Public Health Nutrition: 22(14), 2682–2687 doi:10.1017/S1368980019001228

Commentary

Australia's sugar tale

Adyya Gupta[1,*], Caroline Miller[2,3], Jane Harford[4], Lisa G Smithers[3] and Annette Braunack-Mayer[1,3]

[1]School of Health and Society, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Wollongong, Wollongong, NSW 2522, Australia: [2]Health Policy Centre, South Australian Health and Medical Research Institute, Adelaide, South Australia, Australia: [3]School of Public Health, The University of Adelaide, Adelaide, South Australia, Australia: [4]Australian Research Centre for Population Oral Health, The University of Adelaide, Adelaide, South Australia, Australia

Submitted 20 June 2018: Final revision received 7 February 2019: Accepted 12 March 2019: First published online 23 May 2019

Abstract

Objective: To establish high intake of free sugars and its related disease burden as a significant public health challenge in Australia.
Design: We discuss five key actions to reduce intake of free sugars tailored to the Australian context. These strategies are informed by reviewing the global scientific evidence on the effectiveness of a range of policy responses to reduce intake of free sugars at the population level.
Setting: Australia.
Participants: Australian population.
Results: The five key actions to reduce population levels for intake of free sugars tailored to the Australian context include prioritising health in trade agreements and policy; introducing a fiscal policy supporting health and promoting food reformulation; regulating advertising and improving labelling; strengthening the current dietary guidelines; and encouraging healthy choices.
Conclusions: The adoption and implementation of the strategies discussed in the current commentary would aid in tackling the rising health burden from the intake of free sugars in Australia.

Keywords
Free sugars
Policy
Strategies
Australia

Chronic diseases are the major cause of preventable morbidity and premature mortality worldwide, accounting for 70 % of all deaths[1]. Excess intake of free sugars (all monosaccharides and disaccharides added to foods by the manufacturer, cook or consumer, plus the sugars that are naturally present in honey, syrups and fruit juices) is associated with increased risk of developing chronic diseases including dental caries[2,3] and obesity[4–7]. Sugar-sweetened beverage (SSB) intake is associated with an increased risk of developing type 2 diabetes[8–10]. Obesity is also causally linked to linked to heart disease and thirteen types of cancer[11]. Recognising this, the WHO set strong (<10 % of total energy intake) and conditional (<5 % of total energy intake) recommendations for daily intake of free sugars to improve oral and general health[12]. Many countries, including Australia, have not adopted these WHO recommendations to date[13].

Almost half of Australians exceed the <10 % and nearly 90 % exceed the <5 % intake of free sugars recommendations[14]. According to the Australian Health Survey 2011–2012, Australians on average consumed 57·8 (SD 1·4) g free sugars/d[14,15]. SSB are the largest source of free sugars for Australians[14]. The National Health Survey for 2014–2015[16] shows that 63·4 % of Australians are overweight or obese, nearly 1 million (4·4 %) have type 2 diabetes and three in every ten adults (25–44 years) have tooth decay (or dental caries)[17]. Despite a marginal decline in the intake of free sugars in the form of SSB[18], Australians are consuming free sugars above the recommended amounts. Collectively, this indicates that high intake of free sugars is a whole-of-population problem in Australia and that population-level interventions are required.

There is substantial international literature on the effectiveness of a range of policies to reduce high intake of free sugars in population diets. Sugar taxation (added and/or free sugars)[19] is one strategy that has now been implemented in many countries and states. Other policy

*Corresponding author: Email ag654@uowmail.edu.au

strategies that are effective and being considered in many countries include limiting marketing of foods and drinks[20–24] containing high amounts of free sugars (above the recommended levels), labelling of added and free sugars, and subsiding fruits and vegetables[25–27] to promote uptake of healthy alternatives.

However, Australia is a different case. There is no political consensus to introduce a tax on added and/or free sugars or an SSB tax at the least, despite international evidence and economic modelling demonstrating the health and economic benefits for Australia[25,28–30]. There is widespread exposure to unhealthy food advertising and the current standards and codes that govern food advertising are largely industry regulated[31,32].

Below we discuss five key approaches to reduce intake of free sugars at the population level tailored to the Australian context.

