**Appendix. Regional Manifesto Project**

The analysis of political parties’ discourse strategies is done by applying the RMP approach, the main goal of which is to measure the political parties’ salience and position in multi-level systems using the content analysis of their electoral manifestos (*What Is the RMP?* 2021).

The unit of analysis in the RMP methodology is the quasi-sentence– a coding unit including only one argument. A quasi-sentencecontains exactly one statement or “message” (Alonso et al. 2020). The natural sentence is cut into several quasi-sentences when it contains two unrelated statements, or the statements are related but consider different aspects of a larger policy (Alonso et al. 2020). The code of a quasi-sentence has a two-digit structure. The first number refers to the party’s territorial preferences, and the second part of the code is related to policy preferences. Territorial authority claims consider the level of administration to be addressed or the relationships between the levels. They can address one level of government and then the preferred degree of authority for that level. In addition, the quasi-sentence may refer to more than one level of governance and then indicate the relationships between the levels.

The second part of the quasi-sentence code is assigned to the policy preferences classified by several domains. These domains are external relations, freedom and democracy, political system, economy, welfare and quality of life, the fabric of society, social groups and gender. In general, the code of the quasi-sentence has the structure XX\_YYY(Y), where XX is the territorial preference, and YYY(Y) is the policy preference of the political party (Alonso et al. 2020). The general calculation rule is that the number of quasi-sentences dedicated to each category is computed as a percentage of the overall quasi-sentences in the manifesto.

Saliencywas calculated as the percentage of quasi-sentences assigned to a particular dimension. Our case involves two types of saliency: territorial saliency (percentage related to the center-periphery dimension), and economic saliency (percentage related to the left–right dimension). Saliency scores are interpreted in relative terms rather than absolute ones, and the main focus is on the relative weight of territorial issues vis-à-vis economic ones. It is computed as the ratio between the saliency of economic and territorial dimensions. A value of 1 means that both dimensions are equally important to each other, a value greater than 1 refers to the relative importance of the economic dimension, and a value less than 1 indicates that the party gives more salience to the territorial dimension.

The position was calculated by subtracting the percentages belonging to the opposite categories. It is calculated in the economic dimension and ranges from -100, meaning that the party stands exclusively on the economic left, to +100, meaning that the party positions itself strictly on the economic right. The same logic applies to the territorial dimension (Alonso, Cabeza and Gomez 2015).

Positional blurring reflects the simultaneous presence of arguments regarding and against the same issue. It is calculated as the subtraction of pro-and-con arguments on both dimensions and then the division of this figure into absolute values by the total number of quasi-sentences assigned to the dimension. The operationalized range of positional blurring is from 1 for a completely clear position on the issue to 0 for a blurred position (Alonso, Cabeza and Gomez 2015).