

1 Parental body mass index and offspring childhood body size and eating behaviour: causal inference via parental 2 comparisons and extended children of twins structural equation modelling

3
4 Tom A Bond^{1,2,3,4,*}, Tom A McAdams^{5,6}, Nicole M Warrington^{1,2,7,8}, Laurie J Hannigan^{2,9,10}, Espen Moen Eilertsen^{6,11,12},
5 Ziada Ayorech⁶, Fartein A Torvik^{6,12}, George Davey Smith^{2,3}, Deborah A Lawlor^{2,3}, Eivind Ystrøm^{6,10}, Alexandra
6 Havadahl^{2,6,9,10,§}, David M Evans^{1,2,7,§}

7 ¹The University of Queensland Diamantina Institute, The University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia.

8 ²MRC Integrative Epidemiology Unit at the University of Bristol, Bristol, UK.

9 ³Population Health Sciences, Bristol Medical School, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK.

10 ⁴Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Imperial College London, London, UK.

11 ⁵Social, Genetic and Developmental Psychiatry Centre, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience, King's
12 College, London, UK.

13 ⁶Department of Psychology, PROMENTA Research Center, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway.

14 ⁷Institute for Molecular Bioscience, University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia.

15 ⁸K.G. Jebsen Center for Genetic Epidemiology, Department of Public Health and Nursing, NTNU, Norwegian
16 University of Science and Technology, Norway.

17 ⁹Nic Waals Institute, Lovisenberg Diakonale Hospital, Oslo, Norway.

18 ¹⁰Department of Mental Disorders, Norwegian Institute of Public Health, Oslo, Norway.

19 ¹¹Department of Psychology, University of Oslo, Forskningsveien 3A, 0373, Oslo, Norway.

20 ¹²Centre for Fertility and Health, Norwegian Institute of Public Health, Oslo, Norway.

21 *Corresponding author

22 §These authors contributed equally to this work

23 Abstract

24 Background

25 The intergenerational transmission of obesity-related traits could propagate an accelerating cycle of obesity, if
26 parental adiposity causally influences offspring adiposity via intrauterine or periconceptual mechanisms. We aimed
27 to establish whether associations between parental peri-pregnancy body mass index (BMI) and offspring birth
28 weight (BW), BMI until 8 years and 8-year eating behaviour are due to genetic confounding.

29 Methods

30 We used data from the Norwegian Mother, Father and Child Cohort Study and the Medical Birth Registry of Norway.
31 We compared the strength of the associations of maternal versus paternal BMI with offspring outcomes, and used
32 an extended children of twins structural equation model (SEM) to quantify the extent to which associations were
33 due to genetic confounding ($n = 17001$ to 85866 children).

34 Findings

35 Maternal BMI was more strongly associated than paternal BMI with offspring BW, but the maternal-paternal
36 difference decreased for offspring BMI after birth. Greater parental BMI was associated with obesity-related
37 offspring eating behaviours. SEM results indicated that genetic confounding did not explain the association between
38 parental BMI and offspring BW, but explained the majority of the association with offspring BMI from 6 months
39 onwards. For 8-year BMI, genetic confounding explained 79% (95% CI: 62%, 95%) of the covariance with maternal
40 BMI and 94% (95% CI: 72%, 113%) of the covariance with paternal BMI.

41 Interpretation

42 We found strong evidence that parent-child BMI associations are primarily due to genetic confounding, arguing
43 against a strong causal effect of maternal or paternal adiposity on childhood adiposity via intrauterine or
44 periconceptual mechanisms.

45 Keywords

46 Parent, offspring, obesity, BMI, Child Eating Behaviour Questionnaire, genetic confounding, children of twins, MoBa

1

17 Introduction



18 The positive observational association between parental body mass index (BMI) and offspring adiposity in childhood
19 is well replicated (1), but the mechanisms driving this association remain unknown. If greater maternal or paternal
20 BMI causes greater offspring BMI via prenatal or intrauterine developmental mechanisms, a vicious cycle could
21 amplify BMI through successive generations and be a major driver of the obesity epidemic (2). It is therefore crucial
22 to establish why parental BMI is associated with offspring childhood BMI.

23 Several mechanisms are plausible (**Figure 1a**). Higher parental BMI could cause higher offspring adiposity through
24 pre-conception and/or intrauterine developmental mechanisms (the developmental overnutrition hypothesis) (3-6),
25 with some authors advocating that interventions to maintain women's preconception BMI at a healthy level be used
26 as a means to reduce offspring adiposity (1, 3, 7). Because adiposity is highly heritable across the life course (8),
27 genetic confounding (via the inheritance of parental genetic alleles by the offspring) could result in intergenerational
28 BMI associations. Non-genetic (environmental) confounding, for example via shared familial socioeconomic position
29 or parental influences on offspring postnatal food intake and physical activity behaviours, could also contribute to
30 these associations.

31 Numerous animal studies purport to provide evidence in favour of the developmental overnutrition hypothesis (9).
32 Potential biological mechanisms have been elucidated (**Figure 1b**) (5, 9), including a putatively key role for the
33 programming of offspring appetite via energy homeostasis brain networks (10). In humans, child appetite traits are
34 associated with the child's own BMI (11), and with maternal overweight/obesity (12). However, whether
35 developmental programming of adiposity and appetite occurs in humans remains unclear. Mendelian randomization
36 (13), sibling studies (14, 15) and paternal negative exposure control studies (16, 17) suggest that familial
37 confounding (either genetic or non-genetic) may be an important cause of parent-child BMI associations. However,
38 such associations are generally unchanged on adjustment for measured variables (18), leaving the specific
39 confounders unidentified.

