A battle between experts

A framing analysis of the 2025 EAT-Lancet report in Swedish media

Sara Sällberg

Degree project/Independent project • 30 credits
Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, SLU
Faculty of Natural Resources and Agricultural Sciences
Environmental Communication and Management - Master's Programme
Uppsala 2026



A battle between experts - A framing analysis of the 2025 EAT-Lancet report in Swedish media

Sara Sällberg

Supervisor:	Sara Holmgren, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Department of Urban and Rural Development
Examiner:	Amelia Mutter, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Department of Urban and Rural Development

Credits:	30 credits
Level:	Second cycle, A2E
Course title:	Master thesis in Environmental science, A2E
Course code:	EX0897
Programme/education:	Environmental Communication and Management - Master's Programme
Course coordinating dept:	Department of Aquatic Sciences and Assessment
Place of publication:	Uppsala
Year of publication:	2026
Copyright:	All featured images are used with permission from the copyright owner.
Online publication:	https://stud.epsilon.slu.se (if you don't allow publishing, delete row)
Keywords:	Media framing, scientification, food system transformation, EAT-Lancet, Planetary Health Diet

Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences
Faculty of Natural Resources and Agricultural Sciences
Department of Urban and Rural Development
Division of Environmental Communication

Abstract

Global food systems today are causing problems for both human and planetary health. To address these challenges, the EAT-Lancet Commission has presented extensive scientific reports on the impacts of food systems and food system transformations that will benefit both humans and the planet. The first report (2019) received extensive media attention and was also met with resistance, especially from meat advocates. The updated report launched in 2025 also gained traction in Swedish media. This study examined the Swedish media coverage of the 2025 EAT-Lancet report and its potential effects on reception in Sweden. With framing analysis and the concept of scientification, which is a discursive strategy where an issue is given a scientific character to strengthen arguments, it investigated the media framing and how scientification was used by actors to legitimise or delegitimise the report. The results show that the framing differed depending on the actors behind the articles. While many newspapers framed the report as important science targeting food system challenges, considerable critique of the report, partly based on misleading information and scientification as a strategy to delegitimise the report, was also given space in the media. An interpretation of the results is that the media reporting contributed to a reinforcement of conflicts related to food system transformation and dietary recommendations. By giving space to the critics' use of scientification and misleading information, these media outlets legitimise them and spread misinformation, thereby risking compromising public acceptance of the report and negatively affecting attitudes towards a transformation of the Swedish food system.

Keywords: Media framing, scientification, food system transformation, EAT-Lancet, Planetary Health Diet

Acknowledgements

I want to give a warm thank-you to my supervisor, Sara Holmgren, for your great feedback, wise words and encouragement during my thesis work.

Table of contents

Abstract **3**

List of tables **6**

Abbreviations **7**

1. Introduction **8**

1.1. Global food systems 8

1.2. Background and problem formulation 10

1.2.1. The EAT-Lancet Commission reports 10

1.2.2. Problem formulation 13

1.3. Aim and research questions 14

2. Literature review **15**

2.1. Science and environmental issues in the media 15

2.2. Dietary policy and food recommendations in the media 17

3. Theoretical framework and methods **20**

3.1. Framing theory and analysis 20

3.2. Scientification 23

3.3. Materials and data collection 24

3.4. Operationalisation and method 25

3.5. Ethics 26

4. Analysis **27**

4.1. Media frames 28

4.1.1. The science says frame 28

4.1.2. The political backlash frame 33

4.1.3. The green bubble elitism frame 35

4.1.4. The science is incorrect frame 39

4.1.5. The attack on science frame 43

5. Discussion **47**

6. Conclusion **51**

7. References **52**

8. Popular science summary **55**

Appendices **57**

AI disclosure **73**

List of tables

Figure 1 Dietary targets for a healthy reference diet for adults, with possible ranges, for a population-level energy intake of approximately 2400 kcal/day. Source: Table 1: from The EAT-Lancet Commission on healthy, sustainable, and just food systems. 12

Abbreviations

PHD	Planetary Health Diet
The Commission	The EAT-Lancet Commission
The report	The 2025 EAT-Lancet report
SRC	Stockholm Resilience Centre
PIK	Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research
DN	Dagens Nyheter
SvD	Svenska Dagbladet
NWT	Nya Wermlands Tidningar
NT	Norrköpings Tidningar

1. Introduction

1.1. Global food systems

Global food systems are fundamental for the sustenance, economy, and sustainable development of all humans (UNDP, 2026). A food system can be defined as a system that encompasses all elements and activities related to the production, processing, distribution, consumption, and disposal of food, as well as the socioeconomic and environmental outputs and impacts of these processes (Ochanda, 2025). A sustainable food system means a food system that delivers nutrition and food security in a sustainable way, without compromising the social, environmental, and economic opportunities for food security and nutrition for future generations. According to OECD (2025), global food systems today face a "triple challenge": providing nutrition and food security for a growing global population, supporting the livelihoods of the millions of people working in the agriculture and food sector, and doing this sustainably. A sustainable food system is also central to the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals, and to overcome this triple challenge, the food system needs to become more resilient in all three dimensions (OECD, 2025). This calls for a global food system transformation, reshaping the food systems to be more productive, more inclusive of marginalised population groups, to be environmentally sustainable and resilient, and to deliver healthy and nutritious diets to all people (Nguyen, 2018).

The unsustainability of today's food system has its origin in the 1900's agricultural industrialisation, which led to a large increase in food production, with new and innovative processes and food systems. The consequences of the increased production and agricultural innovations were increased land use for grazing and farming, increased deforestation, increased chemical and fertiliser use, and freshwater consumption (UN Environment Programme, 2026). The food production and consumption of today are continuing to have consequences for the planet. The global food system is responsible for almost a third of the emissions affecting climate change and drives the negative impact on our environment, including biosphere integrity, freshwater change, biochemical flows, land system use, and greenhouse emissions (Rockström et al., 2025). Simultaneously, nearly 800 million people don't have enough to eat, and almost three billion people consume a low-quality diet, based on food intake level, diet quality scores, diet diversity and nutrition (Mazac, 2025).

The Swedish food system, which is the focus of this study, also faces significant challenges related to health and sustainability (Bunge, Gordon et al., 2025). Dietary change, such as lowering meat consumption and increasing intake of fruit and

vegetables, has considerable potential to reduce environmental impacts and improve public health in Sweden. In Sweden, the average meat consumption is 220 grams per day (80 kg per person/year), around 220 grams of fruit and vegetables per day (81,3 kg per person/year) and around 107 grams of sugar/ syrup per day (around 39 kg per person/year) (Swedish Board of Agriculture, 2025). Achieving dietary change requires transformation at the system level, but consumption and individual food choices can also play an important role in reducing environmental impact (Mazac, 2025).

1.2. Background and problem formulation

1.2.1. The EAT-Lancet Commission reports

To meet the triple challenge of the global food system, the *EAT-Lancet Commission on sustainable diets from sustainable food systems* and the *Planetary Health Diet* was announced in 2016 by EAT, Stockholm Resilience Centre (SRC) and The Lancet. EAT is a non-profit organisation founded by philanthropist and physician Gunhild Stordalen, and works at the intersection of science, business, policy and community action to create food systems that nourish people, restore nature and support fair livelihoods (eatforum.org, 2026). SRC, in 2016 led by climate scientist Johan Rockström, is a research centre and joint initiative between Stockholm University and the Beijer Institute of Ecological Economics, focusing on environmental science, sustainability and resilience (stockholmresilience.org, 2026). The Lancet is a large medical journal that publishes science connected to health and medicine (The Lancet, 2026).

The purpose for forming the EAT-Lancet Commission was described as aiming to meet food-related global challenges, such as increasing human health challenges, including rising obesity levels worldwide as well as widespread malnutrition, coinciding with negative effects on the planet's resilience (stockholmresilience.org). The Commission aimed to investigate how to feed a future population of 10 billion people a healthy diet within the planetary boundaries and to study the connections between diet, human health, and the health of the planet to provide a basis for new, evidence-based policies. Co-chair of the Commission, Johan Rockström, described the task of the Commission as *"The new commission will, for the first time, scientifically assess whether a global transformation to a food system delivering healthy diets from sustainable food systems to a growing world population is possible, and what implications it might have for attaining the Sustainable Development Goals and the Paris Climate Agreement."* (SRC, 2016). The EAT-Lancet Commission is now co-chaired by Johan Rockström (PIK), Walter Willett (Harvard), and Shakuntala Thilsted (CGIAR), with support from Line Gordon (SRC) and Mario Herrero (Cornell) (eatforum.org, 2026).

In 2019, the Commission launched its first report, *Food in the Anthropocene: the EAT–Lancet Commission on healthy diets from sustainable food systems,* based on the investigations by the Commission. Findings from the report showed that a transformation to healthy and sustainable diets by 2050 will require significant dietary shifts towards a diet rich in plant-based food. This included a doubled consumption of fruits, vegetables, nuts, and legumes, and a reduction in the

consumption of red meat and sugar by more than 50 per cent. The report contained the Planetary Health Diet (PHD), a science-based reference diet for increased health, in accordance with the planetary boundaries (Willet et al., 2019).

The 2019 EAT-Lancet report and the PHD have been influential both in the scientific community (Ayesha et al., 2023) as well as in public discourse about food system transformation and healthy and sustainable eating. In large part, the academic community supported the recommendations in the report (The Lancet, 2023), but the reception from the public and by the media was more mixed. According to an article in The Lancet investigating the reactions and a digital backlash with critique against the report that followed its launch, the report was received positively by some established media outlets, such as The Guardian and The New York Times, but was also met with critique and negative reactions, mostly online. The report became a catalyst for a polarised debate in digital media, especially on Twitter, where a counter campaign under the hashtag #yes2meat was launched, leading to the spread of misinformation, conspiracy theories, and personal attacks on the scientist behind the report (Garcia et al., 2019). According to the article by Garcia et al. (2019), the countermovement to the EAT-Lancet report was an organised action that managed to dominate online discourse around the report and recommendations. Garcia et al. (2019) argue that this digital campaign helped to form a sceptical online community rallying under the hashtag #yes2meat, and linked the social media activities under the hashtag to a wider spread of negative and critical discourses around the report, and further distribution of critical news articles online (Garcia et al., 2019).

In October 2025, a new scientifically updated and developed report, *The EAT-Lancet Commission on healthy, sustainable and just food systems*, was launched. The new report departs from the 2019 version, defining food group ranges for a healthy diet and identifying the food system's share and impact on all planetary boundaries. It strengthens the justice perspective with analysis of social foundations for justice in the food system and presents projections and gives recommendations for the potential outcomes of a transition to a healthy, sustainable, and just food system (Rockström, Willet et al., 2025). The new report also contains an updated planetary health reference diet (see Table 1 below).

	Per capita recommended intake (g/day [range])	Per capita recommended intake (kcal/day)
Plant foods*		
Whole grains	210 (20–50% of daily energy intake)	735
Tubers and starchy roots‡	50 (0–100)	50
Vegetables	300 (200–600)	95
Fruits	200 (100–300)	145
Tree nuts and peanuts	50 (0–75)	275
Legumes	75 (0–150)	275
Animal-sourced foods**		
Milk or equivalents (eg, cheese)	250 (0–500)	145
Chicken and other poultry	30 (0–60)	60
Fish and shellfish	30 (0–100)	25
Eggs	15 (0–25)	20
Beef, pork, or lamb	15 (0–30)	45
Fats, sugar, and salt		
Unsaturated plant oils	40 (20–80)	355
Palm and coconut oil	6 (0–8)	55
Lard, tallow, and butter	5 (0–10)	..
Sugar (added or free)	30 (0–30)	115
Sodium	<2	..

Table 1: Dietary targets for a healthy reference diet for adults, with possible ranges, for a populationlevel energy intake of approximately 2400 kcal/day

Table 1. Dietary targets for a healthy reference diet for adults, with possible ranges, for a population-level energy intake of approximately 2400 kcal/day. Source: Table 1 in The EAT-Lancet Commission on healthy, sustainable, and just food systems.

1.2.2. Problem formulation

The framing of an issue contributes to our meaning-making and understanding of that particular issue. Media frames help to shape our ideas of what parts of an issue are important, how to interpret and evaluate the issue, what is right or wrong and the right way to act in relation to the issue (Entman, 1993). Since media framing contributes to the meaning-making of issues, including food system transformations, it is interesting to study media framing in relation to food systems. The framing of the EAT-Lancet report can be an important factor in shaping how the report and its recommendations are understood and received by important actors in the food system transformation, such as policymakers, industries, and the public. As the EAT-Lancet is a scientific report, it is also interesting to investigate scientification in media framing, which is the recontextualization of a scientific matter into a media context and a discursive strategy by actors in which an issue is given or renegotiated with a scientific character or to strengthen arguments (Abalo, 2025). Both the 2019 and 2025 reports received considerable media attention in international as well as Swedish media. Even though they were subjects of frequent and extensive media coverage in Sweden, the Swedish media framings of the reports are understudied. A framing analysis can provide insight into what representations of the report the Swedish public was exposed to, and what potential consequences this might have for acceptance or resistance to the report. Examining scientification in the media framing could shed light if/how scientification was used by journalists or other actors in the media in the construction of the frames and in legitimising or delegitimising the report.

1.3. Aim and research questions

The media event that this thesis studies is the launch of the scientific report EAT-Lancet Through framing analysis and analysis of how scientific claims are recontextualised and renegotiated in processes of scientification, this thesis aims to analyse the Swedish media framing of the 2025 EAT-Lancet report and its content. Further, the thesis aims to make visible the potential effects of the identified media framings on acceptance versus resistance of the report in Sweden. The study contributes to knowledge development around the media's role in defining and disseminating scientific findings in relation to diets and food system transformation. To investigate this, I will focus on the following research questions:

- ◊ *How is the EAT-Lancet report, including the scientific findings and recommendations, framed in Swedish media?*
- ◊ *How is the media framing recontextualising and renegotiating the report and the scientific assessments and recommendations of the report?*
- ◊ *Based on the above, what potential implications may the Swedish media coverage of the report have for the acceptance and resistance of the report?*

2. Literature review

2.1. Science and environmental issues in the media

Both an interest among researchers in communicating their research via news media and the media's interest in reporting about scientific research have increased in recent decades, and science has been more common to read about in the news. (Jönsson, 2025). Roslyng et al. (2025) address how media contribute to the construction of facts, truths, and knowledge in environmental issues and conflicts. The authors argue that the media's reporting of scientific matters can lead to both increased and decreased trust in science (Roslyng et al., 2025). According to Jönsson (2025), while the general level of trust in science in Sweden is high, recent studies have shown important differences among groups in the population and increasing trust gaps connected to party affiliation. Among those with lower levels of trust are right-wing sympathisers. Both trust in science and the news media have been pointed out as expressions and a consequence of increased ideological polarisation. The polarisation linked to distrust in science institutions and the media is especially prominent when it comes to societal crises like the climate crisis (Jönsson, 2025).

Media framing of environmental issues and scientific matters contributes to the construction of facts, truths and knowledge mentioned by Jönsson (2025) above. Nisbet & Newman (2015) study media framing of environmental issues, and they present a generalisable typology of frames based on research across environmental issues and policy debates in different contexts. While frames differ depending on contexts, for example, country and culture, the authors argue that their study supports a generalisable set of frames that are drawn from across these contexts (Nisbet & Newman, 2015). The generalised frames they present are the following: Social progress, where focus is on improving life, solutions, or harmony with nature, Economic development/ competitiveness, focusing on economic growth, market benefits or risks and competitiveness, Morality/Ethics, where the issue is fundamentally a matter of right or wrong, Scientific/technical uncertainty, the issue or decision is a matter of expert understanding, Pandora's box/runaway science/fatalism, defines problem or technology as out-of-control or as fatalistic, Public Accountability/governance, the public interest versus serving private interests, Middle way/alternative path, finding a possible compromise position, or a third way between conflicting/polarized views, and Conflict/strategy, where focus is on a broader power game among elites; emphasizing who's ahead or behind in winning debate, in public opinion polling, or political spending (Nisbet & Newman, 2015).

