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Abstract

Objective: In politically-contested health debates stakeholders on both sides present arguments and evidence in order to influence public opinion and the political agenda. The aim of this study was to examine whether stakeholders in the soft drinks industry levy (SDIL) debate sought to establish or undermine the acceptability of this policy through the news media and how this compared to similar policy debates in relation to tobacco and alcohol industries.

Design: Quantitative and qualitative content analysis of newspaper articles discussing sugar-sweetened beverage (SSB) taxation published in 11 UK newspapers between 1 April 2015 and 30 November 2016, identified through the Nexis database. Direct stakeholder citations were entered into NVivo to allow inductive thematic analysis and comparison with an established typology of industry stakeholder arguments used by the alcohol and tobacco industries.

Setting: UK newspapers.

Subjects: Proponents and opponents of SSB tax/SDIL cited in UK newspapers.

Results: 491 newspaper articles cited stakeholders’ (n=287) arguments in relation to SSB taxation (n=1,761: 65% supportive and 35% opposing). Stakeholders’ positions broadly reflected their vested interests. Inconsistencies arose from: changes in ideological position; insufficient clarity on the nature of the problem to be solved; policy priorities; consistency with academic rigour. Both opposing and supportive themes were comparable with the alcohol and tobacco industry typology.

Conclusions: Public health advocates were particularly prominent in the UK newspaper debate surrounding the SDIL. Advocates in future policy debates might benefit from seeking a similar level of prominence and avoiding inconsistencies by being clearer about the policy objective and mechanisms.

Keywords: Sugar-sweetened beverage taxation; SSB tax; soft drinks industry levy; SDIL; public health policy; media content analysis; unhealthy commodity industries, UCIs.
Introduction

Consumption of free sugars by UK adults accounts for 16-17% of their total energy intake\(^{(1)}\), more than triple the 5% maximum recommended by the World Health Organisation (WHO)\(^{(2)}\). An econometric analysis of repeated cross-sectional data on diabetes and nutritional components of food from 175 countries found that sugar availability is a statistically significant determinant of diabetes prevalence rates worldwide\(^{(3)}\). Briggs et al. estimated that a 20% tax on sugar-sweetened beverages (SSBs) might result in a 15% reduction in sugar consumption, potentially preventing approximately 180,000 people in the UK from becoming obese each year\(^{(4)}\). Evidence from countries such as Mexico\(^{(5; 6)}\), Denmark\(^{(7)}\) and parts of the USA\(^{(8)}\) likewise suggest that SSB taxation might be an effective policy in tackling obesity, particularly as part of a multipronged approach\(^{(9; 10)}\).

In March 2016, the UK Government announced a Soft Drinks Industry Levy (SDIL), which came into force in April 2018\(^{(11; 12)}\). As anticipated, the SDIL led the soft drinks industry to reformulate their products to contain less sugar in order to reduce their liability to pay the levy\(^{(13; 14)}\). The SDIL represents an important part of the Government’s plan to reduce obesity\(^{(15)}\) and dental decay in children\(^{(16; 17)}\), and also prevent non-communicable diseases (NCDs) associated with excess sugar consumption\(^{(18; 19; 20; 21; 22; 23)}\). As such, the SDIL has been deemed particularly beneficial to young people and low income populations who suffer the highest burden of diseases associated with excess sugar consumption\(^{(16; 17)}\). The SDIL might thus also reduce health inequalities\(^{(24; 25)}\).

Regulatory attempts to reduce consumption of harmful commodities are often met with opposition from producers and marketers of those commodities, and those stakeholders have been shown to use common strategies in resisting the introduction of such upstream regulation. For example, Mialon et al’s recent systematic review of tactics used by the processed food industry in Australia identified similarities to anti-regulation strategies used by the tobacco and alcohol industries\(^{(26)}\). Like other so-called unhealthy commodity industries (UCIs) they used front groups, lobbying and industry-funded research: to emphasise industry responsibility and the effectiveness of self-regulation; to question the effectiveness of statutory regulation; and frame excessive consumption as the responsibility of individuals, rather than the state\(^{(27; 28; 29; 30)}\). More recently Petticrew et al suggested that the arguments and language used by the alcohol, food, soda and gambling industries may reflect the existence of a cross-industry ‘playbook’, whose use results in the undermining of effective public health policies\(^{(31)}\). In contrast, there is less evidence of public health advocates using similar tactics to gain support for potentially effective regulation of harmful industry activities. Indeed, such advocates face considerable barriers to effectively influencing policy change, including limited resources, time and appropriate skills\(^{(32)}\). In the case of minimum unit pricing for alcohol, Katikireddi et al found that public health advocates worked hard to redefine the policy issue by deliberately presenting a consistent alternative framing of alcohol policy as a
broader, multi-sectoral, public health issue necessitating a whole-population approach\textsuperscript{(33)}. The authors considered that reframing as vital in enabling policymakers to seriously consider the policy\textsuperscript{(33)}. The effectiveness with which stakeholders in a policy debate communicate their arguments is crucial in gaining support for their preferred policy option.

Walton suggests that arguments presented in the media are often used as rhetorically effective techniques to persuade a mass audience\textsuperscript{(34)}. The news media is thus a potentially important channel for stakeholders on both sides of any policy debate to promulgate their message. The way that health problems are defined in the news media (ie: the nature of the problem, its drivers, causal agendas, effects, and potential solutions), known as **framing**, thus plays a potentially very important role in influencing public and decision-makers’ interpretations of health issues\textsuperscript{(35; 36; 37)}. Public acceptance of a specific policy solution is often a prerequisite for decision-makers to implement an evidence-based health policy\textsuperscript{(38; 39)} and media framing of problems and solutions can therefore play a key role in determining that acceptability \textsuperscript{(40; 41; 42)}, as well as shaping social norms \textsuperscript{(43; 44; 45)}.

Systematic reviews of the tactics employed by the alcohol and tobacco industries in attempting to influence marketing regulation have identified a common typology of frames used to argue against such regulation. Namely ‘increased regulation: (1) is unnecessary, (2) is not backed up by sufficient evidence, (3) will lead to unintended negative consequences, and (4) faces legal barriers to implementation; all underpinned by the message that (5) the industry consists of socially responsible companies working toward reducing harmful consumption’\textsuperscript{(27; 28; 29)}. While there are subtle differences in different industries’ argumentation, possibly due to their relative positions in the regulatory hierarchy\textsuperscript{(29)}, the literature broadly supports the idea that UCIs use a cross-industry ‘playbook’ to undermine effective public health policies\textsuperscript{(31)}.

