

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

User testing on Foods with Function Claims labelling in Japan :

An attempt to establish an integrated evaluation system for the usefulness of health information materials

Michiko Yamamoto ¹ [¶]*, Ken Yamamoto ² [¶], Hiromi Takano-Ohmuro ³, Rain Yamamoto ⁴ and Junji Saruwatari ¹

¹ Graduate School of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Kumamoto University, 5-1 Oehonmachi, Chuo-ku, Kumamoto-city, Kumamoto, Japan

² Showa Pharmaceutical University, 3-3165 Higashi-Tamagawagakuen, Machida-city, Tokyo, Japan

³ Faculty of Pharmacy, Musashino University, 1-1-20 Shin-machi, Nishitokyo-city, Tokyo, Japan

⁴ Faculty of Pharmacy, Keio University, 1-5-30 Shibakoen, Minato-ku, Tokyo, Japan

* Corresponding author
E-mail: m-yamamoto@kumamoto-u.ac.jp

[¶] These authors contributed equally to this work.

23 **ABSTRACT**

24 The saturation of self-care products in the market is coupled with inadequate information
25 on their safe usage. In Japan, although foods with function claims (FFC) are prevalent, their
26 labelling falls short in quality and effectiveness as health information, impeding consumer
27 comprehension and proper utilization. Hence, it is imperative to establish a system that assesses
28 the efficacy of labelling information from both provider and user perspectives. From providers' or
29 healthcare professionals' perspective, we already developed a Communication Index to assess FFC
30 labelling, which we utilized to evaluate five FFC products. Those products achieved a proficiency
31 level of approximately 70%, falling below the acceptance criteria. Particularly, challenges were
32 identified in understanding some of the terms and locating important information on the labels. In
33 this study, we conducted user-testing from the user perspective for five same FFC labels to evaluate
34 them using semi-structured interviews with 50 participants of diverse ages and sexes. A passing
35 criterion for comprehension was set as $\geq 90\%$ correct responses to all questions. Of the five FFC
36 products, one passed the user-testing criterion with a 2-min response time; however, none passed
37 the 1-min response time test. The proportions of correct answers were notably low for questions
38 on diet and allergies (each 50-90%), concomitant medications (50-100%), storage (30-100%), and
39 handling (30-100%). Participants' comments revealed a lack of familiarity with FFC, highlighting
40 that the terms and text in the labelling were confusing and overly technical. User-testing provides
41 valuable insights for improving FFC labelling, thereby ensuring safe and appropriate use by
42 aligning with consumers' understanding and perceptions. We assessed FFC label information from
43 both the provider and user perspectives, but neither yielded satisfactory results. Consequently, the
44 implementation of an integrated system capable of evaluating FCC labels as health information
45 material from both perspectives would be necessary.

46 INTRODUCTION

47 Health information provision and consumer understanding in Japan

48 Numerous self-care products, including health food items, saturate the Japanese market.
49 However, the prevalence of inaccurate and unreliable health information sources can mislead
50 consumers, potentially leading to inappropriate use of the product and associated health risks [1].
51 Health information materials serve as crucial tools for effective risk communication.

52 An online survey in 2016 revealed that only 16% of consumers clearly understood the
53 characteristics of foods with function claims (FFC) [2]. Another survey in 2017 reported that 17%
54 of consumers using health food products experienced poor physical conditions [3]. In March 2024,
55 tragically, five people were fatally poisoned by the FFC containing the beni kōji fermented rice in
56 Japan [4]. While the incident was likely caused by a contaminant, it underscored the challenge
57 consumers face in checking the safety of FFC, which are readily available. Consequently, the
58 provision of easy-to-understand information is crucial to ensuring safe product usage and
59 empowering consumers to make informed choices. A comparative analysis of Japanese and
60 European consumer health literacy surveys [5,6] indicated that 41.8% of Japanese respondents,
61 36.2% in Europe, and 30.1% in the Netherlands had difficulty understanding information on food
62 packages [5,6].

63 Given the health literacy gap between professionals and consumers, establishing a
64 communication system ensuring that the quality of information aligns with consumer needs, is
65 imperative.

66 Previous studies investigated consumers' comprehension of the nutrition facts label,
67 health claims, and food labels using online surveys including questionnaires[7-9]. A qualitative
68 study was conducted to investigate how claims can affect consumers' perceptions and behavior

69 [10]. While these studies investigated food labelling, they were not specific to FFC labelling.
70 Although surveys have been conducted in Japan on consumers' awareness and attitudes towards
71 FFC [11], no surveys have been conducted to assess providers' and consumers' perspectives on
72 labelling.

73 Currently, there is no system available in Japan for evaluating the usability of health
74 information materials. To enhance the utility of these materials, it is vital to evaluate information
75 from the providers' perspective and further verify it from the users' perspective. Previously, we
76 developed a usefulness evaluation index for FFC labelling from the providers' or healthcare
77 professionals' perspective [12]. In this study, we developed and evaluated a user test to gauge the
78 accessibility and comprehensibility of the same FFC materials from consumers' perspectives. In
79 addition to user testing, we conducted interviews with a qualitative analysis of the comments
80 obtained from the consumers. The development of these integrated methods considering the
81 provider and consumer perspectives represents the first study on the comprehension of health
82 information, using FFC labelling.

83

84 **Labelling of foods with health claims in Japan**

85 Based on the Health Promotion Law, the 'Foods with Health Claims' system was
86 established in April 2015 to facilitate the appropriate use of such foods for self-care [13,14]. This
87 system comprises Foods for Specified Health Uses (FOSHU), Foods with Nutrient Function
88 Claims, and FFC (S1 Fig). FOSHU undergoes individual reviews for efficacy and safety, and is
89 approved by the Secretary General of the Consumer Affairs Agency (CAA) [15]. In contrast, FFC
90 can display function claims based on scientific evidence, with the responsibility lying on the food
91 business operator. Prior to marketing, information supporting the safety and efficacy of the product

92 is submitted to the Secretary-General of the CAA [16].

93 As of 4 October 2023, there were 7,538 notified FFC [17], while 1,054 FOSHU products
94 received approval [18]. The FFC must feature 16 specified items (Cabinet Office Ordinance No.
95 10, 2015; Table 1, Fig 1). Moreover, FFC labels should bear the following: the product's name,
96 storage method, best before date or expiration date, ingredients, additives, nutritional ingredients,
97 total weight, calorific value of nutritional ingredients, and the name and address of the food
98 business operator [19]. In the actual labels of the product containers and packaging, the order, font
99 size and position of these items differ from the examples given by the CAA (Fig 1).

100

101 **Fig 1.** An example of the label for Foods with Function Claims

102

103 **Table 1.** Labelling on containers and packaging of foods with functional claims.

