

Estimating the impact of mandatory menu calorie labelling policy and sugar-sweetened beverage taxes on adult obesity prevalence and cardiovascular mortality in two European countries: a simulation modelling study

Running title: Impacts of menu calorie labelling and SSB taxation

I Gusti Ngurah Edi Putra PhD¹, Prof Martin O’Flaherty¹, Karl M. F. Emmert-Fees PhD², Maria Salve Vasquez MSc³, Rebecca Evans PhD⁴, Prof Annette Peters^{5,6,7}, Chris Kypridemos PhD¹, Nicolas Berger PhD³, Prof Eric Robinson⁴, Zoé Colombet PhD¹

1. Department of Public Health, Policy, and Systems, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, United Kingdom
2. Professorship of Public Health and Prevention, TUM School of Medicine and Health, Technical University of Munich, Munich, Germany
3. Department of Epidemiology and Public Health, Sciensano (Scientific Institute of Public Health), Brussels, Belgium
4. Department of Psychology, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, United Kingdom
5. Institute of Epidemiology, Helmholtz Zentrum München, Research Center for Environmental Health (GmbH), Neuherberg, Germany
6. Chair of Epidemiology, Institute for Medical Information Processing, Biometry and Epidemiology (IBE), Faculty of Medicine, LMU Munich, Munich, Germany
7. German Centre for Diabetes Research (DZD), partner site: Munich-Neuherberg, Germany

Corresponding author:

I Gusti Ngurah Edi Putra

Department of Public Health, Policy, and Systems, Whelan Building, The University of Liverpool, Brownlow Hill, Liverpool L69 3GB, United Kingdom

i.gusti.ngurah.edi.putra@liverpool.ac.uk

Declarations

Data sharing

We used data from different sources. For Belgium, population projection and census data are available online on the official website of Statbel, the Belgian Statistical Office. Projected mortality data are available upon request from Statbel. Exposure data (BMI, energy and SSB intakes) are from the National Food Consumption Survey, available upon request to the data custodian (Sciensano). For Germany, population projection, census, and mortality data are available online on the German Federal Statistical Office’s website. Exposure data are from KORA (<https://www.helmholtz-munich.de/en/epi/cohort/kora>) and NVS surveys available with the permission from the data custodian. R script to generate the results presented in this study is publicly available at https://github.com/zoecolombet/MenuEnergyLabelling_code_Europe.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

Acknowledgements

ER and ZC were part-funded by the European Research Council (Grant reference: PIDS, 803194). IGNEP is funded by the National Institute of Health and Care Research (NIHR) Development and Skill Enhancement Award (DSE) (Grant reference: NIHR305076). ER and RE are funded by the NIHR Oxford Health Biomedical Research Centre (BRC) (Grant reference: NIHR203316). The views expressed are those of the authors and not those of the funders.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

Authors' contributions

IGNEP, MO'F, ER, ZC designed the study. IGNEP, CK, ZC developed the model. MO'F, CK, and ZC supervised IGNEP. MSV and KME-F did the GAMLSS fitting for exposure data in Belgium and Germany respectively. NB and AP acquired the survey data for Belgium and Germany, respectively. IGNEP and ZC did the analysis and drafted the initial manuscript. RE and ZC verified the results from the analysis. All the authors contributed to the data interpretation and revised the manuscript draft. All the authors approved and accept responsibility to submit for publication.

Word count: 5,000 words

Abstract count: 289

Number of tables: 5

Number of figures: 1

1 **Abstract**

2 **Background:** Implementing population-based policies such as mandatory menu calorie labelling in
3 out-of-home food businesses and sugar-sweetened beverage (SSB) taxes are promising approaches to
4 improve population health. We aimed to estimate and compare the likely impacts of menu calorie
5 labelling and SSB taxes on reducing obesity prevalence, cardiovascular disease (CVD) mortality, and
6 socioeconomic-related equitable impacts, in two European countries (Belgium and Germany).

7 **Methods:** We used microsimulation models over a 20-year simulation horizon (2022–2041). For both
8 policies, we modelled the impacts through assumed changes in energy intake due to consumer
9 responses and food industry reformulation. Scenarios of partial (in “large” out-of-home businesses; \geq
10 250 employees) and full (in all out-of-home businesses) implementation for menu calorie labelling and
11 different tax rates for SSBs (10%, 20%, 30%) were simulated.

12 **Findings:** Compared to the counterfactual scenario (e.g., without additional policies), assuming policies
13 effects on both consumer and industry behaviour, menu calorie labelling applied to all out-of-home
14 businesses was estimated to reduce obesity prevalence by 3·61 (95% uncertainty interval-UI: [2·78, 4·30])
15 and 4·28 (95% UI: [3·64, 5·06]) percentage points and prevent 1600 (95% UI: [400, 3800]) and 30000 (95%
16 UI: [10000, 58000]) CVD deaths in Belgium and Germany over 20 years, respectively. The 30% SSB tax
17 was estimated to reduce obesity prevalence by 0·27 (95% UI: [0·17, 0·43]) and 0·27 (95% UI: [0·17, 0·39])
18 percentage points and postpone 2500 (95% UI: [800, 5200]) and 16000 (95% UI: [7500, 28000]) CVD
19 deaths in Belgium and Germany, respectively. SSB taxation may have socioeconomic-related equitable
20 impacts, while menu calorie labelling may not.

21 **Interpretation:** The menu calorie labelling and SSB taxation have substantial impacts in reducing obesity
22 prevalence and preventing CVD deaths in Belgium and Germany. Implementing both policies will be
23 important to reduce obesity and related CVD burden.

24 **Funding:** European Research Council, National Institute of Health and Care Research

25 **Keywords:** simulation modelling; policy evaluation; food policies; public health policies; Europe

26

27 **Research in context**

28 ***Evidence before this study***

29 We searched simulation modelling studies on the impacts of food-related policies in MEDLINE from
30 1st January 2000 to 30th September 2024 using the search terms ("food polic*" OR "health polic*" OR
31 "fiscal polic*" OR "SSB" OR "sugar" OR "menu label*" OR "calorie label*" OR "energy label*") AND
32 (simulation OR microsimulation) based on titles and abstracts, restricted to human subjects. We
33 identified 602 articles. To date, a few simulation modelling studies estimated the population-level
34 impacts of mandatory menu calorie labelling. In England, implementation of mandatory menu calorie
35 labelling in all out-of-home food businesses were estimated to reduce obesity prevalence by 2-65
36 percentage points and prevent 9200 cardiovascular (CVD) deaths over 20 years. Two different studies
37 in the US estimated 27646 CVD deaths and 16700 cancer deaths prevented over lifetime. Given these
38 estimated impacts and England having pioneered the implementation of mandatory menu calorie
39 labelling in Europe, this policy is currently be considered for implementation in many other European
40 countries. However, no studies have examined the potential impacts of implementing this policy in
41 other countries in Europe, nor the extent to which it may offer greater benefits compared to other
42 widely implemented policies, such as sugar-sweetened beverage (SSB) taxes. Many European countries
43 have implemented SSB taxes, including Belgium and the UK. While SSB taxes have been found to be
44 effective in reducing CVD burden based on a scoping review summarising a handful of studies using
45 simulation modelling approaches in different countries, there are gaps in the literature on the impacts
46 of this policy compared to other policies. No studies have estimated and compared the impacts of
47 mandatory menu calorie labelling and SSB taxes on reducing obesity prevalence and CVD mortality in
48 European countries.

49 ***Added value of this study***

50 This study is the first to estimate and compare the impacts of mandatory menu calorie labelling and
51 SSB taxes in two European countries, Belgium and Germany. Our estimates indicate consistent
52 evidence across both countries for greater benefits in reducing obesity prevalence and CVD mortality
53 from implementing menu calorie labelling in all out-of-home food businesses compared to its
54 implementation limited to large out-of-home food businesses only. While higher tax rates on SSBs
55 were estimated to have bigger benefits, the impact on reducing obesity prevalence was estimated to
56 be smaller compared to mandatory menu calorie labelling in both countries. However, the impact of
57 SSB taxes on CVD mortality was projected to be greater than the mandatory calorie labelling in
58 Belgium, but smaller in Germany. More importantly, based on the current evidence used to inform our
59 models, these policies are complementary as they are estimated to impact CVD mortality through
60 different pathways: mandatory menu calorie labelling primarily affects body mass index (BMI), while
61 SSB taxes mainly operate through a direct BMI-independent effect. In terms of equitable impacts,
62 menu calorie labelling may prevent more deaths in high than low education groups, whereas SSB
63 taxation may postpone more deaths in low than high education groups. Implemented together, these
64 policies will result in greater benefits in addressing diet-related diseases.

