or over), socio-
195 economic status (ABC1, C2, C3, and DE; reference: ABC1), the head of household's education level (less than high school,
196 high school, and more than high school; reference: less than high school), the unemployment rate at the region and
197 quarter level, the number of public holidays at the region and month level, and a pre-post indicator variable for the SSB
198 tax implemented on October 1, 2014.

199 We then used the regression results to derive estimates of the average percentage and absolute changes associated
200 with each phase of the law, calculated as differences in predicted values between the actual scenario and the
201 counterfactual in which the law had not passed. We also estimated monthly means in the actual and counterfactual

202 scenarios to depict these differences over time. We weighted these estimates using Kantar Worldpanel’s annual
203 projection weights.

204 Separately, we created an indicator variable for low SES by combining the lowest two levels, and interacted it with each
205 variable of the impact model to see if SES moderated the law’s impact. For these analyses, we focused on calories as our
206 main outcome of interest. For these models, we dropped the head of household’s education level from the model
207 because it is a component of SES, so keeping it would have meant restricting any moderation effect to the other
208 components of SES.

209 To understand whether there were bigger changes for products that contained more labels (i.e., were high in more
210 nutrients), we also examined the primary outcome by the number of warning labels. Finally, to understand if different
211 food groups changed more or less after the law’s implementation, we conducted analyses using the same model as in
212 the main analyses to examine nutrient outcomes for food and beverage subgroups.

213 **Sensitivity analyses**

214 We conducted a series of sensitivities analyses. First, we reduced the length of the baseline period from 36 months
215 (which balances the pre and post periods) to 24 and 18 months by dropping observations before January 2014 and July
216 2015, respectively. These analyses allow us to understand how the use of different baseline periods may affect results
217 (either through changes to trends in purchasing behaviors, or changes to assumptions around reformulation, or both).

218 Second, although the Poisson model is well-suited for non-negative skewed dependent variables, we compared our food
219 and beverage group results to estimates obtained from a two-part model consisting of a correlated random-effects logit
220 model in the first part (with the same explanatory variables) and the correlated random-effects Poisson model for the
221 non-zero outcomes in the second part.

222 All analyses were conducted in Stata 17 (College Station, TX, USA).

223 *Role of the funding source*

224 Study funders had no role in any aspect of the study, from design to interpretation to publication.

225 Furthermore, none of the coauthors have any conflict of interest.

226 **Results**

227 Descriptive characteristics of the sample can be found in **Table 1**. Household size increased over time; the household
 228 head educational attainment level also increased over time, while socioeconomic status remained consistent.

Table 1. Weighted socio-demographic characteristics of the Kantar WorldPanel sample by year

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Household size	4.2 (1.6)	4.4 (1.7)	4.2 (1.6)	4.2 (1.7)	4.3 (1.7)	4.4 (1.7)	4.5 (1.7)
Main shopper's age	47.9 (14.5)	48.3 (14.7)	48.2 (15.0)	48.6 (14.9)	49.3 (15.2)	49.4 (15.5)	49.6 (15.5)
Number of cars	0.5 (0.7)	0.6 (0.7)	0.7 (0.8)	0.7 (0.7)	0.7 (0.7)	0.7 (0.7)	0.7 (0.8)
Number bathrooms	1.3 (0.6)	1.3 (0.6)	1.3 (0.6)	1.3 (0.6)	1.3 (0.6)	1.3 (0.6)	1.3 (0.7)
Number bedrooms	2.9 (1.0)	3.0 (2.4)	3.1 (1.5)	3.0 (1.0)	3.0 (1.0)	3.0 (1.0)	3.1 (1.0)
Household head's education							
Lower than high school	42%	40%	37%	32%	31%	28%	27%
High school	37%	38%	40%	42%	42%	45%	44%
Higher than high school	21%	22%	23%	25%	27%	28%	29%
Socioeconomic status (SES)							
ABC1 (highest)	8%	8%	8%	8%	8%	8%	7%
C2	17%	17%	17%	16%	16%	17%	16%
C3	27%	27%	27%	27%	27%	27%	28%
DE (lowest)	49%	49%	49%	49%	49%	48%	49%
Region							
North	13%	13%	12%	13%	13%	13%	13%
Center	64%	63%	63%	63%	63%	62%	62%
South	24%	24%	24%	24%	24%	25%	25%
Number of household-month obs.	11,636	23,455	23,292	23,385	22,762	22,684	11,177

229 Notes: The sample starts in July 2013 and ends in June 2019. The definition of SES is based on Chile's Association for
 230 Market Research and Public Opinion (*Asociacion de Investigadores de Mercado y Opinion Publica*), which is a measure of
 231 socioeconomic status based on a list of goods and services consumed by the household, the education level of the head
 232 of household, and income.
 233

234 Prior to the law, approximately 44% of foods were eligible to carry 2 or more warning labels, 25% were eligible to carry
 235 one warning label, and 31% would have had zero warning labels (**Supplemental Table 3**). For beverages, only 3% were
 236 eligible to carry two or more warning labels, 39% were eligible to carry one warning label, and 58% would have had zero
 237 warning labels.

238 **Unadjusted results**

239 Unadjusted results on household purchases can be found in **Supplemental Tables 4 and 5**. The pattern of results
 240 showed a decline in nutrients of concern purchased across the study time period as well as declines in the share of
 241 nutrients from purchases of products with the warning label (“labeled products”), ranging from -5.6 percentage points
 242 for saturated fat to -16.5 percentage points for sugar.

243 **Adjusted results**

244 Comparing weighted estimates of purchases as observed to the counterfactual scenario, we observe significant
 245 decreases in purchases of labeled foods and beverages during Phase 2 (**Figure 1**), including a relative 36.8% reduction in
 246 sugar (-30.4 calories, 95% CI -34.5, -26.3), a 23.0% relative reduction in energy (-51.6 calories, 95% CI -60.7, -42.6), a
 247 21.9% relative reduction in sodium (-85.8 mg, 95% CI -105.0, -66.7) and lastly a 15.7% relative reduction in saturated fat
 248 (-6.4 calories, 95% CI -8.4, -4.3). These decreases were partially compensated by increases in non-labeled purchases
 249 (**Table 2**), but the net effect shows a significant decrease in total nutrients purchased during Phase 2, resulting in relative
 250 reductions of 20.2% in sugar, 13.8% in sodium, -9.6% in saturated fat, and 8.3% in energy from total food and beverage
 251 purchases. The pattern of results was similar between Phase 1 and Phase 2.

252 **Table 2. Adjusted weighted mean differences in nutrient content of total purchases, food purchases, and beverage**
 253 **purchases between the estimated adjusted Phase 1 and Phase 2 post-policy periods and the counterfactual scenario**

	Energy		Saturated fat		Sodium		Sugars	
	Mean (95% CI) calories/capita/day		Mean (95% CI) calories/capita/day		Mean (95% CI) mg/capita/day		Mean (95% CI) calories/capita/day	
	Absolute diff.	Relative % diff.	Absolute diff.	Relative % diff.	Absolute diff.	Relative % diff.	Absolute diff.	Relative % diff.
Phase 1								
Labeled	-40.0 (-45.1,-34.9)	-17.1% (-18.9,-15.3)	-4.4 (-5.5, -3.3)	-10.9% (-13.3, -8.5)	-64.0 (-75.5,-52.5)	-15.2% (-17.6,-12.9)	-23.4 (-25.9,-20.9)	-26.7% (-28.8,-24.6)
Non-labeled	-0.1 (-5.2, 5.0)	0.0% (-2.4, 2.3)	-0.1 (-0.6, 0.4)	-0.6% (-4.9, 3.8)	-3.4 (-10.2, 3.4)	-2.2% (-6.5, 2.1)	3.3 (2.5, 4.1)	13.8% (10.0, 17.6)
Total	-40.0 (-48.5,-31.5)	-8.8% (-10.5, -7.1)	-4.5 (-5.8, -3.2)	-8.6% (-10.9, -6.3)	-66.7 (-80.4,-53.0)	-11.6% (-13.7, -9.5)	-19.6 (-22.3,-16.8)	-17.6% (-19.6,-15.6)
Phase 2								
Labeled	-51.6 (-60.7,-42.6)	-23.0% (-26.2,-19.8)	-6.4 (-8.4, -4.3)	-15.7% (-19.9,-11.4)	-85.8 (-105.0,-66.7)	-21.9% (-25.8,-18.0)	-30.4 (-34.5,-26.3)	-36.8% (-40.1,-33.6)
Non-labeled	15.1 (5.6, 24.6)	7.1% (2.3, 11.9)	1.4 (0.4, 2.3)	11.8% (2.9, 20.7)	10.7 (-0.4, 21.8)	7.3% (-0.9, 15.4)	8.3 (6.8, 9.8)	35.4% (27.0, 43.8)
Total	-36.2 (-51.8, -20.6)	-8.3% (-11.6, -5.0)	-5.0 (-7.5, -2.6)	-9.6% (-13.8, -5.3)	-73.5 (-97.2, -49.9)	-13.8% (-17.6, -9.9)	-21.3 (-25.9,-16.7)	-20.2% (-23.8,-16.7)

Food									
	Energy		Saturated fat		Sodium		Sugars		
	Mean (95% CI)		Mean (95% CI)		Mean (95% CI)		Mean (95% CI)		
	calories/capita/day		calories/capita/day		mg/capita/day		calories/capita/day		
	Absolute diff.	Relative % diff.	Absolute diff.	Relative % diff.	Absolute diff.	Relative % diff.	Absolute diff.	Relative % diff.	
Phase 1									
Labeled	-17.5	-10.0%	-3.8	-9.6%	-55.4	-13.8%	-2.9	-8.6%	
	(-21.5,-13.6)	(-12.1, -8.0)	(-4.8, -2.7)	(-12.0, -7.1)	(-66.7,-44.1)	(-16.3,-11.4)	(-3.8, -1.9)	(-11.2, -6.0)	
Non-labeled	-2.0	-1.1%	0.5	12.3%	-3.3	-2.9%	0.7	10.7%	
	(-6.4, 2.5)	(-3.6, 1.4)	(0.2, 0.7)	(4.6, 20.0)	(-9.6, 2.9)	(-8.4, 2.5)	(0.4, 1.0)	(5.9, 15.5)	
Total	-19.6	-5.5%	-3.3	-7.6%	-58.2	-11.3%	-1.9	-4.8%	
	(-26.5,-12.7)	(-7.4, -3.7)	(-4.4, -2.2)	(-10.0, -5.2)	(-71.1,-45.3)	(-13.6, -9.1)	(-2.9, -0.9)	(-7.3, -2.3)	
Phase 2									
Labeled	-22.6	-13.4%	-5.4	-13.6%	-73.7	-19.8%	-4.3	-14.2%	
	(-29.9,-15.4)	(-17.2, -9.7)	(-7.4, -3.4)	(-18.1, -9.2)	(-92.5,-55.0)	(-23.9,-15.7)	(-5.9, -2.7)	(-18.7, -9.7)	
Non-labeled	10.0	5.9%	1.7	46.6%	8.3	7.8%	2.6	34.0%	
	(1.7, 18.3)	(0.7, 11.0)	(1.3, 2.2)	(29.2, 63.9)	(-1.7, 18.2)	(-2.5, 18.1)	(1.9, 3.2)	(23.2, 44.8)	
Total	-12.8	-3.8%	-3.5	-8.2%	-64.2	-13.5%	-1.0	-2.9%	
	(-25.7, 0.1)	(-7.5, -0.1)	(-5.6, -1.4)	(-12.6, -3.7)	(-86.4,-42.0)	(-17.6, -9.5)	(-2.8, 0.7)	(-7.6, 1.8)	