The aim of this study was therefore to: (i) identify stakeholder arguments used on each side of the SDIL debate in UK newspaper coverage of SSB taxation and compare them with the frames used to resist increased regulation by the alcohol and tobacco industries\textsuperscript{(29)}; and (ii) generate insights into how anti-SDIL arguments may be countered, to inform future public health advocacy on this and other fiscal policies - both in the UK and world-wide, where there is still considerable resistance to such measures, for example in the USA\textsuperscript{(46; 47)} and Australia\textsuperscript{(48)}.

**Methods**

We used quantitative and qualitative content analysis methods. Firstly, we identified citations of relevant stakeholders in newspapers, their overall presented position as proponents or opponents in the SDIL debate, and the specific arguments in support of or opposing SSB tax attributed to them. Secondly, we conducted inductive thematic analysis of cited arguments to identify key themes that emerged from the data, and compared these with the established typology of industry frames\textsuperscript{(29)}. 
Newspaper search and article selection

We employed newsprint content analysis based on methods developed by Hilton and colleagues at the University of Glasgow’s Social and Public Health Sciences Unit\(^{49; 50; 51; 52}\). Eleven UK national newspapers with high circulation figures\(^{53}\) were selected, along with their Sunday counterparts, to represent three genres: ‘broadsheet’, ‘middle-market’ and ‘tabloid’. This typology represents a range of readership profiles diverse in terms of age, social class and political alignment\(^{53; 54}\). The time period of 1 April 2015 to 30 November 2016 was chosen to include coverage triggered by: the publication of reports from the World Health Organisation (WHO)\(^{2}\), Scientific Advisory Committee on Nutrition (SACN)\(^{16}\) and Public Health England (PHE)\(^{10}\); the announcement of the UK SDIL (March 2016) and the UK Government’s consultation on the proposed SDIL\(^{55; 56}\).

The Nexis database\(^{57}\) was searched for all articles published within the selected publications during the relevant date range that discussed the issue of SSB consumption and taxation. To identify relevant articles, a search string was developed for ‘sugar\(^*\)’ and one or more of the following terms: ‘beverage\(^*\)’, ‘soft drink\(^*\)’, ‘fizz\(^*\)’, ‘soda’, ‘tax\(^*\)’ and ‘levy’ occurring anywhere in the text three or more times. The search returned 3,127 articles. While the specific policy debate of interest was the SDIL, many stakeholders used the more generic term of SSB tax or sugar tax when discussing fiscal measures aimed at reducing excess sugar consumption, therefore articles in which stakeholders used any of these terms were included. Hereafter we use the term SSB tax unless stakeholders specifically refer to the SDIL.

Articles were excluded if they: 1) did not directly cite stakeholders’ arguments for or against SSB tax or the SDIL; 2) were short lead-ins to a main story elsewhere in the same edition; 3) appeared exclusively in an Eire edition; 4) appeared in non-news sections of newspapers, including letters, advice, TV guide, sport, weather, obituaries or review sections. Letters are routinely excluded from media analysis as they represent the views of individual members of the public rather than stakeholders in the debate. Where a stakeholder provided an opinion piece for a newspaper, this was included in the analysis as a direct citation. After applying the exclusion criteria 2,636 articles were removed, leaving 491 for in-depth analysis.

Article coding and stakeholder position analysis

All articles were read in detail by one researcher (R1) to identify and capture the text of direct citations of stakeholder individuals and organisations. Each piece of text was coded for newspaper title, date, individual and/or organisation cited, and whether the argument was in support of, or opposition to, SSB taxation. Where stakeholders used evidence to back up their argument, the type
of evidence used was coded. The quantitative coding frame is provided in supplementary information (File S1). A random subsample of 25% of the articles were double-coded by R2 to ensure coding consistency. Data were imported into IBM SPSS version 24 to calculate inter-rater agreement using Cohen’s kappa coefficient\(^\text{58}\). 65% of codes returned a kappa score >0.4, which is typically interpreted as moderate agreement or better\(^\text{59}\). Where less than substantial agreement was identified (kappa <0.61), code definitions were discussed within the research team and the coding frame and descriptor document were revised as required.

An overview of the slant of opinion by stakeholder was calculated based on an index developed by Patterson et al\(^\text{52}\). The index expresses the proportion of all supportive and oppositional statements associated with a stakeholder as a value on a scale from +100% (all supportive) to -100% (all opposed). Cited stakeholders were grouped into six categories according to their organisational affiliations: politicians and political organisations; public health organisations and professional bodies; industry representatives, manufacturers and retailers; non-governmental organisations (NGOs), health charities and campaigners; academics and evidence producers; and think-tanks and other analysts. These categories were constructed based on the need to structure the analysis by grouping stakeholders with likely shared values, and were chosen in line with the research team’s prior experience of researching public health policy debates. Individuals and organisations allocated to each group are listed in the supplementary information (File S2). For each stakeholder, the degree of support was then plotted against the total number of times that stakeholder was cited to provide a graphical representation of the most vocal supportive and oppositional groups.

**Analysis of arguments in support of and in opposition to SSB tax/SDIL**

Direct citations were imported into NVivo 11 for inductive thematic analysis. Each piece of text was coded to two separate nodes; stakeholder and theme raised. Individual stakeholder nodes were nested under stakeholder categories, as described above, and thematic nodes were nested under supportive and oppositional categories of argument.

The themes identified were compared with the established typology of industry arguments identified through systematic reviews of research on the alcohol and tobacco industries\(^\text{27; 28; 29}\). In order to compare arguments used by both sides of the SSB tax debate with arguments relating to the regulation of other UCIs we developed a policy-neutral form of this typology (neither opposition nor support for SSB tax) i.e.: relevance of proposed regulation; evidence; unintended consequences and other benefits; legal and corporate social responsibility.

**Results**

**Overview**
Between 1st April 2015 and 30th November 2016, 491 newspaper articles were identified in which stakeholders were cited as presenting arguments and evidence in the SSB tax debate (Table 1). Most articles were published in UK-wide newspapers (89%) and 74% appeared in ‘broadsheet’ newspapers.

A wide range of stakeholders (n=287: 34% organisations / 66% individuals), were cited in newspaper articles presenting views on SSB tax (n=1,761). A full list of all stakeholder organisations and named individuals is supplied in the supplementary information (File S2). 65% of arguments were in support of some form of SSB tax and 35% in opposition. Stakeholders infrequently cited evidence in support of their arguments (12% of the time) and the type of evidence used fell into 5 categories: academic (citation of a specific academic study), lay opinion, expert opinion, anecdotal and financial (Table 2). The most frequently used type of evidence was anecdotal (44%) which was employed by both supporters and opponents of SSB tax. Supporters were more likely to cite a specific academic study or an expert opinion than opponents.

