

1 **Expected reduction in obesity of a 20% and 30% tax to Sugar-Sweetened-**
2 **Beverages in Brazil: a modeling study**

3

4

5 Ana Basto-Abreu(1), Rossana Torres-Alvarez(2), Tonatiuh Barrientos-Gutierrez(1), Paula
6 Pereda(3), Ana Clara Duran(4)

7

8

9 (1) Center for Population Health Research. National Institute of Public Health, Cuernavaca,
10 Mexico

11 (2) Graduate student and research assistant. Epidemiology department. University of
12 Michigan

13 (3) Department of Economics, School of Economics and Business, University of Sao Paulo,
14 Brazil

15 (4) Center for Food Studies and Research, University of Campinas; Center for
16 Epidemiological Studies in Nutrition and Health, University of Sao Paulo, Brazil

17

18

19

20 Address for correspondence:

21 Ana Clara Duran

22 Center for Food Studies and Research, University of Campinas Address: Av. Albert Einstein,
23 291 Cidade Universitaria, Campinas, SP, 13083-852, Brazil

24 anaduran@unicamp.br

25 +55 19 3521-2177

26

27

28

29

30

31

32 Words, main text with tables, but no references: 4,453

33 Words, abstract:425

34 Tables: 3

35 Figs: 2

36 Key words: obesity; tax; sugar-sweetened beverages; modeling

37 DISCLOSURE: The authors declared no conflict of interest.

38

39 **ABSTRACT**

40

41 Background

42 The consumption of sugar-sweetened beverages (SSB) is associated with obesity, metabolic diseases,
43 and incremental healthcare costs. Given their health consequences, the World Health Organization
44 (WHO) recommended that countries implement taxes to SSB. Over the last 10 years, Brazil has almost
45 doubled its obesity prevalence, yet, in 2016, the Brazilian government cut 23 percentage points to
46 existing federal SSB taxes to their current 4%. To simulate the potential impact of updating the fiscal
47 policy towards SSB in Brazil, we aimed to estimate the price-elasticity of SSB and model the potential
48 impact of a new 20 or 30% excise SSB tax on consumption, obesity prevalence, and healthcare costs.

49 Methods and Findings

50 Using household purchases data from the Brazilian Household Budget Survey (POF) from 2017/2018,
51 we estimated constant elasticity regressions using a log-log specification by income level for all
52 beverage categories: (1) sugar-sweetened beverages, (2) alcoholic beverages, (3) other beverages,
53 and (4) low-calorie sweetened beverages. We estimated baseline intake for each beverage group using
54 24h dietary recall data from POF 2017/2018. Applying the price and cross-price elasticities to the
55 baseline intake, we obtained changes in caloric intake. The caloric reduction was introduced into an
56 individual dynamic model to estimate changes in weight and obesity prevalence. By multiplying the
57 reduction in obesity cases during 10 years by the obesity costs per capita, we predicted the reduction
58 in obesity costs attributable to the sweetened beverage tax. SSB price elasticities were higher in the
59 low (-1.24) than in the high-income tertile (-1.13); cross-price elasticities suggest SSB were weakly
60 substituted by milk, water, and 100% fruit juices. We estimated a caloric change of -17.3
61 kcal/day/person under a 20% excise tax and -25.9 kcal/day/person for a 30% tax. 10 years after
62 implementation, a 20% tax is expected to reduce obesity prevalence by 6.7% and 9.1% for a 30% tax.
63 These reductions translate into a -2.8 million and -3.8 million obesity cases for a 20 and 30% tax,
64 respectively, and a reduction of \$US -257.4 million and \$US -345.9 million obesity costs over 10 years
65 for a 20 and 30% tax, respectively.

66

67 Conclusions

68 Adding a 20 to 30% excise tax on top of Brazil's current federal tax in Brazil could help reduce the
69 consumption of ultra-processed beverages, empty calories, and body weight while avoiding large
70 health-related costs. Given the recent cuts to SSB taxes in Brazil, a program to revise and implement
71 excise taxes could prove beneficial for the Brazilian population.

72

73 INTRODUCTION

74 Consumption of sugar-sweetened beverages (SSB) is associated with increased caloric
75 intake, weight gain, and the development of multiple chronic diseases, such as diabetes,
76 metabolic syndrome, and cancer.[1–3] Governments worldwide are establishing structural
77 interventions to improve consumers' choices. Following the experience of alcohol and
78 tobacco, taxes to SSB have gained international attention as a potentially effective measure
79 to reduce consumption and improve health.[4] A recent systematic review analyzed the impact
80 of SSB taxes in six jurisdictions, finding on average that a 10% tax on SSBs produces a 10%
81 decrease in consumption.[5] Recently, the World Health Organization recommended that
82 countries implement a 20% tax on sugary beverages to improve diet and reduce chronic
83 diseases.[6]

84 Latin America has been at the forefront of SSB taxes.[7] In 2014, Mexico implemented a 10%
85 SSB tax that reduced consumption by 9.7% two years after implementation.[8] Using a
86 dynamic weight change model, we estimated that the 10% SSB tax in Mexico would translate
87 into a 2.54% reduction in the prevalence of obesity in adults over ten years.[9,10]. Further
88 simulation studies estimated important reductions in cardiovascular disease,[11] child body
89 weight,[10,11] and obesity-related cancers.[12] In 2016, Chile implemented an integral
90 package of interventions to reduce SSB consumption, including increasing an existing 13%
91 tax to 18%,[13] front-of-package warning labels, restricted child-directed marketing, and
92 banning sales of SSB and unhealthy foods in schools.[14] By 2017, regulated beverage
93 consumption decreased 23.4%, while caloric content decreased 27.5%. SSB taxes and
94 regulations in the Latin American region have proven to reduce consumption and are expected
95 to produce important health benefits.

