

Annex : methodology for the review presented in the commentary

We identified all studies performed on Nutri-Score (and its initial version, the 5-colours FoPNL or 5C label) published between January 1st 2014 and September 30th 2022 by a systematic search in PUBMED, using the keywords « Nutri-Score », « 5-C label », « 5-C label + Front-of-pack nutrition labels » and « Nutri-Score + Front-of-pack nutrition labels ».

The articles were then classified by two independent scientific readers into:

- 1) original articles (including articles presenting specific results about the characteristics and performances of the Nutri-Score assessed alone or in comparison to other nutrition labels);
- 2) general reviews (systematic reviews, narrative reviews, conceptual articles and papers about the context of the Nutri-Score roll out).

The determination of the existence of conflicts of interest was based on the informations given by the authors within the publications in both the Conflict of Interest section and the Funding section. This include declaration about if some of the authors were salaried employees or received grants, contracts and honoraria from private entities with an interest in the topic and/or if some served directly as consultant for the specific study and/or if they received financial support for conducting the literature search and writing the manuscript and/or if some were members (even non-paid) of working group, institutes or organization supported by food companies and/or if the authors declared that the research received fundinds from private entities

Articles were classified as 'supporting' if the authors reported positive findings regarding the validation of the nutrient profile model (alignment with dietary recommendations, associations with dietary intakes, nutritional status or health events in the expected direction) or validation of the graphical design (favourable perception, objective understanding, effects on purchasing intention or purchases in the expected direction).

Articles were classified as 'non-supportive' if they reported non-significant associations or results in the opposite direction as expected. For reviews, articles were classified as 'supporting' if they overall concluded in favour of the Nutri-Score, and 'non-supportive' otherwise.