-
- 1) A statement indicating that the product is a food with function claims
 - 2) The active ingredient with validated functionality along with the functionality of the ingredient or the food containing it
 - 3) Quantity and calorific value of the nutritional ingredient
 - 4) Quantity of the active ingredient within each recommended daily allowance
 - 5) Approximate daily allowance
 - 6) Notification number
 - 7) Contact details of the food business operator
 - 8) A statement indicating that the product has not undergone evaluation for functionality and safety by the regulatory agency
 - 9) Instructions for the mode of intake
 - 10) Cautionary information for intake
 - 11) Language promoting a well-balanced diet
 - 12) A statement outlining special precautions, if any, required for the cooking or preservation method
 - 13) A statement indicating that the product is not intended for the diagnosis, treatment, or prevention of diseases
 - 14) Information aimed at individuals with diseases, minors, pregnant or nursing women (including those planning to conceive), and lactating women
 - 15) A statement recommending individuals with diseases to consult a physician, and those taking medications to consult either a physician or a pharmacist before using the product
 - 16) A directive to discontinue product intake immediately and consult a physician in case of any physical discomfort
-

104 The 16 items indicated in the Food Labelling Standards (Cabinet Office Ordinance No. 10, 2015)

105 [20]

106

107 **Evaluation of FFC labelling**

108 **Evaluation from the providers' or healthcare professionals' perspective**

109 Foods with Health Claims should present clear information on its label, so that the
110 information is easily understandable to consumers with diverse levels of health literacy. In recent
111 years, public organizations in Europe and the United States have introduced standards to facilitate
112 the creation and provision of health information that is easily understandable for consumers and
113 patients. In the United States, various tools such as 'Clear & Simple' [21] and 'Toolkit for Making
114 Clear and Effective Information' [22] are available. Notably, the Centers for Disease Control and
115 Prevention (CDC) released the 'Clear Communication Index (CCI)' in 2014 as a research-based
116 tool for developing and assessing public communication materials [23]. The CCI comprises 20
117 items, including the main message and action recommendations, with the CDC recommending a
118 score of 90% (18 items) or higher. In this context, a group comprising six university employees,
119 all of whom were qualified as pharmacists and public health professionals, has developed our own
120 CCI for evaluating the FFC labelling (F-CCI) (Table 2).

121 Using the F-CCI index, we evaluated five FFC products from the perspective of healthcare
122 professionals, achieving a level of approximately 70% (12–14 items) which we have already
123 published [12]. None of the five products met the acceptance criteria for the following questions:
124 'Does the material consistently use language familiar to the primary audience? (F-CCI Q7)', 'Is
125 the most important information that the primary audience needs summarized in the first paragraph
126 or section? (Q10)', and 'Does the material consistently explain the meaning of the numbers and
127 units used? (Q16)'. With regard to Q10, usage precautions, such as advising immediate
128 discontinuation of product usage and recommending consultation with a doctor if any physical
129 changes are noticed, were described at the bottom of the label without any particular emphasis. For
130 Q7, certain sentences indicated by the Consumer Affairs Agency (CAA) included technical jargon

131 that was not commonly used by the public. The results indicated that the readability and location
132 of the main message, in particular, should be improved.

133

134 **Table 2.** Evaluation index for labelling foods with function claims

Part A (Core)	F-1	Does the material contain one main message statement? (Does not necessarily have to match the Submitted Claim)
	F-2	Is the main message at the top or beginning, or on the front of the material?
	F-3	Is the main message emphasized with visual cues?
	F-4	Does the material contain at least one visual that conveys or supports the main message?
	F-5	Does the material include one or more calls to action for the primary audience?
	F-6	Do both the main message and the call to action use the active voice?
	F-7	Does the material always use words the primary audience uses?
	F-8	Does the material use bulleted or numbered lists?
	F-9	Is the material organized in chunks with headings?
	F-10	Is the most important information that the primary audience needs summarized in the first paragraph or section?
Part B (Behavioral Recommendation)	F-11	Does the material include one or more behavioral recommendations on functionality for the primary audience?
	F-12	Does the material include one or more behavioral recommendations on safety for the primary audience?
	F-13	Does the material explain why the behavioral recommendation(s) on safety is necessary for the primary audience?
	F-14	Does the behavioral recommendation(s) include specific directions about how to perform the behavior?
Part C (Numbers)	F-15	Does the material always present numbers that the primary audience uses?
	F-16	Does the material always explain what the numbers and units mean?
	F-17	Does the audience have to conduct mathematical calculations?
Part D (Risk)	F-18	Does the material explain the nature (e.g., about specific harms) of the risk?

135

136 **Evaluation of FFC labelling through user-testing**

137 In addition to evaluation from the providers' perspective, it is imperative to assess FFC
138 labelling from the end-user's standpoint. Therefore, a comprehensive evaluation from both
139 perspectives is crucial.

140 User testing is used to assess whether users can easily access and understand FFC[24,25].

141 It is widely employed for assessing the efficacy of consumer health information, ranging from
142 booklets and leaflets to online resources. User testing aims to enhance the understanding of
143 provided information for consumers and patients [24-28]. The interviewer asked participants to
144 answer questions about the content of the materials. When conducting user testing, it is
145 recommended to employ a cohort of 10 participants at a time. This approach is well-established
146 and supported by EU and Australian guidelines and meeting user testing criteria is one of the
147 conditions for the approval of new medicines in the EU [26-28]. This methodology has been widely

148 used, as demonstrated by Raynor DK et al. [29-31].

149 Our initial user testing in Japan targeted the Drug Guides for Patients, which are the label
150 information of prescription drugs for patients [32]. Subsequently, we have continued user testing
151 and gained experience in this field [33]. In the test, the passing criterion is as follows: 90% of the
152 participants should successfully locate and 90% should be able to understand the information.

153 In this study, we evaluated five FFC labels by the F-CCI and conducted user testing on
154 five FFC (Fig 2.). Interviews with 50 participants (five cohorts of 10 participants) in the user testing
155 were conducted to gain insights into users' attitudes to enhance the overall quality of FFC labelling.

156

157 **Fig 2.** Evaluation of integrated usability of Health Information Materials.

158

159 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

160 **Materials**

161 On the FFC search site provided by the CAA [17], we searched for FFC relevant to
162 keywords ‘triglyceride’, ‘presbyopia’, ‘absorption of sugar and fat’, ‘hypertension’, and
163 ‘cholesterol’. These topics are of particular interest to middle-aged and older adults. After
164 reviewing approximately 100 labelling of FFC in a preliminary study, we selected five products,
165 each with distinct claims of functionality that were considered commonplace. Table 3 provides an
166 overview of these five products. Subsequently, we purchased each product and evaluated its
167 labelling content. The labelling and labelling sample (Form VI of the submitted claim) can be
168 found on the CAA website (accessed on 5 January 2020).