Overall stance on SSB taxation

Plotting the aggregate stance of each stakeholder group against frequency of citations revealed that public health organisations and professional medical associations (the most frequently cited stakeholder group with 25% of arguments) were most often cited as proponents of SSB tax, as were NGOs, charities, campaigners and academics (Fig1). Groups more frequently cited as opposing the measure included industry representatives and manufacturers (18% of arguments), think-tanks and economic research organisations. Most stakeholders were cited with consistent arguments, but a minority were cited as making both supportive and oppositional arguments, leaving their degree of support for SSB tax ambiguous and open to interpretation (File S2). Inconsistencies arose from: changes in ideological position (politicians and government representatives); insufficient clarity on the nature of the problem to be solved, excess sugar consumption vs obesity, and policy priorities (public health agencies); and consistency with academic rigour (academics). The group comprising politicians and political organisations were most diverse in their opinions, in line with the ideological positions held by its constituent stakeholders, with 68% of arguments in support of taxation and 32% opposing (Fig 1). Key individuals in this group (David Cameron, then Prime Minister, and Jeremy Hunt, then Health Secretary) were associated with initial oppositional positions and subsequent supporting positions as the debate developed.

Thematic analysis and comparison with alcohol and tobacco frames

The themes that arose from the qualitative analysis of stakeholder arguments could be readily classified into the frame/sub-frame structure developed by researchers studying the alcohol and
tobacco industries (Table 3). Table 3 presents summaries of typical arguments attributed to stakeholders within articles, organised by stance and frame/sub-frame. Most arguments fell into the evidence (40%) and regulation frames (31%), followed by the unintended consequences and other benefits frame (24%), the corporate social responsibility frame (4%) and the legal frame (1%).

**Appropriateness of regulation:**

The arguments falling into the regulation frame focused on whether or not taxation was an appropriate solution to the problem of obesity. Opponents from the food and drink industry argued that the government should not intervene in the market, and that taxation would not prompt behaviour change. For example, the Food and Drink Federation was quoted as stating that: ‘Demonising one nutrient is not a healthy way to proceed. Consumer choice is the best way to go because government intervention simply doesn't work.’ (Independent, 28 August 2015). Some public health agencies opposed the measure because they felt other regulatory mechanisms were of greater priority such as: enforced reformulation and product labelling; control of marketing and promotions; and positive price instruments on healthy products. For example, the President of the Academy of Medical Royal Colleges was quoted as stating that: ‘a sugar tax is probably not top of the list of steps that need to be taken... Higher up would be reformulation of food, and we should curtail marketing of overly sweetened drinks and food like breakfast cereals to children.’ (Guardian, 25 October 2015).

Supporters of SSB taxation emphasised the scale of the problem and the urgent need for government action as part of a package of measures, with an emphasis on protecting young people. For example, the National Obesity Forum and Faculty of Public Health made mutually supportive statements: ‘Sugar is indeed the new tobacco. We know it is very harmful to health and we know we can use the same effective strategies that we used in tobacco control.’ And ‘A little gentle pressure from sugar taxes and other Government policies will help bring home the message’ (Daily Mirror, 2 November 2016).

Very few supporters highlighted the argument that the SDIL could be seen as a win-win solution. This position contends that the measure will either reduce sugar consumption (by discouraging consumer purchasing and/or encouraging manufacturer reformulation) and raise public revenue that can be reinvested in public health initiatives. The win-win concept was alluded to in the 2016 Chancellor’s budget statement: ‘he wanted to save the nation from an obesity crisis with a tax on fizzy drinks. He said he was convinced that his levy of up to 24p on a litre of fizzy pop would reduce consumption and reap a tax dividend for the exchequer’ (The Observer, 19 March 2016). Supportive stakeholders’ limited invocation of the win-win concept was potentially a missed opportunity to counter opponents’ arguments that sought to position reformulation as a failure of the
policy. For example, Investec were associated with that argument: ‘Analysts at Investec said soft 
drinks makers would reformulate their products to avoid the tax, thereby reducing revenue for the 
chancellor.’ (Sunday Times, 20 March 2016).

Evidence of effectiveness (or lack thereof...):

The debate over the evidence bases for supporting or opposing SSB tax centred on the 
definition of the policy target; that is reducing sugar consumption vs tackling obesity. Opposing 
arguments hinged on the likely ineffectiveness of SSB tax in solving the long-term ‘obesity 
epidemic’, positioning the problem as too complex to solved by a fiscal measure. The Food and 
Drink Federation were cited as arguing that: ‘Additional burdensome taxes on foods or drinks are 
rejected by the public. This complex challenge needs a complex solution, one which involves and 
empowers people, not taxes them.’ (Guardian, 4 September 2015). Other opposing arguments 
included observing that SSB consumption was already in decline, but obesity continues to rise, and 
arguing that SSBs are a sufficiently small source of dietary calories that, even if consumption was 
reduced, it would have little or no impact on obesity and related NCDs. For example, the Institute 
of Economic Affairs was cited as saying: ‘Since soft drink taxes have only a modest effect on the 
consumption of this relatively minor source of calories, it should not be surprising that there is 
virtually no evidence sugary drink taxes have reduced obesity or improved health anywhere in the 
world.’ (Times, 13 January 2016).

Conversely, supporting arguments focused on the importance of reducing SSB purchases and 
thus sugar consumption in the short term, emphasising the impact on specific health concerns such 
as type-2 diabetes and dental decay in children. Supporters made extensive use of modelling studies 
and evidence emerging from Mexico to back up their claims. For example, Public Health England 
was quoted as stating that: ‘The review highlights evidence from Mexico, where a soft drinks tax has 
led to a six per cent reduction in purchases. The point of the tax is to nudge people away from 
purchasing these things towards purchasing things that are more consistent with a healthy balanced 
diet.’ (Independent, 20 October 2015)

Three key pieces of evidence were used by stakeholders to support both supportive and 
oppositional arguments: The McKinsey report entitled Overcoming obesity: An initial economic 
analysis\(^9\), the PHE report Sugar Reduction: The Evidence for Action\(^{10}\) and a study published in 
the BMJ evaluating of the impact of the SSB tax in Mexico\(^5\) (Table 4).