1. Include health in trade and policy

For Australia to maintain its public health leadership in the world, it is vital to ensure that all trade and investment agreements (such as the Trans-Pacific Partnership) are made in the country's best interests, including public health interest.

Recent disputes around tobacco suggest the potential risk that international trade and agreements create for domestic public health policy[33]. Several nations, including Australia, have recently been forced to defend their tobacco control policies against legal action raised by tobacco companies in international trade and investment. Australia's ongoing commitment to tobacco plain packaging laws[34] is a clear example where Australia successfully prioritised the health of its citizens in the face of enormous tobacco industry opposition. Trade and investment agreements must not prevent or deter Australia, or other countries, from implementing policies to protect the health of its citizens.

As the influence of the sugar industry is evident in Australia's investment policies[35], trade agreements involving added and free sugars must have protections for public health policy to create healthy environments for better health outcomes. It is vital to refocus policies from one that prioritises industry profits to an approach that gives adequate weight to health[36]. Profit-only negotiations gives large food corporations the power to weaken the government's ability to introduce and enact public health policies[37]. Furthermore, to improve confidence that public health will not be compromised, governments should make the trade negotiation process more transparent and open to public scrutiny.

2. Introduce a fiscal policy supporting health and promote food reformulation

Consistent with international evidence on the effectiveness of SSB tax[30,38–40], the Australian Government should implement a fiscal policy on the major source of free sugars, i.e. SSB. This could be the most effective and viable policy action to reduce free sugars consumption.

In addition to reducing SSB consumption, taxation also encourages manufacturers to reformulate their products by reducing free sugars content. For reformulation to be successful, it is essential that all manufacturers sign up for it. Reformulation has been reported in advance of a two-tiered taxation system in the UK, where beverages containing added sugars are taxed at a higher rate[41–43]. Tesco (a British multinational grocery and general merchandise retailer) reduced the added sugars content in its home-brand products[41]. The UK has also previously been successful with its salt reformulation strategy[44]. Similar reformulations have also occurred in France where Nestlé and Orangina Schweppes have reduced added sugars in foods and drinks[42]. Although evaluation of the effectiveness of these actions is currently underway, modelling studies of the cost-effectiveness of reducing the energy content of SSB has shown that reformulation is a promising strategy that would yield cost savings and long-term health gains for Australia[45]. A core objective of Australia's Healthy Food Partnership[46] (a joint alliance between Australian Government, the food industry and public health) is to 'support industry to reformulate their foods', hence the alliance has the potential to endorse food reformulations with authority and clarity. Setting clear food reformulation targets, aligned with the Australian Dietary Guidelines, would strengthen the impact of this approach, creating a healthier food environment[47].

3. Regulate advertising and improve labelling

There is evidence that ubiquitous marketing of unhealthy food products influences populations' food choices and consumption[48]. Coca Cola, PepsiCo and Schweppes spent nearly $AU 29·6 million, $AU 12·3 million and $AU 10 million, respectively, on media advertising in Australia in 2009[49]. Despite the presence of legislated children's television standards in Australia[50], television advertising of unhealthy foods (includes foods high in fat, sugar and salt) is largely governed by industry codes and self-regulation. Large proportions of children are routinely exposed to unhealthy food and beverage advertising[51]. There is a need for regulatory reform and increased government oversight to limit the volume and content of unhealthy food advertisements, especially for foods high in added and free sugars content. The Obesity Policy Coalition[52,53] has long called for a regulation to protect children from unhealthy food and beverage advertising. Sweden, Norway and Quebec (Canada) have passed laws restricting advertising directed at young children[54]. Experience from both Australia and overseas demonstrates that regulatory measures intended to curb children's exposure to

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1368980019001228 Published online by Cambridge University Press

unhealthy food and beverage advertising need to capture actual exposure and not just advertisers' intent, which is mostly subjective and vulnerable to exploitation.

Another potential point of policy intervention is food labelling laws. At present, there is no clear way for Australian consumers to determine the amount of added or free sugars in the foods and beverages they consume. Product ingredients must be listed on the package in descending order (by ingoing weight). When present, sugars are included in ingredient lists, but sugar goes by many names. Furthermore, nutrition information panels on Australian products describe total sugars only (grouping together, for example, sugars naturally occurring in dairy with added sugars). Transparency would be increased if Australia were, at a minimum, to require sugars in contents lists to be grouped, which is the case in Canada[55], and require added sugars to appear separately in nutrition information panels, as is now required in the USA[56].