169

170 **Participants**

171 For generalizability of the outcomes of user testing, it is imperative to carefully recruit a
172 subject sample that accurately reflects the characteristics of users of the specific product under
173 consideration [26-28]. The distribution of variables such as age, gender, literacy level (e.g.,
174 education), and others within the subject sample should closely mirror the distribution observed
175 among the actual users of the product in question. It is noteworthy, however, that the utilization of
176 random sampling may not be necessary in all cases [28]. We conducted the recruitment between
177 from July 1st 2020 to September 30th 2020 using recruitment flyer distribution, SNS and through
178 a market research company.

179

180 **Criteria for Participant Suitability**

181 The designated number of subjects per product is set at 10, given the execution of five
182 cohorts, resulting in the recruitment of a total of 50 subjects. To guarantee a comprehensive
183 representation within the target group, the following criteria are established for the inclusion of
184 participants:

185 Age: Individuals aged between 30 and 70 years, aligning with the age range during which FFC
186 products are most commonly utilized.

187 Gender: Each gender category must be represented by a minimum of four individuals.

188 Literacy Level: High school, and vocational school graduates or equivalents are to be included,
189 ensuring diverse educational backgrounds within the target group.

190 Occupation: Includes two or more people who do not regularly use written information as part of
191 their occupation

192

193 Exclusion Criteria for Participants

194 1. Individuals who are currently using or have used FFC products under investigation within the
195 past 6 months.

196 2. FFC is utilized by a family member residing in the same household.

197 3. Individuals involved in health professions, pharmaceutical professions, occupations associated
198 with health products, or those with prior work experience in these domains.

199 4. Participants who have been subjects of a user test within six months.

200 Taking into account a balanced distribution in terms of sex, age, and literacy level
201 (education background), as described in Table 4 [26,27]. We provided potential participants with
202 written explanations outlining the purpose and methods of the test and obtained their written
203 informed consent. No people refused to participate or dropped out of the user-test.

204

205 **Table 3.** Overview of foods with function claims subjected to user testing.

	Functional substance	Sales copy	Submitted claim	Containers or packaging	Product format
Product A	Eicosapentaenoic acid, Docosahexaenoic acid: substance A	Reduces triglyceride in individuals with elevated triglyceride levels.	This product contains substance A, known for its triglyceride-reducing properties and reported health benefits for individuals with elevated triglycerides.	Cardboard box	Soft capsules
Product B	Lutein astaxanthin (as free form), Cyanidin-3-glucoside, Docosahexaenoic acid : substance B	Promotes improved focus on near objects to enhance eye health in middle-aged and older individuals. Designed for alleviating difficulties reading small print up close, eliminating the need for reliance on glasses.	This product contains substance B, known to assist with near focus and alleviate neck and shoulder pain associated with eye strain.	Plastic pouch	Tablets
Product C	Non-digestible dextrin (dietary fibre): substance C	Reduces the absorption of dietary sugar and fat.	This product contains substance C, reported to suppress the absorption of dietary fat and sugar.	PET bottle	Liquid
Product D	Lactotripeptide (Valyl-Prolyl-Proline, Isoleucyl-Prolyl-Proline): substance D	Designed for individuals with high blood pressure.	This product contains substance D, reported to lower blood pressure in individuals with elevated levels. It is recommended specifically for those with high blood pressure.	PET bottle	Liquid
Product E	Pine bark-derived procyanidins (as procyanidin B1): substance E	Lowers bad cholesterol. Controls cholesterol (LDL).	This product contains substance E, reported to lower bad cholesterol (LDL) levels. Consequently, this beverage is recommended for individuals concerned about bad cholesterol (LDL).	PET bottle	Liquid

206 PET: Polyethylene terephthalate, LDL: Low-density lipoprotein

207

208 **Table 4.** Characteristics of participants of the user testing of foods with function claims.

Variable		Product A cohort (n=10)	Product B cohort (n=10)	Product C cohort (n=10)	Product D cohort (n=10)	Product E cohort (n=10)	Total (n=50)
Sex	Male	5	5	5	5	5	25
	Female	5	5	5	5	5	25
Age	30s	2	2	2	2	2	10
	40s	2	2	2	2	2	10
	50s	2	2	2	2	2	10
	60s	2	2	2	2	2	10
	70s	2	2	2	2	2	10
	High school	0	1	1	1	2	5
Educational level	Technical school or Two-year college	1	2	3	2	2	10
	Undergraduate degree	9	7	6	7	6	35
Regular use of written information as part of occupation	No	2	3	2	3	3	13
	Yes	8	7	8	7	7	37

209

210 **User-Testing Procedure**

211 The user- testing was conducted as follows:

212 (1) Preliminary preparation

213 i) Development of protocols [34]

214 The user testing procedures and methods were consolidated into a protocol. Specific
215 questions were developed for products.

216 ii) Interviewers

217 The two interviewers underwent training to standardise their levels of observational and
218 listening skills before engaging in user-testing. They are university employees with Ph.D. They
219 are qualified interviewers accredited by the Japanese Interviewer Association.

220 iii) Conducting a pilot test

221 **The user-testing of the pilot test was conducted from October 1st 2020 to January 31th,**
222 **2021 including.** We conducted a pilot test with three participants to assess the appropriateness of
223 the user-testing procedure, the manner and wording of the questions, and response time settings.

224 Subsequently, the protocol was adjusted based on the findings. Written informed consent was
225 obtained from those participants.

226 (2) User-testing

227 The user-testing took place between April 1st 2021 and December 30th 2022. Written
228 informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study.

229 i) Place and timing of the interview

230 A quiet room with adequate privacy was prepared for the participants to relax and be
231 interviewed at home or our work place. Each interview was scheduled to last approximately 1 h,
232 including the time needed to explain the user testing procedure and obtain consent. The interviews
233 were recorded with the participants' consent.

234 ii) User testing questions

235 We developed a dozen questions on labelling according to the characteristics of each of
236 the five FFC labels. Among them, a total of 10 questions were selected. The order of them was
237 arranged randomly rather than following the order on the label. These questions were short and
238 open-ended, as outlined in Table 5. Standardised questions were prepared addressing the
239 appropriate and safe use of the five products. Finally, participants were asked to provide feedback
240 on the comprehensibility, issues, design, and layout of the labels (Table 6).

241

242 **Table 5.** Questions on the content of foods with function claims labelling in the user test.

Q1	What should you pay attention to in your diet?
Q2	What should you do if you are taking medicines?
Q3	What is the recommended daily intake?
Q4	Who is not subject to the development of this product?
Q5	If you are ill, what should you do?
Q6	If you have allergies, where on the label can you find the relevant information?
Q7	What should you do if you experience an unpleasant reaction or develop a concerning symptom?
Q8	What precautions should be observed when storing this product?
Q9	What considerations should be kept in mind when handling this product?
Q10	Where can you find the contact details of the food business operator?