40 We aimed to establish whether associations between peri-pregnancy parental BMI and offspring birth weight,
41 childhood BMI and appetite-related eating behaviours are due to genetic confounding. We first compared the
42 strength of the associations of maternal versus paternal BMI with offspring outcomes, which are likely to be similarly
43 strong if they are primarily due to genetic confounding. We then applied a genetically informed structural equation
44 model (SEM) to a population-based sample of twins, siblings and half siblings, and their children, to quantify the
45 relative importance of genetic confounding versus other mechanisms in underpinning intergenerational associations.
46 Based on prior evidence (13-19) we hypothesized that genetic confounding would not explain the associations of
47 parental BMI with offspring birth weight, but would be a major driver of associations with offspring childhood BMI.

- a**
1. Intrauterine or periconceptional causal effects
 2. Genetic confounding
 3. Non-genetic (environmental) confounding



78 **Figure 1: (a)** Directed acyclic graph (DAG) showing three plausible mechanisms for associations between parental BMI and
 79 offspring weight, BMI and appetite traits. *We define non-genetic (environmental) confounding as confounding that does not
 30 involve the offspring's own genotype (non-genetic confounding could therefore still involve parental genetic effects, i.e. effects
 31 of parental genotype on offspring outcomes independently of offspring genotype, via the offspring's environment). Examples of
 32 non-genetic confounding include shared familial socioeconomic position or parental influences on offspring postnatal food
 33 intake and physical activity behaviours. To the extent that postnatal parental BMI *per se* causally influences offspring outcomes
 34 after birth (e.g. by influencing feeding- and exercise-related parenting practices), this would constitute a postnatal causal effect
 35 rather than non-genetic confounding. **(b)** Conceptual diagram showing putative biological mechanisms by which parental BMI
 36 could have intrauterine or periconceptional causal effects on offspring outcomes. Arrows denote potential causal effects, bold
 37 outlined boxes denote variables analysed in the present study. The intent is to non-exhaustively show some key variables and
 38 relationships that have been hypothesized in the literature

39 **Methods**

30 Study design and participants

31 We analysed data from the Norwegian Mother, Father and Child Cohort Study (MoBa; described in detail elsewhere
32 (20)), a prospective population-based birth cohort conducted by the Norwegian Institute of Public Health, and used
33 data from the Medical Birth Registry of Norway (MBRN), a national health registry containing information about all
34 births in Norway (21). Pregnant women were recruited at 50 out of 52 hospital maternity units in Norway, on
35 attendance of a routine antenatal ultrasound scan offered to all Norwegian women at around 17 weeks of gestation.
36 41% of invitees participated, resulting in a total sample of around 114,500 children born between 1999 and 2009,
37 along with around 95,200 mothers and 75,200 fathers. We used version 11 of the quality assured data files released
38 for research in 2018, and analysed only live-born offspring. Flowcharts detailing sample selection are presented in
39 **Supplementary information S1**. The establishment of MoBa and initial data collection was based on a license from
40 the Norwegian Data Protection Agency and approval from The Regional Committees for Medical and Health
41 Research Ethics. The MoBa cohort is currently regulated by the Norwegian Health Registry Act. The current study
42 was approved by The Regional Committees for Medical and Health Research Ethics (REK 2013/863).

33 Exposures and outcomes

34 The exposures were maternal pre-pregnancy BMI and paternal BMI during pregnancy, calculated from weight and
35 height reported by the parents at the first study questionnaire (around 17 weeks gestation). Maternal height and
36 pre-pregnancy weight were reported by the mothers, and paternal weight and height were reported by the fathers
37 (for 35% of measurements), or by the mothers when paternal report was unavailable (Pearson's $r = 0.98$ between
38 maternally and paternally reported paternal weight and height).

39 Offspring outcomes included birth weight and BMI assessed between age 6 months and 8 years, and appetite-
40 related eating behaviour traits assessed at age 8 years via the Child Eating Behaviour Questionnaire (CEBQ) (22).
41 Birth weight and length were from the MBRN. Mothers completed regular questionnaires when their children were
42 aged between 6 months and 8 years, from which the child's weight and height at age 6 months and 1, 2, 3, 5, and 8
43 years were obtained. Measurements at ages up to 3 years were predominantly from the child's health card, whereas
44 measurements from 5 years onwards were carried out by the parents. In order to maximise statistical efficiency we
45 also used all available offspring BMI measurements to fit a growth curve, from which we predicted offspring BMI at 1
46 year intervals between age 1 and 8 years for children with at least three BMI measurements. These fitted BMI
47 values, which we refer to as "predicted BMI", were used as a supplement to the mother-reported BMI measures
48 described above, enabling comparison of results in an identical (and larger) sample across different ages. Full details
49 of the cleaning of anthropometric data and growth curve fitting are given in **Supplementary information S2**. As pre-
50 planned secondary outcomes we analysed ponderal index (weight [kg]/length [m]³) and BMI at birth, and weight at
51 ages up to 8 years.

52 The CEBQ is a widely used and validated psychometric instrument for child obesogenic eating behaviours (22). At the
53 8-year questionnaire, mothers completed 5-point Likert scales for 18 CEBQ items related to their child's satiety
54 responsiveness, slowness in eating, enjoyment of food, fussiness, emotional overeating and emotional undereating.
55 We calculated the mean item score for each of the six scales for participants with available data for least two out of
56 three items per scale. Covariate data were obtained from the MBRN or study questionnaires and are described in
57 **Supplementary information S3**.