Unintended consequences and other benefits – both economic and public health:

Arguments highlighting unintended consequences and other benefits tended to focus 
specifically on the SDIL rather than SSB taxation more generally. Opponents argued that the SDIL
would create negative economic impacts for soft drinks manufacturers, associated industries, the
wider economy and consumers, particularly those in lower income groups. Opposing arguments
caracterised the measure as: regressive; costly to implement; inflationary and likely to cause job
losses. For example, the British Soft Drinks Association was quoted as explaining that: ‘Given the
economic uncertainty our country now faces, we’re disappointed the Government wishes to proceed
with a measure that analysis suggests will cause thousands of job losses.’ (Independent, 18 August
2016). Opponents also asserted that the levy would fail to raise the anticipated public revenue as
manufacturers would reformulate their products to avoid paying it, positioning this as a negative
outcome rather than the positive one suggested in the ‘‘win-win’’ solution.

Opposing arguments also emphasised the potential negative health consequences of
consumers replacing SSBs with other sources of sugar or artificially-sweetened beverages (ASBs),
suggesting that sugar is addictive and ASBs are no better for health than SSBs. The Institute for
Fiscal Studies was quoted as reasoning that: ‘If people have a strong taste for sugar, although they
may respond to the increase in prices by switching away from sugary soft drinks, it’s entirely possible
and quite likely they might switch towards other high sugar products.’ (Daily Mail, 18 March 2016).

In contrast, supporters of the tax argued that there would be no adverse economic impact for
industry or consumers, as the design of the SDIL allowed industry two years to reformulate their
products with less sugar and that consumers could choose from many alternatives to SSBs and thus
avoid the levy entirely. Additional benefits of the SDIL were highlighted in terms of: the potential
for reinvestment of revenue raised into health improvement programmes and subsidies for
‘‘healthy’’ foods; the positive long-term impact of reduced NCDs on increased productivity and a
reduced burden on the NHS; and sending a strong message to industry and consumers about the
health impacts of excess sugar consumption. For example, the WHO was quoted as suggesting that:
‘Fiscal policies may encourage this group of consumers to make healthier choices (provided
healthier alternatives are made available) as well as providing an indirect educational and public
health signal to the whole population.’ (The Herald, 26 January 2016).

**Legality issues:**

Unsurprisingly, only opponents of SSB tax were cited as making arguments highlighting the
legality and potentially anti-competitive nature of the measure. For example, the British Soft Drinks
Association stated: ‘It’s fair to say we are more than just considering legal action. This has been
rushed through without warning’ (Sunday Times, 20 Mar 2016). However, this line of argument
was transient, surfacing only briefly at the time of the SDIL announcement in early March 2016,
and disappearing by the end of that month. The Telegraph (30 March 2016) quoted AG Barr as
saying: ‘‘[we are] fully committed to working with the Treasury on a full consultation that will have
an outcome that benefits consumers, shareholders and other stakeholders.’, and added that ‘Mr White said that a legal challenge to the sugar tax was not being considered.’. This was in contrast to the response of the alcohol industry to the announcement of minimum unit pricing for alcohol in Scotland, where a legal challenge significantly delayed implementation.

The role of corporate social responsibility:

The final frame represents a line of argument again primarily espoused by opponents of SSB tax: that the soft drinks industry has a positive role to play in promoting public health and that they are voluntarily reformulating their products to be healthier in response to consumer demand, without the need for taxation or other regulation. For example, one soft drinks manufacturer was quoted as stating that: ‘Our job is to understand and have relationships with our customers, which we have had for over 100 years, making sure we offer them choices. In stark contrast to other food and drink categories, we have been reducing sugar content and have a strong [commitment] to do so.’ (Guardian, 29 March 2016). Conversely, supporters of the measure questioned whether or not working in partnership with industry and relying on voluntary action had worked, pointing out the failure of the Public Health Responsibility Deal(60). For example, a Liberal Democrat MP was quoted as stating that: ‘The whole approach has been based on voluntary action. The question is whether that has succeeded. I don’t think anything fundamentally has changed. We need to rethink our approach and ask if it has led to too cosy a relationship with the food industry.’ (Daily Mail, 24 October 2015).

Discussion

Our media content analysis revealed 1,761 arguments made by 287 stakeholders in the debate about SSB tax across 491 UK national newspaper articles, which is comparable with similar public debates on other policy measures such as e-cigarette regulation(52) and minimum unit pricing for alcohol(61; 62). Supportive statements outnumbered opposing ones by almost 2:1. The most frequently cited supporters of SSB tax were public health organisations and professional medical associations, while the most frequently cited opponents were soft drinks industry representatives. Both supportive and opposing arguments aligned with a typology framework developed for studying the alcohol and tobacco industries(27; 28; 29).

Stakeholders on each side of the debate sought to use evidence to support their arguments; however, opponents were less likely to refer to specific academic studies and more likely to use anecdotal evidence. Interestingly, the same reports were sometimes invoked by both proponents and opponents to support their differing arguments, but using subtly different framings. The effective use of evidence is a potentially important factor in influencing public support for proposed policy
interventions\textsuperscript{(38; 63)}. However, a systematic review by Orton and colleagues found that, policy
makers’ sceptical view of research evidence can create a key barrier to its use\textsuperscript{(64)}. Our findings on
how evidence was used by stakeholders in the SDIL debate reinforce the importance of
trustworthiness and reliability in the way research is represented, and then used or dismissed.

The use of taxation as an intervention to influence consumer behaviour and reduce
consumption of unhealthy commodities is a well-established public health policy that has been used
effectively in relation to both tobacco and alcohol\textsuperscript{(65; 66)}. However, a recent systematic review by
Wright and colleagues highlighted the importance for policy actors to be clear about the primary
objective of any health tax, be it for fiscal or health purposes, and to frame the tax accordingly\textsuperscript{(67)}.

Failure to do so leaves a proposed tax vulnerable to hostile lobbying\textsuperscript{(67)}. Our study identified
inconsistencies in argumentation from three possible sources: changes in ideological position
(politicians and government representatives); insufficient clarity on the nature of the problem to be
solved and policy priorities (public health agencies); and consistency with academic rigour
(academics). Whether a policy is anticipated to produce single or multiple outcomes, proponents
need to identify the outcome or outcomes clearly and consistently. More clearly positioning the
SDIL as a ‘win-win solution’, both lowering sugar consumption and raising revenues that can be
reinvested in health service funding, could have been a useful, pragmatic approach to pre-empt
opposing arguments. The limited invocation of that perspective may perhaps represent a missed
opportunity for proponents of the policy.