Extending Nisbet & Newman's (2015) framing typology, Mateu & Dominguez (2019) examine how environmental media frames have evolved over time. They study opinion articles from two Valencian newspapers from the 1980's to 2018. In their study, they identified several additional framings to Nisbet & Newman's (2015) typology: Beauty, Identity symbol, Citizen Right, Ecological and Scientific Value, Uncertainty, Science as a Solution, Public Health and Individual responsibility (Mateu & Dominguez, 2019). Their study showed that the most common frames both across topics and time periods were Economic Development and Competitiveness, Citizen Right, Public Accountability, Pandora's Box, and Public Health. Some frames were only present in some time periods. For example, the social progress frame was common in the 1980's but not present in 2018, and the public accountability frame was common in the 1980's but was exchanged for the new frame, Individual responsibility, emphasising individual action as a response or solution to environmental problems (Mateu & Dominguez, 2019).

The studies above show that science has become an increasingly common media topic and that this contributes to the construction of facts, truths and knowledge in relation to science. The studies also suggest that there are patterns in how media generally tend to frame environmental issues.

Abalo (2025) investigates scientification in Swedish news media, that is, the recontextualization and renegotiation of scientific facts in a media context, and a discursive strategy in public debate (scientification is further described in 4. Theoretical framework). Abalo's (2025) study is based on a case study of the media reporting around environmental risks of microplastics from artificial turf. In his study, an example of scientification is how a research report published by Svenska Miljöinstitutet IVL was constructed in the media. He points to three different ways in which scientification was manifested in the news reporting: to attach weight and certainty to claims, to highlight the uncertainty of claims, and to make faulty results or reasoning be perceived as correct (Abalo, 2025). An insight from Abalo's (2025) study is that scientification is an important tool in the struggle between different actors and interests over environmental risks. He also points to some risks with scientification in media discourse. Since science is used as a discursive strategy to uphold different interests, scientification in the media must be closely guarded, or else we might see ourselves in a situation where scientification is used to spread misinformation and uphold false or doubtful claims. He here points to the responsibility of the media since it is the media that decides what and how it publishes (Abalo, 2025).

The IVL report in Abalo's (2025) study is a recent example of how another scientific report was constructed in Swedish media and how actors used scientification as a strategy to strengthen or weaken scientific claims and reasoning.

2.2. Dietary policy and food recommendations in the media

Dietary policy and food recommendations have become an increasingly covered topic in public debate and in the media, and the media coverage has itself become subject to scholarly analysis. Jelsø (2015) studied the inclusion of environmental aspects in dietary guidelines in several countries. The study reveals that an increasing number of countries were including environmental and climate aspects in their recommendations, and in all cases, these guidelines were met with different kinds of resistance. With the emergence of sustainability considerations in food recommendations, new critiques and conflicts also emerged, including conflicts of interest among actors and between experts in different disciplines and fields of science. He refers to a battle of interests and lobbying around dietary guidelines, particularly regarding meat and sugary foods (Jelsø, 2015). The study also shows that a common critique of environmental reasoning in dietary recommendations is that food and eating are private matters that should not be imposed by obligations, and that interventions in this matter are a threat to individual choice (Jelsø, 2015). According to Jelsø (2015), there is a political and ideological aspect to the acceptance and implementation of dietary guidelines. More conservative-liberal governments tend not to implement proposals for environmentally related dietary guidelines, which may partly be because the proposed guidelines are seen as in conflict with the free market and commercial interests. A conclusion from the study is that, even though environmentally related dietary recommendations are met with resistance and do not always appear very forceful, they have considerable discursive power. He also points out that dietary guidelines can influence frameworks for health professionals and, in many cases, national guidelines, which in turn can influence discourse about food and health. According to the author, much of the debate around food and health is disseminated by the media, often by different experts with conflicting views (Jelsø, 2015).

Media discourse about meat consumption or recommendations is a frequently studied topic. In a 2023 paper, Béné et al. explore the media debate between red meat and plant-based alternatives and investigate its contributions to the food system transformation agenda. According to the authors, narratives and frames can be used as discursive strategies to justify, impose, or question policies (Béné et al., 2023). They exemplify how strategies are used in the debate, and one example is when experts point to the health benefits that a moderate consumption of red meat can bring, but downplay or neglect the negative consequences of consuming too much red meat. In another example, an incorrect reference to livestock as the fastest-growing agricultural sector illustrates another strategy, which is to base part of an argument on false information to strengthen the argumentation. Another

strategy found in the study is to make the opponents look biased or untrustworthy by challenging their knowledge or questioning their scientific integrity. The authors also question whether the meat versus plant-based issue is a true wicked problem. They argue that the issue could be understood as a battle between narratives, creating a discursive battlefield that is more wicked than the real conflicts between economic, ethical, societal, and environmental interests. This discursive battlefield risks reinforcing the wickedness of the problem rather than mitigating it. According to Béné et al. (2023), the wicked appearance of the problem and polarisation in the debate are a result of the scientific, technical, and societal framings used by the different battling actors in the discourse.

Media's role in the construction of arguments around meat reduction in Aotearoa, New Zealand, was studied in an article in Health Promotion International by Booth et al. (2025). The authors conducted a framing analysis of media stories to examine how arguments about meat reduction are made persuasive. Their findings show that the problem was mainly framed in terms of individual responsibility, rather than the responsibility of powerful groups or structures. Here, individuals in the public were addressed as having the responsibility to take collective civil action against political inaction (Booth et al., 2025).

Another investigation of media framing of food guidelines was found in an article in the British Food Journal, written by Tak et al. (2024), who studied media representations and framing of the National Food Strategy in the United Kingdom. The findings show that UK media often used tropes of "culture war", where recommendations were framed as issues of choice and individual responsibility rather than a structural problem where most responsibility falls on the government and industry. A lot of space was given to frames criticising state interventions on individual choice. The study also found that exaggerated headlines were used to shift the debate away from recommendations to reform the UK's food system, in favour of political ideologies often invoked by right-leaning media groups and free-market think tanks. The article concludes that in the media coverage of the strategy, negative framing and criticism of state intervention to solve food system inequalities made it acceptable for the government to not only delay its response but also publish a weak and non-committal response to the recommendations. He also stresses the need for reframing the issue in terms of structural problems and solutions rather than individual responsibilities (Tak et al., 2024).

The studies above illustrate that food and dietary recommendations are surrounded by disagreement and conflict, especially when it comes to meat and sugary foods and when environmental arguments are included. While dietary recommendations can act as important influences for dietary change, they are also polarised topics, with resistance more common among conservative-liberals. The

studies also suggest that the media representations of the disagreements or conflicts related to food and diets might be more severe than they are outside a media context, and that the media helps disseminate debate about dietary recommendations. My thesis complements the studies above by focusing on a Swedish context and the media framing as well as acceptance and resistance of a specific scientific report on the food system. This study has the potential to be an illustrative example of media framing and scientification around scientific reports, but also of media debates around scientifically based dietary recommendations.

3. Theoretical framework and methods

This thesis proceeds from a constructivist and interpretivist perspective, and a standpoint that transformations of food systems are necessary for the sake of the planet. The theoretical framework builds on Framing theory and the concept of scientification, presented below.

3.1. Framing theory and analysis

The framing analysis in this thesis draws on Robert Entman's (1993) theory of media framing and Nisbet & Newman's (2015) description of environmental issue framing and cognitive frames. Entman's (1993) framing theory conceptualises framing as an action actors do: the process of selecting and making salient certain parts or aspects of a phenomenon, rather than others. He describes the act of framing as *"to select some aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating text, in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation for the item described"*(Entman 1997, p.52). In other words, frames define problems, diagnose causes of problems, make moral judgements, and suggest remedies for them (Entman 1993). Framing analysis can contribute to the understanding of the factors influencing actors and processes in relation to environmental issues, such as social movements, political leaders, news coverage, and policy, and can be applied to analyse how media communicate about a specific issue (Nisbet & Newman, 2015).

Frames help people categorise and make sense of their experiences and guide them in understanding the world. Individuals also have their own frames: mental models, schemata, categories, stereotypes, or clusters of ideas, that help guide their processing of information. How something is received depends both on how it is framed and on the individual recipient's frames (Entman 1993). Frames are defined by what they omit as well as what they include, and both can be important in guiding people's understandings. With the increased salience of something, the probability that receivers will perceive this information as important, detect meaning, process it, and remember it also increases. Frames are found in different parts of communication processes. The communicator chooses (knowingly or unknowingly) the framing of what to say and makes judgements based on these frames, the text itself contains frames, seen in the absence or presence of keywords, phrases, sources and sentences reinforcing facts or judgements; the receiver uses frames to interpret the text, which might or might not reflect the first two (communicator and text); and there are cultural frames, common frames among

people belonging to the same culture or social group (Entman 1993). Frames are interactional products, and there is no guarantee that frames affect individuals the same way, but frames have been shown to have common effects on large portions of audiences (Entman 1993).

According to Nisbet & Newman (2015), in environmental politics, policy, and news, frames play a significant role. In many policy debates historically, power has shifted by the ability to control attention to an issue, as well as through the framing of the problems and their solutions (Nisbet & Newman, 2015). Individuals rely on frames to make sense of environmental issues, journalists use frames to create interesting news stories, and policymakers use frames to define their policy solutions and reach decisions in these matters (Nisbet & Newman, 2015). Highlighting some aspects of reality and obscuring others can guide recipients in different ways. This implies that there is competition between news frames as well as competition between actors in environmental issues *(*Nisbet & Newman, 2015). The framing of an environmental issue can influence the broader public's attention to this issue but also shape the perceived "scope of participation", meaning who this issue concerns or not. According to the authors, if a group is favoured by the status quo in relation to environmental policy, it usually is in their best interest to frame environmental issues in highly technical, scientific or legalistic ways to downplay possible risks, and if, on the other hand, a group is not favoured by the status quo, it's usually best to do the opposite and frame the issue in terms of dramatic risks, costs and moral. This is because the former tends to get less media attention and the latter more media spotlight, and thus wider attention to the issue (Nisbet & Newman, 2015).

According to Nisbet & Newman (2015), an individual's cognitive frames can be activated by media frames. They refer to previous studies showing that individuals scoring high on values connected to hierarchy and individualism tend to reject risks related to environmental issues, while individuals valuing egalitarianism and communitarianism tend to accept risks and regulations to mitigate risks in favour of the collective and the vulnerable in society. People valuing individualism viewed regulatory actions to environmental risks as restrictions on markets, businesses, and personal freedom, while hierarchicalists tended to view regulations as threats to status quo practices, societal order, and to the people in power (Nisbet & Newman, 2015). These reactions also depend on the framing, and in experiments where the framing of the issues shifted, so did the tendency to agree on or reject risks. Another type of cognitive frames that the authors refer to is Haidt's typology of moral intuitions: harm/care (concerns about the caring for and protection of others), fairness/cheating (concerns about treating others fairly, upholding justice), loyalty/betrayal (concerns about group membership; loyalty), authority/subversion (concerns about legitimacy, leadership, and tradition), liberty/oppression (concerns

about personal freedom and control by others) and sanctity/degradation (concerns about purity, sanctity, and contamination). Haidt's research showed that in their framing, conservatives tend to focus on activating moral intuitions related to loyalty/betrayal, authority/subversion, sanctity/degradation, and liberty, while liberals tend to focus on triggering intuitions of harm/care, liberty/oppression, and fairness/cheating (Nisbet & Newman, 2015).

3.2. Scientification

Scientification can be understood as a strategy used by actors in public discourse, constructing an issue as a scientific matter by ascribing scientific characteristics to the issue if it benefits their agenda, or when the principles of science are moved to the context of everyday lives of people (Abalo, 2025). When a topic is framed as a scientific matter in the media, it is always recontextualised. This means that it leaves the rules of the academic context and enters the media context, where many of the rules are inapplicable (Abalo, 2025). When the media refers to "science", the strict rules of academia don't apply, and journalists use various ways to brand something as scientific, for example, interviews with researchers, references to scientific studies, and sometimes more vague references to "science" in general.

In this thesis, since the EAT-Lancet report is scientific, the focus is on the media's recontextualization of the report's scientific claims and actors' use of scientification as a strategy in the media debate. The nature of science and scientific facts is always surrounded by a level of uncertainty, which can create challenges for the media when communicating environmental risks and probabilities for events. These uncertainties in the recontextualization from science to media discourse, and the workings of media logic (journalistic routines), can lead to the renegotiation of scientific assessments and contestation of science-based claims in the media (Abalo, 2025). According to Abalo (2025), to some extent, this type of contestation has to do with the media's centration on problems and conflict, and previous research about science journalism suggests that (mediated) conflict regarding research results leads to uncertainty among journalists as well as the public (Abalo, 2025; Jönsson et al., 2025). Media can use scientification for different purposes, for example, for an appealing framing of the issue or to construct conflict around the matter (Abalo, 2025).

The three ways the actors in media in Abalo's (2025) study used scientification were to attach weight and certainty to claims, or, on the other hand, highlight uncertainty of scientific claims, or to make faulty results or reasoning be perceived as correct. In my analysis, I was specifically interested in examining if and how scientification was used in the framing of the report and its messages, and by actors as a strategy to legitimise or delegitimise the report.

3.3. Materials and data collection

The data used in the analysis consists of Swedish text media coverage about the 2025 EAT-Lancet report from the two weeks following the report launch. The articles were collected via an archive search in the media database Retriever, screening for Swedish news articles, debate articles, editorials and columns from different written news outlets that showed up in the search, such as daily newspapers, tabloids, niche magazines and industry magazines. The chosen dates were between 3–17 October 2025, from the launch of the report and two weeks ahead. To search for the articles, I used the keywords “EAT-Lancet” and “EAT-Lancet report”. The purpose of using Retriever was to gather the media coverage more effectively and help to find articles and news outlets that I otherwise might have missed. One limitation of the tool is that it does not always pick up every single article that was published, which means that some articles still might have been missed. The search resulted in 577 hits from the two weeks I defined as a relevant period to investigate. Screened for copies and audio or video content and letters to the editors, the data collection resulted in 45 articles, among them news articles, debate articles and columns. This material was assessed to be extensive and diverse enough to uncover the media framings of the report and limited enough to analyse within the scope and timeframe of the thesis. A list of all articles is found in Appendix 1.

Due to the scope and timeframe of the thesis, and the specific interest in news media framing, the material only included content from written traditional media outlets, and not from social media platforms. Audio and video content were excluded since it would have entailed both too much content and a more time-consuming analysis than the scope of the thesis permitted.

3.4. Operationalisation and method

To analyse the Swedish media framing, including processes of scientification, I coded the news articles using my three research questions as a point of departure.

After a thorough reading of the 45 articles, I coded the frame components of problem descriptions, causes/causalities, morals, solutions/ remedies and saliences. Here, I analysed word choices, phrases, references and quotes that were interpreted to express these frame components. Here, I also examined saliences and silences, and which actors were present or absent in the articles. The coded frame components formed themes that were then classified as frames. The following step in the analysis was describing and interpreting the identified frames and their components, exemplifying with paragraphs from the articles.