65 ***Implications of all the available evidence***

66 Mandatory menu calorie labelling and SSB taxation were estimated to have substantial impacts on
67 reducing obesity prevalence and preventing CVD mortality. The findings inform the policymakers of
68 both countries and emphasise both the need to implement mandatory menu calorie labelling across
69 out-of-home food businesses and apply higher SSBs tax rates to maximise public health impacts.

70 **Introduction**

71 In Europe, more than half of adults live with overweight or obesity, with over 20% attributed to obesity
72 alone.¹ Obesity and its associated physical health burden (e.g., non-communicable diseases (NCDs)) is
73 estimated to have substantial economic impacts in many European countries.² Food environments
74 have been shown to play an important role in influencing diets and the subsequent risk of developing
75 obesity.^{3,4} In line with this, the out-of-home food sector is thought to be a key contributor to the
76 obesity epidemic because eating out is now more commonplace, and out-of-home foods and non-
77 alcoholic beverages (hereafter: food) are characterised by being high in energy.^{5,6} Therefore, public
78 health policies targeting the out-of-home food sector are important in addressing obesity and its
79 adverse health impacts without widening current health inequalities.

80 Calorie labelling, designed to empower consumers to make healthier choices by providing calorie
81 information at the point of purchase when dining out, has been mandatorily implemented for the first
82 time in Europe, in large out-of-home food businesses (i.e., ≥ 250 employees) in England since 2022.^{7,8}
83 This policy has also been implemented in major chain restaurants with 20 or more outlets in the US,^{9,10}
84 and large chain food businesses in some Australian states.¹¹ Based on some previous simulation
85 modelling studies,⁸⁻¹⁰ mandatory menu calorie labelling potentially has population-level impacts in
86 reducing obesity prevalence and NCDs through changing consumer behaviour and inducing industry
87 reformulation. In the US, simulation studies indicate that the implementation of menu calorie labelling
88 in major chain restaurants could prevent 27646 cardiovascular (CVD) deaths⁹ and 16700 cancer deaths
89 over the lifetime of the population.¹⁰ Full implementation of calorie labelling policy in all out-of-home
90 food businesses in England was estimated to potentially reduce obesity prevalence by 2.65 percentage
91 points and prevent 9200 CVD deaths over 20 years without widening health inequalities, whereas at
92 present, the policy is only implemented in large businesses.⁸ Given these projected impacts, mandatory
93 menu calorie labelling should be considered for implementation in other European countries as part of
94 comprehensive prevention efforts targeting the out-of-home food sector alongside other public health
95 policies like sugar-sweetened beverage (SSB) taxes.

96 SSB taxation has been adopted in many European countries (e.g., Belgium, France, Ireland, and the UK)
97 to decrease SSB consumption by increasing the prices and encourage businesses to reformulate
98 products to reduce sugar content.¹² This policy was reported to be promising in preventing obesity and
99 NCDs based on simulation modelling studies from many countries, including Germany, the UK, the US,
100 and Australia.^{13,14} However, a review of studies estimating the impacts of SSB taxes based on simulation
101 modelling approaches concluded that there is limited evidence of (i) the equity impacts of SSB tax
102 across SES groups and (ii) the extent to which SSB tax may offer greater benefits in reducing obesity
103 and CVD mortality compared to other policies,¹⁴ such as the mandatory menu calorie labelling.

104 There is a dearth of studies estimating and comparing the impacts of different public health policies in
105 improving population health and assessing impacts on health inequalities. Comparative assessments
106 between different public health policies will be important for policymakers to consider multiple
107 evidence-based policy options and prioritise resources for implementation.¹⁴ Although structural-based
108 policies (e.g., SSB tax) have been hypothesised to be more effective overall and in reducing health
109 inequality than agency-based policies, which rely on individual motivation (e.g., menu calorie
110 labelling),^{13,15} this may not apply widely. For example, calorie labelling policy does not have differential
111 impacts according to the socioeconomic status based on two meta-analyses^{16,17} and does not seem to
112 widen health inequalities according to a simulation modelling study in England.⁸ In the present study,

113 for the first time, the likely overall population-level impacts and effects across SES groups of
114 implementing calorie labelling and SSB tax were estimated and compared in two European countries
115 with large differences in population size, Belgium and Germany, where obesity prevalence is high (22%
116 for each country¹) and projected to peak at 30% by 2040.¹⁸ Menu calorie labelling has not yet been
117 implemented in either Belgium or Germany. While Germany currently does not impose a tax on SSBs,
118 Belgium has an SSB tax in place before 2016. There is limited evidence from both countries on the
119 potential impacts of mandatory menu calorie labelling and how much greater these impacts might be
120 compared to SSB taxation. We aimed to estimate and compare the potential health impacts of
121 implementing menu calorie labelling and varying SSB tax rates in countries with different current policy
122 implementations.

123

124 **Methods**

125 We extended a previous simulation model of the calorie labelling policy in England⁸ to estimate and
126 compare the impacts of mandatory menu calorie labelling and SSB taxation on obesity prevalence and
127 CVD (coronary heart disease (CHD) and stroke) mortality in Belgium and Germany. The model,⁸
128 originally adapted from the IMPACT Food Policy Model,¹⁹ is a dynamic, stochastic, discrete-time, and
129 open-cohort microsimulation. Under alternative policy scenarios compared to their corresponding
130 counterfactuals (see below), the model simulates the subsequent impact of the policies on relevant
131 exposures (i.e., energy, SSB intake), changes in risk factor (body mass index - BMI), and mortality risk
132 throughout individuals' life course. We simulated the effects of the two policies over 20 years from
133 2022 to 2041. We simulated the models from 2022, as this is when the calorie labelling policy was
134 mandatorily implemented for the first time in England.^{7,8} We conducted the simulation separately in
135 Belgium and German populations aged 30 to 89 years using a synthetic population that mimics the
136 real demographic characteristics, BMI, energy and SSB intakes, and disease-related mortality trends
137 using national data sources (see Section "Creating synthetic population" in supplementary materials).

138 Our scenarios for modelling the impacts of mandatory menu calorie labelling policy in Belgium and
139 Germany followed the current implementation of this policy in England that requires out-of-home
140 "large" food businesses (≥ 250 employees) to display calorie information for non-prepacked food and
141 soft drinks.^{7,8} In Belgium and Germany, large businesses represented 3% and 9% of the number of
142 outlets in the out-of-home food sector and 10% and 21% of this sector turnover in 2019 – 2020,
143 respectively.²⁰ We estimated the impacts of mandatory menu calorie labelling policy based on two
144 main scenarios: 1) "partial implementation" scenario, which refers to the implementation in large out-
145 of-home food businesses only (3% and 9% for the number of outlets or 10% and 21% for the sector
146 turnover in Belgium and Germany, respectively) and 2) "full implementation" scenario which refers to
147 the implementation in every out-of-home food business (100% for Belgium and Germany) (see Table
148 1). For SSB taxes, we modelled different scenarios based on reported changes in SSB consumption
149 following the implementation of the SSB taxes reported by a previous meta-analysis²¹ (see Table 1).

150 For both policies, we compared each scenario with a corresponding counterfactual "baseline" scenario
151 that refers to the current situation or legislation. In Belgium and Germany, "no intervention" served as
152 the counterfactual scenario for modelling mandatory menu calorie labelling as this policy has not yet
153 been implemented. While there is no SSB tax in Germany, Belgium enacted volumetric SSB taxes of
154 €0.03/L before 2016, €0.07/L from 2016, and €0.12/L from 2018.²² Our counterfactual scenarios for
155 modelling SSB taxes were "no policy" for Germany and an implemented "SSB tax of €0.03/L" for

156 Belgium because we used SSB consumption data in 2014 (see Section “SSB tax” in supplementary
157 materials).

158 ***Menu calorie labelling effects***

159 We estimated the impact of mandatory menu calorie labelling on energy intake through 1) consumer
160 response (i.e., customers opt for lower-calorie options) and 2) retailer response (i.e., food reformulation
161 of out-of-home retailers) based on two main scenarios: partial and full implementations (e.g., as in ⁸)
162 (see Table 1, Figure 1).