Beverages									
	Energy		Saturated fat		Sodium		Sugars		
	Mean (95% CI)		Mean (95% CI)		Mean (95% CI)		Mean (95% CI)		
	calories/capita/day		calories/capita/day		mg/capita/day		calories/capita/day		
	Absolute diff.	Relative % diff.	Absolute diff.	Relative % diff.	Absolute diff.	Relative % diff.	Absolute diff.	Relative % diff.	
Phase 1									
Labeled	-23.7	-39.5%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-20.9	-38.1%	
	(-26.0,-21.4)	(-42.0,-37.1)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	(-23.1,-18.8)	(-40.6,-35.6)	
Non-labeled	1.8	4.1%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	2.4	13.6%	
	(0.1, 3.5)	(0.0, 8.1)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	(1.7, 3.1)	(9.2, 18.0)	
Total	-20.9	-20.3%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-17.8	-24.7%	
	(-23.9,-17.9)	(-22.6,-18.0)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	(-20.1,-15.6)	(-27.0,-22.4)	
Phase 2									
Labeled	-30.6	-53.6%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-26.6	-50.8%	
	(-34.4,-26.8)	(-57.1,-50.2)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	(-30.1,-23.1)	(-54.4,-47.2)	
Non-labeled	5.0	11.9%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	5.1	31.3%	
	(2.0, 8.1)	(4.0, 19.9)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	(3.9, 6.3)	(22.0, 40.5)	
Total	-24.1	-24.4%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-20.4	-30.0%	
	(-29.2,-19.1)	(-28.4,-20.5)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	(-24.1,-16.8)	(-33.9,-26.1)	

*The absolute difference estimates are averaged over household-month observations in the relevant post-policy periods. The relative difference estimates are averages of month-specific coefficients. This is because the model yields the same predicted relative changes across all households in a given month, but vary over time (due to the slope change).

255 We observe that nutrient reductions are more pronounced for beverages than for foods for sugar and calories. For
 256 example, in Phase 2, there was a 53.6% relative reduction in energy from labeled beverages (-30.6 calories, 95% CI -34.4,
 257 -26.8), but only a 13.4% relative reduction in energy from labeled foods (-22.6 calories, 95% CI -29.9,-15.4); and only for
 258 beverages did these reductions in labeled energy purchases translate to significant reductions in total energy purchases,
 259 with a similar pattern for sugar purchases. However, among food purchases, there were significant reductions in both
 260 sodium and saturated fat purchases, both among labeled and total food purchases.

261 The pattern of results by number of warning labels also differed for foods and beverages. For foods, we observed
 262 reductions in calories only for foods that had at least two warning labels, whereas in Phase 2, calories purchased
 263 increased for foods that had only one warning label (**Table 3**). In contrast, we observed large reductions among beverages
 264 that carried a single warning and only small reductions among beverages with two or more warnings (likely because very
 265 few beverages contain more than one warning).

266 **Table 3. Adjusted weighted mean differences in energy content of total purchases, food purchases, and beverage**
 267 **purchases between the estimated adjusted Phase 1 and Phase 2 post-policy periods and the counterfactual scenario,**
 268 **by number of warning labels**

Total	Phase 1 Mean (95% CI) calories/capita/day		Phase 2 Mean (95% CI) calories/capita/day	
	Absolute diff.	Relative % diff.	Absolute diff.	Relative % diff.
No warning labels	-0.1 (-5.2, 5.0)	0.0% (-2.4, 2.3)	15.1 (5.6, 24.6)	7.1% (2.3, 11.9)
1 warning label	-16.8 (-19.6, -14.0)	-17.6% (-20.1, -15.1)	-22.7 (-27.2, -18.1)	-25.7% (-29.6, -21.7)
≥2 warning labels	-23.4 (-26.9, -19.9)	-16.9% (19.0, -14.8%)	-29.5 (-36.0, -23.1)	-21.6% (-25.4, -17.9)
All	-40.0 (-48.5, -31.5)	-8.8% (-10.5, -7.1)	-36.2 (-51.8, -20.6)	-8.3% (-11.6, -5.0)
Food	Phase 1 Mean (95% CI) calories/capita/day		Phase 2 Mean (95% CI) calories/capita/day	
	Absolute diff.	Relative % diff.	Absolute diff.	Relative % diff.
No warning labels	-2.0 (-6.4, 2.5)	-1.1% (-3.6, 1.4)	10.0 (1.7, 18.3)	5.9% (0.7, 11.0)
1 warning label	3.2	8.7%	4.2	11.8%

	(1.9, 4.6)	(3.8, 12.7)	(1.9, 6.4)	(3.7, 18.8)
≥2 warning labels	-20.8	-15.3%	-27.1	-20.3%
	(-24.2, -17.4)	(-17.4, -13.2)	(-33.4, -20.8)	(-24.0, -16.5)
All	-19.6	-5.5%	-12.8	-3.8%
	(-26.5, -12.7)	(-7.4, -3.7)	(-25.7, 0.1)	(-7.5, -0.1)
Beverages				
	Phase 1		Phase 2	
	Mean (95% CI)		Mean (95% CI)	
	calories/capita/day		calories/capita/day	
	Absolute diff.	Relative % diff.	Absolute diff.	Relative % diff.
No warning labels	1.8	4.1%	5.0	11.9%
	(0.1, 3.5)	(0.0, 8.1)	(2.0, 8.1)	(4.0, 19.9)
1 warning label	-20.9	-36.7%	-28.0	-51.6%
	(-23.1, -18.6)	(-39.3, -34.1)	(-31.7, -24.3)	(-55.2, -48.0)
≥2 warning labels	-2.6	-89.4%	-2.4	-91.8%
	(-3.1, -2.1)	(-91.3, -87.4)	(-3.1, -1.7)	(-96.3, -87.3)
All	-20.9	-20.3%	-24.1	-24.5%
	(23.9, -17.9)	(-22.6, -18.0)	(-29.2, -19.1)	(-28.4, -20.5)

269

270

Differences by SES Groups

271

Compared to their respective counterfactuals, there were few differences in absolute or relative declines in calories

272

from total, food, or beverage purchases by socio-economic status (low vs. high) in either Phase 1 or Phase 2 of the

273

regulation (**Table 4**). The exception to this is that for beverages, the relative decline in calories purchased from labeled

274

beverages was greater for high SES vs. low SES households in both phases of the law, possibly due to high-SES

275

households' having lower purchases of labeled beverages during the pre-policy period (**Supplemental Table 5**).

Table 4. Adjusted mean differences in energy content of total food and beverage purchases between the Phase 1 and Phase 2 post-policy periods and the counterfactual scenario by socioeconomic status (SES), Mean Difference (95% CI)

Total Foods & Beverages						
	Absolute Differences			Relative % Differences		
	High SES	Low SES	SES Difference	High SES	Low SES	SES Difference
Phase 1						
Labeled	-40.5	-39.8	0.7	-17.8	-16.6	1.2
	(-48.6, -32.5)	(-46.0, -33.6)	(-9.0, 10.5)	(-20.7, -14.9)	(-18.8, -14.5)	(-2.3, 4.6)
Non-labeled	2.8	-2.1	-4.8	1.3	-0.9	-2.2
	(-4.4, 9.9)	(-8.4, 4.3)	(-13.7, 4.0)	(-2.1, 4.7)	(-3.7, 1.9)	(-6.3, 1.9)
Total	-39.5	-40.7	-1.1	-8.9	-8.8	0.1
	(-52.6, -26.5)	(-51.1, -30.2)	(-17.1, 14.8)	(-11.5, -6.2)	(-10.9, -6.7)	(-3.2, 3.3)

