

Tables and Figures

Table 1: Frames Identified and their Underlying Constructs/Arguments

Frame	Underlying Constructs/Arguments – Generated from open coding
Business framing of reformulation	<p>Business/market drivers of reformulation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reformulation will increase sales/profits <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reformulation will improve taste/sensory characteristics • Reformulation will increase marketing/advertising/PR opportunities • Competition • Consumer demand • Consumer and public perception <p>Business case against reformulation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reformulation will hurt business, e.g.: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Risk to sales from negative consumer perceptions ○ Low demand for healthier foods ○ Reformulation is expensive
Health framing of reformulation	<p>Reformulation will promote health</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health/nutrition stats of Americans is poor/getting worse • Product is unhealthy/causes negative health impacts • Dietary guidelines for American’s help guide reformulation <p>Public health case against reformulation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reformulation not effective at improving health, e.g.: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Number of products expands, unhealthy products not removed ○ Industry can work their way around reformulation ○ Reformulation being done is not enough ○ Reformulation does not mean it’s a healthy product
Political framing of reformulation	<p>Reformulation as a response to policy and its political implications</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reformulation is done in response to other policies • Reformulation is ‘part of the solution’ to obesity/NCDs • Need policy for change in food system • Policy loopholes • Evidence use is political <p>Reformulation and its relationship to power dynamics in nutrition policy making</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Food industry is under threat • Industry lobbying • Policy change is difficult/a compromise • Tension between what is right for health and what is good for business

Scott C, Nixon L. The shift in framing of food and beverage product reformulation in the United States from 1980 to 2015

Table 2: Framings identified in the Articles

	Articles Containing the Frame (n=278)	Articles with Primary Frame (N=278)	Articles with Secondary Frame (n=278)
Business Framing	234 (84%)	162 (58%)	35 (13%)
Business-Market Drivers of Reformulation	222 (80%)		
Business Case Against Reformulation	93 (33%)		
Health Framing	144 (52%)	62 (22%)	51 (18%)
Health Drivers of reformulation	124 (45%)		
Public health case against reformulation	71 (26%)		
Political framing of reformulation	116 (42%)	54 (20%)	28 (10%)
Politics/Policy	108 (39%)		
Power	47 (17%)		

Figure 1: Primary Frame by Year (Percent). Note: pre-1997 number are not complete due to missing sources in the Nexis database