163 Effect on consumer response

164 Following two simulation studies in the US^{9,10} using the findings from a meta-analysis by Shangguan et
165 al.,²³ we assumed that exposure to calorie labelling would reduce calories intake by 7.3% (95% CI: [-
166 10.1%, -4.4%]) for each out-of-home meal. This effect is similar to a reduction of 47 kcal (95% CI: [-78;
167 -15]) or 7% relative to the average baseline calories purchased (675 kcal) reported in a Cochrane meta-
168 analysis by Crockett et al.²⁴ (see Section “Mandatory menu calorie labelling” in supplementary
169 materials). We considered a possible calorie compensation of 26.5% (averaging estimates from two
170 meta-analyses at 42%²⁵ and 11%²⁶) throughout the day as individuals may consume additional food
171 due to fewer out-of-home calories consumed. Sensitivity analyses with 11% and 42% compensation
172 were conducted. We assumed no differences in the effects of calorie labelling across
173 sociodemographic characteristics following the current literature.^{16,17}

174 Reformulation effect

175 Similar to previous simulation studies,^{9,10} we assumed that calorie labelling would lead to a reduction
176 of 5% in menu options offered by the food businesses. This is based on empirical data of
177 reformulation observed in US chain restaurants.¹⁰ We assumed the effect was consistent across
178 different menu items due to an absence of contradictory evidence.

179

180 ***SSB tax effects***

181 We also estimated the impact of the SSB taxes through consumer response and reformulation (see
182 Table 1, Figure 1), even though these two pathways were derived from different SSB tax designs (ad
183 valorem tax and tiered tax, respectively).

184 Effect on consumer response

185 We developed scenarios for SSB taxes following the findings from a recent meta-analysis by Andreyeva
186 et al.²¹ Based on a pass-through rate of 82% (95% CI: [66%, 98%]) and a demand price elasticity (i.e., %
187 change in sales or consumption due to % change in price) of -1.59 (95% CI: [-2.11, -1.08]),²¹ we
188 modelled SSB ad valorem taxes of 10%, 20%, and 30% (see Section “SSB tax” in supplementary
189 materials). We assumed no substitution to non-SSBs or untaxed beverages due to increased SSB
190 prices, as shown in a high-quality meta-analysis.²¹ Our scenario of a 20% ad valorem tax on SSBs
191 follows a previous modelling study and is based on scientific recommendations.^{13,21,27} We conducted
192 sensitivity analyses using reductions of 6.7% (95% CI: [-10.4, -3.1%]) and 10.0% (95% CI: [-14.7; -5.0])
193 due to a 10% increase in SSB price reported by Afhsin et al.²⁸ and Teng et al.,²⁹ respectively. We
194 assumed a similar effect of SSB taxes across socioeconomic groups due to mixed evidence across
195 study settings.²¹

196 Reformulation effect

197 We assumed that the SSB tax would lead to a reduction of the sugar content of liable beverages by
198 30% (e.g., as in ¹³) based on the observed effect of the soft drinks industry levy (SDIL) in the UK
199 reported by two studies: 29% decrease in the sugar content of all SSB products sold,³⁰ and a 30%
200 decrease in the sugar volume from soft drinks sold.³¹

201 **Table 1.** Scenarios and key assumptions

| Mandatory menu calorie labelling | |
|--|---|
| Consumer response | |
| Partial implementation | Based on consumer response (7.3%) and compensation (26.5%) with calorie labelling implemented in large food businesses (3% in Belgium and 9% in Germany) |
| Full implementation | Based on consumer response (7.3%) and compensation (26.5%) with calorie labelling implemented in all food businesses (100% in both Belgium and Germany) |
| Reformulation | |
| Partial implementation (Reformulation) | Based on reformulation (5%) with calorie labelling implemented in large food businesses (3% in Belgium and 9% in Germany) |
| Full implementation (Reformulation) | Based on reformulation (5%) with calorie labelling implemented in all food businesses (100% in both Belgium and Germany) |
| Combined | |
| Partial implementation | Based on consumer response (7.3%), compensation (26.5%), and reformulation (5%) with calorie labelling implemented in large food businesses (3% in Belgium and 9% in Germany) |
| Full implementation | Based on consumer response (7.3%), compensation (26.5%), and reformulation (5%) with calorie labelling implemented in all food businesses (100% in both Belgium and Germany) |
| SSB taxes | |
| Consumer response | |
| 10% tax | Equivalent decrease in SSB consumption due to a 10% increase in price based on a pass-through rate (82%) and a demand price elasticity (-1.59) |
| 20% tax | Equivalent decrease in SSB consumption due to a 20% increase in price based on a pass-through rate (82%) and a demand price elasticity (-1.59) |
| 30% tax | Equivalent decrease in SSB consumption due to a 30% increase in price based on a pass-through rate (82%) and a demand price elasticity (-1.59) |
| Reformulation | |
| 30% decrease in sugar | 30% lower sugar content due to industry reformulation, independent of changes in consumer behaviour |
| Combined | |
| Combination of consumer response and reformulation | Each of the scenarios of consumer response above combined with reformulation |

202

203

204 **Data sources**

205 We created a synthetic population for both countries (see Section “Creating synthetic population”,
206 Appendix Tables 1, 2, and 3 in supplementary materials). We used population projections from Statbel,
207 the Belgian Statistical Office and projected mortality trends based on the CVD deaths observed from
208 2012 to 2020. The population projections for Germany were from the German Federal Statistical Office
209 and we projected mortality trends based on the CVD deaths observed from 1991 to 2019. For the
210 exposures (BMI, energy, SSB intakes), we used nationally representative surveys: the National Food
211 Consumption Survey (FCS) for Belgium³² and *Kooperative Gesundheitsforschung in der Region*
212 *Augsburg* (KORA) and *Nationale Verzehrstudie* (NVS) II for Germany.^{33,34} We fitted generalised additive
213 models for location, shape and scale (GAMLSS) models to estimate BMI distribution conditional on
214 year (for Germany only), age, sex and education. Energy and SSB intake distributions were conditional
215 on year, age, sex, education, and BMI (e.g. as in ¹³). We calculated out-of-home energy by multiplying
216 energy intakes with the proportion of out-of-home consumption. Similar approach was used to
217 calculate non-diet SSB intake (see Section “Creating synthetic population” in supplementary materials).
218 All data management and statistical analyses were conducted using R Studio. For code see
219 https://github.com/zoecolombet/MenuEnergyLabelling_code_Europe

220 **Model engine**

221 We modified a framework for simulation modelling of mandatory menu calorie labelling in England.⁸
222 We hypothesised that mandatory menu calorie labelling (partial or full) implementation would
223 immediately reduce the population’s out-of-home energy intake which has further impacts on changes
224 in CVD mortality risk through a reduction in BMI (see Figure 1, and section “Estimating the effect of
225 change in energy and SSB intake on BMI and CVD mortality” in supplementary materials). Changes in
226 energy intake were computed by subtracting post-intervention energy from baseline energy intake
227 every year. The Christiansen & Garby prediction formula³⁵ guided how the changes in energy intake
228 were transformed into equivalent changes in body weight before being converted into BMI changes
229 (see Section “Estimating the effect of change in energy intake on BMI” in supplementary materials).
230 Using BMI changes, we estimated subsequent change (or reduction) in obesity prevalence and the 5-
231 year lag-time changes (e.g., as in ³⁶) in CVD mortality risk. Based on this information, new mortality
232 rates and the number of deaths were projected. We also adopted calorie labelling framework for
233 estimating the impacts of SSB taxes. The effect of SSB taxes on BMI informed changes in obesity
234 prevalence. For the impacts of SSB taxes on CVD mortality, we estimated the simultaneous effects of
235 SSB intake through two pathways: (i) changes in BMI (or BMI-mediated pathway; indirect effect) and (ii)
236 without BMI pathway (direct effect) (see Figure 1 and Section “Estimating the effect of change in SSB
237 intake on BMI and CVD mortality” in supplementary materials). We assumed that SSB intake has
238 immediate effect on BMI, and we followed menu calorie labelling framework in modelling the
239 subsequent effect on BMI changes on CVD mortality risk. For the direct pathway, we assumed the
240 same 5-year lag time for the effect of SSB intake on CVD mortality risk. We also reported the indirect
241 effect of SSB taxes on CVD mortality through BMI as part of the sensitivity analyses. Because we
242 assumed a 5-year lag time, the policies impact the population from 2027 up to the simulation period
243 to 2041.