Phase 2						
Labeled	-54.4	-49.9	4.5	-25.2	-21.4	3.8
	(-67.8,-40.9)	(-61.0,-38.8)	(-11.8, 20.7)	(-30.0,-20.4)	(-25.3,-17.6)	(-2.0, 9.6)
Non-labeled	19.9	11.8	-8.1	9.7	5.4	-4.3
	(6.4, 33.4)	(0.0, 23.6)	(-24.5, 8.3)	(2.6, 16.8)	(-0.2, 11.0)	(-12.5, 3.9)
Total	-37.3	-35.9	1.4	-8.9	-8.0	0.9
	(-60.6,-14.1)	(-55.2,-16.6)	(-26.8, 29.7)	(-14.0, -3.8)	(-12.0, -4.0)	(-5.2, 7.0)
Foods						
	Absolute Differences			Relative % Differences		
	High SES	Low SES	SES Difference	High SES	Low SES	SES Difference
Phase 1						
Labeled	-18.2	-17.2	1.0	-10.5	-9.7	0.9
	(-24.1,-12.3)	(-22.0,-12.4)	(-6.3, 8.2)	(-13.7, -7.4)	(-12.1, -7.2)	(-2.9, 4.6)
Non-labeled	1.0	-3.9	-4.9	0.7	-2.2	-2.8
	(-5.1, 7.1)	(-9.5, 1.7)	(-12.5, 2.6)	(-2.9, 4.2)	(-5.2, 0.9)	(-7.1, 1.5)
Total	-19.0	-20.2	-1.2	-5.4	-5.7	-0.2
	(-29.2, -8.9)	(-28.9,-11.6)	(-13.8, 11.4)	(-8.2, -2.6)	(-7.9, -3.4)	(-3.6, 3.2)
Phase 2						
Labeled	-25.4	-20.6	4.7	-15.5	-11.9	3.6
	(-35.7,-15.0)	(-29.6,-11.7)	(-7.9, 17.3)	(-20.9,-10.0)	(-16.5, -7.3)	(-3.0, 10.2)
Non-labeled	16.7	5.6	-11.0	10.2	3.2	-7.0
	(5.0, 28.3)	(-4.5, 15.8)	(-25.0, 3.0)	(2.5, 17.9)	(-2.7, 9.1)	(-15.8, 1.8)
Total	-12.5	-13.3	-0.8	-3.8	-3.8	0.0
	(-31.1, 6.1)	(-29.2, 2.7)	(-23.4, 21.9)	(-9.3, 1.6)	(-8.2, 0.6)	(-6.5, 6.5)
Beverages						
	Absolute Differences			Relative % Differences		
	High SES	Low SES	SES Difference	High SES	Low SES	SES Difference
Phase 1						
Labeled	-26.9	-21.8	5.1	-45.9	-36.2	9.7
	(-31.5,-22.4)	(-24.7,-19.0)	(-0.5, 10.7)	(-49.5,-42.3)	(-39.2,-33.1)	(5.1, 14.3)
Non-labeled	1.5	2.1	0.6	3.4	4.7	1.3
	(-1.0, 4.0)	(-0.0, 4.2)	(-2.4, 3.6)	(-2.5, 9.3)	(-0.2, 9.6)	(-5.8, 8.4)
Total	-21.0	-20.8	0.3	-21.4	-19.6	1.8
	(-25.9,-16.2)	(-24.5,-17.1)	(-5.7, 6.2)	(-25.1,-17.8)	(-22.4,-16.9)	(-2.7, 6.3)
Phase 2						
Labeled	-34.5	-28.3	6.2	-63.8	-48.4	15.4
	(-40.8,-28.2)	(-33.1,-23.5)	(-1.6, 14.0)	(-68.1,-59.4)	(-52.9,-43.9)	(9.4, 21.4)
Non-labeled	3.2	6.7	3.5	7.6	15.4	7.8
	(-1.0, 7.3)	(2.8, 10.5)	(-1.6, 8.6)	(-2.9, 18.1)	(5.3, 25.4)	(-5.2, 20.8)
Total	-25.6	-23.2	2.3	-27.6	-22.5	5.0
	(-32.9,-18.2)	(-29.7,-16.8)	(-7.0, 11.7)	(-33.5,-21.7)	(-27.5,-17.6)	(-2.4, 12.4)

Note: The definition of SES is based on Chile's Association for Market Research and Public Opinion (*Asociación de Investigadores de Mercado y Opinión Pública*), which is a measure of socioeconomic status based on a list of goods and services consumed by the household, the education level of the head of household, and income.

Food and Beverage Group Adjusted Results

Food and beverage subgroup results can be found in **Table 5** and **Table 6**, respectively.

Table 5. Adjusted mean differences in nutrient content of food group purchases between the Phase 1 and Phase 2 post-policy periods and the counterfactual scenario, Mean Difference (95% CI)

	Calories				Sugar			
	Phase 1		Phase 2		Phase 1		Phase 2	
	Absolute difference	% difference	Absolute difference	% difference	Absolute difference	% difference	Absolute difference	% difference
Breakfast cereals	-1.8	-12.1	-1.9	-12.5	-0.6	-21.4	-0.8	-27.8
	(-2.7, -0.9)	(-17.7, -6.5)	(-3.6, -0.2)	(-22.5, -2.5)	(-0.8, -0.4)	(-27.2, -15.7)	(-1.1, -0.4)	(-37.5, -18.1)
Grain-based desserts	-2.6	-10.8	-2.1	-8.4	-0.7	-10.6	-0.6	-8.8
	(-3.8, -1.4)	(-15.1, -6.4)	(-4.4, 0.1)	(-16.4, -0.3)	(-1.0, -0.4)	(-14.9, -6.2)	(-1.2, 0.0)	(-16.8, -0.7)
Sweets and non-grain-based desserts	-1.5	-6.3	-0.9	-4.2	-0.8	-5.8	-0.4	-3.1
	(-2.4, -0.5)	(-10.4, -2.2)	(-2.5, 0.7)	(-11.4, 3.1)	(-1.4, -0.2)	(-9.9, -1.7)	(-1.3, 0.6)	(-10.4, 4.1)
Meat, poultry and meat substitutes	-2.1	-6.4	-2.4	-7.7	-0.2	-33.0	-0.1	-18.3
	(-3.2, -0.9)	(-9.8, -2.9)	(-4.5, -0.3)	(-13.9, -1.5)	(-0.3, -0.2)	(-36.8, -29.3)	(-0.2, -0.1)	(-26.2, -10.4)
Dairy products and substitutes	-0.8	-3.6	-1.5	-7.1	-0.1	-1.5	-0.2	-3.0
	(-1.7, 0.2)	(-7.9, 0.7)	(-3.3, 0.2)	(-14.9, 0.6)	(-0.5, 0.2)	(-6.3, 3.2)	(-0.9, 0.4)	(-11.5, 5.6)
Condiments and sauces	-0.7	-2.8	1.3	5.9	-0.3	-7.6	-0.4	-8.5
	(-1.6, 0.3)	(-6.8, 1.3)	(-0.4, 2.9)	(-2.0, 13.8)	(-0.5, -0.2)	(-11.2, -4.0)	(-0.7, -0.1)	(-14.8, -2.2)
Oils and fats	-3.4	-9.4	-4.1	-11.3	0.0	40.0	0.0	47.6
	(-4.8, -2.0)	(-12.9, -5.8)	(-6.8, -1.5)	(-17.7, -4.8)	(0.0, 0.0)	(31.3, 48.6)	(0.0, 0.0)	(32.5, 62.6)
	Saturated Fat				Sodium			
	Phase 1		Phase 2		Phase 1		Phase 2	
	Absolute difference	% difference	Absolute difference	% difference	Absolute difference	% difference	Absolute difference	% difference
Breakfast cereals	-0.1	-15.3	-0.1	-9.8	-1.5	-18.8	-2.6	-32.5
	(-0.1, -0.0)	(-21.8, -8.8)	(-0.1, 0.0)	(-22.2, 2.6)	(-2.1, -0.9)	(-24.8, -12.8)	(-3.7, -1.5)	(-41.8, -23.2)
Grain-based desserts	-0.6	-11.9	-0.6	-11.8	-1.7	-12.6	-1.6	-11.5
	(-0.8, -0.3)	(-16.5, -7.4)	(-1.0, -0.1)	(-20.1, -3.6)	(-2.3, -1.0)	(-17.1, -8.2)	(-2.8, -0.3)	(-19.6, -3.4)

Sweets and non-grain-based desserts	-0.3	-10.1	-0.6	-21.1	0.0	-0.1	0.2	1.9
	(-0.5, -0.1)	(-15.3, -4.8)	(-0.9, -0.3)	(-29.3, -12.8)	(-0.5, 0.4)	(-4.9, 4.7)	(-0.6, 0.9)	(-6.6, 10.5)
Meat, poultry and meat substitutes	-0.4	-4.9	-0.5	-6.6	-22.8	-18.3	-20.9	-17.6
	(-0.6, -0.1)	(-8.4, -1.3)	(-1.0, 0.0)	(-13.0, -0.3)	(-27.5, -18.2)	(-21.3, -15.3)	(-29.1, -12.7)	(-23.3, -11.8)
Dairy products and substitutes	-0.3	-4.7	-0.4	-7.9	-1.9	-12.1	-4.2	-26.9
	(-0.5, 0.0)	(-9.8, 0.4)	(-1.0, 0.1)	(-17.2, 1.4)	(-2.7, -1.2)	(-16.3, -8.0)	(-5.5, -2.8)	(-33.4, -20.5)
Condiments and sauces	-0.2	-7.1	0.1	4.2	-13.1	-14.7	-15.0	-17.6
	(-0.3, -0.0)	(-12.1, -2.0)	(-0.1, 0.3)	(-5.9, 14.2)	(-16.2, -10.0)	(-17.6, -11.8)	(-20.3, -9.7)	(-22.7, -12.4)
Oils and fats	-1.5	-8.4	-1.5	-8.5	-3.9	-10.1	-8.4	-23.0
	(-2.2, -0.7)	(-12.2, -4.5)	(-2.9, -0.1)	(-15.7, -1.3)	(-5.4, -2.3)	(-13.8, -6.4)	(-11.2, -5.7)	(-28.8, -17.1)

Table 6. Adjusted mean differences in nutrient content of beverage group purchases between the Phase 1 and Phase 2 post-policy periods and the counterfactual scenario, Mean Difference (95% CI)

	Calories				Sugar			
	Phase 1		Phase 2		Phase 1		Phase 2	
	Absolute difference	% difference	Absolute difference	% difference	Absolute difference	% difference	Absolute difference	% difference
Sodas	-8.3	-20.9	-9.5	-25.9	-8.0	-20.9	-9.2	-25.6
	(-10.0, -6.6)	(-24.4, -17.5)	(-12.3, -6.6)	(-32.0, -19.9)	(-9.7, -6.4)	(-24.4, -17.4)	(-12.0, -6.3)	(-31.7, -19.5)
Fruit and vegetable juice	-5.9	-54.3	-8.2	-66.4	-6.0	-58.5	-8.3	-70.2
	(-6.7, -5.1)	(-57.3, -51.3)	(-9.7, -6.7)	(-70.5, -62.3)	(-6.8, -5.2)	(-61.3, -55.7)	(-9.7, -6.8)	(-73.9, -66.6)
Dairy-based drinks*	-7.4	-16.0	-8.8	-19.2	-4.4	-21.8	-4.9	-25.1
	(-9.2, -5.5)	(-19.3, -12.6)	(-12.1, -5.5)	(-25.1, -13.3)	(-5.2, -3.6)	(-24.8, -18.7)	(-6.3, -3.5)	(-30.5, -19.7)

*Includes plant-based substitutes

For foods, across both phases, calories purchased from breakfast cereals; meat, poultry, and meat substitutes; and oils and fats declined, whereas calories from grain-based desserts, sweets and non-grain-based desserts only declined during Phase 1, and there were no changes in calories from dairy products/substitutes or condiments and sauces in either phase. Across all food groups and across both phases, absolute declines in sugar were trivial (less than one calorie/capita/day). Similarly, declines in saturated fat purchased were also trivial. Sodium purchases declined in both

292 phases for every food group except grain-based desserts. The largest reductions were observed among meat, poultry,
293 and meat substitutes (-20.9 mg/capita/day in Phase 2, 95% CI -29.1, -12.7, or a 17.6% reduction), condiments and sauces
294 (-15.0 mg/capita/day in Phase 2, 95% CI -20.3, -9.7, or a 17.6% reduction), and oils and fats (-8.4 mg/capita/day in Phase
295 2, 95% CI -11.2, -5.7, or a 23.0% reduction).