96 In 2010, Brazil's SSB per capita consumption was estimated at 142 ml/day/person.[15]
97 Between 2009 and 2019, the prevalence of obesity in the country increased from 11.8% to
98 20.3% across all ages, but particularly among young adults,[16] where SSB consumption is
99 more frequent.[15] Despite having high consumption levels, Brazil reduced SSB federal taxes
100 in 2016 by 23 percentage points, and the current SSB federal tax in the country is 4%.[17]
101 Recently, the government and academics have discussed the need to increase SSB taxes to
102 at least 20%.[6,17]

103 We aimed to estimate the potential impact of an SSB tax in Brazil as a tax aiming at
104 disincentivizing sugar-sweetened industrialized beverages. First, we estimated own- and
105 cross-price elasticities for industrialized SSB and other beverages assuming new 20 and 30%
106 excise taxes were added to the existing federal tax. Then, we used a dynamic simulation
107 model to estimate the expected impact of the taxes on body weight in the adult Brazilian
108 population. Prevented obesity cases were then linked to obesity costs so we could estimate
109 the direct healthcare costs averted by such intervention over a 10-year period.

110

111 METHODS


112

113 Model overview

114

115 We used a simulation model to estimate the potential impact of a sweetened beverages tax
116 on obesity and obesity costs in Brazil (Figure 1) as the country is discussing its
117 implementation. First, we used purchases data to estimate own- and cross-price elasticities

118 for industrialized SSB in Brazil; then, we assumed that the expected reduction in purchases is
 119 translated into a proportional reduction in consumed calories. Using a dynamic weight change
 120 model, we estimated changes in body mass index (BMI) and obesity prevalence over 10 years,
 121 then linked to per capita obesity costs to estimate the expected direct costs averted. We
 122 simulated two tax scenarios – using a 20 and a 30% SSB tax –, and we considered changes
 123 in SSB intake only and the potential caloric substitution by other beverages based on the
 124 cross-price elasticities.



125
 126
 127 **Fig 1. Representation of the simulation strategy.** Data sources: POF 2017/2018, PNS
 128 2019, Hall et al.2011, Nilson, 2020, Ward. 2019. Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics
 129 (IBGE).

130
 131 **Price elasticities by income level**
 132

133 To estimate the price elasticities of SSB by income level, we used the Brazilian Household
 134 Budget Survey (*Pesquisa de Orçamentos Familiares - POF*) from 2017-2018 (POF 2017-
 135 2018) collected by the Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics (IBGE). POF 2017-2018
 136 is representative of Brazil, its states, and metropolitan regions. Within POF, we used the
 137 purchase database, which registers all food purchases of a sample of 57,920 Brazilian
 138 households within a week (representing 59,783,430 Brazilian households). We considered
 139 POF survey sampling weights in all estimates.

140
 141 POF data include food acquisition - in total quantity (in kg) - and monetary value (in Brazilian
 142 reais). We categorized the beverage items of POF by using the NOVA classification into the
 143 following categories: (1) sugar-sweetened beverages, (2) alcoholic beverages, (3) other
 144 beverages, and (4) low-calorie sweetened beverages. Table A in S1 Appendix describes the
 145 beverage items included in each category.

146
 147 We also categorized food items to include food prices as controls in the demand regressions.
 148 Other food groups included: (i) fruits, (ii) *in natura* food, (iii) *in natura* meat, (iv) snacks, (v)
 149 sugar, (vi) other processed food, and (vii) other food items. Prices were calculated as unit
 150 values, calculated as total expenditure divided by total quantity consumed (implicit price). If a
 151 household reported zero consumption of an item, we approximated its price by the median of
 152 the neighboring regions. We estimated basic constant elasticity regressions using a log-log
 153 specification for all beverage categories:

154

$$\log(q_{i,b}) = \alpha_{0,b} + \sum_{f=1}^{11} \beta_{f,b} \log(p_f) + X_i \theta_b + \varepsilon_{i,b}$$

155 In which $q_{i,b}$ is the total quantity (in kg) of beverage b acquired by household i . We included the
156 price logarithm for all 11 categories of food and beverages (indexed by f). We also included
157 several sociodemographic variables as control variables (matrix X), such as (i) variables of
158 the household head (gender, years of schooling, race, and marital status), and variables of
159 the household (total members of the household, total children within the household, and
160 logarithm of the income in levels and quadratic).

161
162 We considered different price elasticities by income level. Income levels were categorized
163 using the tertiles (T) of the distribution of income per capita of the households ($TertIncome_T$)
164 calculated using sampling weights. Thus, the basic regression was modified according to the
165 following expression:

$$166 \quad \log(q_{i,b}) = \alpha_{0,b} + \sum_{f=1}^{11} \sum_{T=1}^3 \beta_{f,b} \log(p_f) \times TertIncome_{i,T} + X_i \theta_b + \varepsilon_{i,b}$$

167

168 **Baseline intake of beverages**

169 Baseline intake of beverages and self-reported anthropometric data were collected using the
170 POF 2017-2018. Food consumption was assessed using a single 24h recall because two-day
171 information was collected only in a small subsample of participants. We selected individuals
172 20 years of age and older (37,689 adults), representing 147,852,423 individuals in the adult
173 population in Brazil. Each subject reported the total number of beverages they consumed in
174 standard servings, then we transformed it to milliliters. We selected and classified beverages
175 into SSB, alcoholic beverages, other beverages, and light/diet beverages, according to Table
176 A in S1 Appendix. We added all beverages for each individual in the sample to generate a
177 total beverage consumption variable.

