

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 **Supplementary information**
5

6 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},
7 Ziada Ayorech⁶, Fartein A Torvik^{6,12}, George Davey Smith^{2,3}, Deborah A Lawlor^{2,3}, Eivind Ystrom^{6,10}, Alexandra
8 Havadahl^{2,6,9,10,§}, David M Evans^{1,2,7,§}

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

23 *Corresponding author

24 §These authors contributed equally to this work

26 **Contents**

27 **Supplementary information S1: Sample selection flowchart**..... 3

28 **Supplementary information S2: Anthropometric data cleaning and growth curve fitting** 3

29 **Supplementary information S3: Covariate data** 5

30 **Supplementary information S4: Linear mixed model to account for non-independence between siblings** 6

31 **Supplementary information S5: z-test for the difference in maternal and paternal associations** 6

32 **Supplementary information S6: Summary statistics for transformed and untransformed exposure and outcome**

33 **variables**..... 7

34 **Supplementary information S7: Tests for non-linear associations between exposures and outcomes**..... 8

35 **Supplementary information S8: Multiple Children of Twins and Siblings (MCoTS) model** 30

36 **Supplementary information S9: MCoTS model with ACE partition of parental exposure** 32

37 **Supplementary information S10: MCoTS model with AE partition of parental exposure** 33

38 **Supplementary information S11: Liability threshold model for untransformed CEBQ outcomes**..... 34

39 **Supplementary information S12: Differences in participant characteristics between baseline and 8 year old sample**

40 **..... 35**

41 **Supplementary information S13: Linear associations between parental BMI and offspring predicted BMI** 36

42 **Supplementary information S14: Linear associations between offspring 8 year BMI and CEBQ outcomes** 36

43 **Supplementary information S15: Statistical interaction between maternal and paternal BMI** 37

44 **Supplementary information S16: MCoTS results for the association of parental BMI with offspring birth weight,**

45 **adjusted for potential confounders**..... 38

46 **Supplementary information S17: MCoTS results for the association of parental BMI with offspring birth weight**

47 **and BMI**..... 39

48 **Supplementary information S18: MCoTS results for the association of parental BMI with offspring predicted BMI**

49 **..... 40**

50 **Supplementary information S19: MCoTS results for the association of parental BMI with offspring weight, BMI**

51 **and ponderal index at birth** 41

52 **Supplementary information S20: MCoTS results for the association of parental BMI with offspring eating**


53 **behaviour (CEBQ) traits**..... 42

54 **References** 42

55

56

57 **Supplementary information S1: Sample selection flowchart**



| Outcome | n children with available data for all necessary variables | | |
|------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| | Linear regression analyses | MCoTS analyses (maternal BMI) | MCoTS analyses (paternal BMI) |
| Birth weight | 85866 (74.9%) | 45752 (39.9%) | 50999 (44.5%) |
| 6 month BMI | 69256 (60.4%) | 35913 (31.3%) | 39529 (34.5%) |
| 1 year BMI | 59292 (51.7%) | 31100 (27.1%) | 34210 (29.8%) |
| 2 year BMI | 30904 (27.0%) | 17001 (14.8%) | 18653 (16.3%) |
| 3 year BMI | 39101 (34.1%) | 21512 (18.8%) | 23319 (20.3%) |
| 5 year BMI | 32848 (28.7%) | 18194 (15.9%) | 19393 (16.9%) |
| 8 year BMI | 46620 (40.7%) | 24954 (21.8%) | 27051 (23.6%) |
| Predicted BMI (all ages) | 47524 (41.5%) | 25347 (22.1%) | 27530 (24.0%) |
| CEBQ: food responsiveness | 37265 (32.5%) | 20074 (17.5%) | 21573 (18.8%) |
| CEBQ: fussiness | 37284 (32.5%) | 20089 (17.5%) | 21587 (18.8%) |
| CEBQ: satiety responsiveness | 37371 (32.6%) | 20077 (17.5%) | 21576 (18.8%) |
| CEBQ: slow eating | 37254 (32.5%) | 20071 (17.5%) | 21570 (18.8%) |
| CEBQ: emotional undereating | 36583 (31.9%) | 19713 (17.2%) | 21175 (18.5%) |
| CEBQ: emotional overeating | 36735 (32.0%) | 19807 (17.3%) | 21269 (18.6%) |

58

59 **Supplementary information S2: Anthropometric data cleaning and growth curve fitting**

60 For all anthropometric variables, we set values that were biologically implausible to missing. Biological implausibility
 61 was determined by manual examination of the distribution of weight, height, BMI and ponderal index at each age
 62 and, where relevant, by comparison of values to those at earlier and later timepoints. Implausible weight and height
 63 values were excluded prior to calculation of BMI and ponderal index.

64 We analysed the children’s mother-reported BMI at age 6 months and 1, 2, 3, 5, and 8 years. Analyses involving
 65 mother-reported BMI measurements had different sample sizes for each age due to missing data (either for whole
 66 questionnaires or for individual questions within questionnaires). Furthermore, analyses involving mother-reported
 67 BMI measurements made inefficient use of the available data, because each mother-reported measurement was
 68 considered in isolation without accounting for the child’s other measurements, and sometimes children had multiple
 69 measurements available at similar ages, of which only one was used. In order to maximise statistical efficiency we
 70 therefore used all available offspring BMI measurements to fit a growth curve, from which we predicted offspring
 71 BMI at 1 year intervals between age 1 and 8 years. These fitted BMI values, which we refer to as “predicted BMI”,
 72 were used as outcomes as a supplement to the mother-reported BMI measures described above, enabling
 73 comparison of linear regression and MCoTS results from an identical (and larger) sample across different ages.