A key strategy employed by other UCIs to oppose upstream regulation is the complexity
argument, which Petticrew et al characterise as ‘Nothing can be done until everything is done’\textsuperscript{(31)}.
Opponents of SSB tax employed this tactic by emphasising the complexity of the obesity problem,
and therefore the inappropriateness of discrete legislative measures. Proponents apparently
counteracted this by strategic simplification; that is by focusing on the specific health harming effects
of excess sugar consumption, particularly from SSBs for young people. They further emphasised
that the SDIL was not intended to be a ‘silver bullet’ to tackle obesity, but a small and important
first step focussing on a commodity with negligible nutritional value. Similar, apparently deliberate,
attempts to reframe policy debates were previously used by public health advocates in the case of
minimum unit pricing for alcohol\textsuperscript{(33)}, and by supporters of legislation to prohibit smoking in private
vehicles carrying children\textsuperscript{(68)}.

Advocates clearly need to continue to use effective arguments and embrace the persuasive
power of framing. However, public health advocates and academics should also be aware of the
potential for their over-critical analyses of nuanced aspects of policy measures to result in ‘mixed
messages’ when filtered through media gatekeepers. Nuance is a strength of academia, and many
academics are understandably wary of media commentators championing public health policies.
However, complex messages have the potential to create public confusion and actually undermine the intended public health objectives. Academics readily acknowledge uncertainty, but uncertainty rarely has a place in clear public communication\(^{69}\). Researchers lacking media skills can thus find themselves uncomfortably positioned in complicated moral and affective landscapes, toiling to represent the nuance of their research\(^{70}\). The challenge is to communicate the core truth simply, but without dumbing down the message into simplistic dichotomy. The mass media lens may depict rigorous academic circumspection as fragility of position, while industry representatives opposing regulation are unlikely to concede any uncertainty\(^{69}\).

We suggest that, in a bid to downplay the contribution of SSBs to NCDs, the soft drinks industry employed tactics previously used by other UCIs by ‘directly lobbying’ the public and policy-makers, shifting blame for obesity to complexity and optimistically trying to characterise the soft drinks industry as promoting healthy lifestyles\(^{71}\). Our study also supports the findings of the systematic review by Mialon et al; that information and messaging is one of the most prominent corporate political activities employed by food industry actors\(^{26}\).

Our study has relevance beyond debates about SSB tax. These data add to a growing body of research demonstrating the similarities in frames promoted by different harmful commodity industries across public health policy debates\(^{27; 28; 30; 31}\). Our research may therefore help to inform future media strategies by advocates of upstream legislative public health measures targeting a range of harmful products, including sugar, tobacco\(^{72}\) and alcohol\(^{73}\). In particular, it may be helpful for public health proponents to support arguments with high-quality evidence, to communicate the subtleties of health policy development without undermining key objectives, and to be aware of the apparent shared UCI ‘playbook’\(^{31}\).

Our research strengths include a rigorous approach which offers a robust examination of the newspaper debate around SSB tax. By coding and analysing direct quotations of stakeholders, we sought to minimise the impact of editorial gatekeepers and achieve greater fidelity than the more commonplace approach of analysing entire news articles. Our study is subject to the limitations which are intrinsic to media content analysis. Firstly, these data do not necessarily represent stakeholders’ intended positions, rather a collaboration between stakeholders and media gatekeepers, whereby those positions have been mediated, interpreted, filtered and contextualised by journalists and editors. However our exclusive use of quotes from individuals and directly attributable citations partly mitigates against this. Secondly, newspapers represent only one forum in which policy debates play out. Our analysis therefore omits the parliamentary arena, the judicial arena, social media and any non-public discussions that take place ‘behind closed doors’. However, understanding public debate in the media arena still offers a useful ‘door opener to the backstage of politics’, as Wodak and Meyer argue\(^{74}\). A more comprehensive understanding of stakeholders’
strategies might be triangulated from studying other forms of media, policy documents, or consultation responses, and conducting interviews with stakeholders. Thirdly, this form of representational content analysis cannot (and does not seek to) assess the effectiveness of stakeholder media communication strategies, only their implied intention. Further research on public perceptions of media messaging and stakeholder intention might usefully help to complete the picture.

**Conclusion**

Public health advocates were particularly prominent in the debate surrounding the SDIL in UK newspapers. Mass media engagement can be used to influence how the public and policymakers understand health problems and their solutions and thus the acceptability of specific policies\(^{(35; 75)}\). Research into how public health policy debates unfold in the media may help to inform improved media advocacy strategies\(^{(76)}\). Opponents’ arguments resembled those used by the alcohol and tobacco industries in prior policy debates. Advocates in future policy debates could benefit from seeking a similar level of prominence and avoid inconsistencies by being clearer about the policy objective and mechanisms.
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Tables

Table 1 Number of newspaper articles included in the final sample by region, genre and newspaper title

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region, genre and title</th>
<th>Total articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>United Kingdom</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Broadsheet’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guardian / Observer</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent / i-Independent</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Times / Sunday Times</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Telegraph / Sunday Telegraph</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Middle Market</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Mail / Mail on Sunday</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Express / Sunday Express</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tabloid</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sun / Sunday Sun</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirror / Sunday Mirror</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scotland</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Broadsheet’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotsman / Scotland on Sunday</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Herald / Sunday Herald</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tabloid</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Record / Sunday Mail</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>491</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 Frequency of use of evidence cited in support of and opposition to SSB tax