244 **Model outputs**

245 For every scenario in each policy, changes in obesity prevalence and the total number of CVD deaths
246 prevented or postponed (DPPs) were simulated in adults aged 30-89 years separately in Belgium and


247 Germany. To assess the equitable impacts of both these policies based on socioeconomic status, we
248 presented the outputs stratified by educational level and compared the DPP rates between low and
249 high education groups. We presented the findings to two significant digits for DPPs and to two
250 decimal places for changes in prevalence.

251 **Estimating model uncertainty**

252 We ran 200 iterations using a Monte Carlo method to obtain the uncertainty of model parameters and
253 then reported the results as median values and 95% uncertainty intervals (UIs). See “Estimating model
254 uncertainty” in supplementary materials for detailed information on possible sources of uncertainty.

255 **Role of the funding source**

256 The funder has no role in the study design, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation, writing of
257 the paper, or the decision to submit this work for publication.



258
259 **Figure 1.** Logic diagram of the impacts of mandatory menu calorie labelling and SSB taxes on CVD
260 mortality (adapted from Colombet et al. ⁸)
261
262

263 **Results**

264 ***Mandatory menu calorie labelling***

265 Table 2 presents the estimated impacts of mandatory menu calorie labelling on obesity prevalence and
266 preventing or postponing CVD deaths in Belgium and Germany. In both countries, estimated impacts
267 through consumer response were similar to retailer reformulation. We estimated higher impacts on
268 obesity prevalence and CVD mortality for Germany than Belgium when the full scenario of mandatory
269 menu calorie labelling was implemented.

270 In Belgium, the partial implementation (3% of the total number of outlets) and considering consumer
271 response and reformulation, was estimated to reduce obesity prevalence by 0.12 percentage points
272 (absolute, 95% UI: [0.08, 0.17]) and prevent 51 CVD deaths (95% UI: [0, 400]) over 20 years. However,
273 the full implementation was estimated to have markedly larger impacts on reductions in obesity
274 prevalence (3.61 percentage points; 95% UI: [2.78, 4.30]) and CVD mortality (1600 DPPs; 95% UI: [400,
275 3800]); which is around 0.90% (95% UI: [0.24, 1.88]) of the total expected CVD deaths.

276 In Germany, the partial implementation (9% of the total number of outlets) accounting for both
277 consumer response and reformulation would result in a 0.44 percentage-point decline (95% UI: [0.34,
278 0.54]) in obesity prevalence and 2500 CVD DPPs (95% UI: [500, 6500]) over 20 years. The full
279 implementation in Germany was estimated to reduce obesity prevalence by 4.28 (95% UI: [3.64, 5.06])
280 percentage points. The reduction in CVD mortality was estimated to be 12 times more than that
281 achieved by implementing this policy in large out-of-home sector businesses only: 30000 CVD deaths
282 (95% UI: [10000, 58000]), around 1.14% (95% UI: [0.51, 1.87]) of the total expected CVD deaths.

283 Under the full mandatory menu calorie labelling scenario in both countries, we estimated greater
284 changes in obesity prevalence among low and middle education groups than in high education one
285 (Table 3). Comparing rates of CVD DPPs per 100,000 population between low and high education
286 groups, we estimated ratios of 0.86 and 0.78 for Belgium and Germany, respectively (Appendix Table
287 4). This indicates that menu calorie labelling implemented in all out-of-home businesses may prevent
288 fewer CVD deaths in low than high education groups in both countries.

289 Our sensitivity analyses produced comparable findings. Larger impacts were estimated when using
290 minimum (11%) than maximum (42%) compensation (Appendix Table 5) and using turnover than the
291 proportion of outlets for the partial implementation scenario (Appendix Table 6).

292

293 ***SSB tax***

294 The likely population-level impacts of SSB tax on obesity prevalence and CVD mortality through
295 consumer response increased in line with the higher tax rates implemented (Table 4). The
296 reformulation effect (sugar content reduced by 30%) alone was estimated to have similar impacts than
297 implementing a 20% SSB tax. The estimated changes in obesity prevalence resulting from SSB taxes
298 were similar in Belgium and Germany.

299 In Belgium, consumer response to a 20% and 30% tax rates would reduce obesity prevalence by 0.412
300 (95% UI: [0.07, 0.23]) and 0.18 (95% UI: [0.10, 0.34]) percentage points and prevent 1200 (95% UI: [200,
301 2800]) and 1700 (95% UI: [400, 4200]) CVD deaths over two decades. Reformulation alone was
302 estimated to result in a 0.14 percentage point (95% UI: [0.09, 0.22]) decline in obesity prevalence and
303 1200 CVD DPPs (95% UI: [400, 3600]). Combining both consumer response and reformulation would
304 result in bigger estimated impacts. For example, a 30% tax rate combined with reformulation was
305 estimated to decrease obesity prevalence by 0.27 (95% UI: [0.17, 0.43]) percentage points and

306 postpone 2500 deaths (95% UI: [800, 5200]) or around 1.46% (95% UI: [0.54%, 3.07%]) of the expected
307 CVD deaths.

308 In Germany, consumer response to the implementation of SSB taxes would yield a 0.12-percentage
309 point (95% UI: [0.06, 0.20]) decline in obesity prevalence and 8500 (95% UI: [3000, 16000]) CVD DPPs
310 for the 20% SSB tax and a 0.18-percentage point (95% UI: [0.10, 0.30]) decline in obesity prevalence
311 and 12000 CVD DPPs (95% UI: [4500, 22000]) for the 30% SSB tax. The reformulation alone would
312 decline obesity prevalence by 0.14 percentage points (95% UI: [0.09, 0.20]) and reduce CVD deaths by
313 10000 (95% UI: [3500, 18000]). We estimated bigger impacts from combining consumer response and
314 reformulation with a decline in obesity prevalence by 0.27 percentage points (95% UI: 0.17, 0.39) and a
315 reduction in CVD deaths by 16000 (95% UI: 7500, 28000) (around 0.62% (95% UI [0.27%, 0.97%]) of the
316 predicted deaths) if a 30% SSB tax would be implemented.

317 We estimated greater changes in obesity prevalence in low than in higher education groups in Belgium
318 and Germany (Table 5). We compared rates of CVD DPPs of implementing a 30% SSB tax considering
319 both consumer response and reformulation per 100,000 population between low and high education
320 groups. We estimated ratios of 3.31 and 2.00 for Belgium and Germany, respectively, and the
321 probability of the ratios > 1 was higher than 50% (Appendix Table 4). This indicates that the policy may
322 prevent more CVD deaths in low than high education groups in both countries.

323 Sensitivity analyses using effect sizes from different meta-analyses showed similar findings to the
324 primary analyses of the same 10% SSB tax rate (Appendix Table 7). We found small impacts when the
325 effect of SSB taxes on a reduction in CVD mortality was only estimated through changes in BMI
326 (Appendix Table 8).

