Year	Count	Percent
2022	4	10%
2021	13	33%
2020	5	13%
2019	1	3%
2018	4	10%
2017	1	2%
2016	1	2%
2014	2	5%
2013	2	5%
2012	2	5%
2011	1	2%
2010	1	2%
2009	1	2%
2008	1	2%
2006	1	2%
Grand Total	**40**	**100%**

Single Country?	Count	Percent
No	2	5.00%
Yes	38	95.00%
(blank)		0.00%
Grand Total	**40**	**100.00%**

Country	Count		
USA	17	17	43%
Australia	4	4	10%
Mexico	2	2	5%
United Kingdom	2	2	5%
South Korea	2	2	5%
South Africa	2	2	5%
New Zealand	1	1	3%
Ukraine	1	1	3%
Chile	1	1	3%
Poland	1	1	3%
Germany	1	1	3%

Admin Level	Count		
National	27	27	68%
City	9	9	23%
State	8	8	20%
County	3	3	8%
District	1	1	3%
Regional	1	1	3%
Grand Total	**49**		

Commodity	Count		
SSB	23	23	58%
Tobacco	12	12	30%
Alcohol	7	7	18%
Salt	1	1	3%
Ultra-processed foods	1	1	3%
Gas	1	1	3%
Grand Total	**45**		

Study Design	Count	Percent
Media/content analysis	20	50.00%
Case study	8	20.00%
comparative case study	5	12.50%
"qualitative"	5	12.50%
policy analysis	1	2.50%
focus group	1	2.50%
Grand Total	**40**	**100.00%**

Data Source	Count		
News media	28	28	70%
Key Informant Interv	14	14	35%
gov docs	10	10	25%
industry docs	7	7	18%
NGO reports	5	5	13%
legislative proceedin	3	3	8%
Social Media	3	2	5%
radio	2	2	5%
television	1	1	3%
video	1	1	3%
mailers or billboards	1	1	3%
and conventional pri	1	1	3%
focus group discussi	1	1	3%
Survey	1	1	3%
documents	1	1	3%
Grand Total	**79**		

Theory	Count	Percent
Advocacy Coalition F	1	4.00%
Agenda-setting, fram	1	4.00%
e health policy triang	1	4.00%
Framing Theory	1	4.00%
Framing theory (com	1	4.00%
Framing theory (critic	2	8.00%
Framing theory (new	1	4.00%
Habermasian idea of	1	4.00%
Kingdon's 3 streams	2	8.00%
None	7	#####
Policy arenas and th	1	4.00%
Political Economy Ar	1	4.00%
Theory of framing wit	1	4.00%
(blank)		0.00%

Row Labels	Count	Percent

1

Scotland	1	1	3%	2020-2022	19	47.50%	Framing theory (Gam	1	4.00%
Philippines	1	1	3%	2015-2019	10	25.00%	Framing Theory (critic	1	4.00%
India	1	1	3%	2010-2014	8	20.00%	agenda-setting (light	1	4.00%
Colombia	1	1	3%	2005-2009	3	7.50%	Framing (communica	1	4.00%
Ireland	1	1	3%	**Grand Total**	**40**	**100.00%**	**Grand Total**	**25**	**#####**
Malaysia	1	1	3%						
Uganda	1	1	3%						
Nigeria	1	1	3%						
Finland	1	1	3%						
Grand Total	**43**								

2

Supplemental material

BMJ Publishing Group Limited (BMJ) disclaims all liability and responsibility arising from any reliance
placed on this supplemental material which has been supplied by the author(s)

BMJ Glob Health

Row Labels	Count	Percent
Health Promotion International	3	7.50%
PLoS One	2	5.00%
Social Science & Medicine	2	5.00%
Public Health Nutrition	2	5.00%
American Journal of Public Health	2	5.00%
Tobacco Control	2	5.00%
Health Policy and Planning	2	5.00%
Dissertation	1	2.50%
Journal of Public Health Research	1	2.50%
Journal of Immigrant and Minority Health	1	2.50%
Global Public Health	1	2.50%
Critical Public Health	1	2.50%
Globalization and Health	1	2.50%
Drug and Alcohol Review	1	2.50%
Health Behavior & Policy Review	1	2.50%
Journal of Public Health Management and	1	2.50%
Health Policy	1	2.50%
Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs	1	2.50%
The Milbank Quarterly	1	2.50%
Policy Sciences	1	2.50%
BMC Public Health	1	2.50%
Public Works and Management Policy	1	2.50%
American Journal of Preventive Medicine	1	2.50%
Global Health Action	1	2.50%
Translational Behavioral Medicine	1	2.50%
Versita	1	2.50%
JMIR Public Health and Surveillance	1	2.50%
European Journal of Public Health	1	2.50%
Public Health	1	2.50%
Health Systems & Reform	1	2.50%
American Journal of Health Promotion	1	2.50%
Journal of Epidemioly and Community Hea	1	2.50%
Grand Total	**40**	**100.00%**