178 **Reduction in energy intake**

179

180 To estimate the expected impact of the tax on calories, we created two scenarios considering:
181 1) the own-price elasticity for SSB by income level, and 2) both own and cross-price elasticities
182 for alcoholic beverages, light diet beverages, and other beverages by income level. We
183 assumed that changes in household purchases derived from price elasticities translated
184 directly into household consumption changes. Prior studies suggest the effects of soda taxes
185 on consumption are linear; thus, we assumed linearity in the changes in consumption for the
186 20 and 30% tax scenarios.[18]

187

188 **Adjustment of self-reporting bias on weight and height**

189

190 We adjusted self-reported height and weight from POF 2017-2018, linked to SSB consumption
191 data, using measured data from the Brazilian National Health Survey (*Pesquisa Nacional de*
192 *Saúde* – PNS 2019). The PNS 2019 is a population-based survey, nationally representative,
193 aiming at estimating living and health conditions. This survey measured weight and height
194 using scales, portable stadiometers, and anthropometric tapes with the appropriate training
195 and supervisors. More information about the PNS 2019 can be found elsewhere [19]. Being
196 both POF and PNS nationally representative surveys, we could adjust for self-reporting bias.
197 We adjusted self-reported weight and height from POF to match the distribution of weight and

198 height measured in PNS 2019, following previously published methods.[20] Briefly, we
199 calculated the difference between weight and height data quantiles from both surveys and
200 fitted a cubic spline to smoothly construct a distribution of bias for weight and height. Then,
201 using the quantiles of self-reported weight and height, we estimated the bias using fitted cubic
202 splines (Figures A-B in S1 Appendix). Finally, we added the predicted difference to the self-
203 reported data by sex, as previous articles reported a larger underestimation of weight and
204 overestimation of height in women compared to men.[21] Details are available in section 2
205 from S1 Appendix.

206

207 **Reduction in body weight, BMI, and obesity prevalence**

208

209 To simulate weight changes attributable to the SSB tax on the Brazilian population, we used
210 a microsimulation approach, a dynamic model developed by Hall et al.[22] This model has
211 been previously implemented to estimate the impact of the sugar-sweetened beverages
212 tax.[9,23,24] The model considers changes in extracellular fluid, glycogen, and fat and lean
213 tissues caused by the change in caloric consumption but keeping the physical activity constant
214 at the individual level. Bodyweight is the result of the sum of fat mass and fat-free mass, and
215 it is determined by the model using a system of ordinary differential equations. A detailed
216 description of the equations and model implementation can be found elsewhere.[22] Dietary
217 and anthropometric information from POF were used as inputs for the model to obtain weight
218 changes over ten years, then translated into BMI changes and obesity prevalence changes.
219 An overview of the simulation process is shown in section 3 from S1 Appendix.

220

221 Sensitivity analysis

222 We relied on self-reported weight and height to generate the expected impact of the SSB tax,
223 adjusting the self-report bias expected in POF 2017/2018 using quantiles of weight and height
224 data from PNS 2019. However, recent concerns have been raised about the potential
225 limitations of this method.[25] To validate the results of our analysis, we followed an
226 independent estimation procedure, using measured weight and height from PNS 2019 and
227 SSB consumption from POF 2017/2018. Since these two surveys cannot be linked at the
228 individual level, we estimated the average SSB consumption and BMI for 14 groups by age
229 (20-39, 40-59, 60+) and socioeconomic status (low, middle, and high) for males and females.
230 Then, we implemented Hall's dynamic model using the averages, generating the expected
231 weight reduction in kilograms for each group and compared against the estimated produced
232 using the corrected self-reported data. Results and methods for this analysis are fully available
233 in section 6 in S1 Appendix.

234

235 **Reduction in cases with obesity**

236 We translated the reductions in the prevalence of obesity into obesity cases averted over 10
237 years using the baseline prevalence of obesity in Brazil (assuming a steady state) and the
238 expected reductions in obesity, multiplied by the population projections from the Brazilian
239 Institute of Geography and Statistics for the adult population from 2021 to 2030.

240 **Reduction in healthcare costs**

241 Obesity costs were obtained from a 2020 publication with direct costs attributable to obesity
242 in Brazil: US\$ 365.7 million in 2018 (1 US\$ = R\$ 3,875). [26] Direct costs use the health system

243 perspective, in which out-of-pocket expenses are not included. In 2018, we estimated a 25.2%
244 obesity prevalence in the adult population in Brazil using POF, resulting in 37.2 million persons
245 with obesity. Dividing the annual cost of obesity (US\$ 365.7 million) by the total number of
246 obesity cases, we estimated an annual cost per capita of US\$ 9.84. Using the Consumer Price
247 Index Inflation rate, we converted costs from 2018 to costs in 2021 and obtained an annual
248 cost of US\$ 10.34. Finally, we multiplied the absolute yearly reduction in obesity prevalence
249 by the obesity costs to estimate the total direct costs. A detailed description of cost estimations
250 is included in section 5 from S1 Appendix, following the Consolidated Health Economic
251 Evaluation Reporting Standards (CHEERS) (S2 Appendix).