327 **Table 2.** Estimated impacts of mandatory menu calorie labelling on changes in obesity prevalence and CVD mortality in Belgium and Germany (2022 – 2041).

| Scenarios | Belgium | | | Germany | | |
|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| | Changes in obesity prevalence ^a | CVD DPPs | | Changes in obesity prevalence ^a | CVD DPPs | |
| | | 10 years ^b | 20 years ^c | | 10 years ^b | 20 years ^c |
| Consumer response | | | | | | |
| Partial implementation | -0.06 (-0.10, -0.03) | 8 ^d (0, 200) | 27 ^d (0, 200) | -0.23 (-0.33, -0.14) | 500 (0, 2000) | 1200 (0, 4500) |
| Full implementation | -1.96 (-2.69, -1.08) | 200 (0, 1000) | 800 (0, 2200) | -2.35 (-3.22, -1.63) | 5500 (990, 12000) | 16000 (4500, 32000) |
| Reformulation | | | | | | |
| Partial implementation | -0.06 (-0.08, -0.04) | 8 ^d (0, 200) | 27 ^d (0, 200) | -0.22 (-0.25, -0.19) | 500 (0, 1500) | 1500 (0, 4000) |
| Full implementation | -1.83 (-1.97, -1.70) | 200 (0, 1000) | 800 (200, 2000) | -2.25 (-2.36, -2.15) | 5000 (1000, 12000) | 15000 (5000, 27000) |
| Combined | | | | | | |
| Partial implementation | -0.12 (-0.17, -0.08) | 17 ^d (0, 200) | 51 ^d (0, 400) | -0.44 (-0.54, -0.34) | 1000 (0, 3000) | 2500 (500, 6500) |
| Full implementation | -3.61 (-4.30, -2.78) | 600 (0, 1600) | 1600 (400, 3800) | -4.28 (-5.06, -3.64) | 11000 (3500, 21000) | 30000 (10000, 58000) |

328 ^aChanges in obesity prevalence for 20 years are presented, similar to changes in 10 years.

329 ^bThe first 10 years from the policy implementation (2022 to 2031) with the population-level impacts observed from 2027 to 2031 due to a 5-year lag time.

330 ^cThe first 20 years from the policy implementation (2022 to 2041) with the population-level impacts observed from 2027 to 2041 due to a 5-year lag time.

331 ^dEstimates are presented as mean because the median is 0 (zero).

332 Estimates are presented as median and 95% uncertainty intervals (UIs), unless otherwise specified.

333 CVD = cardiovascular disease; DPPs = Deaths prevented or postponed

334

335 **Table 3.** Estimated impacts of mandatory menu calorie labelling accounting for combined consumer response and reformulation on obesity prevalence and
 336 CVD mortality by educational level in Belgium and Germany (2022 – 2041)

| Scenarios | Belgium | | Germany | |
|-------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|
| | Obesity prevalence | CVD deaths | Obesity prevalence | CVD deaths |
| Counterfactual | Predicted | Predicted | Predicted | Predicted |
| Low education | 33.54 (32.72, 34.29) | 82000 (48000, 130000) | 26.01 (25.38, 26.73) | 300000 (200000, 420000) |
| Middle education | 32.24 (31.44, 32.97) | 52000 (31000, 76000) | 20.61 (20.27, 20.87) | 1500000 (960000, 2200000) |
| High education | 18.79 (18.11, 19.42) | 37000 (22000, 61000) | 14.80 (14.48, 15.09) | 790000 (520000, 1100000) |
| Partial implementation | Changes | DPPs | Changes | DPPs |
| Low education | -0.12 (-0.20, -0.07) | 25 ^a (0, 200) | -0.51 (-0.67, -0.39) | 0 (0, 1000) |
| Middle education | -0.13 (-0.21, -0.09) | 17 ^a (0, 200) | -0.43 (-0.54, -0.34) | 1500 (0, 4500) |
| High education | -0.10 (-0.15, -0.05) | 9 ^a (0, 200) | -0.38 (-0.48, -0.28) | 500 (0, 3000) |
| Full implementation | Changes | DPPs | Changes | DPPs |
| Low education | -3.70 (-4.54, -2.85) | 600 (0, 1600) | -5.05 (-6.13, -4.20) | 2800 (500, 6500) |
| Middle education | -4.11 (-4.85, -3.13) | 600 (0, 1400) | -4.23 (-5.03, -3.60) | 16000 (5000, 32000) |
| High education | -2.96 (-3.53, -2.37) | 400 (0, 1200) | -3.58 (-4.23, -3.03) | 10000 (2500, 21000) |

337 Estimates are presented for 20 years from the policy implementation (2022 to 2041) with the population-level impacts observed from 2027 to 2041 due to a 5-
 338 year lag time.

339 ^aEstimates are presented as mean because the median is 0 (zero).

340 Estimates are presented as median and 95% uncertainty intervals (UIs), unless otherwise specified.

341 CVD = cardiovascular disease; DPPs = Deaths prevented or postponed

342

343

344 **Table 4.** Estimated impacts of SSB tax on changes in obesity prevalence and CVD mortality in Belgium and Germany (2022 – 2041).

| Scenarios | Belgium | | | Germany | | |
|--------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| | Changes in obesity prevalence ^a | CVD DPPs | | Changes in obesity prevalence ^a | CVD DPPs | |
| | | 10 years ^b | 20 years ^c | | 10 years ^b | 20 years ^c |
| Consumer response | | | | | | |
| 10% tax | -0.06 (-0.11, -0.03) | 200 (0, 800) | 600 (0, 2000) | -0.06 (-0.10, -0.03) | 1800 (0, 4500) | 4500 (1000, 9500) |
| 20% tax | -0.12 (-0.23, -0.07) | 400 (0, 1400) | 1200 (200, 2800) | -0.12 (-0.20, -0.06) | 3500 (990, 6500) | 8500 (3000, 16000) |
| 30% tax | -0.18 (-0.34, -0.10) | 600 (0, 1600) | 1700 (400, 4200) | -0.18 (-0.30, -0.10) | 5000 (1500, 9500) | 12000 (4500, 22000) |
| Reformulation | | | | | | |
| 30% decrease in sugar | -0.14 (-0.22, -0.09) | 400 (0, 1400) | 1200 (400, 3600) | -0.14 (-0.20, -0.09) | 4000 (1000, 7000) | 10000 (3500, 18000) |
| Combined | | | | | | |
| 10% tax | -0.19 (-0.30, -0.12) | 600 (0, 1600) | 1800 (600, 4200) | -0.18 (-0.27, -0.12) | 5000 (1500, 9000) | 12000 (4500, 22000) |
| 20% tax | -0.23 (-0.37, -0.15) | 600 (0, 2000) | 2000 (800, 4800) | -0.23 (-0.32, -0.14) | 5500 (1500, 11000) | 15000 (6500, 26000) |
| 30% tax | -0.27 (-0.43, -0.17) | 800 (0, 2200) | 2500 (800, 5200) | -0.27 (-0.39, -0.17) | 6500 (2000, 12000) | 16000 (7500, 28000) |

345 ^aChanges in obesity prevalence for 20 years are presented, similar to changes in 10 years.

346 ^bThe first 10 years from the policy implementation (2022 to 2031) with the population-level impacts observed from 2027 to 2031 due to a 5-year lag time.

347 ^cThe first 20 years from the policy implementation (2022 to 2041) with the population-level impacts observed from 2027 to 2041 due to a 5-year lag time.

348 ^dEstimates are presented as mean because the median is 0 (zero).