74 Children with at least one BMI measurement taken between 1 and 8 years of age were included in the sample used
 75 to fit the growth curve. BMI across childhood has a complex shape; there is a steep increase from birth to around 9
 76 months of age (which is referred to as the adiposity peak), then a decline until around 6 years of age (the adiposity
 77 rebound) before increasing through puberty. Due to this complex shape, measurements taken before age one were
 78 not used as several repeated measures in the first year of life are required to accurately model the adiposity peak

(1). In total, 323,372 measurements from 80,805 individual children (48.8% female) were used, and the mean number of measurements per child was 4.00. We did not natural log transform BMI measurements prior to fitting the growth curve because BMI was only slightly skewed from age five onwards. We fit a linear mixed model, separately in males and females with linear, quadratic and cubic terms for age in both the fixed and random effects to account for nonlinearity of BMI change over time, using the R package nlme (2, 3). The random effects allow the intercept and slope to vary around the population mean for each individual, and appropriately account for clustering of BMI measurements within individual children. Prior to model fitting, age was centered at four years (the mean age in the data). To ensure we had the best fitting model, we varied both the fixed and random effects and the correlation structure for the residuals then compared the models using the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC), Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) and likelihood ratio tests. We established that (i) linear, quadratic and cubic fixed and random effects were required to adequately describe the growth curve, and (ii) a first order continuous autoregressive (AR1) correlation structure for the residuals gave better fit than a compound symmetry structure or unstructured residuals. Therefore, the final model for the BMI of the i^{th} individual at the t^{th} time point (age) was:

$$BMI_{it} = \beta_0 + u_{0i} + \beta_1 age_{it} + u_{1i} age_{it} + \beta_2 age_{it}^2 + u_{2i} age_{it}^2 + \beta_3 age_{it}^3 + u_{3i} age_{it}^3 + e_{it}$$

where $\beta_0, \beta_1, \beta_2$ and β_3 are the fixed coefficients representing the average intercept and linear, quadratic and cubic age effects respectively. u_{0i}, u_{1i}, u_{2i} and u_{3i} are the random coefficients representing the deviation for individual i from the average intercept and linear, quadratic and cubic age effects respectively, with $u_i \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{G})$ where \mathbf{G} is the variance-covariance matrix of the random effects. e_{it} is a normally distributed residual capturing the deviation of the i^{th} individual at the t^{th} time point from the individual growth curve, $e_{it} \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{\Sigma})$ where $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ is the residual correlation matrix and a first order continuous autoregressive (AR1) correlation structure was assumed. The model accounts for missing data on the assumption that data are missing at random.

We used the growth curve to calculate predicted BMI (i.e. the fitted values from the linear mixed model) at one year age intervals between one and eight years, separately for male and female offspring, for children with at least three BMI measurements available. From age five onwards, predicted BMI variables were slightly skewed so were natural log transformed prior to subsequent analysis.

105 **Supplementary information S3: Covariate data**

106 MoBa mothers and fathers each completed a questionnaire at around 17 weeks of gestation (which are referred to
 107 here as “Questionnaire 1”, and “Father Questionnaire”). MoBa questionnaire data were linked to the Medical Birth
 108 Registry of Norway (MBRN) version 2017Q4 (4), which contained data from the birth notification forms (99.9% of
 109 pregnancies), or notification forms related to termination of pregnancy (0.1% of pregnancies). The questionnaire-
 110 and MBRN-derived variables used in the present study are detailed in the table below.

| Variable | Data source | Categories | Notes |
|------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Maternal parity | MBRN | “zero”, “one”, “two”, “three”, “four or more” | The highest value of the separate variables “parity registered by MBRN” and “parity reported by the mother” was used |
| Maternal smoking during pregnancy | Questionnaire 1 | “yes, “no” | |
| Paternal smoking during pregnancy | Paternal questionnaire, Questionnaire 1 | “yes, “no” | Maternal report was substituted for missing paternal report data for 23.9% of fathers |
| Maternal educational attainment | Questionnaire 1 | “Incomplete 9-year secondary school”, “9-year secondary school”, “1-2 year high school”, “vocational high school”, “3-year high school general studies/junior college”, regional technical college/4-year university degree”, “university/technical college, more than 4 years”, “other” | |
| Paternal educational attainment | Paternal questionnaire, Questionnaire 1 | “Incomplete 9-year secondary school”, “9-year secondary school”, “1-2 year high school”, “vocational high school”, “3-year high school general studies/junior college”, regional technical college/4-year university degree”, “university/technical college, more than 4 years”, “other” | Maternal report was substituted for missing paternal report data for 23.6% of fathers |
| Parental language | Questionnaire 1 | “Norwegian”, “other” | |
| Grandparental language | Questionnaire 1 | “Norwegian”, “other” | |
| Maternal income | Questionnaire 1 | “no income”, <150,000 NOK”, “150,000-199,999 NOK”, “200,000-299,999 NOK”, “300,000-399,999 NOK”, “400,000-499,999 NOK”, >500,000 NOK ” | |
| Paternal income | Paternal questionnaire, Questionnaire 1 | “no income”, <150,000 NOK”, “150,000-199,999 NOK”, “200,000-299,999 NOK”, “300,000-399,999 NOK”, “400,000-499,999 NOK”, >500,000 NOK ” | Maternal report was substituted for missing paternal report data for 64.3% of fathers |
| Maternal age at childbirth | MBRN | “≤17 years”, 18-19 years”, “20-24 years”, “20-25 years”, “25-29 years”, “30-34 years”, “35-39 years”, “40-44 years”, 45+ years” | |
| Paternal age at childbirth | MBRN | “≤19 years”, 20-24 years”, “25-29 years”, “30-34 years”, “35-39 years”, “40-44 years”, “45-49 years”, 50+ years” | |
| Offspring gestational age at birth | MBRN | NA | Based on ultrasound estimation. If ultrasound was not available, the gestational age was calculated from the last menstrual period |
| Liveborn status | MBRN | “liveborn”, “stillborn/termination” | |
| Offspring sex | MBRN | “female”, “male” | |

111 **NOK:** Norwegian Krone

112 **Supplementary information S4: Linear mixed model to account for non-independence between siblings**

113 In MoBa there are a large number of siblings in the offspring generation (if siblings were excluded, the sample would
114 be around 17% smaller). In order to maximise power we included siblings in the sample used for linear regression
115 analyses, and used a linear mixed model with a random intercept at the family level to appropriately account for
116 non-independence between siblings:

117
$$Y_{ij} = \beta_0 + u_{0j} + \beta_1 \times \text{maternal BMI}_{ij} + \beta_2 \times \text{paternal BMI}_{ij} + \sum_l \beta_l \times \text{covariate}_{lij} + e_{ij} \quad (1)$$

118 where Y_{ij} is the phenotype for the i^{th} individual in the j^{th} family, $\beta_0, \beta_1, \beta_2$ and β_l are the fixed coefficients for the
119 intercept, maternal BMI, paternal BMI and the l^{th} covariate respectively, u_{0j} is a random intercept for the
120 j^{th} family, $u_j \sim N(0, \sigma_u^2)$, and e_{ij} is a residual, $e_{ij} \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{\Sigma})$. $\mathbf{\Sigma} = \mathbf{I}\sigma_e^2$ is the residual variance-covariance matrix, where
121 \mathbf{I} is an identity matrix and σ_e^2 is the residual variance. Linear mixed models were fitted using the R package nlme (1,
122 2).

123 **Supplementary information S5: z-test for the difference in maternal and paternal associations**

124 For each offspring outcome we used a z-test to test whether associations with maternal and paternal BMI differed in
125 magnitude. We calculated the z statistic as $z = \delta / \sqrt{\text{Var}(\beta_1) + \text{Var}(\beta_2) - 2\text{Cov}(\beta_1, \beta_2)}$, where δ is the difference
126 between the coefficients for maternal BMI and paternal BMI (β_1 and β_2 respectively in equation 1), and
127 $\text{Cov}(\beta_1, \beta_2)$ is from the estimated covariance matrix for the fixed effects in equation 1.

128
129

Supplementary information S6: Summary statistics for transformed and untransformed exposure and outcome variables

| Variable | Mean | SD | Minimum | Maximum | Skew | Kurtosis |
|--|-------|------|---------|---------|-------|----------|
| Maternal BMI (z-score) | 0.00 | 1.00 | -2.68 | 7.84 | 1.42 | 3.02 |
| Log maternal BMI (z-score) ^a | 0.00 | 1.00 | -3.86 | 5.38 | 0.81 | 0.85 |
| Paternal BMI (z-score) | 0.00 | 1.00 | -3.82 | 10.14 | 1.02 | 3.10 |
| Log paternal BMI (z-score) ^a | 0.00 | 1.00 | -5.38 | 6.79 | 0.44 | 0.97 |
| Birth weight (sex standardised z-score) ^a | 0.01 | 0.98 | -5.30 | 4.61 | -0.74 | 2.34 |
| Birth BMI (sex standardised z-score) ^a | 0.01 | 0.98 | -5.96 | 5.24 | -0.50 | 1.96 |
| Birth PI (sex standardised z-score) ^a | 0.01 | 0.99 | -4.85 | 11.91 | 0.32 | 2.81 |
| 6 month weight (age/sex standardised z-score) ^a | 0.00 | 1.00 | -5.57 | 6.21 | 0.26 | 0.70 |
| 6 month BMI (age/sex standardised z-score) ^a | 0.00 | 1.00 | -4.28 | 6.25 | 0.45 | 0.58 |
| 1 year weight (age/sex standardised z-score) ^a | 0.00 | 1.00 | -5.56 | 5.84 | 0.35 | 0.52 |
| 1 year BMI (age/sex standardised z-score) ^a | 0.00 | 1.00 | -5.54 | 5.54 | 0.35 | 0.47 |
| 2 year weight (age/sex standardised z-score) ^a | 0.00 | 1.00 | -4.19 | 5.64 | 0.30 | 0.51 |
| 2 year BMI (age/sex standardised z-score) ^a | 0.00 | 1.00 | -4.29 | 5.52 | 0.31 | 0.70 |
| 3 year weight (age/sex standardised z-score) ^a | 0.00 | 1.00 | -3.79 | 8.59 | 0.48 | 0.99 |
| 3 year BMI (age/sex standardised z-score) ^a | 0.00 | 1.00 | -4.38 | 5.94 | 0.45 | 1.29 |
| 5 year weight (age/sex standardised z-score) | 0.00 | 1.00 | -3.78 | 6.77 | 0.74 | 1.76 |
| Log 5 year weight (age/sex standardised z-score) ^a | 0.00 | 1.00 | -5.42 | 4.93 | 0.17 | 0.74 |
| 5 year BMI (age/sex standardised z-score) | 0.00 | 1.00 | -4.08 | 6.52 | 0.69 | 2.12 |
| Log 5 year BMI (age/sex standardised z-score) ^a | 0.00 | 1.00 | -5.33 | 5.13 | 0.17 | 1.33 |
| 8 year weight (age/sex standardised z-score) | 0.00 | 1.00 | -3.24 | 8.82 | 1.02 | 2.21 |
| Log 8 year weight (age/sex standardised z-score) ^a | 0.00 | 1.00 | -4.97 | 5.78 | 0.38 | 0.57 |
| 8 year BMI (age/sex standardised z-score) | 0.00 | 1.00 | -3.53 | 7.31 | 0.97 | 2.29 |
| Log 8 year BMI (age/sex standardised z-score) ^a | 0.00 | 1.00 | -4.67 | 5.50 | 0.43 | 1.00 |
| 1 year predicted BMI (sex standardised z-score) ^a | -0.01 | 1.04 | -5.03 | 5.73 | 0.34 | 0.52 |
| 2 year predicted BMI (sex standardised z-score) ^a | 0.00 | 1.04 | -4.17 | 5.62 | 0.32 | 0.46 |
| 3 year predicted BMI (sex standardised z-score) ^a | 0.00 | 1.04 | -4.27 | 6.23 | 0.36 | 0.58 |
| 4 year predicted BMI (sex standardised z-score) ^a | 0.00 | 1.04 | -4.12 | 6.84 | 0.45 | 0.82 |
| 5 year predicted BMI (sex standardised z-score) | 0.00 | 1.05 | -4.26 | 7.01 | 0.62 | 1.35 |
| Log 5 year predicted BMI (sex standardised z-score) ^a | -0.01 | 1.05 | -5.23 | 5.80 | 0.31 | 0.73 |
| 6 year predicted BMI (sex standardised z-score) | 0.00 | 1.05 | -4.12 | 6.93 | 0.81 | 1.97 |
| Log 6 year predicted BMI (sex standardised z-score) ^a | -0.01 | 1.05 | -5.02 | 5.70 | 0.43 | 1.04 |
| 7 year predicted BMI (sex standardised z-score) | 0.00 | 1.06 | -3.99 | 7.63 | 0.94 | 2.38 |
| Log 7 year predicted BMI (sex standardised z-score) ^a | -0.01 | 1.06 | -4.92 | 6.10 | 0.51 | 1.21 |
| 8 year predicted BMI (sex standardised z-score) | 0.00 | 1.07 | -3.91 | 7.70 | 0.98 | 2.60 |
| Log 8 year predicted BMI (sex standardised z-score) ^a | -0.01 | 1.07 | -4.90 | 6.07 | 0.51 | 1.26 |
| CEBQ satiety responsiveness (age/sex standardised z-score) | 0.00 | 1.00 | -3.42 | 3.27 | 0.06 | -0.06 |
| CEBQ satiety responsiveness (inverse normalised z-score) ^{a, b} | 0.00 | 1.00 | -3.91 | 4.08 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| CEBQ slow eating (age/sex standardised z-score) | 0.00 | 1.00 | -2.02 | 4.11 | 0.57 | 0.14 |
| CEBQ slow eating (inverse normalised z-score) ^{a, b} | 0.00 | 1.00 | -4.08 | 4.08 | 0.01 | -0.02 |
| CEBQ food responsiveness (age/sex standardised z-score) | 0.00 | 1.00 | -1.23 | 5.84 | 1.88 | 4.01 |
| CEBQ food responsiveness (inverse normalised z-score) ^{a, b} | 0.00 | 0.99 | -3.81 | 4.07 | 0.02 | 0.01 |
| CEBQ fussiness (age/sex standardised z-score) | 0.00 | 1.00 | -2.17 | 2.80 | 0.16 | -0.44 |
| CEBQ fussiness (inverse normalised z-score) ^{a, b} | 0.00 | 1.00 | -3.91 | 4.07 | 0.01 | -0.04 |
| CEBQ emotional overeating (age/sex standardised z-score) | 0.00 | 1.00 | -1.73 | 7.70 | 1.36 | 1.63 |
| CEBQ emotional overeating (inverse normalised z-score) ^{a, b} | 0.00 | 0.99 | -3.74 | 4.06 | 0.01 | 0.02 |
| CEBQ emotional undereating (age/sex standardised z-score) | 0.00 | 1.00 | -1.97 | 3.25 | 0.36 | -0.44 |
| CEBQ emotional undereating (inverse normalised z-score) ^{a, b} | 0.00 | 1.00 | -3.91 | 4.06 | 0.02 | -0.04 |