252 RESULTS

253
254 Table 1 presents the estimated price elasticities for SSBs by income level. Low-income
255 households were, on average, more sensitive to changes in SSB prices, as they had higher
256 price elasticities than higher-income households. SSB price elasticities ranged from -1.13
257 (high income) to -1.24 (low income). Substitution effects from increases in SSB prices were
258 only observed for other beverages (which included milk, water, and 100% fruit juices) in low
259 and high-income households and for light/diet beverages for high-income households. We
260 observed a complementary behavior between the acquisition of SSBs and alcoholic
261 beverages (if one product decreased, the other also decreased).
262

Table 1: Price elasticities of SSB by income tertiles, 2018.

| | | Sugar sweetened beverages | Other beverages | Alcohol beverages | Light/diet beverages |
|--|-------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|
| Dependent variable: Log of Quantity Acquired (in Liters) | | | | | |
| Low income | <i>Mean</i> | -1.241*** | 0.046*** | -0.122** | -0.174 |
| | <i>sd</i> | -0.015 | -0.017 | -0.053 | -0.124 |
| Middle income | <i>Mean</i> | -1.186*** | 0.03 | -0.076 | 0.094 |
| | <i>sd</i> | -0.019 | -0.021 | -0.047 | -0.11 |
| High income | <i>Mean</i> | -1.126*** | 0.066*** | -0.141*** | 0.201** |
| | <i>sd</i> | -0.022 | -0.025 | -0.048 | -0.084 |
| <i>Observations (n)</i> | | 18,876 | 27,488 | 4,263 | 383 |

Notes: All regressions used microdata from POF 2017-2018. Income levels were divided using the tertiles of the distribution of the income per capita of the households). Other controls include logarithm of prices of other products (11 categories included), of income (in levels and squared), characteristics of household head (schooling, age, gender, race), total number of household members and total number of children living within the household (all ages). All regressions are weighted using sample survey weights. Standard errors (in brackets) are clustered by socioeconomic strata. P-values: * 0.10 ** 0.05 *** 0.01

263 Table 2 presents the baseline intake of SSBs and other beverages among Brazilian adults in
264 2018. We estimated a baseline intake of 72 kcal/person/day from SSB. The expected caloric
265 change after the SSBs tax was estimated to be -16.9 kcal/person/day for 20% and -25.3%
266 kcal/day for 30% tax. If we included changes in other beverages to allow for substitution,
267 expected caloric changes increased to -17.3 kcal/person/day for 20% (an extra reduction of
268 0.4 kcal) and -25.9 kcal/person/day for 30% tax (an extra reduction of 0.6 kcal). Expected
269 caloric changes should be higher among younger than older adults and higher income levels.

Table 2. Baseline caloric intake from SSBs and other beverages (alcohol, light and other beverages)

| | Populati on size (million) | Baseli ne intake kcal/ day | Caloric changes from SSB | | | | | Other caloric changes | | | |
|---------------|----------------------------------|--|--------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------|--------------------------------|-------------|--------------------------------|-----------|--------------------------------|-----------|
| | | | 95% CI | 20% tax | | 30% tax | | 20% tax | | 30% tax | |
| | | | | Mean change Kcal/ day | 95% CI | Mean change Kcal/ day | 95% CI | Mean change Kcal/ day | 95% CI | Mean change Kcal/ day | 95% CI |
| Total | 147.9 | 71.8 | 69.3,74.4 | -16.9 | -17.5,-16.3 | -25.3 | -26.2,-24.4 | -0.4 | -0.4,-0.3 | -0.6 | -0.7,-0.5 |
| sex | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>female</i> | 78.2 | 65.1 | 62.4,67.7 | -15.3 | -15.9,-14.7 | -22.9 | -23.9,-22.0 | -0.1 | -0.1,-0.0 | -0.1 | -0.2,-0.0 |
| <i>male</i> | 69.6 | 79.5 | 75.8,83.1 | -18.6 | -19.5,-17.8 | -27.9 | -29.2,-26.7 | -0.7 | -0.8,-0.6 | -1.0 | -1.2,-0.9 |
| Age groups | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20-39 | 62.2 | 92.2 | 88.0,96.5 | -21.7 | -22.7,-20.7 | -32.6 | -34.1,-31.1 | -0.4 | -0.5,-0.3 | -0.7 | -0.8,-0.5 |
| 40-59 | 53.9 | 62.9 | 59.4,66.4 | -14.7 | -15.5,-13.9 | -22.1 | -23.3,-20.8 | -0.5 | -0.6,-0.3 | -0.7 | -0.8,-0.5 |
| 60+ | 31.7 | 46.9 | 43.3,50.6 | -11.0 | -11.9,-10.2 | -16.6 | -17.8,-15.3 | -0.1 | -0.2,-0.0 | -0.2 | -0.3,-0.1 |
| Income status | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Low | 47.4 | 53.5 | 49.9,57.1 | -13.3 | -14.2,-12.4 | -19.9 | -21.3,-18.6 | -0.2 | -0.3,-0.2 | -0.4 | -0.5,-0.2 |
| Middle | 49.1 | 74.0 | 70.2,77.8 | -17.5 | -18.5,-16.6 | -26.3 | -27.7,-25.0 | -0.2 | -0.3,-0.2 | -0.3 | -0.4,-0.2 |
| High | 51.4 | 86.7 | 81.7,91.8 | -19.5 | -20.7,-18.4 | -29.3 | -31.0,-27.6 | -0.6 | -0.8,-0.5 | -0.9 | -1.2,-0.7 |


272 Table 3 presents the expected impact of the SSB tax over the prevalence of obesity, 10 years
273 after implementation, using own-price elasticities. The obesity prevalence is expected to
274 decrease from 25.2% to 23.6%, resulting in a 6.3% reduction with a 20% tax and an 8.7%
275 obesity reduction with a 30% tax. This reduction is expected to be higher among younger (-
276 8.3%) than older adults (-3.6%.) and among higher (-7.8%) than lower-income levels (-5.4%).
277 Allowing for substitution using cross-price elasticities, the expected decrease in the obesity
278 prevalence becomes larger, being -6.7% for 20% and -9.1% for a 30% tax.