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Citations in support of SSB tax (n=155)</th>
<th>Citations in opposition to SSB tax (n=66)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anecdotal</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinion</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Summary of frames, sub-frames and key arguments made by opponents and proponents of SDIL. (Frame adapted from Savell et al.(27; 28) and Martino et al.(29))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frame</th>
<th>Sub frame(s)</th>
<th>Arguments opposing SSB tax</th>
<th>Arguments in support of SSB tax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regulation</td>
<td>Opp 35% / Prop 65%</td>
<td>– Other regulation would to be more effective in tackling obesity</td>
<td>– No silver bullet / a useful start as part of a package of measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– Positive price instruments are needed</td>
<td>– Will prompt reformulation to avoid the levy / health by stealth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– Taxation is an inappropriate mechanism for behaviour change</td>
<td>– Reluctant to impose new taxes but have to start dealing with obesity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– Sugar cannot be regulated like alcohol and tobacco</td>
<td>– somewhere / nothing else is working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– Obesity too complex a problem to solve with fiscal measures</td>
<td>– Sugar is the new tobacco and should be regulated as such</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– Additional taxation is un-conservative and unpopular – nanny statist</td>
<td>– Relatively quick and easy to implement – a quick win</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– Focus should be on solving inequalities</td>
<td>– Public are in favour of decisive government action / even taxation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– SSB consumption is a particular issue for young people, therefore an appropriate target for Government intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>Opp 31% / Prop 69%</td>
<td>– No evidence of effectiveness anywhere in world</td>
<td>– Evidence shows that SSB tax reduces purchases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– Those who buy SSBs are not price sensitive</td>
<td>– Will reduce tooth decay, obesity and related NCDs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– Won’t reduce calorie intake therefore no effect on obesity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– SSB consumption is declining anyway – no effect on obesity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Manufacturers</td>
<td>– Will lead to industry failure, job losses and reduced innovation</td>
<td>– No adverse economic impact as industry has 2 years to reformulate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– The SDIL is complex, confusing and difficult/costly to implement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associated Industries</td>
<td>– The SDIL will cost jobs across the UK in associated industries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public revenue</td>
<td>– The levy will not raise the anticipated revenue</td>
<td>– Revenue raised can be used to fund health improvement programmes and/or subsidise ‘healthy’ foods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– Increased taxation will cause inflation / decline in output</td>
<td>– Reduced loss of productivity from NCDs will benefit economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– Revenue for NHS to offset costs of obesity / reduced long-term costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consumers</td>
<td>– Tax is regressive / will impact lower income groups disproportionately</td>
<td>– There are many alternatives to SSBs / no-one needs to drink SSBs and pay the levy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>Opp 46% / Prop 54%</td>
<td>– People will switch to other sugar sources / unhealthy drinks</td>
<td>– Sends a clear message that sugar is bad for health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– ASBs are no more healthy</td>
<td>– Will nudge people to choose low/no sugar options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– Low income groups will see the greatest health benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>Opp 100% / Prop 0%</td>
<td>– SDIL is illegal / anti-competitive</td>
<td>– The Public Responsibility Deal has failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate social responsibility</td>
<td>Opp 66% / Prop 34%</td>
<td>– Industry is reformulating anyway in response to consumer demand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– SDI plays an active role in promoting healthy lifestyles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report/Study</td>
<td>Use in opposing arguments</td>
<td>Use in supportive arguments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overcoming obesity: An initial economic analysis (2014) Dobbs et al.</strong>(9)</td>
<td>'But we want to see action based on evidence of what works. Taxes did not make the top 10 most effective interventions to reduce obesity in the McKinsey Global Institute's obesity report.' Soft drink manufacturer (Telegraph 26 May 2016)</td>
<td>[Calling for SSB tax and citing the McKinsey report] 'The total economic loss from obesity to the UK was calculated at £49bn in 2012.' Cancer Research UK/UK Health Forum (Guardian 19 February 2016)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sugar reduction: The Evidence for Action (2015) Public Health England</strong>(10)</td>
<td>'It may also be possible, by negotiation, to improve the definition of 'high sugar foods' as the [PHE] report suggests. However, we do not agree that the international evidence supports the introduction of a sugar tax.' Food &amp; Drink Federation (Guardian 29 October 2015)</td>
<td>'We welcome this [PHE] report, and the contribution this will make to reduce obesity levels, particularly among children. Hard-hitting action is necessary on pricing, reformulation and promotion of high-sugar products.' Professional Association (Guardian 22 October 2015)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beverage purchases from stores in Mexico under the excise tax on sugar sweetened beverages: observational study (2016) Colchero et al.</strong>(5)</td>
<td>'The Mexican reductions were equivalent to one less sugar cube a day per person, which was a drop in the calorific ocean.' Academic (Guardian, 7 January 2016)</td>
<td>'Unequivocal evidence from other countries [Mexico] has shown that a sugar tax duty on soft drinks will reduce sales of sugar-sweetened soft drinks, particularly among the more socially deprived.' Health organisations statement (Guardian 24 June 2016)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure legends

Fig 1. Frequency of citations by stakeholder group and their aggregate stance towards SSB tax/SDIL
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Frequency of citations by stakeholder group and their aggregate stance towards SSB tax/SDIL
### Coding frame used to analyse final sample of newspaper articles

**coder initials ................. .  SSB coding frame v14.0 24_04_17**

To be completed if the article specifically mentions SSB taxation/"sugar tax" or the Soft Drinks Industry Levy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article ID</th>
<th>Description of taxation</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>&quot;Sugar tax&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>SSB taxation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>Soft Drinks Industry Levy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 16 Specifically in relation to SSB taxation/"sugar tax" or the Soft Drinks Industry Levy...

#### 16.1 Arguments for taxation...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 16.1.1 | Positive impact on consumption / purchases  
           (ie: will help to change behaviour / reduce consumption of sugar/SSBs) | 1 | 2 |
| 16.1.2 | Positive health impact  
           (ie: will help to reduce obesity/diabetes/other NCDs/mortality) | 1 | 2 |
| 16.1.3 | Positive financial impact  
           (eg: funding for NHS/ schools/ physical education/ PH education / subsidies for F&V etc) | 1 | 2 |
| 16.1.4 | Sends clear message  
           (eg: to industry to change behaviour /reformulate and to parents to and children about importance of reducing consumption / to government to take action) | 1 | 2 |
| 16.1.5 | Proposed tax should be more extreme  
           (ie: needs to be tougher / extend to other sugar containing products / extend to other 'unhealthy' products eg: high fat / needs to happen sooner) | 1 | 2 |
| 16.1.6 | Proposed tax could be an important first step (can be done quickly and relatively easily)  
           (ie: needs to be one of a range of legislative measures / taxation not enough on its own) | 1 | 2 |

#### 16.2 Evidence for taxation...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 16.2.1 | Specific evidence provided - Source: ____________________________________________  
           (ie: specify what type & source - academic / opinion / expert / anecdotal / financial) | 1 | 2 |
| 16.2.2 | Evidence of success  
           (eg: red. SSB/sugar consumption / purchases / health outcomes / inc. reformulation) | 1 | 2 |
| 16.2.3 | Evidence from other countries / contexts  
           (ie: effect in other countries that have introduced such a tax eg: Mexico) | 1 | 2 |