WHO recommends the use of interpretive nutrition labels with simplified information on the front of packaged food. Australia and New Zealand employ a Health Star Rating (HSR) system; this is a government-endorsed front-of-pack nutrition labelling system that is voluntary. The HSR system assigns a rating from 0·5 (least healthy) to 5 stars (most healthy) based on the nutritional composition of the product. Limitations of the current algorithm allow many juices to be awarded 5 stars, despite being very high in free sugars. The HSR system is currently under review[57] and the handling of beverages high in free sugars, as well as added sugars compared with total sugars across all categories, is an important opportunity for improvement.

Internationally there are moves to require front-of-pack consumer warning labels about high sugar content (as well as salt and saturated fat). Chile requires warning labels for products high in added sugars[58]. Israel has passed legislation requiring the same from 2020[59] and other jurisdictions including Canada and Australia are currently reviewing the front-of-pack warning-style labels for products high in sugar. There is substantial room for improvement in Australia's interpretive front-of-pack labelling. A system is required that adequately takes account of free sugars, provides consumers with clear guidance on genuinely healthier options, gives a warning for high sugar and is mandatory to ensure universal application.

4. Strengthen Australian Dietary Guidelines

Although previously the recommendation to limit free sugars to <10 % of energy by the WHO report on *Diet, Nutrition and the Prevention of Chronic Diseases*[60] was briefly discussed in Australia's Nutrient Reference Values (2006)[61], the recommendation was not included the Australian Dietary Guidelines. The Australian Dietary Guidelines, last updated in 2013, advise Australians to 'limit intake' of foods and drinks containing added sugars[13]. Thus, it is time for Australia to review and update its evidence-based guidelines to include the WHO's recommendations on thresholds for intake of free sugars. Furthermore, emphasising limits on the intake of fruit juices is important given the high amounts of free sugars present in them and their high intake by the population[62]. Reviewing the guidelines every 5 years to ensure consistency with evidence is also desirable.

5. Introduce other measures to encourage healthier choices

There are multiple other important environmental drivers of free sugars consumption that should be considered as potential opportunities for intervention to reduce free sugars consumption. Improving the availability and uptake of water[63] as an alternative to drinks containing high free sugars by placing clean water fountains in and around large public places such as shopping malls and food courts is an opportunity. Replacing the unhealthy food with healthy alternatives in vending machines and food outlets within health-care, university and workplace settings is another measure to promote healthy choices[64,65]. Reducing exposures to sweet snacks at the checkout by removing and/or replacing them with healthier alternatives may positively influence food purchasing behaviours[66,67]. As mass media campaigns have been proven to change smoking behaviour[68–70], similar results could be achieved to reduce free sugars consumption[71–73].

Conclusion

In conclusion, the actions required to tackle high intake of free sugars must include a mix of strategies. Although these are discussed in the Australian context in the current commentary, these strategies are applicable worldwide. Key actions include: prioritising health in trade agreements and policy; introducing a fiscal policy supporting health and promoting food reformulation; regulating advertising and improving labelling; strengthening the current dietary guidelines; and encouraging healthy choices. For countries such as Australia, where free sugars are consumed above the levels recommended for prevention of non-communicable diseases, there is a need, first, to recognise that high intake of free sugars is a population problem and that it is modifiable. Second, with the understanding that population-based goals differ from recommendations for individuals, implementing a comprehensive, public health approach to tackle diets high in free sugars and promote overall healthy eating would be valuable. Third, given the evidence on the cost-effectiveness of population-level interventions, it would be effective and efficient to

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1368980019001228 Published online by Cambridge University Press

implement population-based strategies to reduce the intake of free sugars. Finally, keeping health in focus, the government along with community support can help create a healthier environment that facilitates and maintains good health for its population.