296 For beverages, across both phases and across all groups, both calories and sugar purchases declined. Declines in calories
297 and sugar in all beverage groups analyzed were larger than declines in calories and sugar in any food group. For both
298 calories and sugar, the biggest declines were observed in sodas. There was an 8.3 calorie/capita/day reduction in soda
299 calories purchased in Phase 1 (95% CI -10.0, -6.6), or a 20.9% reduction, and a 9.5 calorie/capita/day reduction in soda
300 calories purchased in Phase 2 (95% CI -12.3, -6.6), or a 25.9% reduction; these reductions in calories were almost entirely
301 driven by reductions in sugar. Declines in calories were similar for fruit and vegetable juices and for dairy-based
302 beverages and substitutes (8.2 and 8.8 calories/capita/day in Phase 2, respectively), whereas declines in sugar were
303 larger for juices (-8.3 calories/capita/day in Phase 2, 95% CI -9.7, -6.8) than for dairy-based beverages (-4.9, 95% CI -6.3, -
304 3.5).

305 *Sensitivity analyses*

306 Results from models run using different pre-policy windows on total, labeled, and not labeled calories from foods and
307 beverages can be found in **Supplemental Table 6**. Results for total calorie changes during Phase 1 were generally
308 consistent across from 24 to 42 months; however, reductions in total calories were smaller for the model that used only
309 an 18 month time window. There was more variability in Phase 2 total calorie changes, though again the results
310 consistently reflected a decline in total calories purchased when pre-policy windows from 24 to 42 months were used.
311 However, there was no change in total calories when only an 18 month pre-policy window was used. This lack of effect
312 in total calories during Phase 2 using an 18 month pre-policy window is because the relative increase in non-labeled
313 calories got larger, while the decrease in labeled calories got smaller, resulting in no net impact on total calories.

314 Results using two-part models for food and beverage subgroups were consistent with our main analysis **Supplemental**
315 **Table 7**.

316 **Discussion**

317 The second phase of Chile's law of food labeling and advertising continued the warning label, child-directed marketing,
318 and school foods policies, tightened nutrient thresholds for foods subject to these policies, and imposed a daytime ban
319 on all unhealthy food advertisements on television, regardless of audience. After implementation of this second phase,
320 we observed declines in purchases of nutrients of concern from food and drinks carrying the warning label (and thus
321 subject to all regulations), including a 36.8% decline in sugar, 23.0% decline in energy, 21.9% decline in sodium, and
322 15.7% decline in saturated fat purchased. The declines from labeled products purchased were partially offset by
323 increased purchases from non-labeled products. Still, the overall changes resulted in net declines in nutrients of
324 concerned purchase ranging between 8.3% to 20.2%.

325 Declines in purchases of labeled foods and drinks were larger in Phase 2 than in Phase 1, as would be expected based on
326 the stricter nutrient thresholds and daytime marketing ban that begin in Phase 2. At the same time, however, there
327 were also larger increases in purchases of not labeled foods and beverages in Phase 2, resulting in a partial attenuation
328 on the total effect on nutrient purchases (e.g., for total calories). While longer-term data from food policy evaluations
329 are scarce, research from tobacco suggests that some attenuation of results over time is to be expected from marketing
330 and labeling policies. One particular concern is message fatigue, in which long-term exposure to health-related
331 messages like Chile's warning labels leads to boredom or lack of motivation^{24,25}. Indeed, Chilean mothers have reported
332 paying less attention to the warning labels over time, and that as the prevalence of warning labels increased (as a
333 function of stricter nutrient thresholds), they began to feel oversaturated with labels and also that the labels were not
334 providing new information²⁶. We should note here that Chile, unlike some of the more recent countries with warning
335 labels like Mexico and Colombia, Chile did not have active civil society groups that continued to promote the warning
336 label. After an initial government promotion campaign at the beginning of the warning labels, no future campaigns in
337 the media existed, which may have influenced continued attention to and use of the warning labels.

338 Other aspects of the Chilean policy, like the daytime ban of television advertising of labeled foods introduced in Phase 2,
339 may simply need longer to work, as research in this area suggests that the most likely immediate impacts of such a
340 policy are changes to food attitudes and preferences,²⁷ which may take years to translate into behavioral changes. In

341 other words, the removal of food advertisements does not immediately negate prior exposure to years or decades of
342 food marketing. In addition, industry adaptations may further attenuate these effects. For example, while there was a
343 64% drop in labeled food advertisements during Phase 2¹⁶, 29% of food ads promoted a labeled product, and 34% of
344 children's exposure to food ads was exposure to labeled ads¹⁷. Additionally, although there was a 14% decrease in total
345 food ads, there was continued advertising of non-labeled products and brands,¹⁷ which could increase purchases.
346 Moreover, there has been a trend towards increased expenditures on digital food advertising in Chile²⁸ and while digital
347 advertisements are regulated by the Chilean law on child-directed marketing, they are not subject to the daytime ban,
348 which is only for television, and overall monitoring, enforcement, and compliance in the digital space is unclear. These
349 shifts in advertising could work to maintain consumers' preferences given that previous research suggests that
350 advertising a particular product has the potential to increase preferences for the advertised product, its product
351 category, and brand²⁹⁻³¹. Furthermore, marketing impact consumers' brand knowledge, attitudes, and attachment which
352 won't change immediately after a reduction of marketing exposure³²⁻³⁴.

353 We observed differential results for foods vs. beverages across policy periods. For example, while declines in total
354 energy were similar for foods and beverages in Phase 1, in Phase 2, the estimated overall decline for beverages was
355 nearly double that of foods. This difference is attributable both to a larger drop in labeled purchases as well as a smaller
356 compensation in not high in purchases for beverages compared to foods. With regards to total sugar, there was
357 essentially no change in sugar from food purchases in either phase, whereas the decrease in sugar calories from
358 beverage purchases was sizeable in both Phases due to the large drop in labeled beverages. These results are surprising
359 given that foods were much more affected by stricter nutrient thresholds introduced in Phase 2 (e.g., the sugar
360 threshold for foods went from 22.5 g/100 g in Phase 1 to 15 g/100g in Phase 2, whereas for beverages, the sugar
361 threshold dropped only from 6g/100ml in Phase 1 to 5g/100ml in Phase 2).

362 There are several explanations for the differential results on sugar and energy for foods vs. beverages. One likely
363 possibility is that beverages are easier to reformulate than are foods, since replacing sugar with non-nutritive
364 sweeteners (NNS) may be more likely to cause issues with texture or taste in food products than in drinks³⁵⁻³⁸. Although
365 data from Phase 2 are not yet available, data on the Chilean food supply from Phase 1 showed that NNS use was most

366 prevalent among beverages before the law as well as the highest absolute increase after the law of any food category.³⁹
367 Another evaluation found that, compared to the counterfactual, purchases of NNS in beverages, but not in foods, also
368 increased after Phase 1 of the law³⁷. Notably, multiple other countries who have implemented warning label laws after
369 Chile's have also included a warning for the presence of NNS. It will be important to understand how policy-linked
370 changes in purchases of sugar and NNS compare in these countries as opposed to Chile, which did not include an NNS
371 warning label, particularly for beverage purchases.

372 A second difference between foods and beverages relates to the number of warning labels on products. Because foods
373 are more nutritionally diverse, they are more likely to be high in multiple nutrients of concern and thus more likely to
374 contain multiple warning labels. We observed that among foods, there were decreases in calories purchased among
375 foods that contained 2 or more warning labels, but increases in calories purchased for foods that contained one or no
376 warning labels. This suggests that there is a tendency for consumers to shift purchases away from products with multiple
377 warning labels towards those with fewer warnings, either through changes in consumer behavior (selecting a product
378 with 1 vs 2 or more labels) or reformulation (companies reducing the nutrient content so as to reduce the total number
379 of warning labels on the package). In contrast, among beverages it is much more common for products to carry only one
380 warning label, usually on sugar content. Consequently, we observed calorie reductions for purchases of products
381 carrying a single warning label. Taken together, the results suggest an overall shift from more labels to fewer labels: for
382 foods, the shift is from products with multiple warning labels to those with fewer warning labels, whereas for beverages
383 the shift is from products with a single warning label to those with no warning labels.

384 A third difference between foods and beverages is that that the policies were associated with important declines in
385 sodium purchases from foods, whereas for beverages we did not analyze sodium because so few products were high in
386 them. Purchases of sodium from labeled foods declined by approximately 74 mg/sodium/capita/day, or a nearly 20%
387 relative reduction, and these decreases led to a net reduction of 64 mg/capita/day of total sodium purchases. Sodium
388 reductions occurred across every food group except grain-based desserts, and were particularly sizeable for meat,
389 poultry, and meat substitutes, condiments and sauces, and oils and fats. These results are encouraging, considering that
390 Chile is one of only 5% of the 194 WHO member countries to achieve the highest score for sodium reduction policies,

391 which includes having at least two mandatory policies, all WHO sodium related “best buy” practices, and sodium
392 declarations on packaged foods⁴⁰. Our results suggest that such policies lead to reductions in sodium purchases, though
393 more research is needed to understand how these changes translate to achieving dietary targets for sodium in the
394 Chilean population as well as subsequent sodium-related health benefits such as reduction of high blood pressure and
395 cardiovascular disease. Overall, the results across sugar, sodium, and saturated fat highlight the need to include both
396 foods and beverages in policies in order to reduce nutrients of concern.

397 The result that low-SES households reduced purchases of nutrients of concern after policy implementation were
398 consistent with other data from our evaluation. Our focus group data found that low-SES parents paid attention to,
399 understood, and used the warning labels^{8,41}. In addition, a recent study found that during Phase 1 of the policy
400 implementation, there were no price changes for labeled or not-high in foods⁴². Such price changes, for example if non-
401 labeled-food prices increased as the result of companies passing on the cost of reformulation, could have dampened the
402 effect among low-SES households who tend to be more price sensitive. Instead, the lack of price changes likely increased
403 low-SES parents’ ability to attend to and incorporate information from the warning labels into their decision making.
404 However, a key limitation of our current study is that it did not include data after June 2019, a period which was marked
405 by Chilean social unrest, food supply chain volatility, global food price inflation, and the Covid-19 pandemic and
406 lockdowns, events that could have blunted the effect of the policies in low-SES households. Our qualitative data from
407 2021 suggested that even though the labels helped parents understand which foods were healthy vs. unhealthy, low-
408 SES parents were struggling to choose the healthy options due to cost. Thus, more research is needed to understand the
409 ways in which marketing, labeling, and school foods policies intersect with food prices, particularly during times of
410 economic instability and global food price increases. Moreover, it is important to recognize that price remains a top
411 driver of food choice, particularly for income-constrained households, and marketing and labeling policies to
412 disincentivize unhealthy food choices may have limited effect if not implemented alongside policies that increase
413 affordability or availability of healthier food choices.