Table 3. Baseline obesity in Brazil and expected obesity reduction after SSB tax, considering caloric changes from SSBs and all caloric changes.

| | Obesity changes from SSB | | | | | | Obesity changes from all beverages | | | | | | | |
|---------------|--------------------------|-----------|----------------------|------------|---------------------|----------------------|------------------------------------|---------|---------|------------|---------|---------|------------|---------------------|
| | Baseline obesity (%) | 95% CI | 20% tax | | 30% tax | | 20% tax | 30% tax | 20% tax | 30% tax | 20% tax | 30% tax | | |
| | | | Absolute change (pp) | 95% CI | Relative change (%) | Absolute change (pp) | | | | | | | 95% CI | Relative change (%) |
| Total | 25.2 | 24.4,26.0 | -1.6 | -1.9, -1.4 | -6.3% | -2.2 | -2.5, -2.0 | -8.7% | -1.7 | -1.9, -1.4 | -6.7% | -2.3 | -2.5, 2.0 | -9.1% |
| sex | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>female</i> | 28.8 | 27.8,29.8 | -1.4 | -1.8, -1.2 | -4.9% | -2.1 | -2.5, -1.7 | -7.3% | -1.5 | -1.8, -1.2 | -5.2% | -2.1 | -2.5, 1.8 | -7.3% |
| <i>male</i> | 21.2 | 20.2,22.2 | -1.9 | -2.3, -1.5 | -9.0% | -2.4 | -2.8, -2.0 | -11.3% | -1.9 | -2.3, -1.6 | -9.0% | -2.4 | -2.9, -2.1 | -11.3% |
| Age groups | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20-39 | 21.8 | 20.7,23.0 | -1.8 | -2.2, -1.5 | -8.3% | -2.4 | -2.9, 2.0 | -11.0% | -1.8 | -2.3, -1.5 | -8.3% | -2.5 | -3.0, -2.1 | -11.5% |
| 40-59 | 29.3 | 28.1,30.5 | -1.9 | -2.4, -1.5 | -6.5% | -2.4 | -2.9, -2.0 | -8.2% | -2 | -2.5, -1.6 | -6.8% | -2.4 | -2.9, -2.0 | -8.2% |
| 60+ | 24.8 | 23.4,26.4 | -0.9 | -1.4, -0.5 | -3.6% | -1.5 | -2.2, -1.0 | -6.0% | -0.9 | -1.4, -0.6 | -3.6% | -1.5 | -2.2, -1.0 | -6.0% |
| Income status | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Low | 22.3 | 21.1,23.4 | -1.2 | -1.6, -0.9 | -5.4% | -1.7 | -2.2, -1.3 | -7.6% | -1.2 | -1.7, -0.9 | -5.4% | -1.7 | -2.2, -1.3 | -7.6% |
| Middle | 26.2 | 25.0,27.4 | -1.6 | -2.0, -1.3 | -6.1% | -2.2 | -2.7, -1.9 | -8.4% | -1.7 | -2.1, -1.3 | -6.5% | -2.3 | -2.8, -1.9 | -8.8% |
| High | 27 | 25.5,28.5 | -2.1 | -2.7, -1.6 | -7.8% | -2.7 | -3.3, -2.2 | -10.0% | -2.1 | -2.7, -1.6 | -7.8% | -2.7 | -3.3, -2.2 | -10.0% |

279

280



281

282 Fig 2. Reduction in cases and cost savings 10 years after implementing the SSB tax, using
283 own-price elasticities if we consider only the effect on SSBs or all beverages.

284 Fig 2 shows the expected obesity reduction in cases and potential cost savings 10 years after
285 implementing the SSB tax, using own-price elasticities. A 20% tax is expected to reduce the
286 number of people living with obesity by 2.8 million and by 3.7 million with a 30% tax; this would
287 translate into direct cost savings of \$US 253.9 million with a 20% tax and \$US 341.8 million
288 with a 30% tax. Using cross-price elasticities, these estimates increase, so that the reduction
289 in the number of people living in obesity reaches -2.8 million and -3.8 million for a 30% tax;
290 cost savings increase to \$US 257.4 million with a 20%, and \$US 345.9 million with a 30% tax.
291

292 DISCUSSION

293

294 We aimed to estimate the own and cross-price elasticities of SSBs and translate them into the
295 expected impact of a 20 and 30% SSB tax on obesity over 10 years in Brazil. In Brazil, we
296 found that SSB is elastic and weakly substituted by milk, water, 100% fruit juices, and light
297 beverages. Low-income households were more sensitive to price increases and had a higher
298 elasticity than other income levels. We estimated that a 20% tax on SSBs could translate into
299 a 6.7% reduction in the obesity prevalence and US\$ 257.4 million savings in obesity costs
300 over ten years after implementation. A 30% tax was estimated to reduce 9.1% the obesity
301 prevalence and US\$ 345.9 million in the obesity costs over ten years. The largest benefits of
302 the tax are expected to be experienced by younger adults and by people in the high-income
303 tertile.

304

305 Estimating the impact of price increases on demand for SSB and other beverages in Brazil is
306 key to assessing the potential impact of an SSB tax across income strata. Our analysis
307 indicates that a 10% price increase to SSB in Brazil should result in a 12.4% reduction in
308 purchases among low-income households, 11.9% in the middle, and 11.3% in the high-income
309 strata; this is similar to what has been previously estimated in Mexico, where a 10% price
310 increase was expected to produce an 11.6% reduction in purchases, but higher than a
311 previous analysis in Brazil, that estimated that a 10% price increase would result in an 8.5%
312 reduction in SSB, using data from 2002-2003.[27,28] Our estimates are also similar to the
313 findings of a meta-analysis of observational studies that evaluated changes in intake and
314 consumption after a 10% tax that showed an associated 10% reduction in SSB purchases and
315 intake.[5] Our analysis suggests that SSB purchases in Brazil will decrease if prices are
316 increased, opening the possibility for an SSB tax to produce an impact on consumption.