130 **a:** variable was used in genetically informed structural equation modelling (MCoTS) analyses (variables used in linear regression
131 analyses were identical, with the exception that unlogged parental BMI was used as the exposure, and for models involving
132 weight/BMI/PI, age and sex were included as covariates rather than using age/sex standardized z-scores), **b:** CEBQ variables
133 were regressed on age and sex prior to inverse normalization of the residuals within sex strata


134

135 **Supplementary information S7: Tests for non-linear associations between exposures and outcomes**

136 Our MCoTS structural equation models partitioned the covariance, which is a measure of linear association, between
137 the natural logarithm of the exposure, and the outcome (which was logged when necessary). To assess whether a
138 linear association adequately described the relationship between each logged exposure and outcome we (i) explored
139 whether there was evidence for a quadratic association, (ii) fitted a LOWESS smoother, and (iii) regressed the
140 outcome on categories of log parental BMI equivalent to the World Health Organization obesity classification (<18.5
141 kg/m², 18.5–24.9 kg/m², 25–29.9 kg/m², 30–34.9 kg/m², 35–39.9 kg/m², ≥40 kg/m²). Results are shown in the plots
142 below, with vertical grey lines indicating the log BMI categories used for the categorical fit. Variables were treated as
143 per the MCoTS analyses, i.e. exposures were logged and outcomes were logged when necessary. **INT:** inverse normal
144 transformation.


145 Although there was some evidence for a non-linear association between log maternal BMI and offspring outcomes at
146 younger ages (birth to three years), such that the association plateaued at higher maternal BMI, these departures
147 from linearity were relatively mild, as demonstrated by the LOWESS and categorical fits. For log offspring BMI from
148 age five onwards the associations with log maternal BMI were approximately linear. For log paternal BMI there was
149 also evidence for a slight plateauing of the association with birth weight at higher paternal BMI, but associations
150 with offspring BMI at ages beyond birth were approximately linear.