I examined how scientification manifested in the articles, focusing on how it was used as a strategic tool by actors communicating about the report. Here, I looked at how the report was recontextualised in the media, who the actors were that were given space, what scientific claims they made and references they used, their word choices and descriptions of the report and the Commission. Based on the coding of the scientification expressions and an examination of the actors behind them, I analysed how these expressions could be seen as discursive tools used to legitimise or delegitimise the report or Commission.

According to framing theory, frames are defined by what they omit as well as what they include (Entman 1993). To get a better understanding of if/how the Swedish media coverage contributed to resistance and/or acceptance of the report on food system transformation, I finally analysed saliences, silences and dominance. Here I analysed what topics, frames, voices, and interests were present and dominating, respectively missing or obscured.

3.5. Ethics

The material analysed in this thesis consisted of publicly published articles from Swedish newspapers, and I assessed that no part of the material was considered sensitive information. In relation to the newspapers' copyrights, I have referred to the sources for the quotes used as examples in the analysis, as well as keeping the quotes as short as possible while still including the relevant examples. The methods used in the analysis demanded a lot of interpretation and judgement. This thesis has aimed to be transparent in the interpretations, judgements and reflections that were made, in which I have also strived to rely on theories and previous research. Subjectivity is an inherent part of interpretation, and my own standpoint on the issue might have influenced how I interpreted the media frames. Thus, I want to emphasise that the interpretations in this thesis are the result of my meaning-making of the material.

4. Analysis

The framing analysis of the media reporting of the EAT-Lancet report shows that the report was a topic of interest for the media as well as a catalyst for debate, as a media debate about the report and its messages unfolded during the two studied weeks of media coverage. While several large national and regional newspapers, such as DN, Aftonbladet, Expressen, Sydsvenskan and Göteborg-Posten presented the EAT-Lancet report in line with the messages of the report, several newspapers used critical framings. Critical framings were reproduced by a right-wing newspaper, agricultural and food industry magazines, several local newspapers and the news magazine Fokus. SvD, the second largest morning newspaper in Sweden, published several articles with different framings. The vast coverage of the new report indicated that the report was considered important and newsworthy by the media. The numerous articles and the fact that many large newspapers adopted the messages of the report can also be seen as a sign that the scientific community has a powerful position in the media, as a source of trustworthy and important news. However, the number of critical articles and the debate that emerged suggest that the opposing voices also had considerable power in the media, in terms of getting their critique published and creating debate around the issue.

The voices identified in the media reporting and the following debate were scientists – both advocates and opponents of the report, representing environmental/sustainability science, nutrition and food science, medicine, ecology and history –, citizens interviewed on the streets, the meat industry, the food industry, animal rights, political and cultural debate writers and a politician (in quotes from Christian Democrat Peter Kullgren). Voices from stakeholders such as other policymakers, farmers or agricultural business owners (besides one Timbro writer), civil society organisations or indigenous groups were not found in the reporting.

In the analysis, I identified five frames: the *science says frame*, reflecting the report's messages; the *political backlash frame*, presenting the report as evidence for political inaction; the critical *green bubble elitism frame* and *the science is incorrect frame*; and the *attack on science frame*, defending the report from the critique. The different frames were many times opposing each other and differed significantly in problem formulations, causes, morals, actors, solutions, and scientification uses – recontextualization and renegotiation of scientific claims and arguments, and in who and what was made salient, dominating or obscured.

4.1. Media frames

4.1.1. The science says frame

Many of the articles presented the EAT-Lancet report as a case of new scientific findings. These articles reflected the main report's messages and the communication from the Commission. As such, the content of the news articles focused on describing the negative impact of the current food system and the Commission's recommendations for a food system transformation. This reflection of the messages in the report, and the description of the report as a case of new science, was classified as the *science says* frame. The following paragraphs illustrate this framing:

"Researchers have cracked the code on how to become healthier, boost the economy, and save the planet in the process. The solution lies in our food, according to a major new report" (preamble, Aftonbladet)

"New report: Meat consumption must decrease" (headline, SVT)

"Report: More greens and less meat saves the planet" (headline, DN)

These *science says* framed articles primarily used the press release, the TT news report or interviews with report scientists as their sources. The actors behind this framing are the employees from Stockholm University contacting TT and the journalist writing the TT article, but also the journalists from the newspapers reproducing the frame. The newspapers that used this framing were national as well as local newspapers and niche magazines such as the environmentally focused newspapers Tidningen Global, Extrakt and Impact Loop, and other niche magazines such as Aktuellt i Politiken and Ny Teknik. In the *science says* framed articles, the scientists behind the report were presented as experts, often with name and title, described as renowned scientists, and were frequently quoted or referred to. Examples of these kinds of presentations are found in the following paragraphs:

"It is one of the ten most-cited interdisciplinary studies in policy documents of all time. It deals with how we can eat a healthy diet within planetary boundaries," says Line Gordon, Director of the Stockholm Resilience Centre at Stockholm University" (DN)

"The report is backed by 70 experts from 35 countries and six continents. The lead author is one of the world's most influential climate scientists, Johan Rockström, Director of the Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research" (Impact Loop)

"We/ you" was also mentioned in changing eating habits or making food system transformation happen. Two examples of when "we/you" was used this way are the headlines "This is how you should eat to save the planet (TT), or "If we fix the

food system, the planet will be saved" (DN). Another actor-group that was mentioned, in opposition to the Commission, was "furious meat eaters" (SvD), described as a group enraged by the first EAT-Lancet report's messages. In this frame, the Commission and scientists behind the report were seen as the strongest voices, based on the fact that their messages, quotes and interviews were most frequently used in the articles.

As regards scientification, the *science says* framed articles included several references to the science in the EAT-Lancet report. The journalists writing the articles included numbers, statistics and statements from the report, as well as quotes or interviews from scientists behind it. An example of this is the fact box included in these articles, "*Facts. This is how the food production pressures the planet" (TT),* where the food systems' impact on the different planetary boundaries is presented. While it is natural to make references to the science of a scientific report, an interpretation is that statistics, numbers and quotes from scientists, and descriptions of the report as "*the largest research report of its kind" (*TT) were also included by the journalists to strengthen the trustworthiness, certainty and weight of the claims in the articles and, in that way, a use of scientification as a discursive strategy.

4.1.1.1. Different focuses within the science says frame

Among the articles reproducing the *science says* frame, I identified slight differences in focus. Some articles focused on the planetary health aspects of the report's messages, while some focused more on the human health aspects, and others directed focus to the meat recommendation in the report. However, the main framing of these articles was that the report is a case of new science and was presented as important facts. Hence, these articles were interpreted to belong to the same frame.

Planetary health focus

In the articles with a *science says* frame and a focus on planetary health, the main problem description was that new scientific findings show that food systems cause negative impacts on the climate and environment. An example of this problem description is found in a news story from the news agency TT, whose text was picked up and republished by several other news outlets, among them national newspapers such as SVT, Dagens Nyheter and Aftonbladet, and large local newspapers such as Göteborgs-Posten and Sydsvenskan. The following quote illustrates the problem description.

"The report now gets a follow-up, and she (a report scientist) is one of the lead authors. Recently, it was ascertained that seven of the nine so-called planetary boundaries have been crossed. The report now establishes that the world's food production is the reason that we have transgressed five of these boundaries" (TT)

The causes in the planetary-health focused articles are described as an unsustainable diet, lack of political leadership, resistance from agricultural interests, disinformation, and weak individual ability to choose better food. The causes are described as both systemic and an individual responsibility of food choice. The described solutions presented in these articles are a transformation of the food system and eating a Planetary Health Diet. Described causes and solutions are exemplified in the following paragraphs:

"The study highlights a lack of political leadership and a food industry that doesn't want to transform. With taxes and subsidies and demands on procurement, politicians can help to transform the agricultural sector. The industry counteracts the transition with lobbying and advertising, sometimes pure disinformation. We often feel that we have free choice and that we should take more responsibility as consumers. But in fact we are quite controlled in today's food system" (Aftonbladet)

"A large part of today's environmental problems can be attributed to food, according to the major research report EAT-Lancet" (DN)

"This is how you should eat to save the planet" (headline, TT)

"The easiest thing is to switch to whole grains as much as you can. Switch some of the animal foods you eat today to plant foods instead," says sustainability professor Line Gordon, director of the Stockholm Resilience Centre at Stockholm University" (TT)

The environmentally focused newspapers also focused on planetary health, but presented the problems and causes in more self-evident terms than the other articles with this framing. This was shown in the descriptions of problems and solutions, in more straightforwardly stating that the way we eat is unsustainable, that the report "confirms", or describing the report as a "mega-report" (Impact Loop) and putting forward the report scientists. The following paragraphs illustrate this:

"Almost exclusively plant-based foods on the plate needed to save the planet – according to the new mega-report" (headline, Impact Loop)

"A global shift in diet is required to save the climate and health" (Tidningen Global)

"Global dietary habits threaten both the climate and health" (Landets Fria Tidning)

"The researcher shares their best advice – and especially champions legumes." (Impact Loop)

Human health focus

In the human health-focused articles by Expressen, Omni and Nyheter24, the main problem description was that new science says that we can prevent unnecessary

deaths and declining human health. Planetary health is mentioned in these articles, but human lives and health are in focus. These articles highlight the gains – lives saved and solutions – shifting to a PHD, rather than always explicitly describing the problem, as illustrated in the following paragraphs:

”15 million fewer deaths” (Expressen)

”New dietary guidelines can save 15 million lives per year” (Nyheter24)

“New report: More beans can save 40 000 lives every day” (Omni)

Examples of descriptions of what was interpreted as underlying causes of unnecessary deaths are found in Nyheter24, where one cause is described as food impacting climate emissions that impact humans and in Expressen, mentioning uneven access to healthy food, clean environments and liveable wages. Another example of how the solution implies the problem was found in Omni. Food was here described as a solution, as long as it is in accordance with a PHD. This suggests that if we continue our current food practices, millions of lives will be lost, emissions will increase, and biodiversity loss will continue. Paragraphs exemplifying this are found below:

“Approximately one-third of global climate-impacting emissions are linked to food. Limiting the temperature rise to manageable levels requires us to change our habits and systems” (Nyheter24)

“The new report states that enough food is produced for everyone in the world, but that almost 3.7 billion people lack reliable access to healthy food, a clean environment, or a living wage” (Expressen)

”What we put on our plates can save millions of lives, decrease emissions by billions of tons, stop the loss of biodiversity and create a fairer food system, he (Johan Rockström) says to the Guardian” (Omni)

The meat recommendation focus

Some articles within the *science says* frame particularly problematised the recommendation about meat consumption. The problem description, causes, and solutions were described in line with the report’s, but the recommended amount of meat was highlighted and described as problematic too. The meat recommendation was described as controversial, either implicitly or explicitly, or as part of a “culture war”. This problematization was found in the news articles in SvD, Expressen and Göteborgs-Posten, illustrated in the following paragraphs:

“Advice from the scientists – 15 grams of meat per day: ”Sounds very little”” (Headline, Göteborgs-Posten).

“Last time, they were attacked by furious meat-eaters, and meat became part of the culture war. Now, the new EAT-Lancet report on the diet best suited for the climate and health is being released. And the advice remains the same: eat as little red meat as possible” (SvD)

"PHD, on the other hand, recommends a maximum of one portion or 100 grams (meat) per week. However, the recommendation to cut back on sugar, saturated fat, and salt is not particularly controversial" (Expressen)

One moral implication in the *science says* framed articles is that it is right to fix the problems with the food system, to save human lives and the planet, based on how the problem, causes, and solutions are described. This implies that there is a chance of solving the problem and that there is hope in the solutions proposed by the Commission. Another moral implication is that the science and scientists behind the report are right and trustworthy, derived from how these scientists are described positively, highlighted and quoted. An overall moral implication in this frame is that scientific facts are important, based on the use of phrases like "new report" or "scientists state" that are used in many of the headlines, which usually contain what the journalists believe to be the most important or interesting information.

4.1.2. The political backlash frame

Another frame that I identified was the *political backlash* frame. Here, political backlash in Europe connected to food policy and politicians' responsibility in climate action was the main topic. The report's main messages were presented, but the focus was on a described cause of the problem, namely Europe's broken promise to lead the food system transformation and a political backlash in the transformation in Europe. In most articles that used the press release or TT as their source, a described cause of the problem was weak political leadership, but in this frame it was the focus. This is exemplified in the following paragraphs from the Political backlash-framed article:

> "Our food is destroying the planet – and Europe looks away" (headline)

> "Europe promised to lead the way – but backed away…The publication reports that the Farm to Fork strategy is effectively dead—halted by massive farmer protests, powerful industry lobbies, and the consequences of the war in Ukraine. At the same time, the EU is poised to back away from its targets for reducing methane emissions"

In this framing of the report and its content, the EAT-Lancet report seems to have been treated as a sort of entry point to a public debate about injustice and the European/West responsibility in food system transformation, rather than being the main topic. As regards of scientifiation in the *political backlash* frame, my interpretation is that the report was used as an argument and scientific proof, as a strategy to strengthen the weight of claims in the article. The report was made less salient, partly obscured by the focus on European policy.

In the *political backlash* frame, the mentioned actors were the EU, the Commission, several scientists from the Commission, the rich part of the world, and developing countries. The commissioners were presented as people worth listening to, coming with solutions to the problem, as seen in references and quotes to many of the scientists behind the report. Politicians (in the EU) were presented as irresponsible, not fulfilling their commitments and promises. A divide between rich and poor areas and people was also described, interpreted as the rich being the causative actors in the problems that affect the poor countries and people.

The problem description in the frame was in line with the problem description in the *science says* frame, that our current food system is unsustainable and needs to change. But the causes and actors responsible – Europe and wealthy countries- were highlighted. This is illustrated in the following paragraphs:

> "The wealthiest cause the most damage. At the same time, the report points out that the wealthiest 30 per cent of the global population account for more than 70 per cent of the environmental pressure caused by food systems"

"Instead, there has been a return to old conflicts regarding agricultural subsidies, import rules, and how to appease dissatisfied farmers in countries such as France, Germany, and Poland"

An implicit solution is interpreted to be that European politicians take action and responsibility for a climate transition, based on the presented problem and causes. A more explicit solution presented is people switching to a PHD, which is exemplified in the following paragraph:

"A new diet for both people and the planet. Researchers maintain that it is still possible to feed the Earth's growing population sustainably, but that this requires a complete transformation of our dietary habits. The so-called "planetary health diet" proposed by EAT-Lancet is based on…"

A moral implication in this article is that the flawed food system is wrong and unjust. This implication is illustrated in the problem description and causes, and in the mention that the damage is caused by the wealthy. Another implication is that it is right that European politicians take responsibility for the problems, based on the critique against political inaction.

4.1.3. The green bubble elitism frame

One frame that was critical toward the Commission and the report was the *green bubble elitism* frame. In this frame, the Commission is described as part of a green elite, and the report as an expression of this green elite's agenda. The critique was directed towards the report and Commission, but the recommendations around meat were primarily in focus. What made this frame distinct from the other critical frame is the argumentation around the problem and causes, as well as the description of the Commission. This will be illustrated in further detail below.

Meat production and consumption were a consistent topic throughout the *green bubble elitism* framed articles, found in the problem descriptions and causes, solutions and moral implications. In these articles, the debate writers or journalists expressed advocacy for meat and criticism towards decreasing meat consumption in Sweden. While advocating the production and consumption of meat, the impact of the consumption was omitted. Framing the report as an expression of a green power elite was also seen as a way to silence the problems and solutions for the food system.