414 **Limitations**

415 This study had important limitations. One limitation is that the data included present only a portion of what Chilean
416 households purchase, including important categories that may have been affected by the law (e.g., salty snacks) as well
417 as loose, raw produce and other minimally processed foods that are not typically included in datasets on packaged food
418 purchases (e.g., bread from a bakery). Beyond purchasing data, data on total dietary intake is necessary to fully evaluate
419 the policies, particularly given that one of the policies focused on school food sales, data that is not captured in Kantar
420 WorldPanel. Another key limitation is that while the construction of a counterfactual allowed us to compare observed
421 purchases in the post-policy period to what would have happened in the absence of the policy, decisions about how to
422 create the counterfactual are somewhat arbitrary and can influence results. We conducted sensitivity analyses using
423 different policy windows to construct the counterfactual and showed that the pattern of results remains consistent,
424 though effect sizes can vary. We also provide a more in-depth comparison of current findings with our team's previous
425 findings in **Supplemental Table 8**⁴³.

426 One key limitation to the study is that we could not, as originally planned, evaluate changes in food purchases during
427 Phase 3 of the Chilean law. Phase 3 was implemented in June of 2019. In the following year, the food supply and food
428 purchasing behaviors were severely impacted by national protests in October-December 2019 and lockdowns due to the
429 onset of the Covid-19 pandemic, making it impossible to analyze purchasing trends during this period. However, the
430 results in this study are likely similar to what we would have observed during Phase 3. Although the nutrient thresholds
431 became slightly stricter in Phase 2, there was only a 2% increase in the prevalence of labeled products, and there were
432 no other substantive policy changes during this time. Of course, we cannot rule out other changes that could have
433 occurred during Phase 3 (e.g., more consumer fatigue), but generally, the results presented here for Phase 2 are likely to
434 represent the full implementation of the Chilean law.

435 **Acknowledgments:**

436 While Bloomberg Philanthropies provided much of the funding for this work, earlier grants from the Chilean government
437 (CONICYT) and the Canadian IDRC were also important in starting this effort.

438 We thank Fernanda Mediano for her insights on interpreting the marketing aspects of the Chilean law. We thank Bridget
439 Hollingsworth for overall project management and Donna Miles for data management. We also thank research

440 assistants, including Cindy Granados Evans, Fernanda Olivato, Jessica Ostrowski, Leonela Muñoz Conolly, Julia Wandell,
441 Michelle Perry, Catalina Cornejo Nuñez, and Gina Bautista Herrera, as well as programmers, including Neepa Boode and
442 Stephanie Stewart.

443

444

445

446

447

448

449

450

451

452

453

454

455

456

457

458

459

460

461 **References**

- 462 1. Popkin BM, Barquera S, Corvalan C, et al. Towards unified and impactful policies to reduce ultra-processed food
463 consumption and promote healthier eating. *The Lancet Diabetes & Endocrinology*. 2021/04/15/
464 2021;doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S2213-8587\(21\)00078-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2213-8587(21)00078-4)
- 465 2. Reyes M, Smith Taillie L, Popkin B, Kanter R, Vandevijvere S, Corvalán C. Changes in the amount of nutrient of
466 packaged foods and beverages after the initial implementation of the Chilean Law of Food Labelling and Advertising: A
467 nonexperimental prospective study. *PLoS medicine*. 2020;17(7):e1003220.
- 468 3. Correa T, Reyes M, Taillie LS, Corvalan C, Dillman Carpentier FR. Food Advertising on Television Before and After
469 a National Unhealthy Food Marketing Regulation in Chile, 2016-2017. *American journal of public health*. Jul
470 2020;110(7):1054-1059. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2020.305658
- 471 4. Dillman Carpentier FR, Correa T, Reyes M, Taillie LS. Evaluating the impact of Chile's marketing regulation of
472 unhealthy foods and beverages: pre-school and adolescent children's changes in exposure to food advertising on
473 television. *Public Health Nutr*. Mar 2020;23(4):747-755. doi:10.1017/S1368980019003355
- 474 5. Jensen ML, Carpentier FD, Adair L, Corvalan C, Popkin BM, Taillie LS. Examining Chile's unique food marketing
475 policy: TV advertising and dietary intake in preschool children, a pre- and post- policy study. *Pediatr Obes*. Oct 26
476 2020:e12735. doi:10.1111/ijpo.12735
- 477 6. Jensen ML, Dillman Carpentier FR, Adair L, Corvalán C, Popkin BM, Taillie LS. TV advertising and dietary intake in
478 adolescents: a pre-and post-study of Chile's food marketing policy. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and*
479 *Physical Activity*. 2021;18:1-11.
- 480 7. Mediano Stoltze F, Reyes M, Smith TL, Correa T, Corvalan C, Carpentier FRD. Prevalence of Child-Directed
481 Marketing on Breakfast Cereal Packages before and after Chile's Food Marketing Law: A Pre- and Post-Quantitative
482 Content Analysis. *International journal of environmental research and public health*. Nov 15
483 2019;16(22)doi:10.3390/ijerph16224501
- 484 8. Correa T, Fierro C, Reyes M, Carpentier FRD, Taillie LS, Corvalan C. Responses to the Chilean law of food labeling
485 and advertising: exploring knowledge, perceptions and behaviors of mothers of young children. *International Journal of*
486 *Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*. 2019;16(1):21. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1186/s12966-019-0781-x>

- 487 9. Taillie LS, Reyes M, Colchero MA, Popkin B, Corvalán C. An evaluation of Chile's Law of Food Labeling and
488 Advertising on sugar-sweetened beverage purchases from 2015 to 2017: A before-and-after study. *PLoS medicine*.
489 2020;17(2):e1003015.
- 490 10. Taillie LS, Bercholz M, Popkin B, Reyes M, Colchero MA, Corvalán C. Changes in food purchases after the Chilean
491 policies on food labelling, marketing, and sales in schools: a before and after study. *The Lancet Planetary Health*.
492 2021;5(8):e526-e533.
- 493 11. Barahona N, Otero C, Otero S, Kim J. Equilibrium Effects of Food Labeling Policies. *Available at SSRN 3698473*.
494 2020;
- 495 12. Massri C, Sutherland S, Källestål C, Peña S. Impact of the food-labeling and advertising law banning competitive
496 food and beverages in Chilean public schools, 2014–2016. *American journal of public health*. 2019;109(9):1249-1254.
- 497 13. Fretes G, Corvalán C, Reyes M, et al. Changes in children's and adolescents' dietary intake after the
498 implementation of Chile's law of food labeling, advertising and sales in schools: a longitudinal study. *International*
499 *Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*. 2023;20(1):40.
- 500 14. Colchero MA, Rivera-Dommarco J, Popkin B, Ng SW. In Mexico, evidence of sustained consumer response two
501 years after implementing a sugar-sweetened beverage tax. *Health Affairs*. 2017;36(3):564-571.
502 doi:10.1377/hlthaff.2016.1231
- 503 15. Powell LM, Leider J. Impact of a sugar-sweetened beverage tax two-year post-tax implementation in Seattle,
504 Washington, United States. *Journal of Public Health Policy*. 2021;42:574-588.
- 505 16. Bleich SN, Dunn CG, Soto MJ, et al. Association of a sweetened beverage tax with purchases of beverages and
506 high-sugar foods at independent stores in Philadelphia. *JAMA network open*. 2021;4(6):e2113527-e2113527.
- 507 17. Dillman Carpentier FR, Mediano Stoltze F, Reyes M, Taillie LS, Corvalán C, Correa T. Restricting child-directed ads
508 is effective, but adding a time-based ban is better: evaluating a multi-phase regulation to protect children from
509 unhealthy food marketing on television. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*.
510 2023;20(1):62.
- 511 18. Shrestha A, Cullerton K, White KM, Mays J, Sendall M. Impact of front-of-pack nutrition labelling in consumer
512 understanding and use across socio-economic status: A systematic review. *Appetite*. 2023:106587.

- 513 19. Hough G, Sosa M. Food choice in low income populations—A review. *Food quality and preference*. 2015;40:334-
514 342.
- 515 20. Chile IcE. ENCUESTA NACIONAL DE EMPLEO - ENE. Instituto cione Estadasticas: Chile.
516 <https://webanterior.ine.cl/estadisticas/laborales/ene>
- 517 21. Kanter R, Reyes M, Corvalán C. Photographic methods for measuring packaged food and beverage products in
518 supermarkets. *Current Developments in Nutrition*. 2017;doi:10.3945/cdn.117.001016
- 519 22. Taillie LS, Reyes M, Colchero MA, Popkin B, Corvalan C. An evaluation of Chile's Law of Food Labeling and
520 Advertising on sugar-sweetened beverage purchases from 2015 to 2017: A before-and-after study. *PLoS medicine*. Feb
521 2020;17(2):e1003015. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1003015
- 522 23. Corvalán C, Reyes M, Garmendia ML, Uauy R. Structural responses to the obesity and non-communicable
523 diseases epidemic: Update on the Chilean law of food labelling and advertising. *Obesity Reviews*. 2018;
- 524 24. So J, Kim S, Cohen H. Message fatigue: Conceptual definition, operationalization, and correlates. *Communication
525 Monographs*. 2017;84(1):5-29.
- 526 25. So J. Counterproductive effects of overfamiliar antitobacco messages on smoking cessation intentions via
527 message fatigue and resistance to persuasion. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*. 2021;
- 528 26. Correa T, Fierro C, Reyes M, Taillie LS, Carpentier FRD, Corvalán C. Why Don't You [Government] Help Us Make
529 Healthier Foods More Affordable Instead of Bombarding Us with Labels? Maternal Knowledge, Perceptions, and
530 Practices after Full Implementation of the Chilean Food Labelling Law. *International journal of environmental research
531 and public health*. 2022;19(8):4547.
- 532 27. Boyland E, McGale L, Maden M, Hounsome J, Boland A, Jones A. Systematic review of the effect of policies to
533 restrict the marketing of foods and non-alcoholic beverages to which children are exposed. *Obesity reviews*.
534 2022;23(8):e13447.
- 535 28. Statista. Industries & Markets: Advertising in Chile. Accessed 07/26/2023, 2023. [https://www-statista-
536 com.libproxy.lib.unc.edu/search/?q=digital+advertising+investment+chile&p=1](https://www-statista-com.libproxy.lib.unc.edu/search/?q=digital+advertising+investment+chile&p=1)
- 537 29. Pina JM, Riley FDO, Lomax W. Generalizing spillover effects of goods and service brand extensions: A meta-
538 analysis approach. *Journal of Business Research*. 2013;66(9):1411-1419.