Acknowledgements

Financial A.G. currently receives a University Postgraduate Award and an International Postgraduate Tuition Award scholarship from University of Wollongong. A.B.-M. is a previous recipient of a Healthy Laws grant funded by the Australian National Preventive Health Agency (grant number 182BRA2011) and is currently a head and professor of the Health and Society Unit at the University of Wollongong. The funders had no role in the design, analysis or writing of this commentary. *Conflict of interest:* None. *Authorship:* All authors equally contributed to the conceptualisation and development of this manuscript. A.G. wrote the initial draft and all authors provided feedback and suggestions on multiple drafts of the manuscript. All authors also approved the final manuscript. *Ethics of human subject participation:* Not applicable.

References

1. World Health Organization (2014) *Global Status Report on Noncommunicable Diseases 2014*. Geneva: WHO; available at https://www.who.int/nmh/publications/ncd-status-report-2014/en/
2. Moynihan P & Kelly S (2014) Effect on caries of restricting sugars intake: systematic review to inform WHO guidelines. *J Dent Res* **93**, 8–18.
3. Moynihan P (2016) Sugars and dental caries: evidence for setting a recommended threshold for intake. *Adv Nutr* **7**, 149–156.
4. Gibson S (2008) Sugar-sweetened soft drinks and obesity: a systematic review of the evidence from observational studies and interventions. *Nutr Res Rev* **21**, 134–147.
5. Hu FB (2013) Resolved: there is sufficient scientific evidence that decreasing sugar-sweetened beverage consumption will reduce the prevalence of obesity and obesity-related diseases. *Obes Rev* **14**, 606–619.
6. Bray GA & Popkin BM (2014) Dietary sugar and body weight: have we reached a crisis in the epidemic of obesity and diabetes? Health be damned! Pour on the sugar. *Diabetes Care* **37**, 950–956.
7. Te Morenga L, Mallard S & Mann J (2013) Dietary sugars and body weight: systematic review and meta-analyses of randomised controlled trials and cohort studies. *BMJ* **346**, e7492.
8. Imamura F, O'Connor L, Ye Z *et al.* (2015) Consumption of sugar sweetened beverages, artificially sweetened beverages, and fruit juice and incidence of type 2 diabetes: systematic review, meta-analysis, and estimation of population attributable fraction. *BMJ* **351**, h3576.
9. Wang M, Yu M, Fang L *et al.* (2015) Association between sugar-sweetened beverages and type 2 diabetes: a meta-analysis. *J Diabetes Invest* **6**, 360–366.
10. Tsilas CS, de Souza RJ, Mejia SB *et al.* (2017) Relation of total sugars, fructose and sucrose with incident type 2 diabetes: a systematic review and meta-analysis of prospective cohort studies. *CMAJ* **189**, E711–E720.
11. Lauby-Secretan B, Scoccianti C, Loomis D *et al.* (2016) Body fatness and cancer – viewpoint of the IARC Working Group. *N Engl J Med* **375**, 794–798.
12. World Health Organization (2015) Guideline: *Sugars Intake for Adults and Children*. Geneva: WHO; available at http://who.int/nutrition/publications/guidelines/sugars_intake/en
13. National Health and Medical Research Council (2013) Australian *Dietary Guidelines*. Canberra: NHMRC; available at http://www.nhmrc.gov.au/guidelines-publications/n55
14. Australian Bureau of Statistics (2016) Australian Health Survey: consumption of added sugars, 2011–12. http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/mf/4364.0.55.011 (accessed June 2017).
15. Gupta A, Smithers LG, Braunack-Mayer A *et al.* (2018) How much free sugar do Australians consume? Findings from a national survey. *Aust N Z J Public Health* **42**, 533–540.
16. Australian Bureau of Statistics (2015) National Health Survey: first results, 2014–15. https://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/Lookup/by%20Subject/4364.0.55.001~2014-15~Main%20Features~Key%20findings~1 (accessed September 2016).
17. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (2014) Oral *Health* and *Dental Care* in Australia: *Key Facts* and *Figures Trends* 2014. Canberra: AIHW; available at http://www.aihw.gov.au/reports/dental-oral-health/key-facts-figures-trends-2014/contents/table-of-contents
18. Australian Bureau of Statistics (2011) Consumption of added sugars – a comparison of 1995 to 2011–12. Australian Health Survey: consumption of added sugars, 2011–12. http://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/Lookup/4364.0.55.011Main+Features202011-12?OpenDocument (accessed July 2015).
19. The global social movement NCD Free (2018) Implemented sugar taxes worldwide [An infographic detailing sugar taxes that have been implemented around the world]. Twitter: @NCDFREE.
20. Barragan NC, Noller AJ, Robles B *et al.* (2014) The 'sugar pack' health marketing campaign in Los Angeles County, 2011–2012. *Health Promot Pract* **15**, 208–216.
21. Beaudoin CE, Fernandez C, Wall JL *et al.* (2007) Promoting healthy eating and physical activity short-term effects of a mass media campaign. *Am J Prev Med* **32**, 217–223.
22. Bollard T, Maubach N, Walker N *et al.* (2016) Effects of plain packaging, warning labels, and taxes on young people's predicted sugar-sweetened beverage preferences: an experimental study. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act* **13**, 95.
23. Clarke B & Svanaes S (2014) Literature review of research on online food and beverage marketing to children: Produced for the Committee of Advertising Practice (ACP) by Family Kids and Youth. http://www.asa.org.uk/asset/cd73763f-8619-4939-be6421d122566ea7/ (accessed May 2018).
24. Gordon R, McDermott L, Stead M *et al.* (2006) The effectiveness of social marketing interventions for health improvement: what's the evidence? *Public Health* **120**, 1133–1139.
25. Cobiac LJ, Tam K, Veerman L *et al.* (2017) Taxes and subsidies for improving diet and population health in Australia: a cost-effectiveness modelling study. *PLoS Med* **14**, e1002232.
26. Niebylski ML, Redburn KA, Duhaney T *et al.* (2015) Healthy food subsidies and unhealthy food taxation: a systematic review of the evidence. *Nutrition* **31**, 787–795.
27. Thow A, Downs S & Jan S (2014) A systematic review of the effectiveness of food taxes and subsidies to improve diets: understanding the recent evidence. *Nutr Rev* **72**, 551–565.
28. Lee JY & Giannobile WV (2016) Taxes on sugar-sweetened beverages: a strategy to reduce epidemics of diabetes, obesity, and dental caries? *J Dent Res* **95**, 1325–1326.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1368980019001228 Published online by Cambridge University Press