243

244 **Outcome Measurement**

245 The participants were asked to locate the relevant information, and the response time was
246 recorded for each question. In addition to providing answers, participants were asked to rephrase
247 the information in their own words to assess their understanding of the materials. Two cut-off
248 points, at 1 and 2 min of response time, were used to evaluate participants' understanding. The 1-
249 min cut-off was established based on our previous user testing on drug information, which
250 indicated that, on average, people need 1 min to understand every 1,000 characters of information
251 correctly [32,33]. Given that FFC labelling contains $\leq 1,000$ characters, in theory, 1 min should
252 suffice. The 2-min cut-off was also used based on the results from the pilot test, indicating that
253 participants needed approximately 2 min to answer each FFC-related question. The product was
254 considered to pass the test if 90% or more of the participants could find and correctly understand
255 the information for all 10 questions before the specified cut-off time. If a participant could not find
256 the answer within 2 min, their response time was recorded as 2 min.

257

258 **Qualitative Analysis of Participants' Comments**

259 Using semi-structured interviews, participants were asked to respond to the questions
260 following each user test (Table 6). In our analysis, we incorporated elements of the KJ Method, a
261 qualitative research strategy developed by Kawakita [35,36]. Qualitative analysis was conducted
262 for each question to gain insights from participants' responses.

263

264 **Table 6.** Questions on labelling foods with functional claims for participants' comments

Q1	Do you know what FFC are?
Q2	Besides FFC, there are FOSHU; do you know the difference between FFC and FOSHU?
Q3	If there are any words or sentences in the label contents that you find unclear, please specify.
Q4	Did you face any other challenges in comprehending the information provided in the labelled information?

265

266 **Comparison between the current version and the revised version of** 267 **the standardised wording**

268 Our analysis using the F-CCI indicated potential areas for improvement in the
269 standardised wording included in the FFC label, originally developed by CAA. Some of the
270 wordings were considered difficult to understand. Furthermore, the user testing conducted in this
271 study showed that the current wording was difficult to understand and time-consuming. Therefore,
272 we developed a revised version of the standardised wording to be used on the FFC label and
273 compared it against the current version developed by CAA (Fig 3). To enhance the
274 comprehensibility of container and packaging labels, a QR code can be added to the label. This
275 code can direct the user to a page with clear and concise explanations. The terms 'Submitted Claim'
276 and 'Individual Review', as well as the distinction between FFC and Food for Specified Health
277 Uses (FOSHU), were explained.

278 Participants assessed the current and revised versions on a 5-point scale (5 = very easy to
279 understand, 4 = easy to understand, 3 = neither, 2 = difficult to understand, and 1 = very difficult
280 to understand) across four questions (Q1: Size, legibility, and length; Q2: terms and sentences; Q3:
281 Usefulness of the information; Q4: Overall evaluation). To compare participant evaluations of the
282 current and the revised versions, we conducted a paired t-test with an alpha of 0.05. This analysis
283 was performed using SPSS Statistics Version 29.0.1.0 (IBM, Armonk, NY, USA).

284

285 **RESULTS**

286 **Accessibility and understandability of the FFC labelling in user-** 287 **testing**

288 When the 2-min cut-off was used, only one product (product B) among the five user-
289 tested products met the threshold of 90% for all 10 questions (Table 7-1). However, the overall
290 results were relatively positive. Products A and E achieved 90% or more correct responses for all
291 questions but one (Q6). Product C missed the passing score for Q4 and Q5. Product D, whose
292 labelling had the smallest font size, demonstrated the poorest performance of the five products,
293 with two questions (Q1, Q2) failing to meet the criterion. Questions 3 to 10 had high percentages
294 of 90% or more correct responses for all products, whereas a question on concomitant medications
295 (Q2) had the lowest percentages of correct responses across all five products, ranging from 70%
296 to 100%. When participants were able to find an answer to a question, it was considered they
297 understood its content.

298 When evaluated at 1 min, the overall performance was considerably poorer than that at 2
299 min, with no product meeting the 90% criterion (Table 7-2). Product A and B were still
300 satisfactory-performing products, missing the passing score for two questions (Q1, Q6). Product
301 E missed the passing score of four questions (Q2, Q6, Q7, Q8). Product D remained the worst-
302 performing product, not meeting the 90% threshold for more than half of the questions. The
303 proportion of correct answers within 1 min remained the lowest for Q6 (50–90%), with lower
304 proportions for Q1 (50–90%), Q2 (50–100%), Q8 (30–100%), and Q9 (30–100%), whereas all
305 products successfully passed Q3 and Q10 in less than 1 min. The median access times for each
306 product and question are listed in S1Table.

307
308 **Table 7-1.** The proportion of participants who correctly identified answers for each question
309 within 2 min.

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10
Product A	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	80%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Product B	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	90%	100%	100%	90%	100%
Product C	90%	100%	100%	80%	80%	100%	100%	100%	90%	100%
Product D	80%	70%	100%	100%	100%	90%	100%	100%	90%	100%
Product E	90%	90%	100%	100%	90%	70%	100%	90%	100%	100%

310

311 **Table 7-2.** The proportion of participants who correctly identified answers for each question
312 within 1 min.

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10
Product A	80%	100%	100%	100%	90%	50%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Product B	80%	90%	100%	100%	100%	80%	100%	90%	90%	90%
Product C	90%	70%	90%	70%	60%	90%	80%	30%	50%	90%
Product D	50%	50%	100%	100%	50%	80%	100%	80%	30%	90%
Product E	90%	70%	100%	100%	90%	70%	80%	80%	100%	100%

313

314 **Qualitative analysis of participants' comments**

315 For each question, comments were collected during the interviews, and similar comments
316 were grouped (Table 8). Many participants had insufficient knowledge of FFC and perceived it as
317 potentially beneficial for their health based on its image. Additionally, a significant number were
318 unaware of the distinction between FFC and FOSHU, with 30% incorrectly believing that FFC
319 was superior in effectiveness to FOSHU. The labelling included numerous technical terms such as
320 "Submitted Claim" and "Individual Review". Some sentences posed challenges in comprehension
321 and interpretation. For instance, it was difficult to discern the intended meaning of the statement
322 "This product is not a food developed for people suffering from diseases, minors, pregnant women
323 (including those planning a pregnancy), or lactating women." As a result, the participants were
324 unclear as to whether the relevant individuals were allowed to take it or not.

325 While the sales copy was easily understood because of its large font size and good design,
326 the labelling itself presented difficulties in reading due to the small font size and the shape of its
327 container or packaging.