151




152

6mo BMI vs. log maternal bmi, both sexes




153

1yr BMI vs. log maternal bmi, both sexes




154

3yr BMI vs. log maternal bmi, both sexes



155


2yr BMI vs. log maternal bmi, both sexes



156


157

Log 5yr BMI vs. log maternal bmi, both sexes




158

Log 8yr BMI vs. log maternal bmi, both sexes




159

1yr predicted BMI vs. log maternal bmi, both sexes




160

2yr predicted BMI vs. log maternal bmi, both sexes




161

3yr predicted BMI vs. log maternal bmi, both sexes




162

4yr predicted BMI vs. log maternal bmi, both sexes




163

Log 5yr predicted BMI vs. log maternal bmi, both sexes




164

Log 6yr predicted BMI vs. log maternal bmi, both sexes




165

Log 7yr predicted BMI vs. log maternal bmi, both sexes




166

Log 8yr predicted BMI vs. log maternal bmi, both sexes




167

CEBQ satiety responsiveness (INT) vs. log maternal bmi, both sexes




168

CEBQ slow eating (INT) vs. log maternal bmi, both sexes




169

CEBQ food responsiveness (INT) vs. log maternal bmi, both sexes




170

CEBQ food focus (INT) vs. log maternal bmi, both sexes




171

CEBQ emotional overeating (INT) vs. log maternal bmi, both sexes




172

CEBQ emotional undereating (INT) vs. log maternal bmi, both sexes




173

Birth weight vs. log paternal bmi, both sexes




174

6mo BMI vs. log paternal bmi, both sexes




175

1yr BMI vs. log paternal bmi, both sexes




176

2yr BMI vs. log paternal bmi, both sexes




177

3yr BMI vs. log paternal bmi, both sexes




178

Log 5yr BMI vs. log paternal bmi, both sexes




179

Log 8yr BMI vs. log paternal bmi, both sexes




180

1yr predicted BMI vs. log paternal bmi, both sexes




181

2yr predicted BMI vs. log paternal bmi, both sexes




182

3yr predicted BMI vs. log paternal bmi, both sexes




183

4yr predicted BMI vs. log paternal bmi, both sexes




184

Log 5yr predicted BMI vs. log paternal bmi, both sexes




185

Log 6yr predicted BMI vs. log paternal bmi, both sexes




186

Log 7yr predicted BMI vs. log paternal bmi, both sexes




187

Log 8yr predicted BMI vs. log paternal bmi, both sexes




188

CEBQ satiety responsiveness (INT) vs. log paternal bmi, both sexes




189

CEBQ slow eating (INT) vs. log paternal bmi, both sexes




190

CEBQ food responsiveness (INT) vs. log paternal bmi, both sexes




191

CEBQ food focus (INT) vs. log paternal bmi, both sexes




192

CEBQ emotional overeating (INT) vs. log paternal bmi, both sexes



193

CEBQ emotional undereating (INT) vs. log paternal bmi, both sexes



194

195


196 **Supplementary information S8: Multiple Children of Twins and Siblings (MCoTS) model**

197 To quantify the extent to which exposure-outcome associations were due to genetic confounding, we fitted a
198 genetically informed structural equation model (SEM) in a subset of the MoBa sample. This SEM is an extension of
199 the classic twin design (CTD) which has been widely used to estimate heritability (i.e. the proportion of phenotypic
200 variance that is due to genetic effects). Because monozygotic (MZ) twins are genetically identical but dizygotic (DZ)
201 twins are on average only 50% genetically similar, the expected phenotypic similarity of a heritable trait will be
202 greater for MZ versus DZ twins. Building on the CTD, a Children of Twins design exploits the fact that such patterns of
203 genetic and phenotypic similarity are mirrored in relatives of twins (5). This enables estimation of the extent to
204 which phenotypic similarity between parents and offspring is due to genetic similarity (i.e. genetic confounding). For
205 example, an MZ twin is 50% genetically similar to the child of their co-twin, but a DZ twin will be on average only
206 25% genetically similar to the child of their co-twin. If these relatedness coefficients are reflected by patterns of
207 phenotypic similarity this provides evidence for genetic confounding. We fit an extended children of twins SEM (the
208 Multiple Children of Twins and Siblings [MCoTS] model, described in the path diagrams below and elsewhere (5)).

209

210


211



212


213 Sibling 1 and sibling 2 are full siblings, half siblings, dizygotic twins or monozygotic twins, in the parent generation.
 214 Outcomes are included for up to two children of each parental sibling, and parental BMI is allowed to vary between
 215 pregnancies via the correlation r_E . Genetic correlations are set according to quantitative genetic theory (6). Additive
 216 genetic correlations between sibling pairs (Sibling r_A) are set at 1.0, 0.5 or 0.25 for monozygotic twins, dizygotic
 217 twins/full siblings and half siblings respectively. Additive genetic correlations between cousin pairs (Cousin r_A) are
 218 set at 0.25, 0.125 or 0.0625 for cousins related via monozygotic twins, dizygotic twins/full siblings and half siblings
 219 respectively. Dominance genetic correlations between sibling pairs (Sibling r_D) are set at 1.0 or 0.25 for monozygotic
 220 twins and dizygotic twins/full siblings respectively and are zero for half siblings. Latent (unmeasured) variables are
 221 shown in circles, measured variables are shown in rectangles, single headed arrows denote causal paths, and double
 222 headed arrows denote covariances. A1: additive genetic effects on parental BMI, D1: dominance genetic effects on
 223 parental BMI, E1: nonshared environmental effects on parental BMI, A1': genetic effects common to parental BMI
 224 and offspring outcome, C1: extended family effects, A2: additive genetic effects specific to the offspring outcome,
 225 C2: shared environmental effects on offspring outcome, E2: nonshared environmental effect on offspring outcome,
 226 p: "phenotypic" effect, including any causal effect of parental BMI on the offspring outcome, as well as residual (non-
 227 genetic) confounding, r_E : within-parent correlation between E1 for parenting child 1 and child 2. The path between
 228 A1 and A1' is fixed to 0.5, because parents share 50% of their genome identical by descent with their children. For
 229 simplicity, variance paths have been omitted, but variance was 1 for all latent variables. Consequently, for A1'
 230 residual variance after accounting for the path between A1' and A1 is 0.75. MCoTS SEM were fit in R version 4.0.3
 231 (OpenMx package version 2.18.1) (7, 8). A full description of the MCoTS model is given in McAdams *et al.* (5).