29. Veerman JL, Sacks G, Antonopoulos N *et al.* (2016) The impact of a tax on sugar-sweetened beverages on health and health care costs: a modelling study. *PLoS One* **11**, e0151460.
30. Colchero MA, Rivera-Dommarco J, Popkin BM *et al.* (2017) In Mexico, evidence of sustained consumer response two years after implementing a sugar-sweetened beverage tax. *Health Aff (Millwood)* **36**, 564–571.
31. Australian Communications and Media Authority (2016) Regulatory responsibility. http://www.acma.gov.au/theACMA/About/Corporate/Responsibilities/regulation-responsibilities-acma (accessed January 2018).
32. Australian Association of National Advertisers (2004) Commercial television industry code of practice. http://www.acma.gov.au/Industry/Broadcast/Television/TV-content-regulation/commercial-television-code-of-practice-tv-content-regulation-i-acma (accessed November 2017).
33. Attorney-General's Department, Australian Government (2017) Tobacco plain packaging – investor-state arbitration. http://www.ag.gov.au/Internationalrelations/InternationalLaw/Pages/Tobaccoplainpackaging.aspx (accessed January 2018).
34. Department of Health, Australian Government (2018) Evaluation of tobacco plain packaging in Australia. http://www.health.gov.au/internet/main/publishing.nsf/content/tobacco-plain-packaging-evaluation (accessed January 2018).
35. Australian Sugar Industry Alliance (2010) *Submission to Productivity Commission Review of Bilateral and Regional Trade Agreements*. Brisbane, QLD: Australian Sugar Industry Alliance; available at http://www.pc.gov.au/inquiries/completed/trade-agreements/submissions/sub015.pdf
36. Public Health Association of Australia (2018) PACER Plus: trade agreements must consider health impacts on developing countries and on Australia. http://www.phaa.net.au/documents/item/2681 (accessed May 2018).
37. Friel S, Gleeson D, Thow A-M *et al.* (2013) A new generation of trade policy: potential risks to diet-related health from the Trans Pacific Partnership agreement. *Global Health* **9**, 46.
38. Cabrera Escobar MA, Veerman JL, Tollman SM *et al.* (2013) Evidence that a tax on sugar sweetened beverages reduces the obesity rate: a meta-analysis. *BMC Public Health* **13**, 1072.
39. Colchero MA, Popkin BM, Rivera JA *et al.* (2016) Beverage purchases from stores in Mexico under the excise tax on sugar sweetened beverages: observational study. *BMJ* **352**, h6704.
40. Colchero MA, Salgado JC, Unar-Munguía M *et al.* (2015) Changes in prices after an excise tax to sweetened sugar beverages was implemented in Mexico: evidence from urban areas. *PLoS One* **10**, e0144408.
41. Quinn I (2015) Tesco first to commit to sugar reduction programme. *The Grocer*, 18 May. http://www.thegrocer.co.uk/buying-and-supplying/health/tesco-first-to-commit-to-sugar-reduction-programme/518722.article (accessed January 2018).
42. World Health Organization (2017) Incentives and disincentives for reducing sugar in manufactured foods: an exploratory supply chain analysis. A set of insights for Member States in the context of the WHO European Food and Nutrition Action Plan 2015–2020. http://www.evidence.nhs.uk/document?id=1914507&returnUrl=Search%3Fps%3D20%26q%3DPricing%26s%3DDate&q=Pricing (accessed January 2018).
43. Public Health England (2017) Sugar reduction and wider reformulation. http://www.gov.uk/government/collections/sugar-reduction (accessed March 2018).
44. Macgregor GA & Hashem KM (2014) Action on sugar – lessons from UK salt reduction programme. *Lancet* **383**, 929–931.