328

329 **Table 8.** Classification of participants' comments on the labelling of FFC

Q1. What do you think Foods with Function Claims are?	I don't know what it's like. (21)	I don't understand it. I don't know the difference between drugs and food products.
	A little healthier image (26)	It may be foods with specialized functions. It may be somewhat effective. It is not for therapeutic purposes. It provides support for the disease. There is an image that many middle-aged and older people use it. It would be safe and effective.
	Others (3)	The government sets the national standards, and they are safe to use. It is safe, but not good to take a lot. I am doubtful about the effectiveness and think that SALES COPY is exaggerated
Q2. In addition to FFCs there are FOSHU, and what is the difference between them?	I don't know the difference. (22)	I don't know the difference. I can't distinguish between the two. Does not care. Not interested.
	FFCs are more effective than FOSHU. (15)	• FFCs would be more effective than FOSHU. • FFCs have a hygienic image. • FFCs are well advertised and known, so they seem to be effective.
	FOSHU are more effective than FFCs. (13)	• FOSHU would work better. • FOSHU have more corporate responsibility than Foods with Function Claims. • FOSHU would have more proven functionality.
Q3. If there are words or sentences in the content of the label that you do not understand, please indicate them specifically.	Words that are incomprehensible (or difficult to understand) (47)	• Technical jargon "Submitted Claim," "Individual Review," and "Afflicted with Disease." "Normal temperature, high temperature and humidity (not sure how much)" • Ingredient name (e.g., procyanidin, lactopeptide) • Wording regarding sales copies (e.g., multi-purpose support design, particular design)
	Text that is incomprehensible (or difficult to understand) (50)	• "This product is not a food developed for people suffering from diseases, minors, pregnant women (including those planning a pregnancy), or lactating women." • "There is no mention of whether or not those other than those in the development can take it, which makes it difficult to understand." • "There were two interpretations: that it may be taken and that it should not be taken." • "Under the responsibility of a food business operator, this product has been submitted to the Secretary General of the CAA as a product labelled with a statement that specified health outcomes can be achieved. However, unlike FOSHU, this product has not been individually evaluated by the Secretary-General of the CAA." • "This text explains FFCs and FOSHU, but is difficult to understand and interpret them."
Q4. What is difficult to understand or question in the contents of the label?	Storage and keeping precautions (21)	For the user, the preservation and storage precautions are similar, but the two are listed at different locations, making them difficult to understand them.
	Nutrition Facts, Functional Ingredients, Ingredients. (26)	Each item is difficult to understand because they seem similar.
	The distinction between what is important and what is not is not clear. (14)	The sales copy is easy to read with a large font and clear coloring, but the section on precautions (safety) is difficult to understand. I think the Submitted Claim is different from the sales copy.
	Font size (42)	The text sections are small and difficult to read. The labelling section is small compared to the sales copy.
	Design and coloring. (31)	The sales copy is well designed and easy to understand. Illustrations make it easier to understand. If the color of the text sections in the labelling is the same color as the background, it is not clear in the labelling

330

331 **Comparison between the current version and the revised version of** 332 **the standardised wording**

333 In this user- test of FFC, the participants' comments showed that the standardised wording
334 developed by CAA (current version) is difficult to understand, consistent with our previous finding.
335 Therefore, we developed a proposed revision to improve the original version developed by CAA
336 and conducted additional user testing to compare the two versions (Fig 3). "Due to limited space
337 on the packaging, a QR code is provided for accessing more detailed information, including
338 terminology, which can be obtained by scanning the QR code. 20 participants were asked to
339 compare them on a five-point scale for product B. The results of the evaluation are shown in Table
340 9. The revised version received higher ratings than the current version across all four elements
341 (Size, legibility, and length; terms and sentences; usefulness of the information; and overall
342 evaluation). The differences were all statistically significant.

343

344 **Fig 3.** The description is specified in the Food Labelling Standards and the proposed revision.

345

346 **Table 9.** Comparison between the current version and the revised version of the standardised
347 wording

Question	Current version	Revised version	P-value
Q1 Size, legibility, and length	3.1 ± 0.7	4.3 ± 0.6	.005
Q2 Terms and sentences	2.7 ± 0.6	4.3 ± 0.8	.001
Q3 Usefulness of the information	2.9 ± 0.5	4.3 ± 0.6	<.001
Q4 Overall evaluation	2.6 ± 0.7	4.6 ± 0.5	<.001

348 N=20

349 Current version: the standardised wording shown by the CAA in labelling

350 Revised version: Improvement Proposal based on the current version

351

352 **DISCUSSION**

353 To date, there has been a dearth of studies scrutinizing health food labels from both
354 provider and user perspectives, even in international contexts. In this study, we conducted user
355 testing and evaluated five FFC, which we had previously evaluated using the F-CCI. The results
356 of this user test showed that, in many cases, FFC labels provide inadequate explanations and are
357 difficult to understand. In consumer research on food labelling, qualitative research should be
358 conducted from the consumer's point of view, using a range of approaches including observation
359 and semi-directive interviews in addition to questionnaire surveys [37]. This study marks the first
360 user testing of FFC labelling, complemented by qualitative research, providing novel insights into
361 the evaluation of FFC labelling. When assessing the labelling of FFC, it is crucial to approach the
362 evaluation from the perspectives of both the provider and the end-user.

363 We previously evaluated FFC labelling from the provider's perspective [12]. None of the
364 five products met the acceptance criteria for the questions of F-CCI. Certain sentences indicated
365 by the CAA included technical jargon that was not commonly used by the public.

366 Important information was often not immediately accessible because it was not
367 summarized in the first section or was scattered throughout the label. Based on our previous user
368 testing on drug-related information and considering the word count of the FFC label, we initially
369 expected that one minute would suffice for consumers to capture and comprehend the information
370 accurately. However, the testing revealed consumers needed 2 minutes, twice as long as for drug-
371 related information. One factor contributing to the longer time required for response is that the
372 order of entry, position of entry, and font size in the FFC label are not specified, unlike those in
373 drug labels. This underscores a clear need for improvements in FFC labelling to enhance
374 information accessibility and consumer understanding. In particular, precautions for safe use need

375 to be more clearly alerted in view of the recent incident in Japan. It should also be noted that
376 physical health care is particularly important in the case of self-care.

377 However, during the interviews, it became evident that the participants not only lacked
378 sufficient knowledge about FFC, but also held misconceptions. This could pose a fundamental
379 challenge to the proper use of FFC. Taking into account consumers' health literacy levels,
380 information providers should provide easy-to-understand information.