317
318 We also analyzed cross-price elasticities, finding only a weak substitution by milk, water, and
319 100% fruit juices. Substitution for these beverages was previously reported in a meta-analysis
320 of US, Mexico, France, and Brazil studies.[29] In contrast, our findings suggest that alcohol
321 purchases are expected to decrease if SSB prices increase, while non-caloric beverages will
322 increase only in high-income adults. Considering these substitutions, a 20% tax should lead
323 to a direct caloric reduction of 16.9 kcal from SSB, which will be further increased by
324 substitution or complementation for other liquids with a lower caloric density (-0.4 kcal after a
325 20% tax and -0.6 kcal after a 30% tax). This finding implies that if an SSB tax were to be
326 implemented, no caloric substitution for liquids is to be expected, an observation that is in line
327 with a prior observational study that found a weak caloric compensation for SSB in the
328 Brazilian population[30] and with international studies that suggest that caloric compensation
329 for liquids is incomplete.[31]

330
331 This is the first study in Brazil to estimate the potential impact of a 20 and 30% SSB tax on
332 body weight. Based on our modeling exercise, we estimated that a 20% tax could result in a
333 6.7% reduction in obesity, increasing to 9.1% under a 30% tax. This estimate is within the
334 range of prior modeling studies using a comparable approach. For instance, in Mexico, a 20%
335 tax was estimated to reduce 6.9% the obesity prevalence after ten years.[9] We observed
336 important differences in the expected obesity impact by income tertiles; high-income groups
337 are expected to reduce their obesity prevalence by 7.8%, compared to 5.4% in low-income
338 groups. This could be explained by differences in baseline consumption of SSB, which were
339 86.7 kcal/day for high-, 74.0 kcal/day for middle-, and 53.5 kcal/day for low-income groups.
340 Also, baseline obesity prevalence was 27.0% in high, 26.2% in the middle, and 22.3% in low-
341 income groups; which, along with greater baseline SSB consumption, explain the greater
342 expected reductions in BMI among high-income individuals. We found that a 20 and 30%
343 excise tax on SSB will produce benefits for all income groups as it will reduce obesity levels
344 in all SES groups, however an augmented tax revenue can more disproportionately benefit
345 lower-income groups if they are used to fund redistributive social policies, the Brazilian
346 national unified health system, in particular strategies associated with obesity prevention and
347 treatment.[32]

348
349 An SSB tax in Brazil is expected to produce important savings related to obesity prevention.
350 We estimated a reduction of US\$ 257.4 million in obesity costs ten years after the
351 implementation of a 20% SSB tax. This cost reduction is smaller than what has been estimated
352 in the US (US\$ 23.6 billion) but higher than for Mexico (US\$ 159.5 million) for a similar tax

353 increase (20%) and a similar period (ten years).[12,33] Cost savings estimated in our analysis
354 do not consider out-of-pocket and indirect costs of obesity, such as those related to loss of
355 productivity, absenteeism, or disability. Indirect costs for diabetes were estimated to be 70%
356 of the total diabetes costs in Brazil,[34] which suggest that our estimates of obesity-related
357 cost savings are conservative. Finally, our cost-analysis does not consider the potential
358 benefits derived from the social investment of the tax revenue, particularly if revenue is
359 directed at strengthening obesity prevention measures, which can further increase the health
360 benefits from the tax.

361
362 Some limitations of our study should be mentioned. Available baseline weight and height were
363 self-reported. We relied on a quantile distribution method to calibrate it to the PNS objectively
364 measured data (section 2, S1 Appendix); yet, this method is imperfect and could be insufficient
365 to correct reporting bias.[25] For that reason, we performed a sensitivity analysis using the
366 same dynamic model, but at aggregated level. In this analysis, we used objectively measured
367 weight and height from 14 sex, age, and SES groups (aggregated data) and linked it to SSB
368 consumption. Differences in the expected weight reduction associated with the SSB tax were
369 minimal. In the 14 groups, the aggregated estimation fell within the confidence intervals for the
370 individual model (Table H in S1 Appendix) This sensitivity analysis increases our confidence
371 in the self-reported correction to estimate weight reductions in kilograms, but a similar
372 approach could not be used to assess the effect of the correction on the BMI classification.
373 However, we estimated a 16.9% obesity prevalence using self-reported weight and height,
374 compared to 25.2% using adjusted self-reported data, and to 26.8% obesity prevalence using
375 objective measures of weight and height (Table B in S1 Appendix). The potential error of the
376 adjusted self-reported data on the BMI classification (obesity vs non-obesity) in comparison
377 with the measured data is in the downward direction, suggesting that adjusted data could
378 underestimate the SSB impact on obesity, but in a lower magnitude than if we had used self-
379 reported data without adjustments.

380
381 Because the available literature in obesity costs in Brazil are very heterogeneous, our findings
382 on cost reduction also have limitations. A systematic review found that obesity costs in Brazil
383 (including direct and indirect costs) ranged from USD 133.8 million to USD 6.3 billion per year
384 (47 times the lowest estimation).[35] We relied on the most recent obesity cost estimation in
385 Brazil that uses attributable fraction formulas to calculate the attributable costs to obesity,
386 including 26 diseases (USD 365.7 million per year), and lies between the cost range of the
387 systematic review.[26] Still, the cost estimation uses a health-system perspective, so out-of-
388 pocket and indirect costs are not included, leading to a conservative estimate of the economic
389 benefits of the tax. Our model relies on a steady-state assumption, which implies that the
390 obesity prevalence is constant over the 10 years, and the only caloric change observed is the
391 caloric reduction produced by the SSB tax. If obesity continues to rise, failing to include an
392 increasing trend would lead to an underestimation of the total number of obesity cases
393 reduced and obesity costs because the estimated reduction over time would be multiplied by
394 a fewer number of obesity cases.