This frame was reproduced in a debate article in the national newspaper SvD by an ecologist and a historian, in a news article in the right-wing newspaper Samnytt, in a debate article by the CEO of the meat industry association Svenskt Kött published in the agricultural industry newspaper Land, by different actors interviewed in a column in food industry magazine Livsmedel i Fokus, and by a columnist in the news magazine Fokus. The meat industry was also represented by the CEO of Svenskt Kött, who expressed herself as also speaking for the larger agricultural sector as well as consumers. Prominent voices in this frame were the historian and ecologist writing the debate article in SvD, coining the green bubble metaphor, which will be further described below. The Commission, SRC, the EU's European Green Deal, the Swedish Food Agency and the Swedish Climate Policy Council are mentioned as actors who are part of the "green bubble", an elite with power over the food system. In the Fokus article, another scientist is presented in contrast with "the nutritional scientist professor", who is not named but described as representing the Commission.

The problem description was that the Commission and their meat recommendation are wrong, harmful for Sweden, or not based on feasible stakeholder representation. In the column in Fokus, the topic was food recommendations more generally, and the problem description that the report is reprimanding. The culture war trope was also used in this frame as part of describing the problem. These problem descriptions are exemplified in the following paragraphs:

"The advice to eat less meat and dairy products rests on weak science, lacks a basis in Nordic agriculture, and threatens Sweden's food security" (from preamble, SvD)

"In a short time, meat has become a new battlefront in the culture war. For regardless of whether we can produce plant-based protein in Sweden, we are now being urged to consume less meat and dairy" (SvD)

"Here, researchers, philanthropists, and communicators are given free rein to describe how food is produced—and to shape the food systems of the future—without those who sow, harvest, milk, or struggle to make the family food budget stretch even being allowed in the room" (Land)

"It concerned the officially reprimanding EAT-Lancet report, which tells us we are duty-bound to live on beans to add 15 joyless years to our lives—or else the world will end." (Fokus)

The described causes of these problems are salient in this frame. Here, the cause is described as the Commission being part of an environmental science elite, a "green bubble", that has power over the food system and does not include the perspectives of farmers and consumers in its agenda. The report was presented as an expression of power, or as elitist in terms of the target group (in Fokus). The described causes are illustrated in the following paragraphs:

"The problem is not the ambition to eat sustainably, but rather that decisions are based on models detached from reality. An abstract global theory regarding "planetary boundaries" has come to dictate Swedish food policy. The result is a "green bubble" in which authorities, researchers, and interest groups cite one another but never the actual conditions of agriculture. A green bubble has replaced reality." (SvD)

"For these researchers, it is no longer a matter of science, but of power. The green transition has become an end in itself—a source of revenue in its own right. New projects and updated reports justify more funding and more regulations. Yet this leads to less food from fewer farms" (SvD)

"But the real problem runs deeper—it is about power over food. Power over sustainability. And, above all, power over the narrative. Whoever owns the narrative of what is "sustainable" also gains the authority to define the terms of the political debate. In this context, Eat has become the symbol of something larger— a movement where decisions are made far from both the land and food culture" (Land)

"EAT is rather an interest organisation with strong resources and a clear political agenda than the collected science." (CEO Svenskt Kött, Livsmedel I Fokus)

"The study is based entirely on a top-down perspective that fails to take into account different countries' capacity to produce various types of food." (Peter Kullgren, quote included in Livsmedel i Fokus)

"Studies like EAT-Lancet may play a role in Protestant, secular, rational countries— "if one is well-educated, a city dweller, middle-class, more often women than men – when all these criteria are met, the issue of diet can have an impact." (Fokus)

While the articles in this frame state that eating more sustainably is desirable, the presented solutions are targeting the meat recommendation and the green elite behind it, rather than sustainable eating. One implicit solution in these articles was not to listen to the Commission and report, but to acknowledge its flaws and listen

to the critics instead. In the Land debate article by the CEO of Svenskt Kött, the solution was that the meat industry should take ownership of the green transition and the conversation about sustainability. In the SvD debate article, a solution was described as "bursting the green bubble", which was interpreted as an appeal to uncover the "real" power relations and ruling elite of food policy. In the Fokus article, the described solution was to listen to another scientist, who has a better approach to diets and eating, which can be seen as a case of scientification as a strategy to strengthen the claims in the article. Examples of paragraphs that describe solutions are the following:

> The problem is not the ambition to eat sustainably – but rather that the decisions are based on models that lack a grounding in reality.
>
> "It is therefore time for us to burst this green bubble" (SvD)
>
> "Truly sustainable policy starts with the ground beneath our feet. In the Nordic region, this means a mixed system of crop cultivation and livestock farming, where grazing animals preserve the landscape, fertilise the soil, and provide nutritious food." (SvD)
>
> "We should not merely react to the conversation; we need to initiate and lead it. In every arena and context, we must take ownership of the green transition, take pride in our expertise, stand up for the reality we know, and strive to move forward and improve. Then, no one else will need to tell us what the food of the future is—because we will be the ones showing the way." (Land)
>
> "Tellström's view of society makes our lives bearable. The "nutritional science" makes any sensible person want to go on a hunger strike." (Fokus)

In regard to scientification, the interpreted focus of this frame was to discredit the Commission and report by presenting them as a green elite and power exercise, and scientification was used as part of the strategy. Here, scientification was used in similar strategic ways to those described by Abalo (2025) in his article: to give weight and certainty to one's own claims, to highlight the uncertainty of the opponents' claims, and to make faulty results or reasoning be perceived as correct. In this frame, critics pointed to other scientists, or more loosely, "science" as proof for their claims that the Commission and report are not feasible or trustworthy, exemplified in the following paragraphs:

> "Researchers have already pointed out that the diet does not meet basic nutritional needs…For around 1.6 billion people, it is simply unrealistic" (SvD)
>
> "The new criticism comes from Johan Gärdebo and Stefan Hellstrand—a historian and an ecologist, respectively—who argue that the dietary guidelines rest on weak science" (Samnytt)
>
> "Tellström's view of society makes our lives bearable. The "nutritional science" makes any sensible person want to go on a hunger strike." (Fokus)

Facts presented that support critics' own claims, that can be perceived as scientific but for which no explicit reference was included, were used. This was again found in the debate article in SvD and in the debate article in Land:

"Cows, sheep, and goats have converted grass—inedible for humans—into milk and meat, while simultaneously fertilising the soil. That is why over 90 per cent of Sweden's adult population has the ability to break down lactose. Our Nordic diet has thus evolved out of necessity (SvD)"

"Researchers have already pointed out that the diet does not meet basic nutritional needs…and that it is up to 60 per cent more expensive than the most cost-effective ways to meet nutritional recommendations." (Land)

Claims that are presented as scientific, but are not correct or unconfirmed, are also used, for example:

"If the dietary guidelines are followed, Swedish milk and meat production will be cut by more than half. The resulting gap would be filled by imported plant proteins—primarily from Brazil." (debate, SvD)

"It doesn't turn out well when a handful of people try to create a universal plan for the entire world"(debate, Land).

The news article in Samnytt used quotes from the SvD debate article, which is an opinion piece, not a news article. This can also be seen as a strategy to make faulty claims look correct. None of these claims is correct or confirmed, but in the context of the articles, they can be perceived as such.

Based on the arguments, described problems, causes and solutions above, the implications were that the Commission is wrong, that their recommendations are based on wrong intentions and that the presumed power that they hold is unjustified. This implies that the power of the food system is in the wrong hands, and that power should be removed from the "green elite". This also implies that the Commission and the report are not trustworthy, since it was described as being based on skewed intentions and an illusionist view of reality. Another moral implication is that Swedish meat production and consumption is not bad for people or the environment; rather, decreasing meat in Swedish diets would be harmful for both.

4.1.4. The science is incorrect frame

The other frame that was distinctly critical of the Commission and the report was *the science is incorrect* frame. Besides the report, here too meat was a main topic, and the articles in this frame showed an advocacy for meat consumption. The focus in this frame was that the report and recommendations are not feasible and the Commission is not trustworthy. Here too, my interpretation is that the articles framed this way were targeted to discredit the report and Commission. In this frame too, the impact of meat consumption is omitted, and by drawing attention to the alleged flaws of the report, the problems in the food system were obscured. The following headlines and preambles are telling examples illustrating this framing:

"Meat guidelines need to be reviewed" (headline, Land)

"Things go wrong when the "health diet" leads to nutritional deficiency, starvation, and poverty" (headline, Norrbottens-Kuriren)

"Professor slams the recommendations
The new report from the EAT-Lancet Commission recommends 15 grams of red meat per day—a recommendation with which Professor and Chief Physician Fredrik Nyström disagrees" (Headline and preamble, Jordbruksaktuellt)

"Last week we learned that we shouldn't eat more than 15 grams of red meat per day. That is nonsense." (NWT)

The science is incorrect frame was used in an editorial by a farmer and lead writer from the market liberal think tank Timbro, published in multiple local newspapers, among them Norrbottens-Kuriren, Nya Wermlands Tidning (NWT), Arvika Nyheter and Gotlands Allehanda, a news article in Jordbruksaktuellt, and an editorial in Land. In this frame, other scientists were referred to and described as the "right" experts on the topic, portraying them as the serious experts in contrast to the Commission. This was illustrated in several ways. One way was to describe these scientists with names, titles and merits, illustrated in the quotes above, while the Commission's scientists were presented as *"several scientists from Stockholm Resilience Centre"* (Jordbruksaktuellt) or by name and title but in a miscrediting way, as "experts" within quotation marks (NWT). The agricultural industry was also represented in this frame, in that two of the magazines are agricultural industry newspapers, and in that one writer is a farmer. The voices dominating in *the science is incorrect* frame were agricultural and meat-industry interests and market liberalism, as shown by the actors behind the articles.

The problem description was that the report and recommendations are not true, not feasible or nonsense, and that decreasing meat is problematic for preparedness, nutrition, or will worsen global problems of climate, health and hunger. This is illustrated in the following paragraphs:

"In Dagens Nyheter, Line Gordon—head of the Stockholm Resilience Centre and part of the EAT network—claimed that "most animals in Sweden eat things that humans can also eat." That is incorrect."

"Instead, he (the professor referred to) argues that it is clear that those who follow a strict vegan diet often develop severe vitamin deficiencies unless they take vitamin supplements" (Jordbruksaktuellt)

"In peacetime, a diet consisting largely of imported products may be feasible. But in a crisis—or, in a worst-case scenario, war—we need to eat what can be produced at our latitudes, where meat is an important source of protein." (Land)

"That is a great deal of money for something that solves neither climate, health, nor hunger problems – but rather exacerbates them. Therefore, the EAT report is and remains a mockery of everyone it claims to help." (NWT)

The causes described were that the science behind the report is not correct or feasible, and that it is methodologically flawed or unrealistic. Examples below illustrate this:

"TV4 has spoken to Professor Fredrik Nyström, a chief physician in internal medicine who has conducted health research for over 30 years. He is critical of the report and maintains that there is no evidence to support making recommendations of this kind." (Jordbruksaktuellt)

"The methodological flaws criticized at the time persist. A 2020 review in The Lancet found that the report's models were based on incorrect risk ratios, a lack of transparency, and overestimated effects on mortality" (NWT)

The WHO has withdrawn its support for the report following objections that the diet was nutritionally inadequate and culturally Western. American researcher John Ioannidis, one of the world's most cited experts in evidence-based medicine, described EAT's health arguments as "science fiction." (NWT)

An implicit solution was not to trust the scientific claims by the Commission, but to trust the scientists or studies that the debate writers or journalists referred to in the articles. This interpretation was based on how the Commission's claims are delegitimised, and how the Commission and the report were described as "experts" in quotation, in comparing the report to "real studies", and referring to other "real" experts. Since decreasing meat consumption was described as a problem, another implicit solution was to maintain the current meat consumption. Another solution presented in this frame was for authorities to thoroughly scrutinise the meat recommendation, presented in the editorial in Land. Examples illustrating these solutions are found in the following paragraphs:

"Then "experts" from the West arrive…" (NWT)

"Here, decision-makers and the mainstream media need to scrutinise proposals and create better conditions for increased domestic production—and, in turn, strengthened preparedness" (Land)

John Ioannidis, one of the world's most cited experts in evidence-based medicine, described EAT's health arguments as "science fiction." (NWT)

“The animals that produce red meat primarily consume things we cannot utilize ourselves—such as grass and by-products from the food industry. Can one truly be considered an expert if one seems to have overlooked the fact that humans do not digest cellulose?" (NWT)

“No evidence
"As a researcher and physician working with nutrition, I see absolutely no reason—without having conducted proper studies—to recommend a sudden, radical reduction in the consumption of a vital, nutrient-rich product like meat, simply based on the belief that cutting carbon dioxide emissions will benefit the environment,”" he says (Jordbruksaktuellt)

In this frame, scientification was used to argue against reduced meat consumption by claiming that the report’s recommendations were wrong or unrealistic. Here, scientification was interpreted to be used as a strategy to prove this, to strengthen one’s own claims, to weaken the report’s and Commission’s claims and trustworthiness, and to make false claims appear feasible. References to other studies or scientists were seen as being used as proof that the scientific claims in the report are incorrect. The examples below illustrate this:

“A 2020 review in The Lancet found that the report’s models were based on incorrect risk ratios, a lack of transparency, and overestimated effects on mortality.“ (NWT)

“John Ioannidis, one of the world’s most cited experts in evidence-based medicine, described EAT’s health arguments as “science fiction.”” (NWT)

“TV4 has spoken to Professor Fredrik Nyström, a senior consultant in internal medicine who has conducted health research for over 30 years.”.

The references to other scientists, and presenting these scientists as the true experts, can also be seen as a scientification strategy to make the Commission appear less serious and to create uncertainty around the report. References to other studies were also used to strengthen misleading claims. In the example below, the writer claims that the PHD will lead to nutrient deficiencies, which is neither confirmed nor correct:

“…the fundamental problem remains that the diet leads to nutrient deficiencies. An article in The Lancet Planetary Health points out that the EAT diet does not meet the requirements for vitamin B12, iron, zinc, and iodine.” (NWT).

Another example of a misleading description of the PHD was by implicitly referring to it as a vegan diet, which it is not. This example is found in Jordbruksaktuellt:

“Instead, he argues that it is clear that those who follow a strict vegan diet often develop severe vitamin deficiencies unless they take vitamin supplements”.

In this frame, other ways to delegitimise the Commission were to call the report “nonsense”, “science fiction”, not a real study or to call the Commission “experts” within quotation marks, which I also see as a strategic use of scientification.

Based on the arguments, described problems, causes and solutions above, a moral judgement is that the EAT-Lancet Commission is not trustworthy and should not be listened to. Another moral implication is that the PHD is harmful for people, based on the fact that the diet is described as insufficient when it comes to nutrition, but also that it will reinforce problems of hunger, climate and health. Decreasing the intake of meat was described as harmful for nutrition, which also entails the implication that consuming the current amount of meat today is healthy.