381 The evaluations of the two surveys yielded largely consistent outcomes, highlighting the
382 need for improved labelling to enhance consumer safety and product usage. Overall, there is often
383 a focus on product promotion through design and sales copy rather than facilitating consumer
384 access to important information and comprehension of messages. In particular, precautions for safe
385 use must be presented in a manner that is more easily understandable for consumers.

386 One limitation of this study was that it only evaluated five FFC. In selecting the five
387 products, more than 100 FFC labelling were consulted, and the labelling showed a similar trend in
388 labelling content, with the wording portion recommended by the CAA accounting for about half
389 of the labelling. Nevertheless, valuable insights into consumer perceptions were garnered through
390 live feedback from 50 interviewees. However, future research should explore a broader spectrum
391 of FFC.

392 We believe that the standardized language used in food labelling requires improvement
393 as it currently contains numerous technical terms that pose difficulties for consumers to
394 comprehend. In the development of health information materials, such as FFC, the newly
395 established system facilitates the creation of optimal materials. This is achieved by enabling
396 providers to assess and enhance the materials using a communication index as a specified indicator,
397 followed by a validation process to ascertain their effectiveness and assess consumer

398 comprehension. In future, we intend to promote a website that we have developed to evaluate the
399 usefulness of health-related information materials [34].

400

401 **CONCLUSIONS**

402 In this study, we undertook the first user testing of FFC labelling in Japan to ascertain
403 users' perceptions and comprehension. The results indicated that consumers encountered
404 challenges in locating and understanding information within the current FFC labelling. The
405 evaluation of the user test underscores the need to improve the presentation of key information to
406 ensure safe and appropriate use of FFC, given that most consumers are not familiar with FFC.
407 Moreover, how information is currently provided on FFC labelling may not be adequate in certain
408 situations.

409 In the development and application of FFC labelling for effective risk-benefit
410 communication, a critical evaluation is imperative from both the provider's and user's viewpoints.
411 The importance of establishing an integrated method for assessing usefulness becomes paramount
412 in this context.

413 This initiative holds substantial significance as it has the potential to significantly
414 contribute to consumer decision-making and the secure utilization of health food products
415 including FFC.

416

417 **Author Contributions**

418 Conceptualization, Michiko Yamamoto; Data curation, Ken Yamamoto and Michiko Yamamoto;
419 Formal analysis, Ken Yamamoto and Rain Yamamoto; Funding acquisition, Michiko Yamamoto;
420 Investigation, Michiko Yamamoto, Hiromi Takano-Ohmuro and Junji Saruwatari; Methodology,

421 Michiko Yamamoto; Project administration, Michiko Yamamoto; Software, Ken Yamamoto,
422 Michiko Yamamoto and Junji Saruwatari; Supervision, Michiko Yamamoto and Rain Yamamoto;
423 Validation, Ken Yamamoto, Michiko Yamamoto, Hiromi Takano-Ohmuro, Rain Yamamoto and
424 Junji Saruwatari; Visualization, Ken Yamamoto and Michiko Yamamoto; Writing – original draft,
425 Ken Yamamoto and Michiko Yamamoto; Writing – review & editing, Ken Yamamoto, Michiko
426 Yamamoto, Hiromi Takano-Ohmuro, Rain Yamamoto and Junji Saruwatari.

427

428 **Funding**

429 This study was supported by JSPS KAKENHI (grant number JP19K11744) during fiscal years
430 2019–2022. The funder played no role in the study design, data collection/analysis, decision to
431 publish, or manuscript preparation.

432

433 **Institutional Review Board Statement**

434 The study was conducted according to the guidelines of the Declaration of Helsinki, and approved
435 by the Institutional Review Board of Kumamoto Graduate School of Pharmaceutical Sciences
436 (No.2039)

437

438 **Informed Consent Statement**

439 Written informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study.

440

441 **Data Availability Statement**

442 The data that support the findings of this study are available on request from the corresponding
443 author. The data are not publicly available due to privacy or ethical restrictions.

444

445 **Acknowledgments**

446 We thank all the participants of the user tests.

447

448 **References**

449 1. Umegaki K. Positive and negative aspects of food with health claims in Japan. J Nutr

450 Sci Vitaminol (Tokyo). 2015;61 Suppl: S133-S135.

451 doi: [10.3177/jnsv.61.S133](https://doi.org/10.3177/jnsv.61.S133) • [Google Scholar](#).

452 2. Chiba T, Sato Y, Kobayashi E, Umegaki K. Status of "food with function claims"-

453 Internet survey on consumers, physicians and pharmacists a year later. Shokuhin Eiseigaku

454 Zasshi. 2017;58: 96-106.

455 doi: [10.3358/shokueishi.58.96](https://doi.org/10.3358/shokueishi.58.96). (in Japanese) • [Google Scholar](#).

456 3. Chiba T, Kobayashi E, Sato Y, Ide K, Iketani R, Yamada H et al. Behaviors in response

457 to adverse events associated with health food use: internet survey of consumers, physicians and

458 pharmacists. Shokuhin Eiseigaku Zasshi. 2017;58: 234-240.

459 doi: [10.3358/shokueishi.58.234](https://doi.org/10.3358/shokueishi.58.234). (in Japanese) • [Google Scholar](#).

460 [apologizes-in-presser/](#)

461 4. Inoue Y. Kobayashi Pharma says blue mold compound may be cause of health

462 problems. The Japan Times. 2024 Mar 29 [Cited 2024 March 30]. Available from:

463 <https://www.japantimes.co.jp/news/2024/03/29/japan/science-health/kobayashi-pharma->

464 [apologizes-in-presser/](#)

465 5. Nakayama K, Osaka W, Togari T, Ishikawa H, Yonekura Y, Sekido A et al.