#### 16.3 Arguments against taxation...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 16.3.1 | Negative financial impact  
           (eg: company profits / job losses / consumer confidence / wider economy / inflation / shopping bills) | 1 | 2 |
| 16.3.2 | Impact on lower socio-economic groups  
           (ie: disproportionate impact) | 1 | 2 |
| 16.3.3 | Food & drinks taxes already exit  
           (eg: 20% VAT) | 1 | 2 |
| 16.3.4 | Taxation unfair on SSB industry - anticompetitive / discriminatory  
           (eg: SSB companies being made a scapegoat / punitive / disappointing / should also apply to other industries and/or sugar producers) | 1 | 2 |
| 16.3.5 | Unintended negative health consequences  
           (eg: substitution for other 'unhealthy' products / switch to other low cost options) | 1 | 2 |
| 16.3.6 | Demonisation of sugar  
           (ie: sugars can be enjoyed in moderation/ focusing on one nutrient won't solve obesity) | 1 | 2 |
| 16.3.7 | SSB taxation not the answer - consumption of sugar in SSBs is actually falling  
           (eg: not the most significant source of sugar / other nutrients more/equally damaging  
           eg: high fat / needs a comprehensive set of actions) | 1 | 2 |
| 16.3.8 | Taxation as a mechanism not the answer  
           (ie: not an effective way of changing behaviour / need positive price mechanisms) | 1 | 2 |
| 16.3.9 | Consumer / brand loyalty  
           (ie: consumers will continue to buy regardless  eg: Irn Bru at the heart of being Scottish  
           / price inelasticity of ‘sin’ products) | 1 | 2 |
| 16.3.10 | Other legislation might be better / is needed | 1 | 2 |
| 16.3.11 | Nanny state - autocratic / government intervention doesn't work  
   (ie: loss of freedom of choice for individual / won't be supported by public) | 1 | 2 |
| 16.3.12 | Existing voluntary action is enough / could be extended  
   (ie: SSB industry already doing / planning to do its bit eg: reformulation / advertising controls / portion sizes / calorie caps / banning products in supermarkets / better labelling) | 1 | 2 |
| 16.3.13 | Implementation issues (will take too long / distraction from Brexit)  
   (eg: unworkable / high cost of implementation / which SSBs included/excluded) | 1 | 2 |

### 16.4 Evidence against taxation...

| 16.4.1 | Specific evidence provided - Source: ___________________________  
   (ie: specify what type & source - academic / opinion / expert / anecdotal / financial) | 1 | 2 |
| 16.4.2 | Evidence of failure  
   (eg: no change in SSB/sugar consumption / health outcomes / calorie intake) | 1 | 2 |
| 16.4.3 | Evidence from other countries / contexts  
   (ie: other countries that have introduced such a tax eg: Mexico) | 1 | 2 |
| 16.4.4 | Lack of evidence to support taxation  
   (ie: states that no evidence exists / doesn't believe the evidence) | 1 | 2 |

### 16.5 Other points for debate

| 16.5.1 | Headline position statement  
   (ie: makes a clear headline statement for or against SSB taxation) | 1 | 2 |
| 16.5.2 | Comparison with other legalisation  
   (eg: alcohol / tobacco / salt) | 1 | 2 |
| 16.5.3 | Clarifies what the tax is  
   (ie: is a levy on the SD industry - NOT a sugar tax / does not have to be passed on the consumer) | 1 | 2 |
| 16.5.4 | Legal challenge  
   (ie: suggests a legal challenge to the government) | 1 | 2 |
| 16.5.5 | Evaluation  
   (ie: need to be able to evaluate and withdraw if not working) | 1 | 2 |
| 16.5.6 | Government response  
   (ie: Government is unlikely to support a sugar tax / delaying tactics) | 1 | 2 |

### 17 Who are the key actors in the debate and what arguments to do they make?

#### 17.1 Stakeholders: Government representatives / organisation

#### 17.2 Stakeholders: Public health organisation / advocates / professional body

#### 17.3 Stakeholders: Industry representatives / producers / retailers

#### 17.4 Stakeholders: NGO / Charity

#### 17.5 Stakeholders: Academics / Evidence producers

#### 17.6 Stakeholders: Others (eg: Individuals)
## S2 Supplementary information: Full list of stakeholder organisations, named individuals, allocation to stakeholder groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political representatives / organisations</th>
<th>Proponents</th>
<th>Opponents</th>
<th>Mixed messages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK Government (CON)</td>
<td>UK Government (CON)</td>
<td>Prime Minister’s spokesperson, Jacob Rees-Mogg (MP), Philip Davies (MP), Will Quince (MP)</td>
<td>UK Government (CON)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Freeman (PUSS for Life Sciences Minister), Dan Poulter (former Health Secretary), Nick Herbert (MP), Nicola Blackwood (Public Health Minister), Jane Ellison (ex-PH Minister), Flick Drummond (MP)</td>
<td>Department of Health</td>
<td>Departement of Health</td>
<td>Dame Sally Davies (Chief Medical Officer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Health</td>
<td>George Freeman (PUSS for Life Sciences Minister), Dan Poulter (former Health Secretary), Nick Herbert (MP), Nicola Blackwood (Public Health Minister), Jane Ellison (ex-PH Minister), Flick Drummond (MP)</td>
<td>Department of Health</td>
<td>Departement of Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Liam Donaldson (former CMO), Prof Susan Jebb, (Chair Food Responsibility Network)</td>
<td>Treasury</td>
<td>Treasury</td>
<td>George Osborne (Chancellor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Ellison (Financial secretary to HMT)</td>
<td>Health Select Committee (Cross party)</td>
<td>Health Select Committee (Cross party)</td>
<td>Andrea Jenkyns (CON), Andrew Percy (CON)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Select Committee (Cross party)</td>
<td>Dr Sara Wollaston – Chair (CON),</td>
<td></td>
<td>Andrea Jenkyns (CON), Andrew Percy (CON)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other UK parties</td>
<td>Jeremy Corbyn (LAB), Helen Jones (LAB), Sadiq Khan (LAB – Mayoral candidate), Norman Lamb (LD),</td>
<td>Scottish Politicians</td>
<td>Scottish Politicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Calderwood (CMO), John Swinney (Finance Minister SNP), Scottish Labour Party, Kezia Dugdale (SLAB Leader), Scottish Liberal Democrats, Alex Cole-Hamilton (SLD MSP), Jim Hulme (SLD MSP)</td>
<td>Scottish Politicians</td>
<td>Scottish Politicians</td>
<td>Scottish Politicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welsh Politicians</td>
<td>Welsh Politicians</td>
<td>Welsh Government (WLAB)</td>
<td>Scottish politicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welsh Nationalist Party (WNP)</td>
<td>Scottish Politicians</td>
<td>Scottish Politicians</td>
<td>Scottish Politicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican politicians</td>
<td>Mexican politicians</td>
<td>Mexican politicians</td>
<td>Mexican politicians</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PH orgs / experts / professional bodies</th>
<th>Proponents</th>
<th>Opponents</th>
<th>Mixed messages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Health agencies</td>
<td>Public Health agencies</td>
<td>Public Health agencies</td>
<td>Public Health agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan Selbie (Chief Exec. PHE), Association of Directors of Public Health, Royal Society for Public Health: Dame Shirley Cramer (Chief Exec), UK Faculty of Public Health: Prof John Ashton (President); Prof Simon Capewell (VP for Policy), UK Health Forum: Jane Landon (Dep Chief Exec); Dr Laura Webber (Dir PH Modelling), Overseas Development Institute: Steve Wiggins, World Health Organisation: Margaret Chen (Head), Michael Bloomberg (Global Ambassador for NCDs), Dr Douglas Bettcher (Dir Dept for Prevention of NCDs), Dr Francesco Branca (Nutrition Director), Joao Breda (European PM for Nutrition), World Obesity Federation: Tim Lonstein (Head of Policy), Mexican National Institute of Public Health and PH advocates</td>
<td>Public Health agencies</td>
<td>Public Health agencies</td>
<td>Public Health England, Dr Alison Tedstone (Chief Nutritionist, PHE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Associations &amp; health experts</td>
<td>Medical Associations &amp; health experts</td>
<td>Medical Associations &amp; health experts</td>
<td>Medical Associations &amp; health experts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Board of Science, Academy of Medical Royal Colleges, British Dental Association: Henrik Overgaard Neilson (Chair BDA General Dental Practice Committee), Prof Walmsley (Scientific Advisor), British Dental Health Foundation: Dr Nigel Carter (Chief Exec), Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health: Prof Neena Modi (President), Royal College of Physicians: Prof John Wass (Academic Vice President), Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons Scotland: Prof Derek Bell (President), Royal College of Surgeons: Prof Hunt (Dean of Dental Surgery), Dr Alice Hodkinson (GP), Dr Hema Gore (GP), Dr A Malhotra (Consultant Cardiologist)