349 Estimates are presented as median and 95% uncertainty intervals (UIs), unless otherwise specified.

350 CVD = cardiovascular disease; DPPs = Deaths prevented or postponed

351

352 **Table 5.** Estimated impacts of the SSB tax accounting for combined consumer response and reformulation on obesity prevalence and CVD mortality by
 353 educational level in Belgium and Germany (2022 – 2041)

| Scenarios | Belgium | | Germany | |
|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|
| | Obesity prevalence | CVD deaths | Obesity prevalence | CVD deaths |
| Counterfactual | Predicted | Predicted | Predicted | Predicted |
| Low education | 33.54 (32.72, 34.29) | 82000 (48000, 130000) | 26.01 (25.38, 26.73) | 300000 (200000, 420000) |
| Middle education | 32.24 (31.44, 32.97) | 52000 (31000, 76000) | 20.61 (20.27, 20.87) | 1500000 (960000, 2200000) |
| High education | 18.79 (18.11, 19.42) | 37000 (22000, 61000) | 14.80 (14.48, 15.09) | 790000 (520000, 1100000) |
| 10% tax | Changes | DPPs | Changes | DPPs |
| Low education | -0.23 (-0.37, -0.13) | 800 (200, 2200) | -0.27 (-0.42, -0.16) | 2200 (500, 5500) |
| Middle education | -0.24 (-0.39, -0.15) | 800 (0, 1800) | -0.16 (-0.23, -0.10) | 7000 (2000, 13000) |
| High education | -0.09 (-0.14, -0.03) | 200 (0, 800) | -0.12 (-0.18, -0.07) | 3500 (990, 7000) |
| 20% tax | Changes | DPPs | Changes | DPPs |
| Low education | -0.28 (-0.46, -0.17) | 1000 (200, 2600) | -0.34 (-0.50, -0.19) | 2500 (990, 6000) |
| Middle education | -0.30 (-0.47, -0.18) | 800 (200, 2000) | -0.19 (-0.28, -0.12) | 8000 (3000, 15000) |
| High education | -0.11 (-0.18, -0.05) | 200 (0, 1000) | -0.15 (-0.22, -0.09) | 3500 (1000, 8000) |
| 30% tax | Changes | DPPs | Changes | DPPs |
| Low education | -0.34 (-0.54, -0.20) | 1200 (200, 2800) | -0.39 (-0.62, -0.24) | 3000 (1000, 6500) |
| Middle education | -0.35 (-0.57, -0.21) | 1000 (200, 2200) | -0.23 (-0.34, -0.15) | 8800 (3000, 16000) |
| High education | -0.13 (-0.21, -0.06) | 200 (0, 1000) | -0.17 (-0.26, -0.10) | 4000 (1500, 8500) |

354 Estimates are presented for 20 years from the policy implementation (2022 to 2041) with the population-level impacts observed from 2027 to 2041 due to a 5-
 355 year lag time.

356 Estimates are presented as median and 95% uncertainty intervals (UIs), unless otherwise specified.

357 CVD = cardiovascular disease; DPPs = Deaths prevented or postponed

358 Discussion

359 To inform future food policy in Europe, we modelled the likely population impacts of implementing
360 mandatory menu calorie labelling and SSB taxes on obesity prevalence and CVD mortality in two
361 European countries (2022 – 2041). In both countries, we estimated the impact of menu calorie labelling
362 on obesity prevalence to be greater than SSB taxes when implemented in every out-of-home business.
363 However, implementing menu calorie labelling in all out-of-home businesses is estimated to postpone
364 or prevent more CVD deaths than the highest SSB tax rate (30%) in Germany (1.14% vs 0.62% of the
365 total expected CVD deaths) but not in Belgium (0.90% vs 1.46%). Under the assumption that the
366 policies have the same effect across ages, sexes, and SES groups,⁸ we estimated that SSB taxation may
367 have equitable impacts as the policy tend to prevent more CVD deaths in low than high education
368 groups. However, menu calorie labelling may not have equitable impacts as more CVD DPPs were
369 estimated in high than low education groups.

370 Mandatory menu calorie labelling would have a higher impact across the studied countries if the policy
371 were implemented for all out-of-home businesses, rather than just large businesses, as is currently the
372 case in England.⁸ Our findings are consistent with a previous simulation modelling in England,⁸
373 suggesting large impacts of implementing mandatory menu calorie labelling in all out-of-home
374 sectors with obesity prevalence reduced by 2.65 percentage points. This study also estimated 9200
375 CVD DPPs or around 1.10% (95% UI 0.71–1.60) relative to the expected CVD deaths,⁸ which is similar to
376 our estimates in Belgium (0.90%) and Germany (1.14%).⁸ Our results are also consistent with previous
377 modelling in the US.⁹ For example, our full scenario without reformulation (a compensation level of
378 26.5%) would result in 16000 CVD DPPs in Germany compared to 27646 CVD DPPs in the US (a higher
379 compensation of 50% with much larger population size).⁹ In addition, our research echoes their finding
380 that adding the reformulation doubles the mortality benefits.⁹

381 Our findings for SSB taxation are also similar to those of previous simulation modelling in Germany.¹³
382 Under the same scenario of 20% SSB tax without reformulation assumed, our estimates of 8500 CVD
383 DPPs are half of 17000 all-cause DPPs (combined CVD and non-CVD deaths) reported by the previous
384 modelling (findings on CVD deaths only are not presented).¹³ A handful of studies have simulated the
385 impact of sugary drink policies across different study contexts and reported consistent results.¹⁴ For
386 example, a study from the US with a larger population size estimated 31000 CVD DPPs in the next 15
387 years from implementing a 10% SSB tax.¹⁹ It is important to note that the likely impacts on CVD
388 mortality estimated through BMI only (Appendix Table 8) were similarly modest in size compared to
389 the previous modelling estimates.¹³ In line with this, the benefits of reducing obesity prevalence were
390 much smaller than the estimates for mandatory calorie labelling, indicating that the SSB tax may
391 largely impact CVD mortality through a pathway not involving changes in BMI as discussed in a
392 previous simulation modelling study.¹³

393 We estimated that mandatory menu calorie labelling may have greater population-level impacts than
394 SSB tax in reducing obesity prevalence in both countries, and in preventing CVD deaths in Germany
395 but not in Belgium. Greater impacts of menu calorie labelling on reducing obesity prevalence may be
396 because energy intake from out-of-home has more direct and substantial impacts on weight gain,
397 particularly due to larger portion sizes (volume) and high in fat and overall calorie content.^{5,6,37,38} In line
398 with this, a study of UK Biobank participants reported that BMI has stronger associations with total
399 energy and energy from fat than sugar.³⁹ The greater CVD mortality-related benefits of SSB taxes
400 compared to menu calorie labelling in Belgium, but not in Germany, may be explained by higher SSB

401 intake in Belgium (see Appendix Table 3). Importantly, the evidence used to inform our model
402 suggests that these policies may impact CVD mortality through different pathways that involve
403 changes in BMI for mandatory menu calorie labelling and other BMI-independent mechanisms for SSB
404 taxes. Therefore, the policies are complementary, and implementing both as part of the public health
405 efforts in addressing diet-related diseases will yield greater benefits in both countries. It is important to
406 note that menu calorie labelling may not have equitable impacts in Belgium and Germany as the policy
407 tends to postpone more CVD deaths in high than low education groups. This can be explained by our
408 estimated exposure data, which shows higher out-of-home energy intake in high than low education
409 groups (see Appendix Table 3). However, the estimated out-of-energy intake in our models was
410 calculated by sex and age groups only due to the data unavailability by education. Future modelling
411 studies in other settings are warranted to provide more insights on the relevance of this assumption.

412 The present study has some strengths. To our knowledge, this is the first comparison of likely health
413 impact of mandatory menu calorie labelling and SSB taxation in a European setting. Our findings are
414 particularly robust as we used a validated model that previously has been exercised to estimate the
415 calorie labelling in England and other dietary specific policies in the US.^{8,19} Scenarios were informed
416 from current policy practices (e.g., mandatory menu calorie labelling in England). Our estimates are
417 supported by rigorous sensitivity analyses that account for uncertainties in modelling assumptions and
418 are consistent with findings from previous studies,^{8,9,13,14,19} increasing confidence in the results. Two
419 different policies were examined using the same model framework, addressing the current gaps
420 highlighted by a scoping review¹⁴ on a dearth of evidence on the impacts of SSB policy compared to
421 other policies.