- 539 30. Uribe R, Fuentes-García A. The effects of TV unhealthy food brand placement on children. Its separate and joint
540 effect with advertising. *Appetite*. 2015;91:165-172.
- 541 31. Harris JL, Sacco SJ, Fleming-Milici F. TV exposure, attitudes about targeted food ads and brands, and unhealthy
542 consumption by adolescents: Modeling a hierarchical relationship. *Appetite*. 2022;169:105804.
- 543 32. Keller KL. Brand synthesis: The multidimensionality of brand knowledge. *Journal of consumer research*.
544 2003;29(4):595-600.
- 545 33. Chaplin LN, Roedder John D. The development of self-brand connections in children and adolescents. *Journal of*
546 *consumer research*. 2005;32(1):119-129.
- 547 34. Escalas JE, Bettman JR. Self-construal, reference groups, and brand meaning. *Journal of consumer research*.
548 2005;32(3):378-389.
- 549 35. Rebolledo N, Reyes M, Popkin BM, et al. Changes in nonnutritive sweetener intake in a cohort of preschoolers
550 after the implementation of Chile's Law of Food Labelling and Advertising. *Pediatric Obesity*. 2022;17(7):e12895.
551 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/ijpo.12895>
- 552 36. Rebolledo N, Bercholz M, Corvalán C, Ng SW, Taillie LS. Did the sweetness of beverages change with the Chilean
553 Food Labeling and Marketing Law? A before and after study. *Front Nutr*. 2022;9:1043665.
554 doi:10.3389/fnut.2022.1043665
- 555 37. Rebolledo N, Bercholz M, Adair L, Corvalán C, Ng SW, Taillie LS. Sweetener Purchases in Chile before and after
556 Implementing a Policy for Food Labeling, Marketing, and Sales in Schools. *Current Developments in Nutrition*.
557 2023/02/01/ 2023;7(2):100016. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cdnut.2022.100016>
- 558 38. Fuentealba NR, Reyes M, Corvalan C, Popkin B, Taillie LS. Do Sugary Drink Policies Increase Purchases of Non-
559 Calorically Sweetened Beverages? Evidence from Chile. *Current Developments in Nutrition*. 2020;4(Supplement_2):1478-
560 1478. doi:10.1093/cdn/nzaa061_106
- 561 39. Zancheta Ricardo C, Corvalán C, Smith Taillie L, Quitral V, Reyes M. Changes in the use of non-nutritive
562 sweeteners in the Chilean food and beverage supply after the implementation of the food labeling and advertising law.
563 *Frontiers in nutrition*. 2021;8:773450.
- 564 40. World Health Organization. *WHO Global Report on Sodium Intake Reduction 2023*.

- 565 41. Correa T, Fierro C, Reyes M, Taillie LS, Carpentier FRD, Corvalán C. Why Don't You [Government] Help Us Make
566 Healthier Foods More Affordable Instead of Bombarding Us with Labels? Maternal Knowledge, Perceptions, and
567 Practices after Full Implementation of the Chilean Food Labelling Law. *International Journal of Environmental Research
568 and Public Health*. 2022;19(8):4547.
- 569 42. Paraje G, de Oca DM, Corvalán C, Popkin BM. Evolution of food and beverage prices after the front-of-package
570 labelling regulations in Chile. *BMJ Global Health*. 2023;8(7):e011312.
- 571 43. Taillie L, Bercholz M, Popkin B, Reyes M, Colchero A, Corvalan C. Changes in food purchases after Chile's policies
572 on food labeling, marketing, and sales in schools: a before and after study. *Lancet Planetary Health*. 2021;In press

573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593

594 **Supplemental Figures**595 **Supplementary Table 1. Nutrient thresholds and implementation dates of the Chilean Labeling and Advertising Law**

596

Solid food	26 June 2016	26 June 2018	26 June 2019
Energy (kcal/100g)	350	300	275
Sodium (mg/100g)	800	500	400
Total sugars (g/100g)	22.5	15	10
Saturated fats (g/100g)	6	5	4
Liquids	26 June 2016	26 June 2018	26 June 2019
Energy (kcal/100g)	100	80	70
Sodium (mg/100g)	100	100	100
Total sugars (g/100g)	6	5	5
Saturated fats (g/100g)	3	3	3

597

598

599

600 **Supplemental Table 2. Food and beverage categories included and their aggregate expenditure shares**

Category	Food % expenditure	Beverages % expenditure	Total % expenditure
Cereal-based foods	22.1		13.6
Meat, poultry and meat substitutes*	15.7		9.6
Dairy products and dairy substitutes*	13.1		8.0
Sweets and non-grain-based desserts*	12.2		7.5
Condiments and sauces*	10.2		6.3
Oils and fats*	8.1		5.0
Grain-based desserts*	7.2		4.4
Breakfast cereals*	5.0		3.1
Soups	3.3		2.0
Snacks	2.0		1.2
Traditional mixed dishes	0.5		0.3
Salt and seasoning	0.3		0.2
Fruits, vegetables and mushrooms	0.2		0.1
Fish and seafood	0.0		0.0
Total food	100.0		61.4
Dairy-based beverages and dairy substitutes*		37.5	14.5
Sodas*		33.4	13.0
Industrialized, fruit and vegetable juice*		9.9	3.8
Water		9.7	3.8
Coffee and tea		9.3	3.6
100% fruit/vegetable juice		0.1	0.0
Sports and energy drinks		0.0	0.0
Total beverages		100.0	38.7
Total			100.0

601 Note: asterisks indicate categories that had $\geq 5\%$ share of expenditures in food or in beverages and were included in the
602 food and beverage sub-group analyses.

603

604

605

606

607

608

609

610

611

612

613 **Supplemental Table 3. Raw percentages of products with zero, one, and two or more FOPLs (Phase 3 limits) by period**
 614 **(July 2013-June 2019)**

	Pre-policy	Phase 1	Phase 2
Food			
None	30.8	34.8	38.6
One	24.9	26.5	24.2
Two or more	44.2	38.7	37.2
Beverages			
None	58.4	76.2	82.7
One	39.0	22.5	16.8
Two or more	2.5	1.2	0.5
Total			
None	39.3	47.2	51.9
One	29.3	25.3	22.0
Two or more	31.4	27.5	26.1

615 As a result of the NFP linking protocol, the number of FOPLs a product has may vary within a given period (multiple years
 616 of NFP data used in the pre-policy and phase 1 periods).

617

Supplemental Table 4. Unadjusted weighted means (SD) in food and beverage purchases by July-June period

Total Foods and Beverages	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
Energy						
Labeled	218.4 (151.0)	228.3 (161.7)	233.8 (166.3)	191.7 (139.3)	198.5 (144.3)	177.9 (132.7)
Non-labeled	214.5 (166.6)	216.2 (181.5)	223.4 (186.1)	221.4 (178.9)	217.8 (184.8)	232.0 (191.1)
Total	432.9 (277.2)	444.5 (303.7)	457.3 (311.5)	413.1 (278.7)	416.3 (289.3)	409.9 (288.1)
Labeled share	52.0% (18.1%)	53.2% (18.0%)	52.9% (18.0%)	48.1% (18.3%)	50.0% (18.7%)	45.7% (18.6%)
Saturated fat						
Labeled	35.1 (28.2)	37.1 (31.4)	39.6 (33.9)	35.1 (31.2)	37.1 (32.9)	34.5 (32.0)
Non-labeled	10.6 (12.9)	10.7 (13.5)	11.3 (14.4)	11.8 (14.3)	11.2 (13.6)	13.2 (15.7)
Total	45.7 (35.2)	47.8 (38.9)	50.9 (41.8)	47.0 (38.9)	48.2 (40.3)	47.7 (41.3)
Labeled share	77.3% (18.8%)	78.1% (18.5%)	78.2% (18.4%)	74.0% (19.9%)	76.0% (19.2%)	71.7% (20.4%)
Sodium						
Labeled	412.7 (353.3)	422.7 (379.6)	429.1 (378.8)	357.6 (324.9)	349.1 (319.3)	314.1 (306.9)
Non-labeled	160.5 (190.9)	159.0 (204.4)	161.5 (204.2)	157.7 (177.5)	146.7 (176.7)	159.4 (179.4)
Total	573.2 (464.2)	581.7 (500.6)	590.6 (496.9)	515.3 (428.8)	495.8 (421.1)	473.5 (412.9)
Labeled share	72.4% (19.2%)	73.3% (18.9%)	72.9% (19.1%)	68.7% (19.6%)	70.0% (19.5%)	65.2% (20.3%)
Sugars						
Labeled	85.5 (71.6)	89.5 (77.2)	87.5 (74.2)	64.9 (59.5)	66.1 (59.0)	54.5 (51.8)
Non-labeled	24.0 (22.5)	23.4 (22.6)	24.1 (23.1)	28.2 (24.6)	26.4 (23.3)	32.1 (27.6)
Total	109.4 (81.7)	112.9 (86.9)	111.6 (85.0)	93.1 (71.5)	92.5 (70.4)	86.6 (66.3)
Labeled share	75.9% (16.9%)	77.1% (16.6%)	76.0% (17.0%)	66.6% (19.4%)	68.4% (19.0%)	59.4% (21.2%)
Foods						
	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
Energy						
Labeled	161.1 (118.8)	167.3 (127.5)	175.3 (134.2)	154.1 (119.5)	160.4 (126.1)	149.1 (120.1)
Non-labeled	171.5 (144.2)	173.7 (158.5)	180.3 (161.4)	174.7 (154.3)	175.0 (162.2)	184.5 (165.3)