Food and nutrition experts

Scientific Advisory Committee on Nutrition: Prof Ian Macdonald (Chair Working Group on Carbohydrates and Health), Elspeth Macdonald (Dep Chief Exec FSS), London Food Board: Rosie Boycott (Chair)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry reps / producers / retailers</th>
<th>Proponents</th>
<th>Opponents</th>
<th>Mixed messages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Industry associations &amp; representatives</td>
<td>“The industry”, British Soft Drink Association (BSDA): Gavin Partington (Director General), Peter Harding (President), UK Food &amp; Drink Federation (UKFDF): Ian Wright (Director General), Tim Rycroft (Dir of Corporate Affairs), UK Sugar Bureau, American Beverage Association, Scotland Food &amp; Drink: James Withers (Chief Exec), Scottish Food &amp; Drink Federation: David Thomson (Chief Executive Officer), Scottish Grocers Federation: Pete Cheema (Chief Executive Officer), Industry bodies and retailers in Mexico</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturers &amp; producers</td>
<td>AG Barr: Roger White (Chief Exec), Coca-Cola: Leendert Den Hollander (VP and GM at European Partners), Jon Woods (General Manager Great Britain), Britvic: Simon Litherland (Chief Executive), Paul Graham (Managing Director UK), Peter Harding (Chief Operating Officer, LRS), Marnie Millart (Chief Executive, Vimto), Mary Barnard (Head of UK Division, Cadbury), Pieraldo Oldano (UK Chief Exec, Ferrero Rocher), Unilever: Paul Polman (Chief Executive Officer), AB Sugar, Association British Foods: George Weston (Chief Exec), Paul Kenward (MD British Sugar)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Retailers & restaurateurs

John Vincent (Chief Executive Officer & Co-founder of Leon restaurants) |

Wetherspoons: Tim Martin (Chairman), Starbucks: Sarah Bruce-Goodwin (Vice President for R&D), Ramesh Pabari (sweet shop owner) Sainsburys: Mike Coupe (Chief Exec), Tescos, Waitrose, “supermarket boss”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NGOs / charities / campaigners</th>
<th>Proponents</th>
<th>Opponents</th>
<th>Mixed messages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charities and NGOs</td>
<td>Action on Sugar: Prof Graham MacGregor (Chairman), Katharine Jenner (Campaign Director), Jenny Rosborough (Nutritionist &amp; Campaign Manager), Kawther Hashem (Nutritionist &amp; Researcher), Cancer Research UK: Alison Cox (Dir of Cancer Prevention), Prof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charities and NGOs</td>
<td>Charities and NGOs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mixed messages

Tam Fry (Head Spokesperson, National Obesity Forum)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campaigners</th>
<th>Campaigners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jamie Oliver (chef), James Cracknell (athlete), Paul Hollywood (TV presenter), David Gandy (model), Andrew Fairlie (chef), “campaigners”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heston Blumenthal (chef)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Academics / evidence producers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proponents</th>
<th>Mixed messages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **UK Academics and academic institutions**
  - British Medical Journal study, Prof Simon Capewell (University of Liverpool), Prof Graham MacGregor (Wolfson Institute of Preventative Medicine), Kavitha Hashem (Queen Mary University London), Professor Mike Rayner (Nuffield Dept of Population Health), Prof Francesco Cappuccio (University of Warwick), Dr Richard Hoffman (University of Hertfordshire), Prof Leigh Sparks (Stirling University), Prof M Ezzati (Imperial College London), Brighton University, University of Oxford, |
| **International academics and academic institutions**
  - Prof Sirpa Sarlio Lahteenkorva (Finnish Expert), Mary Gorski (Harvard University), Christina Roberto (University of Pennsylvania), Prof Robert Lustig (University of California), University of North Carolina |
| **Academics and academic institutions**
  - Dr Boyka Bratanova (St Andrews University), Prof JT Winkler (London Metropolitan University), Tom Sanders (King's College London), University of Cambridge, Centre for Diet and Activity Research |
| **Academics and academic institutions**
  - Prof Naveed Sattar (University of Glasgow), Prof Susan Jebb, University of Oxford, Prof Mike Lean (University of Glasgow) |

### Think tanks and other analysts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proponents</th>
<th>Mixed messages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Think tanks**
  - Policy Exchange, Ben Thomson (Chair Reform Scotland) |
| **Other analysts**
  - Credit Suisse, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD): Franco Sassi (Head of Public Health) |
| **Other analysts**
  - TaxPayer’s Alliance, Institute of Economic Affairs (IEA), |
| **Other analysts**
  - McKinsey Global Institute, Institute for Fiscal Studies (IFS), Oxford Economics, Office of Budget Responsibility (OBR), DWF, Ernst & Young, Investec, Numis, Shore Capital “Analysts” |

### Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proponents</th>
<th>Mixed messages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soil Association, other named individuals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton Students against Sugar Tax, “Right wing group”, YouGov Survey, other named individuals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ComRes survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>