28 Linear regression analyses

29 We fitted linear regression models to explore associations between exposures and outcomes, adjusting when
30 relevant for offspring sex and age at outcome measurement, the other parent's BMI, and potential non-genetic
31 confounders including maternal parity, parental and grandparental language group (as a proxy for ethnicity) and
32 maternal and paternal characteristics (age, smoking during pregnancy, educational attainment and income).
33 Participants with non-missing values for all relevant variables were included in analyses. To account for non-
34 independence between siblings we used a linear mixed model with a random intercept at the family level
35 (**Supplementary information S4**), and a z-test was used to test whether associations with maternal and paternal BMI
36 differed in magnitude (**Supplementary information S5**). For ease of interpretation, exposure and outcome variables

37 were standardized, therefore regression coefficients are interpreted as the average change in the outcome in
38 standard deviation (SD) units per 1 SD increase in the exposure. Because the standard deviation may differ for
39 maternal versus paternal BMI we also tested for maternal-paternal differences using unstandardized exposures.
40 Offspring BMI from age 5 years onwards was positively skewed (**Supplementary information S6**) so was natural log
41 transformed, and several CEBQ eating behaviour scores were strongly skewed so were regressed on offspring age
42 and sex followed by rank-based inverse normal transformation of the residuals. We carried out sensitivity analyses
43 including 1) additionally adjusting birth weight models for gestational age at birth, 2) testing for non-linear
44 associations (**Supplementary information S7**), 3) testing for interaction by offspring sex, and 4) testing for maternal
45 BMI-paternal BMI interaction. Analyses were carried out in R version 4.0.3 (23).

16 Genetically informed structural equation modelling

17 To quantify the extent to which exposure-outcome associations were due to genetic confounding, we fit an
18 extended children of twins SEM (the Multiple Children of Twins and Siblings [MCoTS] model, described in
19 **Supplementary information S8** and elsewhere (24)) in a subset of the MoBa sample. An extended pedigree including
20 twins, siblings and half siblings in both the parental and offspring generations was identified within MoBa using data
21 from the study questionnaires, genotyping, and linkage to the Norwegian Population Registry, the Norwegian Twin
22 Registry and the MBRN (24). Our MCoTS model partitions the phenotypic covariance between exposures and
23 outcomes into a part due to genetic confounding and a residual part (due to any causal effects and/or non-genetic
24 confounding). Skewed exposure and outcome variables were transformed as for linear regression analyses, with the
25 exception that parental BMI was also natural log transformed given the multivariate normality assumptions of SEM
26 fit via maximum likelihood. Exposure variables were standardized to give unit variance and zero mean. Outcome
27 variables were standardized (or inverse normalized for eating behaviour variables) within sex strata (or within age
28 and sex strata for child BMI outcomes). Because the variance of exposures and outcome variables was close to one,
29 covariances are approximately equal to Pearson's correlation coefficients. Classic and extended twin studies suggest
30 the presence of dominance genetic effects and absence of common environmental effects for adult BMI (8), but
31 provide support for common environmental effects on birth weight and child BMI (25, 26). We therefore chose *a*
32 *priori* to fit an MCoTS model that partitioned parental BMI variance into additive, dominance and non-shared
33 environmental components (an ADE model) and partitioned offspring outcome variance into additive, common
34 environmental and non-shared environmental components (an ACE model). In sensitivity analyses we fit ACE and AE
35 models for parental BMI as well as stratifying analyses by offspring sex, fitting a liability threshold model for
36 untransformed eating behaviour outcomes (**Supplementary information S9–11**), and refitting BW models having
37 dropped offspring-generation twins (because monozygotic [MZ] twins may share a placenta and twins have lower
38 BW than singletons, which could generate biases). Standard errors and 95% confidence intervals were calculated via
39 bias corrected bootstrapping of the MCoTS model with 10,000 resamples. SEM were fit in R version 4.0.3 (OpenMx
40 package version 2.18.1) (23, 27).

71 Role of the funding source

72 The funders of the study had no role in study design, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation, or writing of
73 the report.

74

75 **Results**

76 **Table 1:** Characteristics of the parental and offspring generation of study participants ($n = 85,866$)

Variable	Mean	SD	<i>n</i>	%
Parental characteristics				
Maternal BMI (kg/m ²)	24.1	4.3		
Paternal BMI (kg/m ²)	25.9	3.3		
Maternal WHO BMI category (kg/m ²)	<18.5		2560	3.0
	18.5–24.9		56367	65.6
	25–29.9		18727	21.8
	≥30		8212	9.6
Paternal WHO BMI category (kg/m ²)	<18.5		197	0.2
	18.5–24.9		37822	44.0
	25–29.9		39120	45.6
	≥30		8727	10.2
Parity (number of previous births)	0		38736	45.1
	1		30807	35.9
	2		12795	14.9
	3		2740	3.2
	4+		788	0.9
Maternal age at birth of child (years)	≤19		624	0.7
	20-24		8029	9.4
	25-29		28245	32.9
	30-34		33814	39.4
	35-39		13465	15.7
	≥40		1689	1.9
Paternal age at birth of child (years)	≤19		180	0.2
	20-24		3497	4.1
	25-29		19167	22.3
	30-34		33725	39.3
	35-39		20734	24.1
	≥40		8563	10.1
Maternal smoking during pregnancy	No		79345	92.4
	Yes		6521	7.6
Paternal smoking during pregnancy	No		65570	76.4
	Yes		20296	23.6
Maternal educational attainment	Incomplete upper 2 ^o school		199	0.2
	Upper 2 ^o school		1527	1.8
	High school/junior college		23896	27.9
	University/college, 4 years		36309	42.3
	University/college, >4 years		22558	26.3
	Other		1377	1.6
Parental language	Norwegian		76521	89.1
	Other		9345	10.9
Offspring characteristics				
Gestational age (weeks)	39.8	2.0		
Birth weight (g)	3563	596		
6 month BMI (kg/m ²)	17.2	1.5		
Age at 6 month BMI measurement (months)	5.8	0.5		
1 year BMI (kg/m ²)	17.0	1.4		
Age at 1 year BMI measurement (years)	1.0	0.1		
2 year BMI (kg/m ²)	16.5	1.4		
Age at 2 year BMI measurement (years)	2.0	0.2		
3 year BMI (kg/m ²)	16.1	1.5		
Age at 3 year BMI measurement (years)	3.0	0.1		
5 year BMI (kg/m ²)	15.6	1.6		
Age at 5 year BMI measurement (years)	5.2	0.3		
8 year BMI (kg/m ²)	16.1	2.0		
Age at 8 year BMI measurement (years)	7.8	0.5		