395
396 Sugar-sweetened beverage taxes have been implemented in more than 73 countries
397 worldwide.[7] Studies have shown that SSB are elastic and respond to increases in price; yet
398 no negative economic effects have been observed in countries where SSB taxes have been
399 implemented,[32] and analyses in Brazil suggest an economic net benefit from implementing
400 an SSB tax.[36]Our findings suggest that implementing an SSB tax in Brazil will lead to an

401 important reduction in the caloric intake of beverages with little to no nutritional added value;
402 this reduction could help reduce the obesity prevalence across all socioeconomic strata. From
403 an economic perspective, an SSB tax could reduce healthcare costs while generating revenue
404 that could be in turn invested in other obesity prevention interventions. In 2017, the World
405 Health Organization recommended that all countries should implement an SSB tax of at least
406 20%. Our analysis suggests that a 30% tax in Brazil could produce greater population health
407 benefits for all income strata.

408

409 **References**

- 410 1. Zhang X, Li X, Liu L, Hong F, Zhao H, Chen L, et al. Dose-response association between
411 sugar- and artificially sweetened beverage consumption and the risk of metabolic
412 syndrome: a meta-analysis of population-based epidemiological studies. *Public Health*
413 *Nutr.* 2020 [cited 2 Apr 2021]. doi:10.1017/S1368980020003614
- 414 2. Qin P, Li Q, Zhao Y, Chen Q, Sun X, Liu Y, et al. Sugar and artificially sweetened
415 beverages and risk of obesity, type 2 diabetes mellitus, hypertension, and all-cause
416 mortality: a dose-response meta-analysis of prospective cohort studies. *Eur J Epidemiol.*
417 2020;35. doi:10.1007/s10654-020-00655-y
- 418 3. Te Morenga L, Mallard S, Mann J. Dietary sugars and body weight: systematic review
419 and meta-analyses of randomised controlled trials and cohort studies. *BMJ.* 2012;346.
420 doi:10.1136/bmj.e7492
- 421 4. Chaloupka FJ, Powell LM, Warner KE. The Use of Excise Taxes to Reduce Tobacco,
422 Alcohol, and Sugary Beverage Consumption. *Annu Rev Public Health.* 2019;40.
423 doi:10.1146/annurev-publhealth-040218-043816
- 424 5. Teng AM, Jones AC, Mizdrak A, Signal L, Genç M, Wilson N. Impact of sugar-sweetened
425 beverage taxes on purchases and dietary intake: Systematic review and meta-analysis.
426 *Obes Rev.* 2019;20. doi:10.1111/obr.12868
- 427 6. World Health Organization. Taxes on sugary drinks: Why do it? 2018. Available:
428 [https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/260253/WHO-NMH-PND-16.5Rev.1-](https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/260253/WHO-NMH-PND-16.5Rev.1-eng.pdf;jsessionid=8D1057AF8F26CED5BA83A9F504FAB4C6?sequence=1)
429 [eng.pdf;jsessionid=8D1057AF8F26CED5BA83A9F504FAB4C6?sequence=1](https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/260253/WHO-NMH-PND-16.5Rev.1-eng.pdf;jsessionid=8D1057AF8F26CED5BA83A9F504FAB4C6?sequence=1)
- 430 7. Sugar-sweetened beverage taxation in the Region of the Americas. Pan American Health
431 Organization; 2021.
- 432 8. Colchero MA, Rivera-Dommarco J, Popkin BM, Ng SW. In Mexico, Evidence Of
433 Sustained Consumer Response Two Years After Implementing A Sugar-Sweetened
434 Beverage Tax. *Health Aff.* 2017;36: 564–571.
- 435 9. Barrientos-Gutierrez T, Zepeda-Tello R, Rodrigues ER, Colchero-Aragónés A, Rojas-
436 Martínez R, Lazcano-Ponce E, et al. Expected population weight and diabetes impact of
437 the 1-peso-per-litre tax to sugar sweetened beverages in Mexico. *PLoS One.* 2017;12:
438 e0176336.
- 439 10. Torres-Álvarez R, Barrán-Zubaran R, Canto-Osorio F, Sánchez-Romero LM, Camacho-
440 García-Formentí D, Popkin BM, et al. Body weight impact of the sugar-sweetened
441 beverages tax in Mexican children: A modeling study. *Pediatr Obes.* 2020;15: e12636.
- 442 11. Sánchez-Romero LM, Penko J, Coxson PG, Fernández A, Mason A, Moran AE, et al.
443 Projected Impact of Mexico's Sugar-Sweetened Beverage Tax Policy on Diabetes and
444 Cardiovascular Disease: A Modeling Study. *PLoS Med.* 2016;13: e1002158.