4.1.5. The attack on science frame

A frame reproduced in opinion articles defending the report and the Commission was the *attack on science* frame. This frame rejects the critique launched at the report and describes the critique as being cases of misinterpretations or attacks on the scientific community. Besides defending the report and replying to the criticism, the main topic in this frame was science's role in society. Both scientists from the Commission and other advocates highlighted the importance of science. The following paragraphs are examples illustrating this framing:

"Misleading description of health report" (headline, Norrköpings Tidningar)

"EAT-Lancet is about facts – not power" (headline, Land)

"Camilla Björkbom: The meat lobby continues to spread disinformation" (headline, Syre)

This frame was used by the report authors in replies to articles by the Timbro writer and in Land, and by scientists from other academic institutions, in a reply to the debate article in SvD. It was also reproduced in editorials in Syre and in Sydsvenskan. Here, the scientists from the report had a dominating voice, shown in that many *attack on science* framed articles were written by representatives from the Commission, or were referred to in other articles. This frame was also reproduced by actors outside academia, as the editorial in Syre was written by a person working with food policy and the editorial in Sydsvenskan was written by a lead writer. In these articles, the Commission was presented as trustworthy and right, illustrated in the defence, corrections of misinterpretations, counterclaims, and in how the report was described. The report was, for example, described as containing strong evidence or as a result of extensive work by a large group of scientists, illustrated in the paragraphs below:

"…the scientific evidence is even stronger regarding both climate and health" (Syre)

"The new EAT-Lancet report is the result of several years of work by researchers from 35 countries—in the fields of nutrition, agriculture, economics, climate, and the environment" (reply, Gotlands Allehanda)

It (the report) gathered researchers from Sweden and 34 other countries across various disciplines, including nutrition, agriculture, economics, climate, and the environment" (reply, Land)

The critics also had a voice in this frame, in that they or their arguments were mentioned in the articles. The critics were implicitly described as wrong or ill-informed, stating that the claims are misleading or based on misconceptions, which is illustrated in examples of cause descriptions below. Another group that was mentioned in this frame was the meat industry/lobby and meat advocates. In Syre, the meat industry/ lobby and meat defenders were presented as opponents to the Commission, described as being responsible for attacks on the new report. Another

way to describe meat advocates in this frame was as “culture warriors”, who were being triggered by threats to meat and tried to shoot down the report’s claims. This will be further exemplified in a paragraph from Sydsvenskan below.

The problem presented was that the critique towards the report and the Commission is also an attack on science and scientists. The replies were addressed to critics who misinterpreted or wrongfully described the report and its intended function, as well as accusing the Commission of using the report as an exercise of power. Another problem description was that the food systems are unsustainable and unhealthy, and that Sweden consumes too much meat, in line with the report’s messages. The critique of the report was also described as cases of disinformation and lobbying. The following paragraphs exemplify these problem descriptions:

“Johan Gärdebo and Stefan Hellstrand are concerned that a diet with more plant-based foods and less meat and dairy products could threaten Sweden’s food supply (SvD Debatt, Oct. 11). However, their conclusions are based on several misconceptions” (reply, SvD)

”It is extremely worrying that a compilation of science is interpreted as an attempt to "seize power". The task of research is to contribute knowledge as a basis for other actors' decisions." (reply, Land)

“The Swedish diet is currently among the most climate-damaging in the world. We need to reduce meat and dairy consumption for the sake of both better health and improved preparedness” (SvD)

“Changing Markets has managed to obtain an audio recording from a secretive meat industry conference, in which it is suggested that a similar disinformation campaign is being planned against the new report. The tactic involves sowing doubt and questioning the facts and scientific consensus.” (Syre)

A described cause was that the critics are not knowledgeable enough. This is based on an argument in the SvD debate reply illustrated below, where the critics are encouraged to take part in research on the topic. Another cause is presented in the lead article in Sydsvenskan, as the meat recommendation is an emotional topic and a threat that triggers “culture warriors”. Other described causes are disinformation from the meat lobby and other meat advocates, and insufficient media scrutiny of industry connections of actors in the debate, presented in the editorial in Syre. Illustrative examples of these causes are the following paragraphs:

“We encourage Gärdebo and Hellstrand to engage with the extensive research and the many perspectives being discussed regarding food, climate, health, the environment, and societal transformation” (SvD)

“For the topic of how the world’s food production can become sustainable for the planet, enough for everyone and healthy for everyone, emotions are running high” (Sydsvenskan)

“Perceived threats to the bloody steak trigger culture warriors even more than perceived threats to gasoline-powered cars.” (Sydsvenskan)

"Disinformation campaigns would not be so successful if journalists investigated the industry ties of those who begin to question what has been produced through solid scientific work" (Syre)

A presented solution was keeping to the facts and treating science in accordance with its role. This was described implicitly in the counterargument against claims that the report is about power, where the defenders of the report point to the role of science, correct critics' misunderstandings, and encourage the critics to read up on the topic. Another solution was that the media should more thoroughly examine the backgrounds and industry connections of the critical voices to mitigate disinformation, as in the example in Syre. A third solution was more nuanced discussions about the issue, and that science, politics and production start to collaborate around issues in the green transition. Examples of this are found in the following paragraphs:

"If Sweden truly wants to take the lead in the green transition, we need to build bridges between research, policy, and production. It is through this collaboration that the sustainable food systems of the future can emerge" (reply, Land)

"My hope is that we can have a nuanced discussion about how food can become a solution—not a problem—for our shared future" (reply, NT)

In this frame, scientification was used as a strategy to strengthen one's own claims and to argue against the critics' claims. To rebut the claims that are described as misleading or misinterpreted, the defenders point to the report and other scientific studies, exemplified in the following paragraphs:

"On the contrary, the report shows…"(NT)

"an increased intake of animal-based foods may be beneficial, as described in the report" (NT)

"The report itself is not intended to impose anything on anyone. It provides a scientific basis regarding the impact of our current diet on the environment, health, and equity, and how we can create a more robust and resilient food system" (reply, Gotlands Allehanda).

"Organisations such as the IPCC, IPBES, and the WHO have long established that a shift in diet is required to achieve these goals and improve public health (SvD)"

In this frame, the report's scientific claims were also contrasted with unsubstantiated claims to point to the weakness of the opponents' arguments, as for example in the following paragraphs:

"In her opinion piece, Isabel Moretti argues that the EAT-Lancet Commission is attempting to seize control over food…This is a misunderstanding of both the purpose and the role of the EAT-Lancet Commission."

"It is highly concerning that a compilation of scientific findings is interpreted as an attempt to "seize power".

The editorials in Sydsvenskan and Syre were also contrasting scientific facts with "non-science", referring to a coordinated culture war, emotional reactions, and discreditation by the opponents:

> "But tell me the scientific research that can't be shot down with a little coordinated culture war and a powerful hashtag" (Sydsvenskan)

> "But also a storm of baseless claims and outright disinformation—not only accusations of climate extremism and hypocrisy but also lies about coercion and bans—partly orchestrated by powerful industry associations within the food sector" (Sydsvenskan)

> "Even worse are the government representatives who have already begun to discredit the most comprehensive report ever produced on diet, health, and the climate. Minister for Rural Affairs Peter Kullgren writes on social media that "many media outlets are currently circulating a report that, among other things, advocates for extremely low meat consumption as the healthiest and most environmentally smart option"—as if it were just any ordinary report. He also attempts to portray the report's findings as extreme by using that very word" (Syre)

A moral judgement in this frame was that the Commission and report are right and trustworthy, while the critics are wrong and untrustworthy. This was based on the counterclaims – that the critics, the meat industry among others, are spreading false claims and disinformation, and on the problematisation of accusing the report of being an exercise of power. Another moral implication was that the scientific community is important, shown by describing the problem with the attack on science. A third moral implication was that it is right to decrease consumption of meat and dairy, since it is right to protect the planet and improve human health.

5. Discussion

The different framings of the report reproduced by the media can have several possible effects on the public's meaning-making of the report and thus be a contributing factor to their acceptance or resistance to it. As previously mentioned, many articles in the media reproduced a *science says* framing. This frame was used by several large national newspapers, which means that a considerable number of Swedes potentially were exposed to this framing. Presenting the report as important could have the potential effect of increasing awareness about the issue and contributing to acceptance of the report. The contradictory frames, such as *science says* versus *the science is incorrect*, or *green bubble elitism* versus *attack on science,* as well as public criticism and debate, on the other hand, risk fuelling polarisation and creating distrust around the report and food system transformation, which risks the public rejecting the report. The different framings could also be an expression of existing polarisation around the issue of dietary recommendations and food system transformation, and a sign that the report will meet resistance outside the media too. Relating to the conclusion from Tak et al.'s (2024) study, negative framing and criticism, especially towards interventions in economic or market interests, could also affect how policymakers and government actors act on the report's messages and recommendations.

A reflection regarding different frames reproduced by different newspapers is that it is not unexpected that newspapers affiliated with the agricultural or meat industry frame the report negatively, due to the report's message about reducing meat consumption. However, these magazines address key stakeholders in the food system transformation, namely farmers and agricultural businesses, whose role in the transformation is important. Thus, framing the report negatively in these newspapers might risk these stakeholders' acceptance of the report. Another reflection is that national news media and local newspapers have a large and broad audience combined, and their framings of the report have the potential to reach many people. That one of the largest daily newspapers, SvD and TV4 (referred to in Jordbruksaktuellt), as well as many local newspapers, gave space to actors who used false or unconfirmed scientific claims to delegitimise the report, which means spreading these messages to a rather large public. This might also influence the acceptance of the report.

According to Nisbet & Newman (2015), different frames are likely to activate distinct cognitive schemata among members of the public, which can affect the likelihood that the report's messages are accepted or rejected. Individuals with values, morals or interests that match the ones expressed in the critical framings are interpreted to be more likely to agree with these and thus less likely to accept the

report and recommendations, while individuals with values matching the ones expressed in the advocating frames are more likely to accept them. But the plethora of opposing scientific claims, facts and opinions about the report in the different frames might create confusion and uncertainty for individuals, making it hard to know what to believe or who to trust, which can also affect the acceptance of the report.

An interesting finding is the focus on meat consumption in the reporting. Relating to Bené (2024), Booth (2025), and Tak (2023), in this study, meat was also found to be a highly mediated and conflicted topic. That almost all articles mentioned meat is not surprising since meat is part of the PHD, but that a great part of the articles, in one way or another, highlighted meat consumption, is interesting. Meat is only one of the food sources mentioned in the report and PHD, and while it states that meat consumption needs to decrease, this is far from the only message. This can be interpreted to show that meat consumption is a hot topic for the media. A potential effect of making the meat recommendation salient and silencing other parts is that key messages of the report are missed, and that a belief that the issue is solely about meat consumption and not food system transformation is reproduced. This risks steering focus to a public debate about meat consumption rather than a food system transformation. Another potential effect of describing the report's meat recommendation as harmful in relation to human nutrition or Swedish preparedness, economy, or ecology is spreading the belief that consuming less meat would be wrong.

Another finding that I believe is interesting is the use of the trope of culture war to describe the meat debate. This can potentially contribute to a view that meat consumption is a matter of values, culture, or ideology, rather than a matter of health or environmental impact. Another risk with this description is that it suggests that the issue is a matter of individual choice and responsibility, rather than a structural problem where the industry and government actors have responsibility, as mentioned in the study by Tak (2023).

A reflection connected to the focus on meat is that many of the media outlets were conflict-oriented and facilitated debate around the issue by publishing opinion pieces. This could be seen as an expression of the media's logic to focus on conflict. One example of this conflict focus was the emphasis on meat, which relates to Jelsø's (2015) findings of a discursive battlefield of interests and lobbying around dietary guidelines, particularly around meat and sugary foods. Other examples of conflict orientation were the highlighting of different interests in disagreement, or different standpoints between experts. The contrasting media frames, debate and conflict focus might give the impression that the report is subject to quite an intense conflict. But as shown in the analysis of voices in the debate, not all stakeholders

in relation to a Swedish food system transformation were represented in the media coverage, and the voices from farmers, consumers, agriculturists and civil society were limited. The media helps construct our understanding of the report and the conflict surrounding it. While the mediatisation of the conflict helps construct it, it might not fully mirror the conflict situation concerning the report outside the media context. This could be a case of the media and debaters creating a discursive battlefield that is more severe than the real conflicts between interests and actors, similar to what Béné (2024) described in his study. If so, there is a risk that the polarisation and the depth of the conflict are reinforced rather than mitigated, which could also have implications for the acceptance of the report and a food system transformation. Other potential risks of this conflict focus are that it could contribute to confusion and uncertainty in the public's meaning-making of the report and decrease the level of trust in the Commission.

Scientification was found to be used by actors to strengthen claims, critique or defence in the media reporting. References to studies, scientists or, more loosely, science, were used by critics to discredit and delegitimise the Commission and report, and by the defence to rebut the critique. In some cases, such as in the *political backlash* frame and in the *green bubble elitism* frame, the report was interpreted to be a catalyst for debate and an opening to public dialogue about food policy, environmental governance and political responsibility, or a critique of the environmental science community. The use of scientification as a strategy, with scientific claims to discredit or question other scientific claims, is also seen as fuelling the conflict in the media and creating uncertainty around the science. The conflict orientation can also be seen as an effect of a media logic and journalists' tendency to focus on conflict, as described by Abalo (2025).

Several actors outside academia were given speaking opportunities as experts in the media, using scientification as a discursive tool to argue for their opinions and interests. The critique and delegitimisation attempts by these non scientific actors can also be interpreted as a potential risk of affecting the trust and attitude towards the report negatively, which can also affect the acceptance of the report and its messages. Another risk with scientification use in the media pointed out by Abalo (2025) is the spread of misinformation or false or doubtful claims. Findings in this analysis confirm that this was the case in several newspapers in the media coverage, publishing articles by, or referring to, "experts" with false or doubtful scientific claims, in attempts to delegitimise the report. The misinformation is seen as a factor fuelling the polarisation, uncertainty or doubt about the report, which risks leading to rejection of it. Abalo (2025) points to the responsibility of the media when it comes to not spreading misinformation, since they have control over what to publish. Relating to what was mentioned in Syre, that the media should more thoroughly investigate the critics, their interests, and their sources could mitigate

the spread of unsupported claims. Due to the prevalence of scientifically framed misinformation in some of the media coverage, often used as a strategy to uphold interests, it seems like the media failed to fully scrutinise actors and scientific claims before publishing them.

Relating to the generalised frames by Nisbet & Newman (2015) and Mateu & Dominguez (2019), frames identified in my analysis were found to have similarities with these typologies. For example, the *science says* frame could be compared to *social progress*, *public health*, or *science as a solution*, and *the science is incorrect* frame could be compared to *scientific uncertainty* or *public health. Social progress*, with a focus on improving life and solutions, or harmony with nature, is in line with how the *science says* frame describes the report's recommendations and solutions, as a way to improve health for the planet and humans. *Public health* can be compared to how saved life and increased human health are described as an outcome of adapting to a PHD, and in how the risks and problems for human health that the current food system poses are described in the *science says* frame. *Science as a solution* can be compared to *science says* too, in the way the reports' scientific findings and recommendations are presented as solutions for the food system. *The science is incorrect* frame and *scientific uncertainty* are similar in that they point to the issue as being a matter of expert understanding, and in this study's case, to address what the critics mean by incorrect or wrong scientific claims. This indicates that these typologies are largely applicable in this case.

Due to limitations in the scope and timeframe of the thesis, audio and video coverage and articles after the first two weeks were not included in the analysis. This might have affected the results, as more content from more sources could have exposed additional frames, voices or layers in the debate. To get a deeper understanding of the media representation of the report, the meaning-making of the report, and conflicts connected to it and a Swedish food system transformation, it would be relevant to examine social media coverage, as well as the public's meaning-making from their perspective. To understand the impact of the report, as well as the media framing, it would also be interesting to follow potential policy development around the issue. This could be a relevant task for future research.