422 The present study also has some limitations. First, we used a proportional effect estimate (7-3%
423 reduction)²³ for the main analysis. Even though this estimate has been used in previous simulation
424 modelling studies^{9,10} and similar to findings from another meta-analysis others may not be transferable
425 to the population in Belgium and Germany as the effect may vary depending on the study context.
426 While there is an absence of evidence for Belgium and Germany, observational studies showed that
427 implementation of menu calorie labelling in a single fast food chain across three US states was
428 associated with a purchase reduction per customer of 82 calories,⁴⁰ but not such reduction in calories
429 per transaction was observed in England from a recent pre-post comparison study.⁴¹ This limitation
430 applies to the reformulation effect of menu calorie labelling and the effect estimates (consumer
431 response, reformulation) used for simulating the effects of SSB tax. Evidence based on empirical
432 impacts of the policies in both countries would improve the precision of modelling the long-term
433 policy impacts. we assumed the effects of policies remain stable throughout the simulation period due
434 to the absence of contrasting evidence. However, this is not always the case as the effect may change
435 (e.g., decrease due to habituation to information, or increase due to increased awareness and policy
436 campaign) over time.⁸ We also did not consider cumulative effects of out-of-home energy and SSB
437 intakes over the life course

438 Our exposures (i.e., BMI, energy, SSB intakes) were based on the most recent available representative
439 surveys in 2014 or earlier, and we assumed the patterns have continue since then. Similarly, the
440 proportions of out-of-home intakes were derived from studies conducted in early 2000s, assuming no
441 subsequent changes by age groups and sex. While these sources are the best available, dietary habits
442 may change in respond to the COVID-19 pandemic⁴² and recent economic downturns.⁴³ We assume
443 that these limitations would be more likely to underestimate rather than overestimate policy impacts.
444 For example, in the context of the menu calorie labelling policy, eating out may now be more common
445 reflected by the increased numbers of out-of-home food retailers in the last 20 years in both

446 countries.²⁰ For Belgium, we used the €0.03/L tax (before 2016) as the counterfactual scenario because
447 we used SSB consumption data in 2014. SSB intake may have decreased due to a new tax of 0.12/L
448 implemented in 2018. We assumed this price increase, from €0.03/L to €0.12/L, is approximately
449 equivalent to a 10% SSB tax (see Section “SSB tax” in supplementary materials). Therefore,
450 implementing higher SSB taxes (20% or 30%) would result in greater impacts than the current
451 implemented SSB tax rate (€0.12/L).

452 We modelled the impacts specific to the population aged 30-89 years, and therefore, the results do
453 not capture potential policy benefits related to peak SSB consumption in younger ages,⁴⁴ nor do the
454 results account for changes in obesity from childhood to young adults. Finally, we modelled the
455 exposures conditional on education level and we estimated the policy impacts across these education
456 groups. Consequently, we excluded individuals with no information (“unknown”, “not applicable”) on
457 education level in Belgium and this is a limitation. In addition, we assumed the same price elasticity
458 across all SES groups due to mixed evidence.²¹ However, low SES group may benefit more from SSB
459 taxes as they tend to be more responsive to price increases.⁴⁵

460 Our findings provide new evidence that implementing mandatory menu calorie labelling across all out-
461 of-home food establishments and applying higher tax rates (e.g., 30%) on SSBs would yield substantial
462 public health benefits by reducing obesity prevalence and preventing CVD deaths. Each of the policies
463 has also been demonstrated to be cost-effective by previous studies.^{10,13} In Belgium, implementing
464 mandatory menu calorie labelling in all out-of-home sectors together with higher tax rates is
465 recommended to maximise public health efforts to tackle diet-related diseases. As neither of the
466 policies has been adopted in Germany, our results emphasise the need for the government to take
467 ambitious steps towards implementing both mandatory menu calorie labelling policy in all-out-home
468 businesses and SSB tax at higher rates for greater public health benefits. More importantly, these
469 policies need to be seen as complementary approaches, and with additional measures across the food
470 system highlighting the fact that no single policy will be enough to significantly reduce the burden of
471 unhealthy diets in populations.

472 **Conclusion**

473 This study provides the first evidence of population-level benefits of implementing national level
474 mandatory menu calorie labelling policy and SSB taxes in Belgium and Germany. Implementing both
475 policies is needed in order to tackle obesity and CVD burden in both countries.

476

477

478 References

- 479 1. WHO. WHO European Regional Obesity Report 2022. <https://iris.who.int/handle/10665/353747>
- 480 2. Hoogendoorn M, Galekop M, van Baal P. The lifetime health and economic burden of obesity in
481 five European countries: what is the potential impact of prevention? *Diabetes, Obesity and*
482 *Metabolism*. 2023/08/01 2023;25(8):2351-2361. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/dom.15116>
- 483 3. Atanasova P, Kusuma D, Pineda E, Frost G, Sassi F, Miraldo M. The impact of the consumer and
484 neighbourhood food environment on dietary intake and obesity-related outcomes: A systematic
485 review of causal impact studies. *Social Science & Medicine*. 2022/04/01/ 2022;299:114879.
486 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2022.114879>
- 487 4. Eskandari F, Lake AA, Rose K, Butler M, O'Malley C. A mixed-method systematic review and meta-
488 analysis of the influences of food environments and food insecurity on obesity in high-income
489 countries. *Food Science & Nutrition*. 2022/11/01 2022;10(11):3689-3723.
490 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1002/fsn3.2969>
- 491 5. Robinson E, Jones A, Whitelock V, Mead BR, Haynes A. (Over)eating out at major UK restaurant
492 chains: observational study of energy content of main meals. *BMJ*. 2018;363:k4982.
493 doi:10.1136/bmj.k4982
- 494 6. Gesteiro E, García-Carro A, Aparicio-Ugarriza R, González-Gross M. Eating out of Home: Influence
495 on Nutrition, Health, and Policies: A Scoping Review. *Nutrients*. 2022;14(6):1265.
- 496 7. Department of Health and Social Care. Guidance: Calorie labelling in the out of home sector.
497 Accessed 10 October 2024, [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/calorie-labelling-in-the-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/calorie-labelling-in-the-out-of-home-sector)
498 [out-of-home-sector](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/calorie-labelling-in-the-out-of-home-sector)
- 499 8. Colombet Z, Robinson E, Kypridemos C, Jones A, O'Flaherty M. Effect of calorie labelling in the
500 out-of-home food sector on adult obesity prevalence, cardiovascular mortality, and social
501 inequalities in England: a modelling study. *Lancet Public Health*. Mar 2024;9(3):e178-e185.
502 doi:10.1016/s2468-2667(23)00326-2
- 503 9. Liu J, Mozaffarian D, Sy S, et al. Health and Economic Impacts of the National Menu Calorie
504 Labeling Law in the United States. *Circulation: Cardiovascular Quality and Outcomes*. 2020/06/01
505 2020;13(6):e006313. doi:10.1161/CIRCOUTCOMES.119.006313
- 506 10. Du M, Griecci CF, Cudhea F, et al. What is the cost-effectiveness of menu calorie labelling on
507 reducing obesity-associated cancer burdens? An economic evaluation of a federal policy
508 intervention among 235 million adults in the USA. *BMJ Open*. 2023;13(4):e063614.
509 doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2022-063614
- 510 11. Wellard-Cole L, Goldsbury D, Havill M, et al. Monitoring the changes to the nutrient composition
511 of fast foods following the introduction of menu labelling in New South Wales, Australia: an
512 observational study. *Public Health Nutr*. Apr 2018;21(6):1194-1199.
513 doi:10.1017/s1368980017003706
- 514 12. Thow AM, Rippin HL, Mulcahy G, Duffey K, Wickramasinghe K. Sugar-sweetened beverage taxes in
515 Europe: learning for the future. *European Journal of Public Health*. 2022;32(2):273-280.
516 doi:10.1093/eurpub/ckab211
- 517 13. Emmert-Fees KMF, Amies-Cull B, Wawro N, et al. Projected health and economic impacts of
518 sugar-sweetened beverage taxation in Germany: A cross-validation modelling study. *PLOS*
519 *Medicine*. 2023;20(11):e1004311. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1004311
- 520 14. Smith NR, Grummon AH, Ng SW, Wright ST, Frerichs L. Simulation models of sugary drink policies:
521 A scoping review. *PLoS One*. 2022;17(10):e0275270. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0275270
- 522 15. Adams J, Mytton O, White M, Monsivais P. Why Are Some Population Interventions for Diet and
523 Obesity More Equitable and Effective Than Others? The Role of Individual Agency. *PLOS Medicine*.
524 2016;13(4):e1001990. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1001990
- 525 16. Robinson E, Boyland E, Christiansen P, et al. Is the effect of menu energy labelling on consumer
526 behaviour equitable? A pooled analysis of twelve randomized control experiments. *Appetite*.
527 2023/03/01/ 2023;182:106451. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2023.106451>