77 Statistics are for the sample used for linear regression analyses of birth weight ($n = 85,866$), aside from the other outcome
78 variables, for which statistics are from the corresponding linear regression samples. Equivalent data for the 8-year BMI sample
79 ($n = 46,620$) are presented in **Supplementary information S12**. **SD**: standard deviations, **WHO**: World Health Organization

30

31 The number of offspring included in linear regression analyses varied by outcome, from 85,866 (74.9% of recruited
32 sample) to 30,904 (27.0% of recruited sample) for analyses of birth weight and 2-year BMI respectively.
33 **Supplementary information S1** shows the proportion of the sample with non-missing data for each analysis, and
34 **Table 1** shows the characteristics of the study participants. There was statistical evidence for selective attrition, such
35 that the sample used for analyses of 8-year BMI ($n = 46,620$) was more highly educated and had lower obesity
36 prevalence and greater maternal age versus the baseline sample, but the magnitude of such differences was
37 relatively small (**Supplementary information S12**).

38 Linear regression analyses provided strong statistical evidence that the association of maternal BMI with offspring
39 birth weight is stronger than that of paternal BMI with offspring birth weight (**Figure 2a**). However, after birth the
40 associations with offspring BMI converged, and the associations of maternal and paternal BMI with offspring 2–5-
41 year BMI were similar. Although for 8-year BMI there was statistical evidence that the paternal association was
42 slightly weaker, the difference was not large, and when we used unstandardized parental variables the paternal
43 association was actually slightly stronger than the maternal association (**Supplementary table S1**). These results
44 were not markedly different when using offspring BMI predicted from a modelled growth curve (**Supplementary
45 information S13**), when substituting birth weight for ponderal index/BMI at birth and substituting child BMI for
46 weight, when stratifying by offspring sex, or when additionally adjusting for gestational age (**Supplementary table
47 S1**). With respect to eating behaviour outcomes, both maternal and paternal BMI were positively associated with
48 offspring food responsiveness and emotional overeating, and negatively associated with emotional undereating.
49 Only paternal BMI was associated (negatively) with offspring satiety responsiveness and slow eating. Offspring 8-
50 year BMI was associated with all eating behaviour outcomes except for emotional undereating, in the directions that
51 would be expected from the behavioral susceptibility theory of obesity (22) (**Supplementary information S14**). We
52 did not observe large departures from log-linear relationships (**Supplementary information S7**), and statistical
53 interaction between maternal and paternal BMI was at most minor (**Supplementary information S15**).

54 **Table 2** shows the sample size available for MCoTS analyses, stratified by maternal and offspring relationship. The
55 MCoTS results indicated that the positive phenotypic covariance between maternal BMI and offspring birth weight
56 was not explained by genetic confounding, with genetic covariance estimates that were statistically indistinguishable
57 from zero (**Figure 3**). The weak positive phenotypic covariance between paternal BMI and offspring birth weight was
58 also not explained by genetic confounding. Surprisingly, there was statistical evidence for a small negative genetic
59 covariance between paternal BMI and offspring birth weight, but this attenuated and became statistically
60 indistinguishable from zero when, in exploratory analyses, we adjusted exposures and outcomes for potential
61 confounders (including maternal BMI, paternal age and paternal income), suggesting that bias due to uncontrolled
62 confounding may be the explanation (**Supplementary information S16**).

63 From age 6 months onwards, genetic covariance estimates became positive and increased in magnitude, such that
64 for offspring 8-year BMI, genetic confounding explained 79% ($0.19 / 0.24 * 100$) (95% CI: 62%, 95%) of the
65 covariance with maternal BMI and 94% ($0.20 / 0.21 * 100$) (95% CI: 72%, 113%) of the covariance with paternal BMI
66 (**Figure 3, Supplementary information S17**). Genetic confounding explained a high and stable proportion of the
67 phenotypic covariance with predicted BMI from age 1 to 8 years (**Figure 4, Supplementary information S18**). Results
68 did not appreciably differ when we fitted ACE or AE models instead of the primary ADE model in the parent
69 generation (**Supplementary Table 2**), when birth weight was substituted for ponderal index/BMI at birth and child
70 BMI was substituted for weight (**Supplementary Table 2, Supplementary information S19**), or when BW models
71 were refit without offspring-generation twins (results available from the authors on request). Although sex stratified
72 models were underpowered, they provided no evidence for large sex differences in estimates (**Supplementary Table
73 2**). MCoTS models for eating behaviour outcomes were underpowered and uninformative (**Supplementary Table 2,
74 Supplementary information S20**). Full MCoTS results including model fit statistics and estimated variance
75 components for parental and offspring phenotypes are presented in **Supplementary Table 2**.

26


27 **Table 2:** Number of families available for MCoTS analyses, stratified by parental and offspring relationship