232



234

235 Sibling 1 and sibling 2 are full siblings, half siblings, dizygotic twins or monozygotic twins, in the parent generation.
 236 Outcomes are included for up to two children of each parental sibling, and parental BMI is allowed to vary between
 237 pregnancies via the correlation rE . Genetic correlations are set according to quantitative genetic theory (6). Additive
 238 genetic correlations between sibling pairs (Sibling rA) are set at 1.0, 0.5 or 0.25 for monozygotic twins, dizygotic
 239 twins/full siblings and half siblings respectively. Additive genetic correlations between cousin pairs (Cousin rA) are
 240 set at 0.25, 0.125 or 0.0625 for cousins related via monozygotic twins, dizygotic twins/full siblings and half siblings
 241 respectively. Latent (unmeasured) variables are shown in circles, measured variables are shown in rectangles, single
 242 headed arrows denote causal paths, and double headed arrows denote covariances. A1: additive genetic effects on
 243 parental BMI, C1: shared environmental effects on parental BMI, E1: nonshared environmental effects on parental
 244 BMI, A1': genetic effects common to parental BMI and offspring outcome, C1: extended family effects, A2: additive
 245 genetic effects specific to the offspring outcome, C2: shared environmental effects on offspring outcome, E2:
 246 nonshared environmental effect on offspring outcome, p: "phenotypic" effect, including any causal effect of
 247 parental BMI on the offspring outcome, as well as residual (non-genetic) confounding, rE : within-parent correlation
 248 between E1 for parenting child 1 and child 2. The path between A1 and A1' is fixed to 0.5, because parents share
 249 50% of their genome identical by descent with their children. For simplicity, variance paths have been omitted, but
 250 variance was 1 for all latent variables. Consequently, for A1' residual variance after accounting for the path between
 251 A1' and A1 is 0.75. MCoTS SEM were fit in R version 4.0.3 (OpenMx package version 2.18.1) (7, 8). A full description
 252 of the MCoTS model is given in McAdams *et al.* (5).



254

255 Sibling 1 and sibling 2 are full siblings, half siblings, dizygotic twins or monozygotic twins, in the parent generation.
 256 Outcomes are included for up to two children of each parental sibling, and parental BMI is allowed to vary between
 257 pregnancies via the correlation rE . Genetic correlations are set according to quantitative genetic theory (6). Additive
 258 genetic correlations between sibling pairs (Sibling rA) are set at 1.0, 0.5 or 0.25 for monozygotic twins, dizygotic
 259 twins/full siblings and half siblings respectively. Additive genetic correlations between cousin pairs (Cousin rA) are
 260 set at 0.25, 0.125 or 0.0625 for cousins related via monozygotic twins, dizygotic twins/full siblings and half siblings
 261 respectively. Latent (unmeasured) variables are shown in circles, measured variables are shown in rectangles, single
 262 headed arrows denote causal paths, and double headed arrows denote covariances. A1: additive genetic effects on
 263 parental BMI, E1: nonshared environmental effects on parental BMI, A1': genetic effects common to parental BMI
 264 and offspring outcome, C1: extended family effects, A2: additive genetic effects specific to the offspring outcome,
 265 C2: shared environmental effects on offspring outcome, E2: nonshared environmental effect son offspring outcome,
 266 p : "phenotypic" effect, including any causal effect of parental BMI on the offspring outcome, as well as residual (non-
 267 genetic) confounding, rE : within-parent correlation between E1 for parenting child 1 and child 2. The path between
 268 A1 and A1' is fixed to 0.5, because parents share 50% of their genome identical by descent with their children. For
 269 simplicity, variance paths have been omitted, but variance was 1 for all latent variables. Consequently, for A1'
 270 residual variance after accounting for the path between A1' and A1 is 0.75. MCoTS SEM were fit in R version 4.0.3
 271 (OpenMx package version 2.18.1) (7, 8). A full description of the MCoTS model is given in McAdams *et al.* (5).

272

273 **Supplementary information S11: Liability threshold model for untransformed CEBQ outcomes**

274 Because several CEBQ outcomes were severely skewed, for the primary MCoTS analysis we regressed all CEBQ
275 outcome variables on age and sex then applied a rank-based inverse normal transformation to the residuals. As a
276 sensitivity analysis we instead applied a liability threshold MCoTS model to CEBQ outcomes that were recoded into
277 three equally sized categories. Liability threshold models assume that a continuous, normally distributed liability
278 captures all latent genetic and environmental determinants of the trait. The observed categorical outcome (Y) is
279 related to the continuous liability (Z) by thresholds τ_1 and τ_2 , such that

280
$$Y = \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if } Z \geq \tau_2 \\ 1 & \text{if } \tau_2 < Z < \tau_1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

281 Liability threshold MCoTS SEM were fit in R version 4.0.3, similarly to the MCoTS models for continuous outcomes
282 (OpenMx package version 2.18.1) (7, 8). The means vectors for offspring outcomes were fixed to zero and the
283 outcome phenotypic variance was constrained to one, with τ_1 and τ_2 being freely estimated.

284

Supplementary information S12: Differences in participant characteristics between baseline and 8 year old sample

| Variable | Baseline sample | | 8 year sample | | <i>P</i> _{difference} |
|--|------------------------------|------|---------------|------|--------------------------------|
| | Mean | % | Mean | % | |
| Parental characteristics | | | | | |
| Maternal BMI (kg/m ²) | 24.1 | | 23.9 | | 8.1e-16 |
| Paternal BMI (kg/m ²) | 25.9 | | 25.8 | | 4.4e-08 |
| Maternal WHO BMI category (kg/m ²) | <18.5 | | 3.0 | 2.7 | 4.5e-31 |
| | 18.5–24.9 | | 65.6 | 66.9 | |
| | 25–29.9 | | 21.8 | 21.7 | |
| | ≥30 | | 9.6 | 8.6 | |
| Paternal WHO BMI category (kg/m ²) | <18.5 | | 0.2 | 0.2 | 5.5e-11 |
| | 18.5–24.9 | | 44.0 | 44.7 | |
| | 25–29.9 | | 45.6 | 45.5 | |
| | ≥30 | | 10.2 | 9.6 | |
| Parity (number of previous births) | 0 | | 45.1 | 45.9 | 6.5e-09 |
| | 1 | | 35.9 | 35.6 | |
| | 2 | | 14.9 | 14.6 | |
| | 3 | | 3.2 | 3.0 | |
| | 4+ | | 0.9 | 0.8 | |
| Maternal age at birth of child (years) | ≤19 | | 0.7 | 0.5 | 4.0e-147 |
| | 20-24 | | 9.4 | 7.4 | |
| | 25-29 | | 32.9 | 32.4 | |
| | 30-34 | | 39.4 | 40.9 | |
| | 35-39 | | 15.7 | 16.7 | |
| | ≥40 | | 1.9 | 2.1 | |
| Maternal smoking during pregnancy | No | | 92.4 | 94.4 | 3.6e-130 |
| | Yes | | 7.6 | 5.6 | |
| Paternal smoking during pregnancy | No | | 76.4 | 78.4 | 8.5e-54 |
| | Yes | | 23.6 | 21.6 | |
| Maternal educational attainment | Incomplete upper 2° school | | 0.2 | 0.2 | <2.2e-308 |
| | Upper 2° school | | 1.8 | 1.0 | |
| | High school/junior college | | 27.9 | 23.5 | |
| | University/college, 4 years | | 42.3 | 45.0 | |
| | University/college, >4 years | | 26.3 | 28.9 | |
| | Other | | 1.6 | 1.4 | |
| Maternal income | No income | | 2.3 | 1.7 | 1.5e-198 |
| | <150,000 NOK | | 15.1 | 13.0 | |
| | 150,000–199,999 NOK | | 11.1 | 9.9 | |
| | 200,000–299,999 NOK | | 34.3 | 34.6 | |
| | 300,000–399,999 NOK | | 25.6 | 28.1 | |
| | 400,000–499,999 NOK | | 7.1 | 7.7 | |
| | >500,000 NOK | | 4.5 | 4.9 | |
| Parental language | Norwegian | | 89.1 | 90.0 | 1.3e-17 |
| | Other | | 10.9 | 10.0 | |
| Offspring characteristics | | | | | |
| Gestational age (weeks) | | 39.8 | 39.8 | | 4.7e-17 |
| Birth weight (g) | | 3563 | 3572 | | 3.9e-07 |

