

Appendix 2

This appendix was part of the submitted manuscript and has been peer reviewed. It is posted as supplied by the authors.

Appendix to: Zurzolo GA, JJ, Mathai ML, et al. Perceptions of precautionary labelling among parents of children with food allergy and anaphylaxis. *Med J Aust* 2013; 198: 621-623. doi: 10.5694/mja12.11669.

Appendix 2

Participant knowledge regarding precautionary food labels.

| Question* | Anaphylaxis group range, range† | Mild/moderate reactions, range† | Chi2 P value |
|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------|
| The food is present in the product due to manufacturing techniques | 50-71% | 51-74% | P=0.84 |
| The food might be present in the product due to manufacturing techniques | 76-89% | 75-93% | P=0.44 |
| There are only small amounts of the food present, therefore it is safe to eat | 28-33% | 34-40% | P=0.80 |
| There are only small amounts of the food present, therefore it is not safe to eat | 56-65% | 52-65% | P=0.51 |
| The risk of cross contamination is low, but may be possible | 80-85% | 85-90% | P=0.41 |
| This statement only protects the manufacture from litigation | 89-96% | 92-96% | P=0.66 |
| I do not find this statement useful, as I don't know if it is safe to eat | 78-84% | 82-86% | P=0.64 |

^{*}Participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed with each of the following statements for 6 different precautionary statements. The precautionary statements examined were: "may contain traces", "made on the same production line", "made on the same equipment", "made in the same factory", "made in the same premises" and "may be present". For each precautionary statement, the percentage of 'true' responses was calculated by adding the following: true, probably true and possibly true.

[†] Responses for all precautionary statements fell within this range.