Relationship type	Relatedness coefficient	<i>n</i>			
		Total	Parental exposure data available ^a	Offspring BW data available ^a	Offspring 8yr BMI data available ^a
Maternal BMI analyses					
Extended families (<i>n</i> = 16292)					
<i>n</i> stratified by mothers' relatedness in each extended family					
MZ twin mother pair	1.00	61	60	61	48
DZ twin mother pair	0.50	34 ^b	34	34	24
Full sibling mother pair	0.50	4916	4745	4910	3472
Maternal half sibling mother pair	0.25	376	355	375	218
Unrelated sister-in-law mother pair	0.00	10905	10495	10887	7633
<i>n</i> offspring pairs linked to each mother ^c					
Full sibling offspring pair	0.50	4538	4477	4535	3154
Maternal half-sibling offspring pair	0.25	38	38	38	20
Unpaired (single) offspring	...	28008	20205	22288	11689
Unpaired nuclear families (<i>n</i> = 7339)					
<i>n</i> offspring pairs linked to each mother					
MZ twin offspring pair	1.00	287	269	278	157
DZ twin offspring pair	0.50	738	698	735	379
Full sibling offspring pair	0.50	6229	6142	6227	4216
Maternal half sibling offspring pair	0.25	85	81	85	37
Paternal BMI analyses					
Extended families (<i>n</i> = 17036)					
<i>n</i> stratified by fathers' relatedness in each extended family					
MZ twin father pair	1.00	27	27	27	24
DZ twin father pair	0.50	16 ^b	16	16	13
Full sibling father pair	0.50	3154	3127	3154	2462
Paternal half sibling father pair	0.25	171	168	171	128
Unrelated brother-in-law father pair	0.00	13668	13164	13603	9621
<i>n</i> offspring pairs linked to each father ^c					
Full sibling offspring pair	0.50	5710	5570	5706	3861
Paternal half sibling offspring pair	0.25	28	28	28	22
Unpaired (single) offspring	...	28334	22207	25046	12605
Unpaired nuclear families (<i>n</i> = 7537)					
<i>n</i> offspring pairs linked to each father					
MZ twin offspring pair	1.00	287	265	278	157
DZ twin offspring pair	0.50	951	854	924	453
Full sibling offspring pair	0.50	6229	6152	6227	4216
Paternal half sibling offspring pair	0.25	70	67	69	39

28 **a:** Number of relative pairs for which at least one member had exposure/outcome data available (the numbers given in **Figures 3**
29 **and 4** for individual offspring with available data for each outcome are therefore greater), **b:** Parent-generation relatedness was
30 modelled between same-sex DZ twins/siblings only, therefore opposite-sex DZ twins/siblings were treated as unrelated siblings-
31 in-law, **c:** MZ and DZ twins in the offspring generation were only retained for singleton parents, **MZ:** monozygotic (identical)
32 twins, **DZ:** dizygotic (non-identical) twins


34 **Figure 2:** Linear associations of maternal and paternal BMI with offspring birth weight, child BMI and 8-year eating
 35 behaviours

a



36

37 **b**




38 Linear associations of maternal and paternal BMI with offspring outcomes. **a:** offspring birth weight and child BMI, **b:** offspring 8-
 39 year old CEBQ eating behaviour traits, P : P -value testing the null hypothesis that regression coefficient is zero, P_{dif} : P -value
 40 testing the null hypothesis that maternal and paternal regression coefficients are equal

41

42

43


14 **Figure 3:** MCoTS SEM estimates of phenotypic and genetic covariance of parental BMI with offspring birth weight and 8yr BMI



15 **Phenotypic covariance** denotes the overall covariance between the exposure and outcome, **Genetic covariance** denotes the
 16 part of the phenotypic covariance that is due to genetic confounding, ***P***: *P*-value for phenotypic covariance calculated via a z-test
 17 using the standard error from bootstrapping the MCoTS model, *P*-value for genetic covariance calculated via a chi squared test
 18 for deterioration of model fit on deletion of the α_1' path coefficient, ***n***: number of offspring with outcome data available

19

50 **Figure 4:** MCoTS SEM estimates of phenotypic and genetic covariance of parental BMI with offspring predicted BMI



51 **Phenotypic covariance** denotes the overall covariance between the exposure and outcome, **Genetic covariance** denotes the
 52 part of the phenotypic covariance that is due to genetic confounding, ***P***: *P*-value for phenotypic covariance calculated via a z-test
 53 using the standard error from bootstrapping the MCoTS model, *P*-value for genetic covariance calculated via a chi squared test
 54 for deterioration of model fit on deletion of the α_1' path coefficient, ***n***: number of offspring with outcome data available

55 Discussion

56 We triangulated evidence from two analytic approaches applied to a large European birth cohort, to infer the
57 mechanisms underlying associations between parental BMI and offspring BW, BMI until 8 years and 8-year eating
58 behaviour. There were not large differences in the magnitude of the associations of maternal and paternal BMI with
59 offspring BMI beyond early childhood, suggesting confounding within families as the most parsimonious explanation
60 for such associations. This was confirmed by our MCoTS analyses, which indicated that the covariance between
61 parental BMI and offspring BMI from age 6 months to 8 years is primarily due to genetic confounding.

62 We have previously used genomic restricted maximum likelihood (GCTA-GREML) to explore whether
63 intergenerational BMI associations could be due to genetic confounding (18). Those analyses investigated whether
64 mother-offspring BMI covariance was explained by a set of ~8 million imputed common genetic variants, in
65 nominally unrelated individuals from 3 European birth cohorts. In contrast, the present MCoTS analyses investigated
66 confounding involving all genetic variants, using expected relatedness inferred via quantitative genetic theory in a
67 pedigree of close relatives. GCTA-GREML indicated that for maternal BMI, imputed variants explained 43% (95% CI:
68 15%, 72%) of the covariance with offspring 15-year BMI, with a similar estimate for 10-year BMI. This is highly
69 consistent with the present MCoTS estimates: 79% (95% CI: 62%, 95%) of the covariance between maternal BMI and
70 offspring 8-year BMI was explained by genetic confounding. MCoTS estimates were somewhat higher than those
71 from GCTA-GREML, which is expected given that GCTA-GREML uses a set of measured genetic variants whereas
72 MCoTS infers the effects of all variants. Furthermore, both GCTA-GREML and MCoTS indicated that the covariance
73 between maternal BMI and offspring birth weight was not due to genetic confounding. The high concordance of
74 results between the two methods, which make different assumptions and were applied to different cohorts,
75 provides strong evidence that genetic confounding is a major driver of associations between parental BMI and
76 offspring adiposity in late childhood.