6. Conclusion

This study has shown that the framing of the EAT-Lancet report in Swedish media was fragmented. Depending on the actors behind the framing and their interests, the report was either presented as important science, or as nonsense/ untrustworthy science or as a power expression. The media, on the one hand, presented the report as trustworthy new science that sheds light on challenges in the food system, which could bring awareness to the issue and contribute to acceptance of the report. But the media also facilitated debate and conflict, giving considerable space to critics who used scientification and misleading information as a strategy to delegitimise the report. This could lead to uncertainty and decreased trust among the public towards the report, which can have a negative effect on the reception by the public as well as policymakers, business leaders, farmers and other stakeholders in the food system transformation. In conclusion, by giving considerable space to critics and their use of scientification and misleading information, the media legitimises them and spreads misinformation, thereby risking compromising public acceptance of the report and negatively affecting attitudes towards a transformation of the Swedish food system.

7. References

Abalo, Ernesto. (2025). The scientification of risks and the risks of scientification. 10.4324/9781003479550-3, in Roslyng, M.M., Rantasila, A., & Jönsson, A.M. (Eds.). (2025). Communicating Science, Climate Change and the Environment in Hybrid Media: Constructed Facts, Contested Truths (1st ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003479550

Ayesha I T Tulloch, Fiona Borthwick, Diana Bogueva, Mahmoud Eltholth, Amanda Grech, Dylan Edgar, Sinead Boylan, Geraldine McNeill, How the EAT–Lancet Commission on food in the Anthropocene influenced discourse and research on food systems: a systematic review covering the first 2 years post-publication, The Lancet Global Health, Volume 11, Issue 7, 10.1016/S2214-109X(23)00212-7

Béné C and Lundy M (2023) Political economy of protein transition: Battles of power, framings and narratives around a false wicked problem. Front. Sustain. 4:1098011. doi: 10.3389/frsus.2023.1098011

Booth, Amanda, Blake, Denise, Breheny, Mary, Who's responsible? A media framing analysis of climate change and meat reduction in Aotearoa New Zealand, *Health Promotion International*, Volume 40, Issue 3, June 2025, daaf065, https://doi.org/10.1093/heapro/daaf065

Bunge, A.C., Clark, M. & Gordon, L.J. "Fika in the Anthropocene": leveraging food systems transformations through food cultures. Sustain Sci 20, 2141–2155 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-025-01680-0

EAT, eatforum.org, The EAT-Lancet, The Planetary Health Diet https://eatforum.org/eat-lancet/the-planetary-health-diet/, 2026-01-22

EAT, eatforum.org, About, https://eatforum.org/about/, 2026-06-18

Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. Journal of Communication, 43(4), 51–58. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1993.tb01304.x

Garcia, David et al. EAT-Lancet vs yes2meat: the digital backlash to the planetary health diet, The Lancet, Volume 394, Issue 10215, 2153 – 2154, 10.1016/S0140-6736(19)32526-7

Jelsøe, E. (2015). Dietary guidelines: Nutritional health communication versus sustainable food policy. Journal of Transdisciplinary Environmental Studies, 14(2), 36-51.

Jönsson, Anna. (2025). Mediated science and issues of public knowledge and trust. 10.4324/9781003479550-12, in Roslyng, M.M., Rantasila, A., & Jönsson, A.M. (Eds.). (2025). Communicating Science, Climate Change and the Environment in Hybrid Media: Constructed Facts, Contested Truths (1st ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003479550

Mateu, Anna & Dominguez, Marti. (2019). The green battle in the media: A framing analysis of environmental press coverage. Communication & Society. 32. 275-290. 10.15581/003.32.4.275-290.

Mazac, R., Karlsson Potter, H., Persson, U.M. et al. Diet changes in food futures improve Swedish environmental and health outcomes. Commun Earth Environ 6, 755 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1038/s43247-025-02679-2

Newman, Todd & Nisbet, Matthew. (2015). Framing, the Media, and Environmental Communication. 10.4324/9781315887586.ch28. In The Routledge Handbook of Environment and Communication. Chapter: 28, Routledge

Nguyen, H (2018), Sustainable food systems Concept and framework, Food and Agriculture Organization of The United Nations https://openknowledge.fao.org/handle/20.500.14283/ca2079en

Ochanda, Daniel. (2025). OVERVIEW: GLOBAL FOOD SYSTEMS AND FOOD SYSTEMS SUSTAINABILITY TRANSITION (By Daniel Ochanda) 1.1 Definition. 10.13140/RG.2.2.35410.26564.

OECD (2021), OECD.org, Food systems and the triple challenge https://www.oecd.org/content/dam/oecd/en/publications/reports/2021/01/food-systems-and-the-triple-challenge_7c29bcba/2b4fea77-en.pdf, 2026-01-22,

Plesner, U. (2012). The Performativity of “Media Logic” in the Mass Mediation of Science. *Public Understanding of Science*, *21*(6), 674-688. https://doi.org/10.1177/0963662510385309

Rockström, J, et al. 2025, The EAT–Lancet Commission on healthy, sustainable, and just food systems, The Lancet, Volume 406, Issue 10512, 1625 – 1700

Roslyng, M.M., Rantasila, A., & Jönsson, A.M. (Eds.). (2025). Communicating Science, Climate Change and the Environment in Hybrid Media: Constructed Facts, Contested Truths (1st ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003479550

Stockholm Resilience Centre, Stockholmresilience.org, Research, New solutions for our global food system,

https://www.stockholmresilience.org/research/research-news/2016-06-14-new-solutions-for-our-global-food-system.html, 2026-02-05

Swedish Board of Agriculture, Jordbruksverket.se, Livsmedelskonsumtion och näringsinnehåll. Livsmedelskonsumtion och näringsinnehåll. Uppgifter till och med 2024, https://jordbruksverket.se/om-jordbruksverket/jordbruksverkets-officiella-statistik/jordbruksverkets-statistikrapporter/statistik/2025-12-11-livsmedelskonsumtion-och-naringsinnehall.--uppgifter-till-och-med-2024, 2026-02-05

Tak, Mehroosh & Blair, Kirsty & Marques, João. (2024). Who is responsible for fixing the food system? A framing analysis of media reactions to the UK's National Food Strategy. British Food Journal. 126. 119-142. 10.1108/BFJ-04-2023-0338

UNDP, UNDP.org, Global Food Systems, Food System Transformation, https://www.undp.org/facs/food-systems-transformation, 2026-01-21

Willett W, Rockström J, Loken B et al., Food in the Anthropocene: the EAT–*Lancet* Commission on healthy diets from sustainable food systems, The Lancet, 2019; 393, 447-492, 10.1016/S0140-6736(18)31788-4.

8. Popular science summary

A battle between experts*

Analysing the Swedish media coverage of the 2025 EAT-Lancet report

The 2025 EAT-Lancet Commission report is the most extensive assessment of global food systems to date, and the report's message is clear: we need to change how we eat for the sake of the planet and human lives. But not everyone agrees. The report received significant media attention in Sweden and also sparked debate. A new study of Swedish media coverage shows that the report was framed in different ways depending on the newspaper and the actors behind it, and that the reporting tended to be conflict-oriented. The analysis also found that critics attempted to delegitimise the report in the media debate, which could affect the report's perceived credibility and people's acceptance of its messages.

Today's global food systems are far from sustainable and need to be changed if we want to improve human health and ease the pressure on our planet. Food systems include all parts and activities relating to producing, processing, distributing, consuming, and disposing of food, as well as the social, economic, and environmental outputs and impacts of these activities (Ochanda, 2025). The EAT-Lancet Commission 2019 and 2025 assessed global food systems and provided solutions for supplying just, sustainable, and healthy food to humans globally. Implementing the reports' recommendations can have great benefits for both people and the planet, but the reports were the subject of debate in both Swedish and international media. Many people get their information about new science from the media, and the way the media frames an issue can have effects on how you perceive the issue, whether it is important, if it is right or wrong, and how you should act on it. This applies to individuals in the public as well as politicians, business leaders, and other decision-makers.

Through framing analysis, together with an analysis of scientification use by actors in the media, which is the recontextualization of a scientific matter and a discursive strategy by actors where an issue is given or renegotiated with a scientific character or to strengthen arguments (Abalo, 2025), the study analysed Swedish media articles from the two weeks following the report launch.

The analysis revealed several interesting findings. The EAT-Lancet report was framed differently by different media outlets, depending on the actors behind the articles. While several newspapers framed the report as important science targeting food system challenges, considerable critique of the report, partly based on misleading information and scientification as a strategy to delegitimise the report, was also given space in the media. Critics framed the report as a case of power expression by a green elite, or as a case of incorrect or untrustworthy science. An interesting finding was that many of the newspapers tended to focus on disagreement or conflict in their reporting. In the debate that unfolded

during the studied weeks, some newspapers highlighted disagreeing experts, both arguing for and against the report's messages, or pointed out that there was uncertainty about the report's messages. There was also a focus on meat consumption in the debate, which is a highly conflicted topic. Even though the report only mentions high meat consumption as one of the problems, and a limited amount of meat in the recommended diet, many articles choose to put emphasis on meat.

The study concludes that it is likely that the overall media coverage contributed to a reinforcement of conflicts related to food system transformation and dietary recommendations. By giving considerable space to the critics' use of scientification and misleading information, these media outlets legitimise them and spread misinformation, thereby risking compromising public acceptance of the report and a transformation of the Swedish food system. This can affect how members of the public, as well as politicians, the agriculture and food industry, and other decision-makers choose to act on the report's messages and recommendations, and, by extension, the Swedish food system transformation.

This study can help increase awareness of the media's role in disseminating and representing the EAT-Lancet report in Sweden and provide insight into Swedish advocacy and resistance to the report's messages. It also contributes to knowledge development about the media's role in disseminating information about dietary recommendations, food system transformation, and scientific findings. The study can also be used as part of a larger research project about individuals' views and understandings of food system transformation, and in a wider context, contribute to increased insights about how to communicate with people about these issues in an effective way.

Appendices

Appendix 1: List of all analysed articles

Expressen – 15 miljoner färre förtida dödsfall
SvD – Forskare: Max 15 gram rött kött per dag för en hållbar framtid
SvD – Den planetära dieten hotar vår matförsörjning
SvD – Växtbaserad mat är en storfördel
DN – Rapport: Mer grönt och mindre kött räddar planeten
Göteborgsposten – Rådet från forskarna – 15 gram kött per dag: ”Låter väldigt lite”
Göteborgsposten – Studie: Så ska du äta för att skona jorden
TT – Så ska du äta för att skona jorden
TT – Rapport: Mer grönt och mindre kött räddar planeten
Aftonbladet – Rapport: Mer grönt och mindre kött räddar planeten
Sydsvenskan – Stor studie: mer grönt och mindre kött räddar planeten
Sydsvenskan – Jesper Sahlin: Räkna med kulturkrigstjafs om köttet
Omni – Ny rapport: Mer bönor kan rädda 40 000 liv varje dag
Nyheter24 – Nya kostråd kan rädda 15 miljoner liv om året
Nya Wermlands-Tidningen – Svårsmälta kostråd
Nya Wermlands-Tidningen – Missvisande bild av rapport
Nya Wermlands-Tidningen – Line Gordon har fel!
Arvika Nyheter – Svårsmälta kostråd
Norrbottens-Kuriren – Fel när "hälsodiet" leder till näringsbrist, svält och fattigdom
Gotlands Allehanda – ”Hälsodieten” ger näringsbrist
Gotlands Allehanda – Maten kan bli en lösning – inte ett problem
Norrköpings Tidningar – Debatt: Missvisande bild av hälsorapport
Gefle Dagblad – Efter rapporten – så ska du äta för att leva miljövänligt
Blekinge Läns Tidning – Studie: Så ska du äta för att skona jorden
Helsingborgs Dagblad – Stor studie: mer grönt och mindre kött räddar planeten
Helsingborgs Dagblad –Jesper Sahlin: Räkna med kulturkrigstjafs om köttet
SVT – Ny rapport: Köttkonsumtionen måste minska
Dagens PS –Vår mat förstör planeten – och Europa tittar bort
Livsmedel i Fokus – Nya EAT Lancet väcker debatt: ”Både plus och minus”
Tidningen Global – Global kostomställning krävs för att rädda klimat och hälsa
Aktuellt i politiken – Klimatsmartare mat kan rädda miljontals liv
Extrakt – EAT Lancet: Nya matvanor viktigaste omställningen
Samnytt – Kostråd om minskad köttkonsumtion sågas

Impact Loop – Nästan bara växtbaserat på tallriken som ska rädda planeten – det visar nya megarapporten
Jordbruksaktuellt – Professorn sågar rekommendationerna
Landets Fria – Världens matvanor hotar både klimat och hälsa
Tidningen Land – Köttråd behöver granskas
Tidningen Land – 15 gram kött – och resten är makt
Tidningen Land –Eat-Lancet handlar om fakta – inte om makt
Tidningen Land – Forskning behövs – och den måste tåla verkligheten
Tidningen Syre – Camilla Björkbom: Köttlobbyn fortsätter att sprida desinformation
Fokus – All makt till Richard Tellström!
Privata Affärer – Rapport: Så stärker vi ekonomin – och räddar planeten
Ny Teknik – Rapport knäcker koden: Så räddar vi planeten och stärker ekonomin
Feber – Rapport: Mindre kött räddar planeten och stärker ekonomin

Appendix 2: Framing analysis categorisation framework

Frame categorisation

News articles

Headline	Frame	Problem	Cause(ality)	Solution	Salient	Scientification
15 miljoner färre förtida dödsfall Expressen	Science says *Human health*	Premature / unnecessary deaths, controversial with meat recommendations	Lack of healthy diets, unjust food system, meat consumption	Recommendations in EAT-Lancet report, PHD	Health effects of PHD, unhealthy eating	Strengthen articles facts, claims, trustworthiness and legitimicy
Rapport: Mer grönt och mindre kött räddar planeten TT	Science says *Planetary health*	Planet is in crisis due to unsustainable diet, five PB crossed because of food system	We eat to much meat and unsustainable food, lack of political leadership, agricultural industry, individual demand weak	(Scientifically developed) diets solve environmental and health issues. More vegetables and less meat	Scientific arguments, scientists, Planetary health, systemic change	Strengthen articles facts, claims, trustworthiness and legitimicy
Nästan bara växtbaserat på tallriken som ska rädda planeten – det visar nya megarapporten Impact Loop	Science says *Planetary health*	We eat unsustainably and unhealthy	Consumption of animal products,	Plant based food, PHD, legumes	Plant based food as solution, the report and recommendations in line with food system transformation	Strengthen articles facts, claims, trustworthiness and legitimicy
Rapport: Mer grönt och mindre kött räddar planeten Aftonbladet	Science says *Planetary health*	Planet is in crisis due to unsustainable diet, five PB crossed because of food system	We eat to much meat and unsustainable food, lack of political leadership, agricultural industry, individual demand weak	(Scientifically developed) diets solve environmental and health issues. More vegetables and less meat	Scientific arguments, scientists, Planetary health, systemic change	Strengthen articles facts, claims, trustworthiness and legitimicy
Stor studie: mer grönt och mindre kött räddar planeten Sydsvenskan	Science says *Planetary health*	Planet is in crisis due to unsustainable diet, five PB crossed because of food system	We eat to much meat and unsustainable food, lack of political leadership, agricultural industry, individual demand weak	(Scientifically developed) diets solve environmental and health issues. More vegetables and less meat	Scientific arguments, scientists, Planetary health, systemic change	Strengthen articles facts, claims, trustworthiness and legitimicy
Forskare: Max 15 gram rött kött per dag för en hållbar Framtid	Science says-but the meat recommendation is	(Scientists say) we eat in an unsustainable way, high emissions from	We eat to much meat and unsustainable food, meat is controversial	Food system transformation, PHD, no remedy for culture war	Scientific arguments, scientists, "The meet issue" Meat	Strengthen articles facts, claims, trustworthiness and legitimicy

