



## OPEN ACCESS

APPROVED BY  
Frontiers Editorial Office,  
Frontiers Media SA, Switzerland

\*CORRESPONDENCE  
Sarah Dickie  
✉ s.dickie@deakin.edu.au

RECEIVED 16 May 2023  
ACCEPTED 01 June 2023  
PUBLISHED 04 July 2023

CITATION  
Dickie S, Woods J, Machado P and Lawrence M  
(2023) Corrigendum: A novel food  
processing-based nutrition classification  
scheme for guiding policy actions applied to  
the Australian food supply.  
*Front. Nutr.* 10:1223316.  
doi: 10.3389/fnut.2023.1223316

COPYRIGHT  
© 2023 Dickie, Woods, Machado and  
Lawrence. This is an open-access article  
distributed under the terms of the [Creative  
Commons Attribution License \(CC BY\)](#). The use,  
distribution or reproduction in other forums is  
permitted, provided the original author(s) and  
the copyright owner(s) are credited and that  
the original publication in this journal is cited, in  
accordance with accepted academic practice.  
No use, distribution or reproduction is  
permitted which does not comply with these  
terms.

# Corrigendum: A novel food processing-based nutrition classification scheme for guiding policy actions applied to the Australian food supply

Sarah Dickie\*, Julie Woods, Priscila Machado and Mark Lawrence

School of Exercise and Nutrition Science, Institute for Physical Activity and Nutrition (IPAN), Deakin University, Geelong, VIC, Australia

## KEYWORDS

nutrition classification, food classification, NOVA, ultra-processed food, nutrient profiling, food policy, front-of-pack labelling (FOPL), food tax

## A corrigendum on

### A novel food processing-based nutrition classification scheme for guiding policy actions applied to the Australian food supply

by Dickie, S., Woods, J., Machado, P., and Lawrence, M. (2023). *Front. Nutr.* 10:1071356. doi: 10.3389/fnut.2023.1071356

In the published article, the references “Davidou S, Christodoulou A, Fardet A, Frank K. The holistico-reductionist Siga classification according to the degree of food processing: an evaluation of ultra-processed foods in French supermarkets. *Food Funct.* (2020) 11:2026–39. doi: 10.1039/c9fo02271f” and “Davidou S, Christodoulou A, Frank K, Fardet A. A study of ultra-processing marker profiles in 22,028 packaged ultra-processed foods using the Siga classification. *J Food Comp Anal.* (2021) 99:103848. doi: 10.1016/j.jfca.2021.103848” were not cited in the article. The citations have now been inserted as reference (43) and (44), in Section “2.1. Model development,” Sub-section “2.1.5. Model 2,” paragraph 1 and should read:

“The use of markers of ultra-processing (MUPs) (i.e., processed food substances and cosmetic additives) to identify ultra-processed foods is a simple and effective way to capture the concept (43, 44).”

In the published article, there was an error. Text was missing from the methods section.

A correction has been made to Section “2.1. Model development,” Sub-section “2.1.5. Model 2,” paragraph 1. This paragraph previously stated:

“The use of markers of ultra-processing (MUPs) (i.e., processed food substances and cosmetic additives) to identify ultra-processed foods is a simple and effective way to capture the concept. Ultra-processed foods are defined as “formulations of ingredients, mostly of exclusive industrial use, that result from a series of industrial processes” (9), and MUPs have been used as proxies to identify food ultra-processing. Another common characteristic of ultra-processed foods is the low presence or absence of intact whole foods. This is a difficult dimension to metricise considering the limited information about ultra-processing techniques available on food labelling. For the purpose of using the NOVA system to inform the development of this scheme, we assumed that when only one MUP is used, most of the food matrix of wholefoods is preserved or the product might not be a “formulation of

ingredients.” In our previous research we found a small number of examples of these food and beverage products, such as cheeses, yoghurts, and breads. Therefore, a second version of the model (Model 2) was developed and tested. Model 2 follows the same criteria as Model 1, except the ultra-processed group is divided into sub-groups (group 4.1: foods contain only one MUP, group 4.2: foods contain more than one MUP).”

The corrected paragraph appears below:

“The use of markers of ultra-processing (MUPs) (i.e., processed food substances and cosmetic additives) to identify ultra-processed foods is a simple and effective way to capture the concept (43, 44). The MUPs term was first coined by Davidou et al. when developing the SIGA classification scheme (43, 44). Ultra-processed foods are defined as “formulations of ingredients, mostly of exclusive industrial use, that result from a series of industrial processes” (9), and MUPs have been used as proxies to identify food ultra-processing. Another common characteristic of ultra-processed foods is the low presence or absence of intact whole foods. This is a difficult dimension to metricise considering the limited information about ultra-processing techniques available on food labelling. For the purpose of using the NOVA system to inform the development of this scheme, we assumed that when only one MUP is used, most of the food matrix of wholefoods is preserved or the product might not be a “formulation of ingredients.” In our

previous research we found a small number of examples of these food and beverage products, such as cheeses, yoghurts, and breads. Therefore, a second version of the model (Model 2) was developed and tested. Model 2 follows the same criteria as Model 1, except the ultra-processed group is divided into sub-groups (group 4.1: foods contain only one MUP, group 4.2: foods contain more than one MUP). The division of the ultra-processed group by number of MUPs is a technical approach first applied in the Siga classification scheme (43).”

The authors apologize for this error and state that this does not change the scientific conclusions of the article in any way. The original article has been updated.

## Publisher's note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.