Total	332.7 (226.2)	341.1 (249.2)	355.6 (257.5)	328.8 (235.3)	335.4 (249.2)	333.6 (249.6)
Labeled share	50.7% (20.7%)	51.6% (20.8%)	51.7% (20.7%)	49.3% (21.0%)	51.0% (21.5%)	47.7% (21.2%)
Saturated fat						
Labeled	34.2 (27.8)	36.1 (30.9)	38.5 (33.4)	35.0 (31.1)	36.2 (32.4)	34.4 (31.9)
Non-labeled	3.2 (5.9)	3.3 (6.1)	3.6 (6.5)	4.3 (6.8)	4.1 (7.2)	5.6 (9.3)
Total	37.4 (30.2)	39.4 (33.4)	42.2 (36.0)	39.3 (33.9)	40.3 (35.2)	40.0 (36.3)
Labeled share	90.7% (12.4%)	90.7% (12.8%)	90.5% (12.8%)	87.2% (14.9%)	88.9% (14.3%)	84.9% (16.5%)
Sodium						
Labeled	393.2 (346.6)	402.3 (372.5)	409.4 (371.8)	347.1 (321.7)	337.1 (315.6)	307.3 (305.5)
Non-labeled	117.7 (173.8)	116.8 (187.8)	118.4 (186.3)	113.0 (160.1)	105.8 (160.9)	115.0 (161.5)
Total	510.9 (436.8)	519.1 (471.9)	527.8 (466.8)	460.1 (404.6)	442.9 (398.6)	422.3 (391.5)
Labeled share	78.5% (20.6%)	79.3% (20.4%)	78.8% (20.5%)	76.0% (20.8%)	77.2% (20.6%)	73.0% (21.6%)
Sugars						
Labeled	32.8 (27.5)	33.4 (28.2)	33.8 (29.4)	28.8 (26.3)	31.1 (28.9)	26.5 (25.5)
Non-labeled	4.6 (5.2)	4.6 (5.4)	5.6 (6.2)	7.1 (7.1)	7.5 (7.6)	10.5 (11.1)
Total	37.4 (29.9)	38.0 (30.7)	39.4 (32.3)	35.9 (29.6)	38.6 (32.6)	37.0 (31.5)
Labeled share	84.8% (15.0%)	85.0% (15.3%)	82.3% (16.8%)	76.1% (19.4%)	76.4% (19.4%)	67.8% (21.7%)

Beverages

	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
Energy						
Labeled	57.3 (62.3)	61.0 (69.1)	58.5 (64.7)	37.6 (50.4)	38.2 (51.6)	28.8 (43.5)
Non-labeled	42.9 (46.3)	42.5 (47.8)	43.2 (50.0)	46.8 (50.4)	42.8 (46.6)	47.5 (50.0)
Total	100.2 (84.3)	103.4 (90.9)	101.7 (89.6)	84.3 (76.4)	80.9 (74.1)	76.3 (69.9)
Labeled share	55.4% (28.2%)	57.3% (28.1%)	56.4% (28.1%)	42.1% (29.4%)	43.4% (30.4%)	34.0% (30.6%)
Saturated fat						
Labeled	1.0 (1.9)	1.0 (2.1)	1.1 (2.2)	0.2 (0.7)	0.8 (5.2)	0.1 (1.1)
Non-labeled	7.4 (10.5)	7.3 (11.0)	7.6 (11.8)	7.5 (11.4)	7.1 (10.3)	7.6 (11.1)

Total	8.3	8.4	8.7	7.7	7.9	7.7
	(10.9)	(11.6)	(12.3)	(11.5)	(11.8)	(11.2)
Labeled share	24.4%	25.6%	24.8%	4.9%	5.5%	2.1%
	(34.4%)	(35.2%)	(34.5%)	(16.9%)	(19.4%)	(11.3%)
Sodium						
Labeled	19.5	20.4	19.8	10.5	12.0	6.8
	(21.7)	(23.5)	(22.4)	(13.9)	(19.5)	(11.2)
Non-labeled	42.8	42.2	43.1	44.7	40.9	44.4
	(46.9)	(47.3)	(49.4)	(48.0)	(44.3)	(47.0)
Total	62.3	62.6	62.8	55.1	52.9	51.2
	(55.7)	(56.9)	(58.6)	(51.9)	(50.5)	(49.2)
Labeled share	37.4%	38.9%	37.9%	24.4%	26.3%	17.7%
	(28.0%)	(28.2%)	(27.7%)	(24.4%)	(25.8%)	(22.9%)
Sugars						
Labeled	52.7	56.1	53.7	36.1	35.1	27.9
	(59.1)	(65.5)	(61.0)	(49.2)	(47.5)	(42.7)
Non-labeled	19.3	18.9	18.5	21.1	18.9	21.6
	(20.3)	(20.3)	(20.3)	(21.4)	(19.5)	(21.6)
Total	72.0	74.9	72.2	57.2	53.9	49.6
	(65.7)	(71.4)	(67.6)	(56.4)	(53.6)	(50.0)
Labeled share	66.4%	68.2%	67.8%	53.4%	54.4%	43.6%
	(27.4%)	(27.0%)	(27.1%)	(31.2%)	(32.0%)	(33.8%)

Energy, sugar, and saturated fat means are specified in terms of calories/capita/day purchased. Sodium is specified as mg/capita/day purchased.

620 **Supplemental Table 5. Unadjusted weighted mean (SD) nutrient content of food and beverage**
 621 **purchases by policy period and SES**

Total	Pre-policy		Phase 1		Phase 2	
	High SES	Low SES	High SES	Low SES	High SES	Low SES
Energy						
Labeled	263.7 (179.5)	215.2 (151.4)	216.5 (155.3)	188.3 (136.6)	190.5 (143.7)	173.9 (128.8)
Non-labeled	231.4 (186.7)	213.8 (175.5)	228.4 (180.5)	216.8 (182.2)	241.0 (194.6)	229.2 (189.9)
Total	495.2 (326.7)	429.0 (286.6)	445.0 (294.0)	405.1 (280.1)	431.4 (301.8)	403.1 (283.3)
Labeled share	54.7% (16.5%)	52.1% (18.5%)	50.0% (17.5%)	48.8% (18.8%)	45.8% (18.0%)	45.6% (18.8%)
Saturated fat						
Labeled	46.4 (37.4)	34.4 (28.5)	44.4 (38.7)	33.5 (29.2)	42.8 (40.1)	31.9 (28.5)
Non-labeled	13.4 (15.7)	10.0 (12.8)	13.8 (16.0)	10.8 (13.2)	16.2 (19.6)	12.2 (14.2)
Total	59.8 (45.9)	44.4 (35.5)	58.2 (46.9)	44.2 (36.3)	59.0 (51.2)	44.2 (36.9)
Labeled share	77.6% (17.9%)	78.0% (18.8%)	75.3% (18.8%)	74.9% (19.8%)	71.1% (20.3%)	71.9% (20.4%)
Sodium						
Labeled	464.3 (407.6)	408.0 (357.4)	375.2 (336.4)	346.4 (317.1)	310.3 (301.3)	315.3 (308.6)
Non-labeled	195.5 (227.0)	149.1 (189.2)	178.9 (197.1)	143.6 (169.5)	192.3 (210.0)	149.1 (167.3)
Total	659.8 (547.5)	557.0 (464.2)	554.2 (455.6)	490.0 (413.7)	502.6 (439.1)	464.3 (403.9)
Labeled share	71.1% (18.3%)	73.4% (19.3%)	67.3% (19.0%)	70.0% (19.7%)	60.9% (20.2%)	66.6% (20.2%)
Sugars						
Labeled	91.9 (75.4)	86.1 (74.0)	63.7 (59.6)	66.1 (59.1)	49.5 (48.3)	56.0 (52.8)

Non-labeled	28.4 (26.3)	22.4 (21.3)	31.4 (27.1)	25.9 (22.7)	36.4 (32.0)	30.8 (25.9)
Total	120.2 (89.0)	108.5 (82.9)	95.2 (73.4)	92.0 (70.1)	85.9 (66.9)	86.8 (66.1)
Labeled share	74.6% (16.9%)	76.9% (16.8%)	63.9% (19.7%)	68.6% (18.9%)	54.8% (21.5%)	60.8% (20.9%)

Foods

	Pre-policy		Phase 1		Phase 2	
	High SES	Low SES	High SES	Low SES	High SES	Low SES
Energy						
Labeled	206.2 (146.1)	155.8 (118.0)	184.8 (136.5)	148.5 (116.8)	169.3 (133.6)	142.7 (114.7)
Non-labeled	179.9 (159.3)	173.7 (153.6)	175.9 (153.2)	174.5 (159.9)	186.9 (163.3)	183.8 (165.9)
Total	386.1 (267.5)	329.5 (235.7)	360.6 (248.3)	322.9 (239.7)	356.3 (260.6)	326.5 (245.5)
Labeled share	55.4% (18.8%)	50.1% (21.2%)	53.2% (19.7%)	49.1% (21.6%)	49.6% (20.2%)	47.1% (21.5%)
Saturated fat						
Labeled	45.2 (37.0)	33.5 (28.1)	44.0 (38.5)	32.9 (28.8)	42.7 (40.0)	31.8 (28.4)
Non-labeled	5.1 (8.3)	2.9 (5.2)	6.0 (9.6)	3.6 (5.9)	8.6 (13.8)	4.7 (7.0)
Total	50.3 (40.2)	36.3 (30.1)	50.0 (42.1)	36.6 (31.1)	51.3 (46.3)	36.5 (31.7)
Labeled share	89.1% (13.1%)	91.1% (12.5%)	86.6% (15.0%)	88.5% (14.5%)	81.7% (17.9%)	85.9% (15.9%)
Sodium						
Labeled	442.9 (399.1)	388.6 (351.0)	365.0 (332.3)	334.8 (313.9)	305.2 (300.1)	307.9 (307.1)
Non-labeled	137.8 (204.4)	111.2 (174.9)	123.5 (175.8)	104.9 (155.1)	135.9 (185.1)	108.5 (152.8)
Total	580.7 (512.6)	499.8 (438.6)	488.4 (426.5)	439.7 (392.8)	441.1 (410.8)	416.4 (385.1)
Labeled share	78.2% (19.7%)	79.0% (20.7%)	75.9% (20.2%)	76.9% (20.9%)	69.7% (21.5%)	74.1% (21.4%)

Sugars						
Labeled	40.2 (33.2)	31.1 (26.3)	34.2 (30.0)	28.6 (26.7)	29.2 (27.3)	25.7 (24.9)
Non-labeled	6.0 (6.8)	4.6 (5.2)	7.9 (7.9)	7.1 (7.2)	11.7 (13.1)	10.1 (10.4)
Total	46.2 (36.3)	35.8 (28.6)	42.1 (33.4)	35.7 (30.3)	40.8 (33.8)	35.8 (30.6)
Labeled share	84.5% (14.6%)	83.9% (16.2%)	77.4% (18.1%)	75.9% (19.8%)	68.3% (21.3%)	67.7% (21.8%)