SvD	controversial -frame	food sector (Meat) recommendations lead to debate, "culture war",			reduction, small meat consump, debate about meat	Strengthen articles facts, claims, trustworthiness and legitimicy
Ny rapport: Mer bönor kan rädda 40 000 liv varje dag Omni	Science says *Human health*	The food system and human diet is bad for health and environment	We eat unsustainably, we eat unhealthy	Eat PHD	PHD, plant based food can save lives	Strengthen articles facts, claims, trustworthiness and legitimicy
Nya kostråd kan rädda 15 miljoner liv om året Nyheter24	Science says *Human health*	We eat unhealthy and unsustainably, harming planet and humans, Strong reactions, growing resistance	We eat unsustainably, we eat unhealthy	Should change diets to save planet and lives	Planetary health, scientific arguments, "The meet issue" Change is needed, but resistance is high	Strengthen articles facts, claims, trustworthiness and legitimicy
Efter rapporten – så ska du äta för att leva miljövänligt Gefle Dagblad	Science says *Planetary health*	Food sector is unsustainable, our diets are unsustainable	We eat unsustainably, we produce unsustainably	Eat according to PHD	Normative: this is how you should eat, according to science, focus on what to eat, PHD	Strengthen articles facts, claims, trustworthiness and legitimicy
Rådet från forskarna – 15 gram kött per dag: "Låter väldigt lite" Göteborgs-Posten	Science says- but the meat recommendation is controversial -frame	Science says we need to change how we eat, but recommendations around meat is low, will be hard to change	People are used to eating meat, hard not to eat meat	Unclear	Scientific arguments," The meet issue" Meat reduction, small meat consump, individual's attitudes	Strengthen articles facts, claims, trustworthiness and legitimicy
Studie: Så ska du äta för att skona jorden Blekinge Läns Tidning	Science says *Planetary health*	Food sector is unsustainable, our diets are unsustainable	We eat unsustainably, we produce unsustainably	Eat according to PHD	Normative: this is how you should eat, according to science, focus on what to eat, PHD	Strengthen articles facts, claims, trustworthiness and legitimicy
Nya EAT Lancet väcker debatt: "Både plus och minus" Livsmedel i fokus	Science says- but the meat recommendation is controversial -frame	We need to eat healthier and sustainably- but can we trust EAT-Lancet science?	The reports results and conclusions, models etc can be questioned	We need broader work, inclusion of people from agriculture, industry, trade and consumers	The debate about the report, different experts* or stakeholders perspectives	Strengthen articles facts, claims, trustworthiness and legitimacy, weaken others claims and strengthen own arguments
Global kostomställning krävs för att rädda klimat och hälsa	Science says *Planetary health*	We need to change how we eat for health and the planet	Our way of eating harms planet and risks human lives	PHD, indivudals need to change, food	Normative: food system and diet change is needed,	Strengthen articles facts, claims, trustworthiness and legitimicy

Tidningen Global				system need to change	Scientific arguments, the report and recommend ations in line with food system transformati on	
Klimatsmartare mat kan rädda miljontals liv Aktuellt i politiken	Science says *Human health*	Premature / unnecessary deaths	Lack of healthy diets, injust food system, meat consumption	Recommendat ions in EAT-Lancet report, PHD	Food change to mitigate deaths and climate impact, scientific arguments	Strengthen articles facts, claims, trustworthiness and legitimicy
EAT Lancet: Nya matvanor viktigaste omställningen Extrakt	Science says *Planetary health*	Planet is in crisis due to unsustainable diet, five PB crossed because of food system, unjust food system	We eat to much meat and unsustainable food, lack of political leadership, agricultural industry, individual demand weak	(Scientifically developed) PHD can solve environmental and health issues. More vegetables and less meat	Food system transformati on is needed, the report and recommend ations in line with food system transformati on	Strengthen articles facts, claims, trustworthiness and legitimicy
Rapport: Så stärker vi ekonomin – och räddar planeten Privata affärer	Science says	Planet is in crisis due to unsustainable diet, five PB crossed because of food system	We eat to much meat and unsustainable food, lack of political leadership, agricultural industry, individual demand weak	(Scientifically developed) PHD can solve environmental and health issues. More vegetables and less meat, can help economy	Economic wins to change diets, scientific arguments	Strengthen articles facts, claims, trustworthiness and legitimicy
Kostråd om minskad köttkonsumtio n sågas Samnytt	Green bubble elitism	The facts in the report are questionable, harmful to agriculture in Sweden	"green bubble", scientific elite,	Listen to critics	"The meet issue" EAT-Lancet is untrustwort hy and harmful to Sweden	Weaken trustworthiness and certainty to others claims, strengthen own claims and articles legitimacy
Ny rapport: Köttkonsumtio nen måste minska SVT	Science says-but the meat recommendat ion is controversial -frame	Planet is in crisis due to unsustainable diet, five PB crossed because of food system, meat is highly debated	Meat cons/ prod need to go down	(Scientifically developed) PHD can solve environmental and health issues. More vegetables and less meat	Scientific arguments, planetary health, "The meet issue" Meat reduction, small meat consump	Strengthen articles facts, claims, trustworthiness and legitimicy
Rapport knäcker koden: Så räddar vi planeten och stärker ekonomin Ny Teknik	Science says	Planet is in crisis due to unsustainable diet, five PB crossed because of food system	We eat to much meat and unsustainable food, lack of political leadership, agricultural industry,	(Scientifically developed) PHD can solve environmental and health issues. More vegetables and less meat, can help economy	Economic wins to change diets, scientific arguments	Strengthen articles facts, claims, trustworthiness and legitimicy

			individual demand weak			
Rapport: Mindre kött räddar planeten och stärker ekonomin Feber	Science says	We eat unsustainable diet, five PB crossed because of food system	We eat to much meat and unsustainable food, lack political leadership, agricultural industry, individual demand weak	(Scientifically developed) PHD can solve environmental and health issues. More vegetables and less meat, can help economy	Economic wins to change diets, scientific arguments	Strengthen articles facts, claims, trustworthiness and legitimicy
Stor studie: mer grönt och mindre kött räddar planeten Helsingborgs Dagblad	Science says *Planetary health*	Planet is in crisis due to unsustainable diet, five PB crossed because of food system	We eat to much meat and unsustainable food, lack of political leadership, agricultural industry, individual demand weak	(Scientifically developed) diets solve environmental and health issues. More vegetables and less meat	Scientific arguments, scientists, Planetary health, systemic change	Strengthen articles facts, claims, trustworthiness and legitimicy
Studie: Så ska du äta för att skona jorden Göteborgs-Posten	Science says *Planetary health*	Food sector is unsustainable, our diets are unsustainable	We eat unsustainably, we produce unsustainably	Eat according to PHD	Normative: this is how you should eat, according to science, focus on what to eat	Strengthen articles facts, claims, trustworthiness and legitimicy
Studie: Så ska du äta för att skona jorden TT	Science says *Planetary health*	Food sector is unsustainable, our diets are unsustainable	We eat unsustainably, we produce unsustainably	Eat according to PHD	Normative: this is how you should eat, according to science, focus on what to eat	Strengthen articles facts, claims, trustworthiness and legitimicy
Vår mat förstör planeten – och Europa tittar bort Dagens PS	Political backlash	Food sector drives climate change, Europe don't act	Unsustainable food system, EU initiatives stopped, protests from farmers, political passivity, the rich responsible for most harm	Political action, take lead on transformation, global food system transformation	"The meet issue" Systemic/ structural focus, act is needed	Strengthen articles facts, claims, trustworthiness and legitimacy, as opener to public debate about policy
Världens matvanor hotar både klimat och hälsa Landets Fria	Science says *Planetary health*	Food and food system threat planet and health, we eat in an unsustainable way	Food system is bad, lack of political leadership, agricultural industry, individual demand weak	(Scientifically developed) PHD can solve environmental and health issues. More vegetables and less meat	Focus on report as whole, not only PHD, food system change is needed, report and recommend ations are right	Strengthen articles facts, claims, trustworthiness and legitimicy
Professorn sågar rekomme ndationerna Jordbruksaktue llt	The science is incorrect	Recommendati ons are incorrect	Study based on incorrect applied methods	Don't listen to EAT-Lancet	"The meet issue" Scientific debate, professor argues	Weaken trustworthiness and certainty to others claims, strengthen own claims and

					against recommend ations	articles legitimacy
Rapport: Mer grönt och mindre kött räddar planeten DN	Science says *Planetary health*	Planet is in crisis due to unsustainable diet, five PB crossed because of food system	We eat to much meat and unsustainable food, lack of political leadership, agricultural industry, individual demand weak	(Scientifically developed) diets solve environmental and health issues. More vegetables and less meat	Scientific arguments, scientists, Planetary health, systemic change	Strengthen articles facts, claims, trustworthiness and legitimicy

Opinion articles

Headline	**Frame**	**Problem**	**Cause(alit y)**	**Solution**	**Salient**	
Jesper Sahlin: Räkna med kulturkrigstjafs om köttet. Leader (SvD,)	Attack on Science	Emotional subject, "cultural war" around food and eating	Triggering to recommend to reduce meat, packaging of PHD, disinformation and critique	Beware of critique and emotional reactions	"The meet issue" Meat conflict, culture war about food/meat	Legitimise report Weaken trustworthiness of others critique, strengthen own claims legitimacy
Jesper Sahlin: Räkna med kulturkrigstjafs om köttet. Leader (Sydsvenskan)	Attack on Science	Emotional subject, "cultural war" around food and eating	Triggering to recommend to reduce meat, packaging of PHD, disinformation and critique	Beware of critique and emotional reactions	"The meet issue" Meat conflict, culture war about food/meat	Legitimise rreport Weaken trustworthiness of others critique, strengthen own claims legitimacy
Svårsmälta kostråd Leader (Arvika Tidningen) Per-Ola Olsson/SNB	The science is incorrect	Recommendati ons about meat in EAT-Lancet is "baloney", mockery of real people's situations	Facts and results in report is not correct, scientists not experts	Don't listen to the report or recommendati ons	"The meet issue" EAT-Lancet is wrong	Deligitmise report Weaken trustworthiness and certainty to others claims, strengthen own claims and legitimacy
Svårsmälta kostråd Leader (NWT) Per-Ola Olsson/SNB	The science is incorrect	Recommendati ons about meat in EAT-Lancet is "baloney", mockery of real people's situations	Facts and results in report is not correct, scientists not experts	Don't listen to the report or recommendati ons	"The meet issue" EAT-Lancet is wrong	Deligitmise report Weaken trustworthiness and certainty to others claims, strengthen own claims and legitimacy
Fel när "hälsodiet" leder till näringsbrist, svält och Fattigdom Leader (Norrbottens-Kuriren)	The science is incorrect	Recommendati ons about meat in EAT-Lancet is "baloney", mockery of real people's situations	Facts and results in report is not correct, scientists not experts	Don't listen to the report or recommendati ons	"The meet issue" EAT-Lancet is wrong	Deligitmise report Weaken trustworthiness and certainty to others claims, strengthen own claims and legitimacy

Per-Ola Olsson/SNB						
”Hälsodieten” ger näringsbrist Leader (Gotlands Allehanda) Per-Ola Olsson/SNB	The science is incorrect	Recommendations about meat by EAT-Lancet is “baloney”, mockery of real people’s situations	Facts and results in report is not correct, scientists not experts	Don’t listen to the report or recommendations	“The meet issue” EAT-Lancet is wrong	Deligitmise report Weaken trustworthiness and certainty to others claims, strengthen own claims and legitimacy
15 gram kött – och resten är makt Debate (Land Lantbruk) Isabel Moretti, VD Svenskt Kött.	Green bubble elitism	Recommendations by EAT-Lancet is not right, not healthy, threat to	Power issue. Decisions made far from the “real food system”, Farmers and consumers persp. not included in EAT-Lancet	The meat industry need to take lead on the narrative and conversation around green transition	“The meet issue” EAT-Lancet is harmful, unjust to farmers, expression of power of the green science community	Deligitmise report Weaken trustworthiness and certainty to others claims, strengthen own claims and legitimacy
Eat-Lancet handlar om fakta – inte om makt Reply on debate by Isabel Moretti (Land) Line Gordon, Johan Rockström	Attack on science	Very worrying that science and facts are interpreted as power play, scientific community is often kept out of processes where it could be best used	Misinterpretation by debater about the purpose and the of the report and commission, incorrect fatcs and assumptions	We need to bridge science, politics and production if we are to be in front of green transition. Collaboration is the key.	Critiques misinterpret, science is right, harmful to accuse science to be expression of power	Leligitmise report Weaken trustworthiness and certainty of others claims, strengthen own claims and legitimacy
Den planetära dieten hotar vår matförsörjning Debate (SvD) historian Johan Gärdebo, ecologist Stefan Hellstrand.	Green bubble elitism	PHD threaten Swedish food preparedness, “green bubble”, PHD illusionistic	Recommendations about meat and dairy in EAT-Lancet weak science, theoretical, low anchoring in Nordic agriculture or “real world”, “culture war”, power, ideology	Real sustainable politics comes from the soil, In Nordics mixed economy between plant agri and grazing, not PHD	“The meet issue” EAT-Lancet is wrong, harmful to Sweden and Swedes, expression of power of the green science community	Deligitmise report Weaken trustworthiness and certainty of others claims, strengthen own claims and legitimacy
Missvisande bild av rapport Reply to leader, (NWT) Line Gordon	Attack on science	The leader critique about facts, content and intentions is incorrect,	Got facts wrong, unnuanced and biased interpretation	A nuanced discussion about how food can be a solution for the future	Critiques misinterpret, are wrong, science is right, harmful to accuse science to be expression of power	Leligitmise report Weaken trustworthiness and certainty of others claims, strengthen own claims and legitimacy
”Line Gordon har fel” Reply to reply to leader (NWT)	The science is incorrect	Line Gordon is wrong in her reply, her reply confirms the problems with EAT, EAT	Don’t back up her claims with facts, don’t point to examples	Keep the discussion about concrete critique about nutritional problems,	Line Gordon & EAT-Lancet is wrong	Deligitmise report Weaken trustworthiness and certainty of others