- 445 12. Basto-Abreu A, Barrientos-Gutiérrez T, Vidaña-Pérez D, Colchero MA, Hernández-F M,
446 Hernández-Ávila M, et al. Cost-Effectiveness Of The Sugar-Sweetened Beverage Excise
447 Tax In Mexico. *Health Aff* . 2019;38: 1824–1831.
- 448 13. Caro JC, Corvalán C, Reyes M, Silva A, Popkin B, Taillie LS. Chile's 2014 sugar-
449 sweetened beverage tax and changes in prices and purchases of sugar-sweetened
450 beverages: An observational study in an urban environment. *PLoS Med*. 2018;15:
451 e1002597.
- 452 14. Taillie LS, Reyes M, Arantxa Colchero M, Popkin B, Corvalán C. An evaluation of Chile's
453 Law of Food Labeling and Advertising on sugar-sweetened beverage purchases from
454 2015 to 2017: A before-and-after study. *PLoS Med*. 2020;17: e1003015.
- 455 15. Singh GM, Micha R, Khatibzadeh S, Lim S, Ezzati M, Mozaffarian D, et al. Estimated
456 Global, Regional, and National Disease Burdens Related to Sugar-Sweetened Beverage
457 Consumption in 2010. *Circulation*. 2015;132: 639–666.
- 458 16. Silva LES da, Oliveira MM de, Stopa SR, Gouvea E de CDP, Ferreira KRD, Santos R de
459 O, et al. Temporal trend of overweight and obesity prevalence among Brazilian adults,
460 according to sociodemographic characteristics, 2006-2019. *Epidemiol Serv Saúde*.
461 2021;30. doi:10.1590/S1679-49742021000100008
- 462 17. Pereda P, Garcia CP. Price impact of taxes on sugary drinks in Brazil. *Econ Hum Biol*.
463 2020;39: 100898.
- 464 18. Fletcher JM, Frisvold DE, Tefft N. Non-linear effects of soda taxes on consumption and
465 weight outcomes. *Health Econ*. 2015;24: 566–582.
- 466 19. Stopa SR, Szwarcwald CL, Oliveira MM de, Gouvea E de CDP, Vieira MLFP, Freitas
467 MPS de, et al. Pesquisa Nacional de Saúde 2019: histórico, métodos e perspectivas.
468 *Epidemiol Serv Saúde*. 2020;29. doi:10.1590/S1679-49742020000500004
- 469 20. Ward ZJ, Bleich SN, Cradock AL, Barrett JL, Giles CM, Flax C, et al. Projected U.S. State-
470 Level Prevalence of Adult Obesity and Severe Obesity. *N Engl J Med*. 2019;381: 2440–
471 2450.
- 472 21. Engstrom JL, Paterson SA, Doherty A, Trabulsi M, Speer KL. Accuracy of self-reported
473 height and weight in women: an integrative review of the literature. *J Midwifery Womens
474 Health*. 2003;48: 338–345.
- 475 22. Hall KD, Sacks G, Chandramohan D, Chow CC, Wang YC, Gortmaker SL, et al.
476 Quantification of the effect of energy imbalance on bodyweight. *The Lancet*. 2011. pp.
477 826–837.
- 478 23. Basu S, Vellakkal S, Agrawal S, Stuckler D, Popkin B, Ebrahim S. Averting obesity and
479 type 2 diabetes in India through sugar-sweetened beverage taxation: an economic-
480 epidemiologic modeling study. *PLoS Med*. 2014;11: e1001582.
- 481 24. Lin B-H, Smith TA, Lee J-Y, Hall KD. Measuring weight outcomes for obesity intervention
482 strategies: the case of a sugar-sweetened beverage tax. *Econ Hum Biol*. 2011;9: 329–
483 341.
- 484 25. Flegal KM, Graubard BI, Ioannidis JPA. Evaluation of a suggested novel method to adjust
485 BMI calculated from self-reported weight and height for measurement error. *Obesity* .
486 2021;29: 1700–1707.

- 487 26. Nilson EAF, Andrade R da CS, de Brito DA, de Oliveira ML. [Costs attributable to obesity,
488 hypertension, and diabetes in the Unified Health System, Brazil, 2018Costos atribuibles
489 a la obesidad, la hipertensión y la diabetes en el Sistema Único de Salud de Brasil, 2018].
490 Rev Panam Salud Publica. 2020;44: e32.
- 491 27. Price elasticity of the demand for sugar sweetened beverages and soft drinks in Mexico.
492 Econ Hum Biol. 2015;19: 129–137.
- 493 28. Claro RM, Levy RB, Popkin BM, Monteiro CA. Sugar-sweetened beverage taxes in Brazil.
494 Am J Public Health. 2012;102: 178–183.
- 495 29. Escobar MAC, Cabrera Escobar MA, Lennert Veerman J, Tollman SM, Bertram MY,
496 Hofman KJ. Evidence that a tax on sugar sweetened beverages reduces the obesity rate:
497 a meta-analysis. BMC Public Health. 2013. doi:10.1186/1471-2458-13-1072
- 498 30. Gombi-Vaca MF, Sichieri R, Verly E Jr. Caloric compensation for sugar-sweetened
499 beverages in meals: A population-based study in Brazil. Appetite. 2016;98: 67–73.
- 500 31. Almiron-Roig E, Palla L, Guest K, Ricchiuti C, Vint N, Jebb SA, et al. Factors that
501 determine energy compensation: a systematic review of preload studies. Nutr Rev.
502 2013;71: 458–473.
- 503 32. Barrientos-Gutiérrez T, Colchero MA, Sánchez-Romero LM, Batis C, Rivera-Dommarco
504 J. [Position paper on taxes to non-basic energy-dense foods and sugar-sweetened
505 beverages]. Salud Publica Mex. 2018;60: 586–591.
- 506 33. Long MW, Gortmaker SL, Ward ZJ, Resch SC, Moodie ML, Sacks G, et al. Cost
507 Effectiveness of a Sugar-Sweetened Beverage Excise Tax in the U.S. Am J Prev Med.
508 2015;49: 112–123.
- 509 34. Boarati PPAC, Guidetti B. Economic Burden of Diabetes mellitus in Brazil. University of
510 São Paulo (FEA-USP); 2019 Jul. Report No.: 2019_24. Available:
511 <https://ideas.repec.org/p/spa/wpaper/2019wpecon24.html>
- 512 35. Braga BC, Ricardo C, Carvalho V, Duran AC. Direct and Indirect Costs of Obesity in
513 Brazil: A Systematic Review. Current Developments in Nutrition. 2020;4: 1623.
- 514 36. Balbinotto G, Cardoso L. Measuring The Economic Impact Of Ssb Taxes In Brazil: An
515 Input-Output Analysis. Value Health. 2016;19: A101.
- 516
517






Figure 1

Obesity cases (millions)



Obesity costs (US million dollars)



Caloric changes

- SSB
- All beverages

Figure