77 Our results are consistent with previous maternal-paternal comparison, MR and sibling studies (several of which
78 share authors with the present study), which have not supported a large causal effect of maternal BMI on offspring
79 childhood adiposity (13, 14, 16, 17). However, sibling studies do provide a degree of support for potential causal
80 effects of more extreme maternal metabolic dysregulation (for example maternal diabetes and severe obesity) on
81 offspring adiposity beyond birth (2, 14). Taken together, this suggests that putative causal effects observed in animal
82 models of developmental overnutrition (5, 9) should be interpreted cautiously and do not necessarily occur in
83 humans. The association between maternal BMI and offspring size/adiposity at birth has been invoked in the
84 literature to argue that maternal adiposity has a causal effect on offspring adiposity beyond birth (28). Indeed, MR
85 and sibling studies (13, 19, 29, 30) support a causal effect of maternal BMI on offspring birth size. However, the
86 present results, alongside previous studies (13, 17-19, 29), strongly suggest that the causes of weight at birth are
87 somewhat different from the causes of BMI in later childhood.

88 We observed some associations between parental BMI and offspring obesity-related eating behaviours assessed via
89 the CEBQ questionnaire. Previous studies in smaller samples have found similar associations, albeit somewhat
90 inconsistently (12, 31). In particular, we found that greater maternal and paternal BMI were associated with
91 increased scores on the CEBQ food responsiveness and emotional overeating scales, and a reduced score on the
92 emotional undereating scale. Offspring satiety responsiveness and slow eating were only associated with paternal
93 BMI; however, we cannot exclude measurement error as an explanation for the absent maternal associations
94 because the CEBQ questionnaire was completed by mothers and is inherently subjective. Given our maternal-
95 paternal comparison results it is plausible that child appetite-related eating behaviours mediate the genetically
96 driven association between parent and child BMI. However, it was not possible to confirm this because our MCoTS
97 analyses were underpowered for eating behaviours.

98 Our results have important public health implications, when considered alongside prior evidence. Maternal BMI is
99 unlikely to have a large causal effect on child BMI beyond birth, although a small causal effect remains plausible,
100 potentially mediated via maternal glycaemia during pregnancy. Any causal effect of paternal BMI on offspring
101 childhood BMI is likely to be similar to or smaller than that of maternal BMI. Consequently, reductions in the BMI of
102 either parent before pregnancy are unlikely to cause large reductions in childhood adiposity. It is possible that
103 interventions targeting parental BMI reduction could influence childhood adiposity via parental lifestyle changes that

34 persist after birth and affect the offspring's environment. However, whether preconceptional interventions are the
35 optimal approach for preventing childhood obesity requires further evaluation in light of evidence from the present
36 study. Importantly, women considering pregnancy should still be advised and supported to maintain a healthy
37 weight, because there is good evidence that maternal obesity in pregnancy causes adverse perinatal outcomes in the
38 mother and offspring (32).

39 Our study has important strengths. We have analysed data from a large prospective birth cohort, enabling precise
40 estimation of the associations between parental BMI assessed during pregnancy and offspring outcomes in mid
41 childhood. We leveraged a pedigree involving twin and sibling relationships in both the parental and offspring
42 generations, to partition parent-offspring phenotypic covariance via an MCoTS SEM that is rooted in quantitative
43 genetics theory. We gained increased power over a conventional children of twins model by including non-twin
44 siblings in the parent and offspring generations, and up to two children for each parent. We also acknowledge
45 potential limitations of this study. First, because the MCoTS model cannot simultaneously estimate dominance
46 genetic effects and common environmental effects, we fitted an ADE model in the parent generation, which assumes
47 that common environmental effects are absent. This assumption is supported by classic and extended twin studies
48 of adult BMI (8) and the similarity of our findings when we used ACE or AE models in the parent generation
49 (**Supplementary table 2**). Second, our MCoTS analyses assume that phenotypic associations between log parent BMI
50 and offspring outcomes are linear. In our data there were only mild deviations from log-linearity which would be
51 unlikely to meaningfully alter our conclusions (**Supplementary information S7**). Third, our MCoTS analyses did not
52 account for assortative mating. However, we do not expect this to have had a large impact on our results because
53 spousal phenotypic correlations for BMI are relatively weak (13, 33), and spousal correlations at BMI associated loci
54 are weaker still (13). Fourth, the MCoTS model does not account for gene by environment interaction, and if
55 interactions exist between the additive genetic and common environmental variance components our results could
56 overestimate genetic confounding. We believe any such bias is likely to be small though because extended twin
57 family design data suggest common environmental effects are negligible for adult BMI (8). Fifth, the residual
58 covariance estimated by the MCoTS model will not be indicative of the true causal effect of parental BMI, to the
59 extent that residual confounding affects associations between parental BMI and offspring outcomes. It is likely that
60 the negative residual covariance estimate for paternal BMI and offspring birth weight reflects residual confounding,
61 particularly as this estimate attenuated on adjustment for potential confounders (**Supplementary information S15**).
62 Sixth, our maternal-paternal comparisons did not account for non-paternity, which could weaken paternal
63 associations. However, a previous simulation study showed that for a maternal-paternal comparison analysis using
64 MoBa data with follow up to age three years, results would have changed little with non-paternity rates of up to 10%
65 (17). Seventh, BMI is an imprecise proxy measure for adiposity. Despite this, BMI is highly correlated with more
66 direct adiposity measures in childhood (34). Eighth, MoBa has a participation rate of 41% and there has been
67 attrition over follow up (20). Although we cannot exclude an effect of selection bias on our results, we believe it
68 unlikely that this would be of sufficient magnitude to alter our conclusions. Lastly, we have studied a Norwegian
69 population which has relatively high obesity prevalence and income per capita in international terms and it would be
70 beneficial to replicate our analyses in other settings.

71 In summary, we have shown that in a Norwegian population the linear association between parental BMI around the
72 time of pregnancy and offspring BMI from age 6 months to 8 years is primarily due to genetic confounding. Our
73 results suggest that neither the mothers' nor fathers' pre-pregnancy BMI has a large causal effect on childhood BMI.
74 This implies that any hypothetical intervention that successfully reduced parental BMI before pregnancy, without
75 altering the offspring's postnatal environment, would be insufficient to achieve large reductions in the offspring's
76 childhood obesity risk. Our results suggest that in the studied population, maintaining healthy parental BMI before
77 conception is unlikely to be a promising target for childhood obesity prevention interventions.