45. Crino M, Herrera AMM, Ananthapavan J *et al.* (2017) Modelled cost-effectiveness of a package size cap and a kilojoule reduction intervention to reduce energy intake from sugar-sweetened beverages in Australia. *Nutrients* **9**, E9813.
46. Australian Department of Health (2016) Healthy Food Partnership. http://www.health.gov.au/internet/main/publishing.nsf/content/healthy-food-partnership (accessed January 2018).
47. Obesity Policy Coalition and Global Obesity Centre (2017) *Tipping the Scales: Australian Obesity Prevention Consensus*. Melbourne, VIC: Obesity Policy Coalition; available at http://www.opc.org.au/downloads/tipping-the-scales/tipping-the-scales.pdf
48. Bialkova S, Sasse L & Fenko A (2016) The role of nutrition labels and advertising claims in altering consumers' evaluation and choice. *Appetite* **96**, 38–46.
49. Nielsen (2010) Special report – top media advertisers [Non-alcoholic beverages]. *AdNews*, 26 March. http://www.adnews.com.au/07878040-6C6D-11DF-BCB9005056B05D57 (accessed January 2018).
50. Australian Communications and Media Authority (2009) Children's television standards. http://www.acma.gov.au/-/media/Diversity-Localism-and-Accessibility/Advice/pdf/childrens_tv_standards_2009-pdf.pdf (accessed September 2017).
51. Smithers L, Haag D, Agnew B *et al.* (2018) Food advertising on Australian television: frequency, duration and monthly pattern of advertising from a commercial network (4 channels) for the entire 2016 year. *J Paediatr Child Health* **54**, 962–967.
52. MacKay SAN, Martin J & Swinburn B (2011) *A Comprehensive Approach to Protecting Children from Unhealthy Food Advertising*. Melbourne, VIC: Obesity Policy Coalition; available at http://www.opc.org.au/downloads/submissions/protecting-children-unhealthy-food-advertising-promotion.pdf
53. Obesity Policy Coalition (2018) *Policy Brief: Food Advertising to Children*. Melbourne, VIC: Obesity Policy Coalition; available at http://www.opc.org.au/downloads/policy-briefs/food-advertising-to-children.pdf
54. Caraher M, Landon J & Dalmeny K (2006) Television advertising and children: lessons from policy development. *Public Health Nutr* **9**, 596–605.
55. Canadian Food Inspection Agency (2018) Carbohydrate and sugars claims. http://inspection.gc.ca/food/labelling/former-food-labelling-for-industry/former-nutrient-content/former-specific-claim-requirements/eng/1516637484495/1516637485428?chap=11 (accessed May 2018).
56. Food and Drug Administration (2017) Changes to the nutrition facts label. http://www.fda.gov/Food/GuidanceRegulation/GuidanceDocumentsRegulatoryInformation/LabelingNutrition/ucm385663.htm (accessed January 2018).
57. Health Star Rating System (2018) Formal review of the system after five years of implementation (June 2014 to June 2019). http://healthstarrating.gov.au/internet/healthstarrating/publishing.nsf/Content/formal-review-of-the-system-after-five-years (accessed May 2018).
58. FratiniVergano (2015) Chile adopts warning statements in the form of a black STOP sign for 'HFSS foods' (i.e., foods high in fat, salt or sugar). *Trade Perspectives*© issue 16. http://www.fratinivergano.eu/static/upload/1/1/15.09_.11_TP_Issue_16_.pdf (accessed January 2018).
59. State of Israel, Ministry of Health (2019) Food label and nutritional labeling. http://www.health.gov.il/English/Topics/FoodAndNutrition/Nutrition/Adequate_nutrition/Pages/labeling.aspx (accessed February 2019).
60. World Health Organization (2003) *Diet, Nutrition and the Prevention of Chronic Diseases. WHO Technical Report*