Organization Type	Count			
NGO	32.00	32.00	80%	Avg
industry associate	30.00	30.00	75%	6.00
corporate entity	27.00	27.00	68%	
ministry/dept of he	26.00	26.00	65%	
legislative politician	21.00	21.00	53%	
media	20.00	20.00	50%	
university	16.00	16.00	40%	
executive branch	15.00	15.00	38%	
treasury/ministry of	15.00	15.00	38%	
multilateral	10.00	10.00	25%	
professional health	8.00	8.00	20%	
Private philanthrop	5.00	5.00	13%	
judicial politician	4.00	4.00	10%	
regulatory agency	1.00	1.00	3%	
Chamber of Comm	1.00	1.00	3%	
medical experts	1.00	1.00	3%	
City officials (gener	1.00	1.00	3%	
public relations firm	1.00	1.00	3%	
social influencer/ce	1.00	1.00	3%	
economists private	1.00	1.00	3%	
residents	1.00	1.00	3%	
advocacy groups	1.00	1.00	3%	
retailers	1.00	1.00	3%	
think tanks	1.00	1.00	3%	
Grand Total	**240.00**			

Pro-tax MF	Count		
Care/harm	35	35	88%
fairness/cheating	18	18	45%
liberty/oppression	17	17	43%
sanctity/degredatio	10	10	25%
authority/subversio	7	7	18%
loyalty/betrayal	5	5	13%
Grand Total	**92**		

Anti-tax MF	Count		
fairness/cheating	26	26	65%
liberty/oppression	21	21	53%

Tax Type	Count		
excise	30	30.00	75%
value added/wholesale/gross reciepts	7	7.00	18%
retail transaction	2	2.00	5%
import duty	1	1.00	3%
vendor priviledge	1	1.00	3%
Grand Total	**41**		

Outcome	Count		
Old tax modified	14	14	35%
New tax created	14	14	35%
Contestation (unresolved)	12	12	30%
New tax rejected	5	5	13%
New tax modified	2	2	5%
(blank)			
Grand Total	**47**		

CPA	Count		
shaping the evidence -> Lobbying	29	29.00	73%
shaping the evidence -> shaping research	8	8.00	20%
constituency building -> promoting or spor	8	8.00	20%
constituency building -> financial or non-fir	7	7.00	18%
contributing to health policy consultations	6	6.00	15%
partnership of voluntary agreements with g	5	5.00	13%
(blank)			
Grand Total	**63**		

Misc	Count		
Jingle or slogan	11	11	28%
series of events	9	9	23%
social media influencers	1	1	3%
wearables	1	1	3%
celebrity endorsement	1	1	3%
petitions	1	1	3%
Grand Total	**24**		
			0%

4

Care/harm	18	18	45%
authority/subversic	10	10	25%
loyalty/betrayal	8	8	20%
sanctity/degredatic	4	4	10%
Grand Total	**87**		

Pro-tax Value	Count		
welfare	34	34	85%
Equity	21	21	53%
Efficiency	21	21	53%
liberty	16	16	40%
security	11	11	28%
Grand Total	**103**		

Anti-tax Value	Count		
Efficiency	21	21	53%
liberty	21	21	53%
Equity	19	19	48%
welfare	19	19	48%
security	12	12	30%
Grand Total	**92**		

Frame Type	Count		
Policy action (surface level)	30	30	75%
Institutional (intermediate)	10	10	25%
Metacultural (deep/broad)	4	4	10%
(blank)			
Grand Total	**44**		

Argument For	Count		
Reduces suffering and premature death	33	33	83%
lucrative for governments	22	22	55%
cost containment/savings	19	19	48%
pro-poor policy	14	14	35%
education	9	9	23%
everyone else is doing it	9	9	23%
product reformation	5	5	13%
cheap	4	4	10%
Grand Total	**115**		

Argument Against	Count		
threat to industry	25	25	63%
tax on the poor	23	23	58%
hurts/eliminates jobs	21	21	53%
better means to end	21	21	53%
narrow and unfair	19	19	48%
meaningless (too small/ineffective)	18	18	45%
nanny state	17	17	43%
Promote illicit trade	5	5	13%
Grand Total	**149**		