78 **Contributors**

79 Tom A Bond: conceptualisation, data analysis, software, data interpretation, literature search, writing- original draft

80 Tom A McAdams: funding acquisition, data curation, methodology, software, data interpretation, writing- review
81 and editing

82 Nicole M Warrington: methodology, software, data interpretation, writing- review and editing

53 Laurie J Hannigan: methodology, data curation, software, data interpretation, writing- review and editing
54 Espen Moen Eilertsen: methodology, data curation, software, data interpretation, writing- review and editing
55 Fartein A Torvik: methodology, data curation, software, data interpretation, writing- review and editing
56 Ziada Ayorech: data curation, software, data interpretation, writing- review and editing
57 George Davey Smith: data interpretation, writing- review and editing
58 Deborah A Lawlor: data interpretation, writing- review and editing
59 Eivind Ystrom: funding acquisition, methodology, software, data interpretation, writing- review and editing
60 Alexandra Havdahl: funding acquisition, conceptualisation, supervision, data interpretation, writing- review and
61 editing
62 David M Evans: funding acquisition, conceptualisation, supervision, data interpretation, writing- review and editing

63 **Data sharing**

64 Data from the Norwegian Mother, Father and Child Cohort Study and the Medical Birth Registry of Norway used in
65 this study are managed by the national health register holders in Norway (Norwegian Institute of Public Health) and
66 can be made available to researchers, subject to approval from the Regional Committees for Medical and Health
67 Research Ethics (REC), compliance with the EU General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and approval from the
68 data owners. The consent given by the participants does not cover storage of data on an individual level in
69 repositories. Researchers who want access to data sets for replication should apply through helsedata.no. Access to
70 data sets requires approval from The Regional Committee for Medical and Health Research Ethics in Norway and an
71 agreement with MoBa.

72 **Declaration of interests**

73 DAL received support from Medtronic Ltd and Roche Diagnostics for research unrelated to that presented here. All
74 other authors report no conflict of interest.

75 **Acknowledgements**

76 The Norwegian Mother, Father and Child Cohort Study is supported by the Norwegian Ministry of Health and Care
77 Services and the Ministry of Education and Research. We are grateful to all the participating families in Norway who
78 take part in this on-going cohort study. TAB, GDS, DAL, NMW and DME work in or are affiliated a unit that receives
79 support from the University of Bristol and UK Medical Research Council (MC_UU_00011/1 and MC_UU_00011/6).
80 This study has received support from the British Heart Foundation Accelerator Award at the University of Bristol
81 (AA/18/1/34219) and a University of Queensland-University of Exeter Accelerator grant. LJH was supported by the
82 South-Eastern Norway Regional Health Authority (2018058, 2019097) during the completion of this work. NMW is
83 funded by a NHMRC Investigator grant (APP2008723). DME is funded by an Australian National Health and Medical
84 Research Council Senior Research Fellowship (APP1137714) and this work was funded by National Health and
85 Medical Research Council (Australia) (NHMRC) project grants (GNT1157714, GNT1183074). FAT was partly supported
86 by the Research Council of Norway through its Centers of Excellence funding scheme (262700). ZA is funded by a
87 Marie Skłodowska-Curie Fellowship from the European Research Council (894675). TAM is supported by a Wellcome
88 Trust Senior Research Fellowship (220382/Z/20/Z). AH was supported by grants from the Norwegian Research
89 Council (274611, 3006668) and the South-Eastern Norway Regional Health Authority (2018059, 2020022). EY was
90 supported by the Research Council of Norway (288083). This paper is the work of the authors and does not
91 necessarily represent the views of individuals or organizations acknowledged here.

92 **References**

- 93 1. Heslehurst N, Vieira R, Akhter Z, Bailey H, Slack E, Ngongalah L, et al. The association between maternal body
94 mass index and child obesity: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS Med.* 2019;16(6):e1002817.
- 95 2. Lawlor DA. The Society for Social Medicine John Pemberton Lecture 2011. Developmental overnutrition—an
96 old hypothesis with new importance? *Int J Epidemiol.* 2013;42(1):7-29.
- 97 3. Godfrey KM, Reynolds RM, Prescott SL, Nyirenda M, Jaddoe VW, Eriksson JG, et al. Influence of maternal
98 obesity on the long-term health of offspring. *Lancet Diabetes & Endocrinology.* 2017;5(1):53-64.
- 99 4. Sharp GC, Lawlor DA. Paternal impact on the life course development of obesity and type 2 diabetes in the
100 offspring. *Diabetologia.* 2019;62(10):1802-10.