286

287

288


289

290

Statistics are for the “Baseline” sample used for linear regression analyses of birth weight ($n = 85,866$), and an “8 year” sample similar to that used for linear regression analyses of 8 year BMI ($n = 46,539$). *P*_{difference}: for continuous variables: *P*-value from a linear regression model testing the null hypothesis that variables have equal mean in both samples; for categorical variables: *P*-value from a chi squared test of the null hypothesis that variables are equally distributed in both samples, **NOK**: Norwegian Krone

291

Supplementary information S13: Linear associations between parental BMI and offspring predicted BMI



292

293

294

Supplementary information S14: Linear associations between offspring 8 year BMI and CEBQ outcomes

| CEBQ outcome | Beta ^a | Lower 95% CI | Upper 95% CI | <i>P</i> |
|------------------------------|-------------------|--------------|--------------|-----------|
| CEBQ: food responsiveness | 0.37 | 0.36 | 0.38 | <2.2e-308 |
| CEBQ: fussiness | -0.09 | -0.10 | -0.08 | 8.2e-72 |
| CEBQ: satiety responsiveness | -0.26 | -0.27 | -0.25 | <2.2e-308 |
| CEBQ: slow eating | -0.14 | -0.15 | -0.13 | 6.7e-164 |
| CEBQ: emotional overeating | 0.16 | 0.15 | 0.17 | 3.1e-180 |
| CEBQ: emotional undereating | 0.00 | -0.01 | 0.01 | 0.44 |

295

296

297

298

299

a: regression coefficient from regression of offspring 8 year CEBQ outcome (regressed on offspring age and sex prior to inverse normalization of the residuals) on offspring 8 year BMI (z-score), adjusting for offspring age and sex, maternal parity, maternal and paternal covariates (age, smoking during pregnancy, educational attainment and income), parental language and grandparental language


Supplementary information S15: Statistical interaction between maternal and paternal BMI

| Offspring outcome | Maternal BMI (z score) ^a | | | | Paternal BMI (z score) ^b | | | | Maternal-paternal BMI interaction ^c | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|----------|-------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|----------|--|--------------|--------------|---------|
| | Beta | Lower 95% CI | Upper 95% CI | P | Beta | Lower 95% CI | Upper 95% CI | P | Beta | Lower 95% CI | Upper 95% CI | P |
| Birth weight (z score) | 0.124 | 0.116 | 0.132 | 8.4e-220 | 0.018 | 0.010 | 0.025 | 5.5e-06 | -0.015 | -0.023 | -0.007 | 4.8e-07 |
| 6 month BMI (z score) | 0.090 | 0.081 | 0.099 | 3.1e-89 | 0.061 | 0.052 | 0.069 | 4.9e-43 | -0.011 | -0.020 | -0.003 | 1.1e-03 |
| 1 year BMI (z score) | 0.104 | 0.094 | 0.113 | 8e-101 | 0.075 | 0.065 | 0.084 | 1.4e-55 | -0.011 | -0.020 | -0.001 | 3.4e-03 |
| 2 year BMI (z score) | 0.087 | 0.074 | 0.100 | 2.5e-38 | 0.072 | 0.059 | 0.085 | 6.7e-27 | -0.007 | -0.020 | 0.006 | 0.17 |
| 3 year BMI (z score) | 0.083 | 0.071 | 0.095 | 2.1e-42 | 0.082 | 0.070 | 0.094 | 1.2e-43 | -0.005 | -0.017 | 0.007 | 0.31 |
| Log 5 year BMI (z score) | 0.142 | 0.129 | 0.155 | 5.6e-101 | 0.134 | 0.121 | 0.147 | 8.2e-98 | -0.004 | -0.017 | 0.009 | 0.47 |
| Log 8 year BMI (z score) | 0.202 | 0.191 | 0.212 | 1e-302 | 0.179 | 0.168 | 0.189 | 1.3e-252 | 0.002 | -0.008 | 0.013 | 0.60 |
| Predicted 1 year BMI (z score) | 0.107 | 0.097 | 0.118 | 6.6e-86 | 0.094 | 0.084 | 0.105 | 2.1e-70 | -0.012 | -0.023 | -0.002 | 3.9e-03 |
| Predicted 2 year BMI (z score) | 0.105 | 0.094 | 0.116 | 1e-80 | 0.099 | 0.088 | 0.109 | 5.4e-75 | -0.011 | -0.022 | 0.000 | 0.01 |
| Predicted 3 year BMI (z score) | 0.116 | 0.106 | 0.127 | 2.8e-98 | 0.113 | 0.102 | 0.123 | 1.8e-96 | -0.008 | -0.019 | 0.003 | 0.07 |
| Predicted 4 year BMI (z score) | 0.139 | 0.128 | 0.149 | 1.7e-139 | 0.134 | 0.123 | 0.145 | 8.5e-137 | -0.005 | -0.015 | 0.006 | 0.29 |
| Log predicted 5 year BMI (z score) | 0.159 | 0.148 | 0.170 | 2.2e-185 | 0.151 | 0.141 | 0.162 | 1.5e-176 | -0.005 | -0.015 | 0.006 | 0.29 |
| Log predicted 6 year BMI (z score) | 0.175 | 0.164 | 0.185 | 1e-226 | 0.164 | 0.154 | 0.175 | 5.8e-210 | -0.003 | -0.014 | 0.007 | 0.42 |
| Log predicted 7 year BMI (z score) | 0.187 | 0.176 | 0.197 | 2.7e-261 | 0.173 | 0.163 | 0.184 | 1.2e-236 | -0.004 | -0.014 | 0.007 | 0.39 |
| Log predicted 8 year BMI (z score) | 0.192 | 0.181 | 0.202 | 2.5e-275 | 0.177 | 0.166 | 0.187 | 1.9e-245 | -0.005 | -0.016 | 0.005 | 0.21 |
| CEBQ: food responsiveness (z score ^d) | 0.089 | 0.076 | 0.101 | 2.2e-44 | 0.063 | 0.050 | 0.075 | 6.2e-25 | 0.003 | -0.010 | 0.015 | 0.58 |
| CEBQ: fussiness (z score ^d) | -0.011 | -0.023 | 0.002 | 0.10 | -0.007 | -0.020 | 0.005 | 0.23 | 0.009 | -0.003 | 0.022 | 0.06 |
| CEBQ: satiety responsiveness (z score ^d) | 0.013 | 0.001 | 0.026 | 0.04 | -0.030 | -0.043 | -0.018 | 9e-07 | -0.002 | -0.014 | 0.011 | 0.70 |
| CEBQ: slow eating (z score ^d) | 0.013 | 0.000 | 0.025 | 0.04 | -0.022 | -0.034 | -0.009 | 4.1e-04 | 0.003 | -0.009 | 0.016 | 0.53 |
| CEBQ: emotional undereating (z score ^d) | -0.029 | -0.041 | -0.016 | 9.9e-06 | -0.012 | -0.025 | 0.001 | 0.05 | 0.008 | -0.005 | 0.020 | 0.14 |
| CEBQ: emotional overeating (z score ^d) | 0.039 | 0.027 | 0.052 | 1e-09 | 0.019 | 0.007 | 0.032 | 1.7e-03 | -0.001 | -0.013 | 0.012 | 0.90 |