Per-Ola Olsson		creates more problem than it solves		unreasonable numbers, method problems		claims, strengthen own claims and legitimacy
Köttråd behöver granskas Leader (Land) Anna Nilsson	The science is incorrect	EAT-Lancet threatens Swedish food preparedness	Wrong focus, should focus on preparedness and Swedish food security	Meat recommendations need to be scrutinized by decision makers and media	"The meet issue" Meat recommendations need scrutiny, EAT-Lancet is not right	Deligitmise report Weaken trustworthiness and certainty of others claims, strengthen own claims and legitimacy
Forskning behövs – och den måste tåla verkligheten Reply on reply on debate (Land) Isabel Moretti, VD Svenskt Kött.	Green bubble elitism	Polarisation and mistrust, farmers left out, EAT-Lancet is one sided	One sided image and low recognition of farmers	More voices is needed, need collaboration between science, politics and production but on equal terms where all perspectives count.	EAT-Lancet is wrong, don't include right stakeholders, power of green scientific community	Deligitmise report Weaken trustworthiness and certainty of others claims, strengthen own claims and legitimacy
Maten kan bli en lösning – inte ett problem Reply on leader Gotlands Allehanda Line Gordon	Attack on science	The leader critique about facts, content and intentions is incorrect	Got facts wrong, unnuanced and biased interpretation	A nuanced discussion about how food can be a solution for the future	Debater is wrong, food is solution, harmful to accuse science to be expression of power	Leligitmise report Weaken trustworthiness and certainty of others claims, strengthen own claims and legitimacy
Debatt: Missvisande bild av hälsorapport Debate article, Norrköpings tidningar	Attack on science	The leader critique about facts, content and intentions is incorrect	Got facts wrong, unnuanced and biased interpretation	A nuanced discussion about how food can be a solution for the future, hinder cardiovascular disease, cancer, diabetes	Critiques misinterpret, are wrong, science is right, harmful to accuse science to be expression of power	Leligitmise report Weaken trustworthiness and certainty of others claims, strengthen own claims and legitimacy
"Växtbaserad mat är en storfördel" Reply to debate SvD Elin Röös et al	Attack on science	Swede's dietary habits are among the worst for climate, the debaters are wrong, problem that scientists are accused of power play	The debater's arguments are built on misinterpretations	Plant based food will be good for preparedness, the debaters should review the broad base of science about food climate, health and societal transformation	Critiques are wrong, EAT-Lancet is right, problematic that scientists are accused	Leligitmise report Weaken trustworthiness and certainty of others claims, strengthen own claims and legitimacy
Camilla Björkbom: Köttlobbyn	Attack on science	Swedes eat unsustainably, nothing has been done	Meat lobbyists, politicians and critics toward the science get	We need to be reminded that Sweden has among highest	Meat lobbyism and disinformation, is harmful	Leligitmise report Weaken trustworthiness

fortsätter att sprida Desinformation Chronicle Tidningen Syre Camilla Björkholm		since last report, disinformation about report, meat lobbyism	to much media space	climate impact from food, due to high meat consumption	for food system transformation that is needed	and certainty of others claims, strengthen own claims and legitimacy
All makt till Richard Tellström! Chronicle Fokus Johan Hakelius	Green bubble elitism	EAT-Lancet not relevant outside secular, protestant, rich countries, ignores food culture and enjoyment	Food and eating are more than health and environment, dietary science makes people want to hunger strike	Listen to Richard Tellström instead of EAT-Lancet	EAT-Lancet recommendations will not work, right way is not to tell people what to eat, recommendations are in opposition to food culture	Delegitmise report Weaken trustworthiness and certainty of others claims, strengthen own claims and legitimacy

Framing process coding

Headline	News outlet	Direction	Format/ section	References, sources, actors
15 miljoner färre förtida dödsfall	Expressen	Tabloid, opinion/debate, against "national socialism and violent doctrines", 5 m readers/week	Science news	EAT-Lancet report, press release, EAT-Lancet Commission
Rapport: Mer grönt och mindre kött räddar planeten	TT	Sweden's national news agency, independent news mediation, editorial content	News	EAT-Lancet report, press release, EAT-Lancet Commission, Line Gordon
Rapport: Mer grönt och mindre kött räddar planeten	DN	Newspaper, Independent liberal, not connected to political parties, organisations or economic power spheres, 2 m readers / week	News, Sweden	TT, EAT-Lancet Commission, Line Gordon
Nästan bara växtbaserat på tallriken som ska rädda planeten – det visar nya megarapporten	Impact Loop	Impact (sustainable) focused news service	Food	Press release, EAT-Lancet report, Anne-Charlotte Bunge, EAT-Lancet Commission
Rapport: Mer grönt och mindre kött räddar planeten (Aftonbladet)	Aftonbladet	Tabloid, news, leader section is independent social democratic, partly owned by LO (9%), 5,5 m readers/week	News	TT, EAT-Lancet Commission, Line Gordon
Stor studie: mer grönt och mindre kött räddar planeten (Sydsvenskan)	Sydsvenskan	Local newspaper, Southern Sweden's leading newspaper, 629 t readers/ week	News, Climate and environment	TT, EAT-Lancet Commission, Line Gordon

Forskare: Max 15 gram rött kött per dag för en hållbar framtid	SvD	Independent moderate, liberal-conservative, market economy focused, 1,74 m readers/week	News	EAT-Lancet report, interview with Line Gordon & Victor Galaz (SRC), EAT-Lancet Commission, Gunhild Stordalen
Ny rapport: Mer bönor kan rädda 40 000 liv varje dag	Omni	News service, news aggregator, 6,49 t readers/ week	Debate about meat consumption	EAT-Lancet report, CNN, The Guardian, Johan Rockström, EAT-Lancet Commission
Nya kostråd kan rädda 15 miljoner liv om året	Nyheter24	News site / webbnews news mediation, debate focus	News, science	SvD, SR, Press release, EAT-Lancet Commission
Efter rapporten – så ska du äta för att leva miljövänligt	Gefle Dagblad	Local newspaper, Gästrikland, liberal, 122 t readers/ week	National & International news, Climate	TT, SRC, EAT-Lancet Commission
Rådet från forskarna – 15 gram kött per dag: ”Låter väldigt lite”	Göteborgs -Posten	Local newspaper, Gothenburgs largests newspaper, independent liberal, 1,25 m readers/week	News	Press release/ TT people interviewed on the street, EAT-Lancet Commission
Studie: Så ska du äta för att skona jorden (Blekinge Läns Tidning)	Blekinge Läns Tidning	Local newspaper Blekinge, 67 t readers/week	News, Climate	TT, SRC, EAT-Lancet Commission
Nya EAT Lancet väcker debatt: ”Både plus och minus”	Livsmedel i fokus	Network org. For food business, news about food business	News	Press release Line Gordon, Peter Kullgren (rural minister), Elisabeth Rytter nutrition scientist Livsmedelsföretagen, Maria Sitell, Brödinsitutet, Isabel Moretti Svenskt Kött, Sofia Steinwall Ica Växa, Axfoundation (image of food), EAT-Lancet Commission
Global kostomställning krävs för att rädda klimat och hälsa	Tidningen Global	Owned by media house Grön Press, focused on societal transformation,”för alla som vill förändra världen och se ett fritt, demokratiskt, solidariskt och hållbart samhälle bortom tillväxtdogmer och arbetslinjer”, ca 16 t readers/week	News, diet	EAT-Lancet report, Line Gordon, press release, Anne Charlotte Bunge (SRC) Johan Rockström (SRC PIK), EAT-Lancet Commission
Klimatsmartare mat kan rädda miljontals liv	Aktuellt i politiken	Political focus, societal news, owned by AIP Media Produktion, subsidiary to Socialdemokraterna	News, Climate	EAT-Lancet report, press release, TT, SRC, EAT-Lancet Commission
EAT Lancet: Nya matvanor viktigaste omställningen	Extrakt	Popular science journalism paper focus on sustainability, issued by Formas	Food and agriculture	EAT-Lancet report, press release, TT, SRC, EAT-Lancet Commission

Rapport: Så stärker vi ekonomin – och räddar planeten	Privata Affärer	Private economy, investment, stockmarket, 102 t readers/week	Private economy	TT, EAT-Lancet Commission
Kosträd om minskad köttkonsumtion sågas	Samnytt	Right-wing populist newssite, ”specialbevakar de områden där etablissemangsmedia uppvisar underlåtenhetsförsynd elser, men fokuserar också brett på allmän nyhetsjournalistik”,	National news	Debate article in SvD by Gärdebo och Hellstrand, Peter Kullgren (rural minister), EAT-Lancet Commission
Ny rapport: Köttkonsumtion en måste minska	SVT news article	Swedish national television news,	National news	TT, Line Gordon, Johan Rockström, EAT-Lancet Commission
Rapport knäcker koden: Så räddar vi planeten och stärker ekonomin	Ny Teknik	News about tech and innovation, 162 t readers/week	Environment	TT, EAT-Lancet Commission
Rapport: Mindre kött räddar planeten Och stärker ekonomin	Feber	Webbsite tech, trinkets (prylar), science, popculture	News, society	DN, EAT-Lancet Commission, Line Gordon
Stor studie: mer grönt och mindre kött räddar planeten (Helsingborgs Dagblad)	Helsingborgs Dagblad	Local news Helsingborg (med omnejd), 138 t/week	News, Climate and Environment	EAT-Lancet report, press release, EAT-Lancet Commission, Line Gordon
Studie: Så ska du äta för att skona jorden (GP)	Göteborgs -Posten	Local newspaper, Gothenburgs largests newspaper, independent liberal, 1,25 m readers/week	National news	TT, EAT-Lancet report, EAT-Lancet Commission
Studie: Så ska du äta för att skona jorden (TT)	TT	Sweden’s national news agency, independent news mediation, editorial content	News	Press release, EAT-Lancet report, EAT-Lancet Commission
Vår mat förstör planeten – och Europa tittar bort	Dagens PS	News about stockmarket, economy, independent,	Global news	EAT-Lancet report, press release, Politico, other articles from Dagens PS, SVT,
Världens matvanor hotar både klimat och hälsa	Landets Fria Tidning	News magazine focus sustainable societal transformation, focus on omställningsrörelsen, part of Media House Grön Press	”On the Radar”	EAT-Lancet report, TT, Line Gordon, Anne-Charlotte Bunge, Johan Rockström
Professorn sågar rekommendationerna	Jordbruks aktuellt	Industry magazine for agricultural business, distributed to all Swedish agricultural businesses, 69 t copies	News	EAT-Lancet report, TV4, medicinal doctor Fredrik Nyström, EAT-Lancet Commission

Så ska vi äta för att värna om planeten	Vetlanda-Posten	Local news, independent liberal	News, Climate	TT, EAT-Lancet Commission

Headline	News outlet	Direction	Section	References, sources, actors
Jesper Sahlin: Räkna med kulturkrigstjafs om köttet. Leader (Sydsvenskan)	SvD	Independent moderate, liberal-conservative, market economy focused, 1,74 m readers/week	Leader	TT, The Guardian, EAT-Lancet report, Jens Sahlin
Svårsmälta kostråd Leader (Arvika Nyheter) Per-Ola Olsson/SNB	Arvika Nyheter	Local News Arvika + Eda, part of NWT Media AB, 17 t readers/week	Opinions	Loose reference to “media”, EAT-Lancet report, DN, Per-Ola Olsson
Svårsmälta kostråd Leader (NWT) Per-Ola Olsson/SNB	Nya Wermlands Tidning	Local News Värmlands + Dalsland, conservative, 115 t readers/week	Leader	Loose reference to “media”, EAT-Lancet report, DN, Per-Ola Olsson
Fel när "hälsodiet" leder till näringsbrist, svält och Fattigdom Leader (Norrbottens-Kuriren) Per-Ola Olsson/SNB	Norrbottens-Kuriren	Local News Norrbotten, independent moderate, 60 t readers/week	Leader	Loose reference to “media”, EAT-Lancet report, DN, Per-Ola Olsson
”Hälsodieten” ger näringsbrist Leader (Gotlands Allehanda) Per-Ola Olsson/SNB	Gotlands Allehanda	Local News Gotland	Leader	Loose reference to “media”, EAT-Lancet report, DN, Per-Ola Olsson
15 gram kött – och resten är makt Debate (Land Lantbruk) Isabel Moretti, CEO Svenskt Kött.	Tidningen Land	Rural focus, rural development in Sweden, 500 t readers/week	Agriculture, Debate	EAT-Lancet report, loosely to “media”, Isabell Moretti CEO Svenskt Kött
Eat-Lancet handlar om fakta – inte om makt Reply on debate by Isabel Moretti (Land Lantbruk)	Tidningen Land	Rural focus, rural development in Sweden, 500 t readers/week	Agriculture, forestry, debate reply	Debate article (Isabel Moretti), EAT-Lancet report, pre-work with ELR, Nationella livsmedelsforskningsprogrammet, Livsmedelspolitiska rådet, Line Gordon, Johan Rockström

Line Gordon, Johan Rockström				
”Den planetära dieten hotar vår matförsörjning” Debate (SvD) historiker Johan Gärdebo, ekolog Stefan Hellstrand.	SvD	Independent moderate, liberal-conservative, market economy focused, 1,74 m readers/week	Debate	EAT-Lancet report, vague references to science, Johan Gärdebo, Stefan Hellstrand
Missvisande bild av rapport Reply to leader, (NWT) Line Gordon	Nya Wermlands Tidning	Local News Värmlands + Dalsland, conservative, 115 t readers/week	Leader	Leader, EAT-Lancet report, Line Gordon
”Line Gordon har fel” Reply to reply to leader (NWT) Per-Ola Olsson	Nya Wermlands Tidning	Local News Värmlands + Dalsland, conservative, 115 t readers/week	Leader	Leader, John Ioannidis, Per-Ola Olsson
Köttråd behöver granskas Leader (Land Lantbruk) Anna Nilsson	Tidningen Land	Rural focus, rural development in Sweden, 500 t readers/week	Agriculture, debate	EAT-Lancet report, Anna Nilsson
Forskning behövs – och den måste tåla verkligheten Reply on reply on debate (Land) Isabel Moretti, VD Svenskt Kött.	Tidningen Land	Rural focus, rural development in Sweden, 500 t readers/week	Agriculture, forestry, debate	EAT-Lancet, Line Gordon, Johan Rockström, Isabel Moretti, CEO Svenskt Kött.
Maten kan bli en lösning – inte ett problem Reply on leader (Gotlands Allehanda) Line Gordon	Gotlands Allehanda	Local News Gotland	Reply on leader	EAT-Lancet report, leader, Line Gordon
Debatt: Missvisande bild av hälsorapport	Norrköpings Tidningar	Local News Norrköping + Söderköping, moderate, 216 t readers/week	Debate	Leader (Per-Ola Olsson), EAT-Lancet report, Line Gordon
”Växtbaserad mat är en storfördel” Reply to debate	SvD	Independent moderate, liberal-conservative, market economy focused, 1,74 m readers/week	Debate reply	Debate article (Johan Gärdebo, Stefan Hellstrand, NNR 2023s, EAT-Lancet report, IPCC, IPBES, WHO, Elin Röös, et al

(SvD) Elin Röös et al				
Camilla Björkbom: Köttlobbyn fortsätter att sprida Desinformation Chronicle (Tidningen Syre) Camilla Björkholm	Tidningen Syre	Owned by media house Grön Press, focused on societal transformation, 16 t readers/week	Chronicle	EAT-Lancet report, Changing Markets, Edward Blom , TV4, Peter Kullgren,, Camilla Björkbom
All makt till Richard Tellström! Chronicle (Fokus) Johan Hakelius	Tidningen Fokus	Features, news, politics, societal issues, deep analysis, 40 t/ edition (41/year)	Chronicle	EAT-Lancet report, Richard Tellström, SR P1 Godmorgon världen, ”The Professor” (Line Gordon), Johan Hakelius

Publishing and archiving

Approved students' theses at SLU can be published online. As a student you own the copyright to your work and in such cases, you need to approve the publication. In connection with your approval of publication, SLU will process your personal data (name) to make the work searchable on the internet. You can revoke your consent at any time by contacting the library.

Even if you choose not to publish the work or if you revoke your approval, the thesis will be archived digitally according to archive legislation.

You will find links to SLU's publication agreement and SLU's processing of personal data and your rights on this page:

- https://libanswers.slu.se/en/faq/228318

☒ YES, I, Sara Sällberg, have read and agree to the agreement for publication and the personal data processing that takes place in connection with this.

☐ NO, I/we do not give my/our permission to publish the full text of this work. However, the work will be uploaded for archiving and the metadata and summary will be visible and searchable.

AI disclosure

I have used ChatGPT to help me summarise relevant course literature and articles I researched to help me better understand the texts and to help clarify them. I also used Chat GPT for language check and comprehensibility of my research questions, in assignment 1, to make sure the questions were clearly formulated and that they aligned (not to develop the questions). I did not use generative AI for any text outputs, and no AI outputs have been used in this thesis.