Beverages

	Pre-policy		Phase 1		Phase 2	
	High SES	Low SES	High SES	Low SES	High SES	Low SES
Energy						
Labeled	57.5 (62.2)	59.4 (66.4)	31.8 (48.4)	39.8 (51.7)	21.1 (37.6)	31.2 (45.0)
Non-labeled	51.6 (54.3)	40.1 (45.5)	52.5 (53.8)	42.3 (46.5)	54.0 (56.4)	45.4 (47.7)
Total	109.1 (92.3)	99.5 (86.9)	84.3 (77.7)	82.1 (74.5)	75.1 (71.8)	76.6 (69.3)
Labeled share	51.8% (28.4%)	57.9% (27.9%)	34.4% (29.5%)	45.4% (29.6%)	24.6% (28.6%)	36.9% (30.6%)
Saturated fat						
Labeled	1.3 (2.6)	0.9 (1.9)	0.4 (3.1)	0.5 (3.9)	0.1 (1.0)	0.1 (1.1)
Non-labeled	8.3 (12.0)	7.2 (10.8)	7.8 (11.4)	7.1 (10.7)	7.6 (11.7)	7.5 (10.9)
Total	9.6 (12.5)	8.1 (11.3)	8.2 (11.9)	7.7 (11.5)	7.7 (11.7)	7.7 (11.0)
Labeled share	24.3% (34.1%)	25.1% (34.9%)	4.9% (17.7%)	5.3% (18.4%)	1.7% (10.0%)	2.2% (11.7%)
Sodium						
Labeled	21.4 (24.8)	19.4 (21.7)	10.3 (17.8)	11.5 (16.7)	5.1 (10.3)	7.3 (11.4)
Non-labeled	57.8 (59.8)	37.9 (42.3)	55.4 (55.5)	38.8 (42.0)	56.4 (58.7)	40.6 (42.0)
Total	79.1	57.3	65.7	50.3	61.6	47.9

	(69.5)	(51.4)	(60.3)	(47.3)	(60.2)	(44.7)
Labeled share	32.6%	39.8%	19.0%	27.4%	11.5%	19.7%
	(26.4%)	(28.2%)	(22.4%)	(25.6%)	(19.0%)	(23.7%)
Sugars						
Labeled	51.7	55.0	29.6	37.5	20.4	30.3
	(57.7)	(63.3)	(45.6)	(49.0)	(36.3)	(44.2)
Non-labeled	22.3	17.8	23.5	18.9	24.8	20.7
	(23.4)	(19.1)	(23.6)	(19.3)	(25.1)	(20.3)
Total	74.0	72.7	53.1	56.3	45.1	51.0
	(67.0)	(68.7)	(54.3)	(55.2)	(46.7)	(50.9)
Labeled share	63.5%	68.8%	44.7%	56.8%	32.5%	47.2%
	(28.3%)	(26.7%)	(32.6%)	(30.7%)	(33.2%)	(33.3%)

622

623

624 **Supplemental Table 6. Weighted adjusted mean differences between the observed post-policy**
 625 **purchases and counterfactual purchases of calories from total foods and beverages across models**
 626 **using different pre-policy windows**

# months pre-policy	Policy time-window	Phase 1						Phase 2					
		Total		Labeled		Non-labeled		Total		Labeled		Non-labeled	
		Absolute (95% CI)	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)	Relative (95% CI)
42	January 2013-June 2016	-36.9 (-44.9,-29.0)	-8.2 (-9.8,-6.5)	-39.3 (-43.9,-34.6)	-16.8 (-18.5,-15.2)	2.3 (-2.4,7.0)	1.1 (-1.1,3.3)	-30.7 (-44.9,-16.5)	-7.1 (-10.2,-4.1)	-50.3 (-58.3,-42.3)	-22.5 (-25.4,-19.7)	19.5 (10.9,28.2)	9.4 (4.9,13.8)
36	July 2013- June 2016*	-40.0 (-48.5,-31.5)	-8.8 (-10.5,-7.1)	-40.0 (-45.1,-34.9)	-17.1 (-18.9,-15.3)	-0.1 (-5.2,5.0)	0.0 (-2.4,2.3)	-36.2 (-51.8,-20.6)	-8.3 (-11.6,-5.0)	-51.6 (-60.7,-42.6)	-23.0 (-26.2,-19.8)	15.1 (5.6,24.6)	7.1 (2.3,11.9)
30	January 2014- June 2016	-33.6 (-42.8,-24.4)	-7.5 (-9.4,-5.5)	-36.0 (-41.5,-30.6)	-15.6 (-17.6,-13.6)	2.4 (-3.2,8.0)	1.1 (-1.5,3.7)	-24.8 (-41.6,-8.0)	-5.9 (-9.6,-2.1)	-44.6 (-54.3,-34.9)	-20.5 (-24.1,-16.9)	19.7 (9.4,30.0)	9.4 (4.1,14.8)
24	July 2014- June 2016	-33.1 (-42.8,-23.5)	-7.4 (-9.4,-5.3)	-34.4 (-40.0,-28.8)	-15.0 (-17.1,-12.9)	1.2 (-4.7,7.1)	0.6 (-2.1,3.3)	-23.8 (-41.4,-6.2)	-5.6 (-9.5,-1.7)	-41.9 (-51.9,-31.8)	-19.5 (-23.3,-15.7)	17.8 (7.0,28.6)	8.4 (2.9,14.0)
18	January 2015-June 2016	-17.0 (-27.7,-6.3)	-3.8 (-6.2,-1.4)	-25.7 (-31.9,-19.5)	-11.5 (-14.1,-9.0)	8.8 (2.2,15.3)	4.2 (0.9,7.5)	6.6 (-12.9,26.0)	1.6 (-3.4,6.6)	-25.7 (-36.6,-14.8)	-12.9 (-17.7,-8.1)	32.2 (20.1,44.3)	4 (9.3,23.5)

* This is the main model used in the paper

627

628

629

630

631

632

633

634

635

636 **Supplemental Table 7. One-part vs. two-part models for total calories (Labeled and Non-labeled) by**
 637 **food and beverage group**

	Average absolute changes				On
	Phase 1		Phase 2		
	One-part	Two-part	One-part	Two-part	
Breakfast cereals	-1.9 (0.5)	-1.8 (0.5)	-2.0 (0.9)	-1.9 (0.8)	
Grain-based Desserts	-2.8 (0.6)	-2.7 (0.6)	-2.2 (1.2)	-2.1 (1.2)	
Sweets and Non-grain-based Desserts	-1.6 (0.5)	-1.5 (0.5)	-0.9 (0.9)	-0.9 (0.9)	
Meat, Poultry and Meat Substitutes	-2.1 (0.6)	-2.0 (0.6)	-2.4 (1.1)	-2.1 (1.1)	
Dairy Products and Dairy Substitutes	-0.8 (0.5)	-0.8 (0.5)	-1.6 (1.0)	-1.6 (1.0)	
Condiments and Sauces	-0.7 (0.5)	-0.6 (0.5)	1.3 (0.9)	1.5 (0.9)	
Oils and Fats	-3.7 (0.8)	-3.7 (0.8)	-4.5 (1.5)	-4.4 (1.4)	
Sodas	-8.1 (0.9)	-8.1 (0.9)	-9.4 (1.5)	-9.2 (1.5)	
Industrialized, Fruit and Vegetable Juice (FVJ)	-6.5 (0.5)	-6.4 (0.4)	-9.2 (0.9)	-8.7 (0.8)	
Dairy-based Beverages and Dairy Substitutes	-7.7 (1.0)	-7.7 (1.0)	-9.3 (1.8)	-9.4 (1.8)	

Absolute changes are predicted as observed minus the counterfactual, relative changes are predicted as observed divided by counterfactual, errors in parentheses.

638
 639
 640
 641
 642
 643
 644
 645

646 **Supplemental Table 8.** *Differences between papers*

647 The overall pattern of results reported in the current study is consistent with our previously published
648 evaluations of the first phase of the Chilean Law using Kantar WorldPanel data in that they show an
649 overall decline in calories driven by a decline in Labeled calories, with partial compensation by an
650 increase in Non-labeled calories. However, when comparing current Phase 1 results for total food and
651 beverage purchases to our previously published results, there are several differences. Compared to our
652 previously published results, declines in Labeled calories purchased are smaller and increases in Non-
653 labeled calories purchased are also smaller, resulting in a larger estimation of declines in overall calories
654 purchases. This pattern is consistent across nutrients, with the exception that for sugar, current results
655 yield a larger decline in Labeled calories from sugar than did previous results. There are multiple
656 explanations for these findings relating to differences in the datasets used for these analyses. In our
657 previous results, we applied Phase 1 cutoffs to classify Labeled vs. Non-labeled foods, whereas in our
658 current results, we applied Phase 3 (more stringent) cut-offs across all phases in order to have a
659 consistent definition of regulation status over time; these differences in classifications resulted in a
660 higher proportion of foods being classified as “Labeled” and less as “not high in” during Phase 1 in our
661 current analysis. In our previous results, we used a shorter pre-policy window (January 1, 2015- June
662 2016) whereas in our current results, we used a longer pre-policy window (July 1, 2013-June 2016) in
663 order to achieve balance with the longer post-policy window, since we were examining both Phase 1
664 and Phase 2. As shown in the sensitivity results, altering the pre-policy window changes the
665 counterfactual, which is based on pre-existing trends, and can lead to estimation of larger or smaller
666 differences between the observed and counterfactual. Similarly, our current results included the entire
667 Phase 1 (July 1, 2016-June 30, 2018), and included updated Nutrition Facts Panel information collected
668 in the first semester of 2018, whereas our previous results were truncated at December 31, 2017 due to
669 data availability at the time of publication. It is possible that products were additionally reformulated in
670 2018 in anticipation of Phase 2 of the law, which was implemented in July 2018 and included stricter
671 nutrient thresholds, which would likely lead to larger reductions in nutrients purchased. Finally, there
672 were other differences between the analyses, including covariates (e.g., public holidays by region and
673 month, inclusion of the SES variable), weighting technique (matching by production period vs. month),
674 and model specifications, which reflect our updated understanding of the dataset. The differences in
675 results highlights the need for careful attention to methodological issues such as how products are
676 reviewed and linked to NFP data as well as how pre- and post-policy time windows are created. As policy
677 implementation continues across the globe, it will be important to understand not only how policy-
678 linked purchasing patterns change over time, but how to develop and implement methodological
679 strategies for natural experiments to evaluate these.

Figure 1. Mean adjusted weighted purchases of nutrients from labeled food and beverage purchases during the pre-policy period, Phase 1, and Phase 2 of implementation of the Chilean Law of Food Labeling and Advertising