- 528 17. Robinson E, Polden M, Langfield T, et al. Socioeconomic position and the effect of energy
529 labelling on consumer behaviour: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *International Journal of*
530 *Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*. 2023/02/06 2023;20(1):10. doi:10.1186/s12966-023-
531 01418-0
- 532 18. Janssen F, Bardoutsos A, Vidra N. Obesity Prevalence in the Long-Term Future in 18 European
533 Countries and in the USA. *Obesity Facts*. 2020;13(5):514-527. doi:10.1159/000511023
- 534 19. Pearson-Stuttard J, Bandosz P, Rehm CD, et al. Reducing US cardiovascular disease burden and
535 disparities through national and targeted dietary policies: A modelling study. *PLOS Medicine*.
536 2017;14(6):e1002311. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1002311
- 537 20. Eurostat. Services by employment size class (NACE Rev. 2, H-N, S95) (2005-2020). Accessed 10
538 July 2024,
539 [https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/databrowser/view/sbs_sc_1b_se_r2_custom_12638400/default/tab](https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/databrowser/view/sbs_sc_1b_se_r2_custom_12638400/default/table?lang=en)
540 [e?lang=en](https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/databrowser/view/sbs_sc_1b_se_r2_custom_12638400/default/table?lang=en)
- 541 21. Andreyeva T, Marple K, Marinello S, Moore TE, Powell LM. Outcomes Following Taxation of Sugar-
542 Sweetened Beverages: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Network Open*.
543 2022;5(6):e2215276-e2215276. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2022.15276
- 544 22. Chatelan A, Rouche M, Kelly C, et al. Tax on sugary drinks and trends in daily soda consumption
545 by family affluence: an international repeated cross-sectional survey among European
546 adolescents. *The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*. 2023/03/01/ 2023;117(3):576-585.
547 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajcnut.2023.01.011>
- 548 23. Shangguan S, Afshin A, Shulkin M, et al. A Meta-Analysis of Food Labeling Effects on Consumer
549 Diet Behaviors and Industry Practices. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*. 2019/02/01/
550 2019;56(2):300-314. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2018.09.024>
- 551 24. Crockett RA, King SE, Marteau TM, et al. Nutritional labelling for healthier food or non-alcoholic
552 drink purchasing and consumption. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. Feb 27 2018;2(2):Cd009315.
553 doi:10.1002/14651858.CD009315.pub2
- 554 25. Robinson E, McFarland-Lesser I, Patel Z, Jones A. Downsizing food: a systematic review and meta-
555 analysis examining the effect of reducing served food portion sizes on daily energy intake and
556 body weight. *British Journal of Nutrition*. 2023;129(5):888-903. doi:10.1017/S0007114522000903
- 557 26. Robinson E, Khuttan M, McFarland-Lesser I, Patel Z, Jones A. Calorie reformulation: a systematic
558 review and meta-analysis examining the effect of manipulating food energy density on daily
559 energy intake. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*. 2022/04/22
560 2022;19(1):48. doi:10.1186/s12966-022-01287-z
- 561 27. WHO. Fiscal policies for diet and the prevention of noncommunicable diseases.
562 <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789241511247>
- 563 28. Afshin A, Peñalvo JL, Del Gobbo L, et al. The prospective impact of food pricing on improving
564 dietary consumption: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS One*. 2017;12(3):e0172277.
565 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0172277
- 566 29. Teng AM, Jones AC, Mizdrak A, Signal L, Genç M, Wilson N. Impact of sugar-sweetened beverage
567 taxes on purchases and dietary intake: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *Obesity Reviews*.
568 2019/09/01 2019;20(9):1187-1204. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/obr.12868>
- 569 30. von Philipsborn P, Huizinga O, Leibinger A, et al. Interim Evaluation of Germany's Sugar Reduction
570 Strategy for Soft Drinks: Commitments versus Actual Trends in Sugar Content and Sugar Sales
571 from Soft Drinks. *Annals of Nutrition and Metabolism*. 2023;79(3):282-290.
572 doi:10.1159/000529592
- 573 31. Bandy LK, Scarborough P, Harrington RA, Rayner M, Jebb SA. Reductions in sugar sales from soft
574 drinks in the UK from 2015 to 2018. *BMC Medicine*. 2020/01/13 2020;18(1):20.
575 doi:10.1186/s12916-019-1477-4
- 576 32. Bel S, Van den Abeele S, Lebacqz T, et al. Protocol of the Belgian food consumption survey 2014:
577 objectives, design and methods. *Archives of Public Health*. 2016/05/16 2016;74(1):20.
578 doi:10.1186/s13690-016-0131-2

- 579 33. Heuer T, Krems C, Moon K, Brombach C, Hoffmann I. Food consumption of adults in Germany:
580 results of the German National Nutrition Survey II based on diet history interviews. *Br J Nutr*. May
581 28 2015;113(10):1603-14. doi:10.1017/s0007114515000744
- 582 34. Holle R, Happich M, Löwel H, Wichmann HE. KORA--a research platform for population based
583 health research. *Gesundheitswesen*. Aug 2005;67 Suppl 1:S19-25. doi:10.1055/s-2005-858235
- 584 35. Christiansen E, Garby L. Prediction of body weight changes caused by changes in energy balance.
585 *Eur J Clin Invest*. Nov 2002;32(11):826-30. doi:10.1046/j.1365-2362.2002.01036.x
- 586 36. Kypridemos C, Allen K, Hickey GL, et al. Cardiovascular screening to reduce the burden from
587 cardiovascular disease: microsimulation study to quantify policy options. *BMJ*. 2016;353:i2793.
588 doi:10.1136/bmj.i2793
- 589 37. Vandevijvere S, Lachat C, Kolsteren P, Van Oyen H. Eating out of home in Belgium: current
590 situation and policy implications. *British Journal of Nutrition*. 2009;102(6):921-928.
591 doi:10.1017/S0007114509311745
- 592 38. Orfanos P, Naska A, Trichopoulou A, et al. Eating out of home: energy, macro- and micronutrient
593 intakes in 10 European countries. The European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and
594 Nutrition. *Eur J Clin Nutr*. Nov 2009;63 Suppl 4:S239-62. doi:10.1038/ejcn.2009.84
- 595 39. Anderson JJ, Celis-Morales CA, Mackay DF, et al. Adiposity among 132 479 UK Biobank
596 participants; contribution of sugar intake vs other macronutrients. *International Journal of*
597 *Epidemiology*. 2017;46(2):492-501. doi:10.1093/ije/dyw173
- 598 40. Petimar J, Zhang F, Rimm EB, et al. Changes in the calorie and nutrient content of purchased fast
599 food meals after calorie menu labeling: A natural experiment. *PLoS Med*. Jul 2021;18(7):e1003714.
600 doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1003714
- 601 41. Polden M, Jones A, Essman M, et al. Evaluating the effect of mandatory kilocalorie labelling on
602 energy consumed in the out-of-home food sector: a pre vs. post-implementation observational
603 study in England. *PsyArXiv*. 2024 2024;doi:10.31234/osf.io/azcqy
- 604 42. Bennett G, Young E, Butler I, Coe S. The Impact of Lockdown During the COVID-19 Outbreak on
605 Dietary Habits in Various Population Groups: A Scoping Review. *Front Nutr*. 2021;8:626432.
606 doi:10.3389/fnut.2021.626432
- 607 43. Robinson E. Obesity and the cost of living crisis. *International Journal of Obesity*. 2023/02/01
608 2023;47(2):93-94. doi:10.1038/s41366-022-01242-9
- 609 44. Lara-Castor L, Micha R, Cudhea F, et al. Sugar-sweetened beverage intakes among adults between
610 1990 and 2018 in 185 countries. *Nature Communications*. 2023/10/03 2023;14(1):5957.
611 doi:10.1038/s41467-023-41269-8
- 612 45. Rogers N, Pell D, Cummins S, et al. OP79 Medium term changes in household purchasing of soft
613 drinks following the UK soft drinks industry levy by income and household composition:
614 controlled interrupted time series analysis, March 2014 to November 2019. *Journal of*
615 *Epidemiology and Community Health*. 2022;76(Suppl 1):A38-A39. doi:10.1136/jech-2022-
616 SSMabstracts.78

617