301 **a**: regression coefficient from regression of offspring outcome on maternal BMI (z-score), adjusted for covariates as per the main linear regression analyses (Model 3), plus a maternal BMI ×
302 paternal BMI interaction term, **b**: regression coefficient from regression of offspring outcome on paternal BMI (z-score), adjusted for covariates as per the main linear regression analyses
303 (Model 3), plus a maternal BMI × paternal BMI interaction term, **c**: regression coefficient for the maternal BMI (z-score) × paternal BMI (z-score) interaction term, **d**: CEBQ outcomes were
304 regressed on offspring age and sex prior to inverse normalization of the residuals

306
307

Supplementary information S16: MCoTS results for the association of parental BMI with offspring birth weight, adjusted for potential confounders




308
309
310
311

Model 1: not adjusted for potential confounders (as per main MCoTS analyses), **Model 2:** exposure and outcome adjusted (via linear regression) for the other parent's BMI, **Model 3:** exposure and outcome adjusted (via linear regression) for the other parent's BMI and the index parent's age and income


312
313

Supplementary information S17: MCoTS results for the association of parental BMI with offspring birth weight and BMI



314


Supplementary information S18: MCoTS results for the association of parental BMI with offspring predicted BMI



317

318

Supplementary information S19: MCoTS results for the association of parental BMI with offspring weight, BMI and ponderal index at birth




319

320

Supplementary information S20: MCoTS results for the association of parental BMI with offspring eating

321

behaviour (CEBQ) traits

322

Supplementary table S1:

323

Full linear regression results for associations between exposures and outcomes (see separate excel file sup_tables.xlsx).

324

325

326

Supplementary table S2:

327

Full MCoTS results including model fit statistics and estimated variance components for parental and offspring phenotypes (see separate excel file sup_tables.xlsx).

328

329

330

References

331

1. Sovio U, Mook-Kanamori DO, Warrington NM, Lawrence R, Briollais L, Palmer CNA, et al. Association between Common Variation at the FTO Locus and Changes in Body Mass Index from Infancy to Late Childhood: The Complex Nature of Genetic Association through Growth and Development. *PLOS Genetics*. 2011;7(2):e1001307.

332

333

334

2. Pinheiro J, Bates D, R Core Team. nlme: Linear and Nonlinear Mixed Effects Models. R package version 31-149. 2022.

335

336

3. Pinheiro J, Bates D. Mixed-effects models in S and S-PLUS: Springer science & business media; 2006.

337

4. Irgens LM. The Medical Birth Registry of Norway. *Epidemiological research and surveillance throughout 30*

338

years. *Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand*. 2000;79(6):435-9.

- 339 5. McAdams TA, Hannigan LJ, Eilertsen EM, Gjerde LC, Ystrom E, Rijdsdijk FV. Revisiting the children-of-twins
340 design: improving existing models for the exploration of intergenerational associations. *Behav Genet.*
341 2018;48(5):397-412.
- 342 6. Lynch M, Walsh B. *Genetics and analysis of quantitative traits*. Sunderland, MA: Sinauer; 1998.
- 343 7. R Core Team. *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for
344 Statistical Computing; 2020.
- 345 8. Neale MC, Hunter MD, Pritikin JN, Zahery M, Brick TR, Kirkpatrick RM, et al. OpenMx 2.0: Extended Structural
346 Equation and Statistical Modeling. *Psychometrika*. 2016;81(2):535-49.

347

348