5. Lane M, Zander-Fox DL, Robker RL, McPherson NO. Peri-conception parental obesity, reproductive health, and transgenerational impacts. *Trends Endocrinol Metab.* 2015;26(2):84-90.
6. McPherson NO, Fullston T, Aitken RJ, Lane M. Paternal obesity, interventions, and mechanistic pathways to impaired health in offspring. *Ann Nutr Metab.* 2014;64(3-4):231-8.
7. Larqué E, Labayen I, Flodmark C-E, Lissau I, Czernin S, Moreno LA, et al. From conception to infancy — early risk factors for childhood obesity. *Nature Reviews Endocrinology.* 2019;15(8):456-78.
8. Maes HH, Neale MC, Eaves LJ. Genetic and environmental factors in relative body weight and human adiposity. *Behav Genet.* 1997;27(4):325-51.
9. Friedman JE. Developmental programming of obesity and diabetes in mouse, monkey, and man in 2018: where are we headed? *Diabetes.* 2018;67(11):2137-51.
10. Rasmussen JM, Thompson PM, Entringer S, Buss C, Wadhwa PD. Fetal programming of human energy homeostasis brain networks: Issues and considerations. *Obes Rev.* 2022;23(3):e13392.
11. Webber L, Hill C, Saxton J, Van Jaarsveld CHM, Wardle J. Eating behaviour and weight in children. *Int J Obes.* 2009;33(1):21-8.
12. Albuquerque G, Severo M, Oliveira A. Early Life Characteristics Associated with Appetite-Related Eating Behaviors in 7-Year-Old Children. *The Journal of Pediatrics.* 2017;180:38-46.e2.
13. Bond TA, Richmond RC, Karhunen V, Cuellar-Partida G, Borges MC, Zuber V, et al. Exploring the causal effect of maternal pregnancy adiposity on offspring adiposity: Mendelian randomisation using polygenic risk scores. *BMC Med.* 2022;20(1):34.
14. Lawlor DA, Lichtenstein P, Långström N. Association of maternal diabetes mellitus in pregnancy with offspring adiposity into early adulthood: sibling study in a prospective cohort of 280,866 men from 248,293 families. *Circulation.* 2011;123(3):258-65.
15. Branum AM, Parker JD, Keim SA, Schempf AH. Prepregnancy Body Mass Index and Gestational Weight Gain in Relation to Child Body Mass Index Among Siblings. *Am J Epidemiol.* 2011;174(10):1159-65.
16. Patro B, Liber A, Zalewski B, Poston L, Szajewska H, Koletzko B. Maternal and paternal body mass index and offspring obesity: a systematic review. *Ann Nutr Metab.* 2013;63(1-2):32-41.
17. Fleten C, Nystad W, Stigum H, Skjærven R, Lawlor DA, Smith GD, et al. Parent-offspring body mass index associations in the Norwegian Mother and Child Cohort Study: a family-based approach to studying the role of the intrauterine environment in childhood adiposity. *Am J Epidemiol.* 2012;176(2):83-92.
18. Bond TA, Karhunen V, Wielscher M, Auvinen J, Männikkö M, Keinänen-Kiukaanniemi S, et al. Exploring the role of genetic confounding in the association between maternal and offspring body mass index: evidence from three birth cohorts. *Int J Epidemiol.* 2020;49(1):233-43.
19. Tyrrell J, Richmond RC, Palmer TM, Feenstra B, Rangarajan J, Metrustry S, et al. Genetic evidence for causal relationships between maternal obesity-related traits and birth weight. *JAMA.* 2016;315(11):1129-40.
20. Magnus P, Birke C, Vejrup K, Haugan A, Alsaker E, Daltveit AK, et al. Cohort Profile Update: The Norwegian Mother and Child Cohort Study (MoBa). *Int J Epidemiol.* 2016:dyw029.
21. Irgens LM. The Medical Birth Registry of Norway. *Epidemiological research and surveillance throughout 30 years.* *Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand.* 2000;79(6):435-9.
22. Wardle J, Guthrie CA, Sanderson S, Rapoport L. Development of the Children's Eating Behaviour Questionnaire. *The Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines.* 2001;42(7):963-70.
23. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2020.
24. McAdams TA, Hannigan LJ, Eilertsen EM, Gjerde LC, Ystrom E, Rijdsdijk FV. Revisiting the children-of-twins design: improving existing models for the exploration of intergenerational associations. *Behav Genet.* 2018;48(5):397-412.
25. Lunde A, Melve KK, Gjessing HK, Skjærven R, Irgens LM. Genetic and environmental influences on birth weight, birth length, head circumference, and gestational age by use of population-based parent-offspring data. *Am J Epidemiol.* 2007;165(7):734-41.
26. Silventoinen K, Jelenkovic A, Sund R, Hur Y-M, Yokoyama Y, Honda C, et al. Genetic and environmental effects on body mass index from infancy to the onset of adulthood: an individual-based pooled analysis of 45 twin cohorts participating in the Collaborative project of Development of Anthropometrical measures in Twins (CODATwins) study. *The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition.* 2016;104(2):371-9.
27. Neale MC, Hunter MD, Pritikin JN, Zahery M, Brick TR, Kirkpatrick RM, et al. OpenMx 2.0: Extended Structural Equation and Statistical Modeling. *Psychometrika.* 2016;81(2):535-49.

- 55 28. Catalano PM, Shankar K. Obesity and pregnancy: mechanisms of short term and long term adverse
56 consequences for mother and child. *BMJ*. 2017;356:j1.
- 57 29. Chen J, Bacelis J, Sole-Navais P, Srivastava A, Juodakis J, Rouse A, et al. Dissecting maternal and fetal genetic
58 effects underlying the associations between maternal phenotypes, birth outcomes, and adult phenotypes: A
59 mendelian-randomization and haplotype-based genetic score analysis in 10,734 mother–infant pairs. *PLoS Med*.
60 2020;17(8):e1003305.
- 61 30. Villamor E, Cnattingius S. Interpregnancy weight change and risk of adverse pregnancy outcomes: a
62 population-based study. *The Lancet*. 2006;368(9542):1164-70.
- 63 31. Boswell N, Byrne R, Davies PSW. Eating behavior traits associated with demographic variables and
64 implications for obesity outcomes in early childhood. *Appetite*. 2018;120:482-90.
- 65 32. Borges MC, Clayton G, Freathy RM, Felix JF, Fernández-Sanlés A, Soares AG, et al. Integrating multiple lines
66 of evidence to assess the effects of maternal BMI on pregnancy and perinatal outcomes in up to 497,932 women.
67 *medRxiv*. 2022:2022.07.22.22277930.
- 68 33. Horwitz TB, Keller MC. A comprehensive meta-analysis of human assortative mating in 22 complex traits.
69 *bioRxiv*. 2022:2022.03.19.484997.
- 70 34. Bell JA, Carlslake D, O’Keeffe LM, Frysz M, Howe LD, Hamer M, et al. Associations of body mass and fat
71 indexes with cardiometabolic traits. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2018;72(24):3142-54.

72