466 Comprehensive health literacy in Japan is lower than in Europe: a validated Japanese-language

- 467 assessment of health literacy. BMC Public Health. 2015;15: 505.
- 468 doi: [10.1186/s12889-015-1835-x](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-015-1835-x) • [Google Scholar](#).
- 469 6. HLS-EU Consortium. *Comparative report of health literacy in eight EU Member States.*
- 470 *The European health literacy survey HLS-EU.* [Cited 15 October 2023]. Available from:
- 471 <http://www.healthliteracy.eu>; 2012.
- 472 7. Kim EJ, Ellison B, Prescott MP, Nayga RM, Jr. Consumer comprehension of the
- 473 nutrition facts label: A comparison of the original and updated labels. Am J Health Promot.
- 474 2021;35: 648-657.
- 475 doi: [10.1177/0890117120983128](https://doi.org/10.1177/0890117120983128) • [Google Scholar](#).
- 476 8. Grunert KG, Scholderer J, Rogeaux M. Determinants of consumer understanding of
- 477 health claims. Appetite. 2011;56: 269-277.
- 478 doi: [10.1016/j.appet.2011.01.009](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2011.01.009) • [Google Scholar](#).
- 479 9. Chopera P, Chagwena DT, Mushonga NG. Food label reading and understanding in
- 480 parts of rural and urban Zimbabwe. Afr Health Sci. 2014;14: 576-584.
- 481 doi: [10.4314/ahs.v14i3.12](https://doi.org/10.4314/ahs.v14i3.12) • [Google Scholar](#).
- 482 10. Benson T, Lavelle F, McCloat A, Mooney E, Bucher T, Egan B et al. Are the claims to
- 483 blame? A qualitative study to understand the effects of nutrition and health claims on perceptions
- 484 and consumption of food. Nutrients. 2019;11.
- 485 doi: [10.3390/nu11092058](https://doi.org/10.3390/nu11092058) • [Google Scholar](#).
- 486 11. Ujiie N, Shimada M, Narui K, Watanabe K. A survey of Japanese consumers'
- 487 recognition and consciousness of the foods with function claims system. Jpn J Drug Inform.
- 488 2018;20: 104-110.
- 489 doi: [10.11256/jjdi.20.104](https://doi.org/10.11256/jjdi.20.104).

- 490 12. Yamamoto K, Takano-Ohmuro H, Saruwatari J, Yamamoto M. Development and
491 evaluation of a communication index for the labelling of foods with function claims. *Jpn J Drug*
492 *Inform.* 2023;25: 76-82.
493 doi: [10.11256/jjdi.25.76](https://doi.org/10.11256/jjdi.25.76). (in Japanese).
- 494 13. Director-General. Pharmaceutical Safety and Environmental Health Bureau, Ministry of
495 Health, Labour and Welfare, PSEHB/PSD Notification No. 244, Regarding the establishment of
496 the health functional food system. [Cited 15 October 2023]. Available from:
497 https://www.mhlw.go.jp/web/t_doc?dataId=00ta61111&dataType=1&pageNo=1; March 8, 2001.
498 (in Japanese).
- 499 14. Kamioka H, Tsutani K, Origasa H, Yoshizaki T, Kitayuguchi J, Shimada M et al.
500 Quality of systematic reviews of the foods with function claims in Japan: comparative before-
501 and after-evaluation of verification reports by the consumer affairs Agency. *Nutrients.* 2019;11:
502 1583.
503 doi: [10.3390/nu11071583](https://doi.org/10.3390/nu11071583) • [Google Scholar](https://scholar.google.com/citations?user=...).
- 504 15. Food with health claims. [Cited 15 October 2023]. Available from:
505 <https://www.mhlw.go.jp/english/topics/foodsafety/fhc/02.html>.
- 506 16. Consumer Affairs Agency, Government of Japan [Introduction]. [Cited 15 October
507 2023]. Available from:
508 https://www.caa.go.jp/policies/policy/food_labeling/information/pamphlets/pdf/151224_2.pdf;
509 2015.
- 510 17. Consumer Affairs Agency Search site for information on notified Food with functional
511 claims. [Cited 15 October 2023]. Available from: <https://www.fld.caa.go.jp/caaks/cssc01/search>.
- 512 18. List of foods for specified health use licensed (approved) items. [Cited 15 October

- 513 2023]. Available from:
514 https://www.caa.go.jp/policies/policy/food_labeling/foods_for_specified_health_uses/; updated
515 August 25, 2023.
- 516 19. Food labeling act. [Cited 15 October 2023]. Available from:
517 <https://www.japaneselawtranslation.go.jp/ja/laws/view/2601>.
- 518 20. Guidelines for Submitted Claims, etc. for Foods with Function Claims by CAA. [Cited
519 15 October 2023]. Available from:
520 https://www.caa.go.jp/policies/policy/food_labeling/foods_with_function_claims/assets/foods_w
521 [ith_function_claims_230929_0002.pdf](https://www.caa.go.jp/policies/policy/food_labeling/foods_with_function_claims/assets/foods_w); updated September 29, 2023.
- 522 21. National Institutes of Health. Clear & simple. [Cited 1 December, 2022]. Available
523 from: [https://www.nih.gov/institutes-nih/nih-office-director/office-communications-public-](https://www.nih.gov/institutes-nih/nih-office-director/office-communications-public-liaison/clear-communication/clear-simple)
524 [liaison/clear-communication/clear-simple](https://www.nih.gov/institutes-nih/nih-office-director/office-communications-public-liaison/clear-communication/clear-simple).
- 525 22. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. Toolkit for making written material clear
526 and effective. [Cited 1 December, 2022]. Available from: [https://www.cms.gov/Outreach-and-](https://www.cms.gov/Outreach-and-Education/Outreach/WrittenMaterialsToolkit)
527 [Education/Outreach/WrittenMaterialsToolkit](https://www.cms.gov/Outreach-and-Education/Outreach/WrittenMaterialsToolkit).
- 528 23. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. CDC clear communication index score
529 sheet. [Cited 1 December, 2022]. Available from: [https://www.cdc.gov/ccindex/pdf/full-index-](https://www.cdc.gov/ccindex/pdf/full-index-score-sheet.pdf)
530 [score-sheet.pdf](https://www.cdc.gov/ccindex/pdf/full-index-score-sheet.pdf).
- 531 24. Raynor DK, Dickinson D. Key principles to guide development of consumer medicine
532 information—content analysis of information design texts. *Ann Pharmacother*. 2009;43: 700-706.
533 doi: [10.1345/aph.1L522](https://doi.org/10.1345/aph.1L522) • [Google Scholar](https://scholar.google.com/citations?user=...).
- 534 25. Grime J, Blenkinsopp A, Raynor DK, Pollock K, Knapp P. The role and value of written
535 information for patients about individual medicines: a systematic review. *Health Expect*.

536 2007;10: 286-298.

537 doi: [10.1111/j.1369-7625.2007.00454.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1369-7625.2007.00454.x) • [Google Scholar](#).

538 26. Guideline on the readability of the labelling and package leaflet of medicinal products
539 for human use. 1st revision. [Cited 15 October 2023]. Available from:

540 <https://health.ec.europa.eu/system/files/2016->

541 [11/2009_01_12_readability_guideline_final_en_0.pdf](https://health.ec.europa.eu/system/files/2016-11/2009_01_12_readability_guideline_final_en_0.pdf); 2009.

542 27. Guideline on the packaging information of medicinal products for human use authorised
543 by the union by European Commission in 2015. [Cited 15 October 2023]. Available from:

544 http://ec.europa.eu/health/files/eudralex/vol-2/2015-02_packaging.pdf.

545 28. Sless D, Shrensky R. Writing about medicines for people : usability guidelines for
546 consumer medicine information; Australian Self-Medication Industry North Sydney. North
547 Sydney; 2007.