Series no. 916. Geneva: WHO; available at http://www.who.int/hpr/NPH/docs/who_fao_expert_report.pdf
61. National Health and Medical Research Council, Australian Government Department of Heakth and Ageing & New Zealand Ministry of Health (2006) *Nutrient Reference Values for Australia and New Zealand*. Canberra: NHMRC; available at http://www.nhmrc.gov.au/guidelines-publications/n35-n36-n37
62. Singh GM, Micha R, Khatibzadeh S *et al.* (2015) Global, regional, and national consumption of sugar-sweetened beverages, fruit juices, and milk: a systematic assessment of beverage intake in 187 countries. *PLoS One* **10**, e0124845.
63. Vargas-Garcia EJ, Evans CEL, Prestwich A *et al.* (2017) Interventions to reduce consumption of sugar-sweetened beverages or increase water intake: evidence from a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Obes Rev* **18**, 1350–1363.
64. Olstad DL, Goonewardene LA, McCargar LJ *et al.* (2014) Choosing healthier foods in recreational sports settings: a mixed methods investigation of the impact of nudging and an economic incentive. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act* **11**, 6.
65. Newman L, Javanparast S, Baum F *et al.* (2015) Evidence review: settings for addressing the social determinants of health inequities. http://www.vichealth.vic.gov.au/~/media/resourcecentre/publicationsandresources/health inequalities/fair foundations/full reviews/healthequity_settings-evidence-review.pdf (accessed August 2016).
66. Thornton LE, Cameron AJ, McNaughton SA *et al.* (2012) The availability of snack food displays that may trigger impulse purchases in Melbourne supermarkets. *BMC Public Health* **12**, 194–194.
67. World Health Organization (1986) *The Ottawa Charter for Health Promotion*. Geneva: WHO; available at http://www.who.int/healthpromotion/conferences/previous/ottawa/en/
68. Wakefield M, Durkin S, Spittal M *et al.* (2008) Impact of tobacco control policies and mass media campaigns on monthly adult smoking prevalence. *Am J Public Health Aff* **98**, 1443–1450.
69. Brinn MP, Carson KV, Esterman AJ *et al.* (2010) Mass media interventions for preventing smoking in young people. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* issue 11, CD001006.
70. Durkin S, Brennan E & Wakefield M (2012) Mass media campaigns to promote smoking cessation among adults: an integrative review. *Tob Control* **21**, 127–138.
71. Lane H, Porter K, Estabrooks P *et al.* (2016) A systematic review to assess sugar-sweetened beverage interventions for children and adolescents across the socioecological model. *J Acad Nutr Diet* **116**, 1295–1307.
72. Zoellner JM, Hedrick VE, You W *et al.* (2016) Effects of a behavioral and health literacy intervention to reduce sugar-sweetened beverages: a randomized-controlled trial. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act* **13**, 38.
73. Hedrick VE, Davy BM, You W *et al.* (2017) Dietary quality changes in response to a sugar-sweetened beverage-reduction intervention: results from the Talking Health randomized controlled clinical trial. *Am J Clin Nutr* **105**, 824–833.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1368980019001228 Published online by Cambridge University Press