548 29. Raynor DK, Knapp P, Silcock J, Parkinson B, Feeney K. "User-testing" as a method for
549 testing the fitness-for-purpose of written medicine information. Patient Educ Couns. patient ed.
550 2011;83: 404-410.

551 doi: [10.1016/j.pec.2011.03.016](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2011.03.016) • [Google Scholar](#).

552 30. Brooke RE, Herbert NC, Isherwood S, Knapp P, Raynor DK. Balance appointment
553 information leaflets: employing performance-based user-testing to improve understanding. Int J
554 Audiol. 2013;52: 162-168.

555 doi: [10.3109/14992027.2012.745200](https://doi.org/10.3109/14992027.2012.745200) • [Google Scholar](#).

556 31. Tong V, Raynor DK, Aslani P. Developing alternative over-the-counter medicine label
557 formats: how do they compare when evaluated by consumers? Res Social Adm Pharm. 2018;14:
558 248-261.

559 doi: [10.1016/j.sapharm.2017.03.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sapharm.2017.03.003) • [Google Scholar](#).

560 32. Yamamoto M, Doi H, Yamamoto K, Watanabe K, Sato T, Suka M et al. Adaptation of
561 the European Commission-recommended user testing method to patient medication information
562 leaflets in Japan. *Drug Healthc Patient Saf.* 2017;9: 39-63.

563 doi: [10.2147/DHPS.S114985](https://doi.org/10.2147/DHPS.S114985) • [Google Scholar](#).

564 33. Yamamoto K, Doi H, Hirosawa I, Watanabe K, Yamamoto M. User testing of the
565 effectiveness of revised “Drug Guides for Patients in Japan” in paper-based and online formats
566 for an anticoagulant, *JAASP.* 2020;9: 37-43.

567 34. Website of. Development and validation of an integrated usefulness evaluation system
568 for consumer health information materials for self-care supported by Ministry of Education,
569 Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology Basic Research (C)(General). [Cited 15 October 2023].
570 Available from: https://www.pharm.kumamoto-u.ac.jp/Labs/tiryougaku/research/post_1.html.

571 35. Kawakita J. KJ method, Hasso Hou idea generation method. Tokyo, Japan: Chuokoron-
572 Shinsha, Inc.; 1967. (in Japanese).

573 36. Scupin R. The KJ method: A technique for analyzing data derived from Japanese
574 ethnology. *Hum Organ.* 1997;56: 233-237.

575 doi: [10.17730/humo.56.2.x335923511444655](https://doi.org/10.17730/humo.56.2.x335923511444655) • [Google Scholar](#).

576 37. Leathwood PD, Richardson DP, Sträter P, Todd PM, van Trijp HC. Consumer
577 understanding of nutrition and health claims: sources of evidence. *Br J Nutr.* 2007;98: 474-484.

578 doi: [10.1017/S000711450778697X](https://doi.org/10.1017/S000711450778697X) • [Google Scholar](#).

579

580 **Supporting information**

581 **S1 Fig. Types of food with health claims**

582 **S1 Table. Accessibility per question for each product during the user testing** IQR: interquartile
583 range

1. Provider's side

Evaluation Indicators

Target: Material providers

Format: Check sheet (Yes or No)

Key point for evaluation:

- Readability
- Recommendations for appropriate actions
- Notation of risk, etc.

Passing criteria;

90% of the indicators (questions) are yes.

Improve the material

2. User's side

User Testing

Target: Consumers

Format: Semi-structured Interview

Questions: Precautions for use, etc.
Open questions

Improve the description
and test again.

Passing criteria;

90% of users find the
answer and understand it.

User testing
(10 participants)

Creation of protocols
Interviewer training

Recruitment of
participants

Pilot testing of
target materials

Fig2

**Current version
(the standardized wording in FCCs labelling)**

Under the responsibility of a food business operator, this product has been submitted to the Secretary-General of the Consumer Affairs Agency as a product labelled with a statement that specified health outcomes can be achieved. However, unlike Foods for Specified Health Uses, this product has not undergone individual evaluation by the Secretary-General of the Consumer Affairs Agency. This product is not intended for the diagnosis, treatment, or prevention of disease. It is not a food developed for people suffering from diseases, infants, pregnant women (including those planning a pregnancy), or lactating women. Consult a physician if you are suffering from a disease, or a doctor or pharmacist if you are taking any medications. If you experience any changes in your health condition, discontinue use immediately and consult with a physician.

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.04.23.24306252>; this version posted April 25, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license.

Description specified in the Food Labelling Standards Article 3

**Proposed version
(Improvement proposal)**

Food with Functional Claims

- This product has been notified to the Consumer Affairs Agency (CAA) by the business operator in the hope of a specific health purpose. But it has not undergone individual evaluation by the CAA, unlike Food for Specified Health Uses.
- It is not intended to diagnose, treat, or prevent disease.
- Note that this food is not developed for people who are ill, minors, pregnant women (including those who may become pregnant) or nursing mothers. Consult a doctor pharmacist before use.
- Consult a doctor if you are ill, or a doctor or pharmacist if you are use drugs.
- **If you feel unwell, stop taking it right away and consult a doctor.**

Click here for detailed instructions.



To the following explanation by QR code



Food with Functional Claims: Based on the rules set by the government, this is a food product that can be labelled with its functionality if the classifier notifies the Commissioner of the Consumer Affairs Agency of the necessary matters, including scientific evidence regarding the safety and functionality of the food, prior to its sale. Unlike Food for Specified Health Use, the government does not conduct an examination, thus business operators are responsible for proper labelling based on chemical evidence.

Foods for Specified Health Uses: Food for Specified Health Use is a food that contains health-functional ingredients that affect the physiological functions of the body and can be labelled to indicate that a specific health purpose can be expected from its intake (indication of health use).

Individual evaluation: In order to sell a food as a Food for Specified Health Uses, each food must undergo a government review of its functionality and safety and be approved by the government. This is called an individual examination.

Submitted Claim: The content for which the business operator has notified the Commissioner of the Consumer Affairs Agency of the functionality based on scientific evidence is labelled. The contents that can be expected to have a specific health purpose (help maintain and promote health) are labelled.


Item	Foods for Specified Health Uses (FOSHU) System	Foods with Functional Claims (FFC) System
Individual Evaluation	Yes (by the Consumer Affairs Agency)	No
Notification to the Consumer Affairs Agency	Yes	Yes
Mark of approval by the Consumer Affairs Agency	Yes 	No
Disclosure of information on safety, functionality and quality	No obligation	Yes (the Consumer Affairs Agency Website [under a food business operators' responsibility])
How to demonstrate functionality and safety	Need to show scientific evidence by conducting human trials.	Need to show scientific evidence by human trial or by literature review.
Enforcement year of the system	1991	2015

Fig3




Fig1