

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

4  
5 I Gusti Ngurah Edi Putra PhD<sup>1</sup>, Prof Martin O’Flaherty<sup>1</sup>, Karl M. F. Emmert-Fees PhD<sup>2</sup>, Maria Salve Vasquez  
6 MSc<sup>3</sup>, Rebecca Evans PhD<sup>4</sup>, Prof Annette Peters<sup>5,6,7</sup>, Chris Kypridemos PhD<sup>1</sup>, Nicolas Berger PhD<sup>3</sup>, Prof Eric  
7 Robinson<sup>4</sup>, Zoé Colombet PhD<sup>1</sup>

- 8  
9 1. Department of Public Health, Policy, and Systems, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, United Kingdom  
10 2. Professorship of Public Health and Prevention, TUM School of Medicine and Health, Technical University  
11 of Munich, Munich, Germany  
12 3. Department of Epidemiology and Public Health, Sciensano (Scientific Institute of Public Health), Brussels,  
13 Belgium  
14 4. Department of Psychology, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, United Kingdom  
15 5. Institute of Epidemiology, Helmholtz Zentrum München, Research Center for Environmental Health  
16 (GmbH), Neuherberg, Germany  
17 6. Chair of Epidemiology, Institute for Medical Information Processing, Biometry and Epidemiology (IBE),  
18 Faculty of Medicine, LMU Munich, Munich, Germany  
19 7. German Centre for Diabetes Research (DZD), partner site: Munich-Neuherberg, Germany  
20  
21

22 **Corresponding author:**

23 I Gusti Ngurah Edi Putra  
24 Department of Public Health, Policy, and Systems, Whelan Building, The University of Liverpool, Brownlow  
25 Hill, Liverpool L69 3GB, United Kingdom  
26 [i.gusti.ngurah.edi.putra@liverpool.ac.uk](mailto:i.gusti.ngurah.edi.putra@liverpool.ac.uk)

27	<b>Table of contents</b>	
28	Modelling approach .....	3
29	Mandatory menu calorie labelling.....	3
30	Scenarios and coverages .....	3
31	Effect of mandatory menu calorie labelling on energy intake .....	4
32	Consumer response to mandatory menu calorie labelling .....	4
33	Reformulation effect due to menu calorie labelling .....	4
34	Sugar sweetened beverage (SSB) tax.....	5
35	Scenarios and coverages .....	5
36	Effect of SSB tax on SSB intake .....	5
37	Consumer response to SSB tax.....	5
38	Reformulation effect due to SSB tax .....	6
39	Creating synthetic population .....	6
40	Population projection.....	6
41	Cardiovascular disease (CVD) mortality projection.....	6
42	Body mass index (BMI).....	6
43	Out-of-home energy intake.....	7
44	Non-diet SSB intake .....	7
45	Estimating the effect of change in energy and SSB intake on BMI and CVD mortality .....	7
46	Estimating the effect of change in energy intake on BMI .....	7
47	Estimating the effect of change in BMI on CVD mortality .....	8
48	Estimating the effect of change in SSB intake on BMI and CVD mortality.....	8
49	Estimating model uncertainty .....	9
50	Appendix Table 1. Data sources used in the model .....	10
51	Appendix Table 2. Assumptions implemented in the model.....	12
52	Appendix Table 3. Estimates of baseline population, out-of-home energy, SSB intake, and obesity status (in	
53	2022) .....	13
54	Appendix Table 4. Ratios of DPP rates (per 100,000 population) between low- and high-education groups for	
55	mandatory menu calorie labelling and the SSB tax, based on combined consumer response and reformulation	
56	scenarios.....	14
57	Appendix Table 5. Sensitivity analyses for mandatory menu calorie labelling using minimum (11%) and	
58	maximum compensation (42%) .....	15
59	Appendix Table 6. Sensitivity analyses for mandatory menu calorie labelling using percentages of turnover of	
60	large out-of-home businesses.....	16
61	Appendix Table 7. Sensitivity analyses for SSB tax using different effects reported in other meta-analyses .....	17
62	Appendix Table 8. Sensitivity analyses for the indirect effect of SSB tax on CVD mortality through BMI only	
63	References.....	19
64		
65		

## 66 **Modelling approach**

67 We extended a comparative risk assessment model previously developed to estimate the impacts of mandatory  
68 menu calorie labelling in England.<sup>1</sup> The model,<sup>1</sup> originally adapted from the IMPACT Food Policy Model<sup>2</sup> was  
69 modified to incorporate dynamic, stochastic, discrete-time, and open-cohort microsimulation for this present  
70 study. We used this updated model to estimate the likely population-level impacts of mandatory menu calorie  
71 labelling and SSB tax in Belgium and Germany over a 20-year horizon from 2022 to 2041. We selected 2022 as  
72 the initial year for the simulation modelling following the year the mandatory menu calorie labelling policy  
73 was officially implemented for the first time in England and also Europe.<sup>1,3</sup> The simulation modelling was  
74 conducted using R Studio (see [https://github.com/zoecolombet/MenuEnergyLabelling\\_code\\_Europe](https://github.com/zoecolombet/MenuEnergyLabelling_code_Europe) for the R  
75 script).

## 77 **Mandatory menu calorie labelling**

### 78 *Scenarios and coverages*

79 We compared two main scenarios: 1) “partial implementation” which refers to mandatory menu calorie labelling  
80 applied to large out-of-home food businesses only ( $\geq 250$  employees) following the current implementation of  
81 this policy in England,<sup>1,3</sup> and 2) “full implementation” which extends this policy to every out-of-home food  
82 business. Both scenarios were compared to a counterfactual “no intervention” (baseline) scenario as this policy  
83 has not yet been implemented in Belgium and Germany.

84 We used the most updated data from Eurostat (European Statistical Office, that provide official and harmonised  
85 data for the European Union members)<sup>4</sup> to determine the proportions of large out-of-home food businesses ( $\geq 250$   
86 employees) in Belgium and Germany. As the number of outlets for different sizes of enterprises (micro, small,  
87 medium, large) was not available, we used the average number of outlets (or sites) by sizes of businesses in the  
88 UK (1 outlet for micro businesses, 1.08 outlets for small businesses, 2.43 outlets for medium businesses, and  
89 63.16 outlets for large businesses).<sup>5,6</sup> We combined information from Eurostat<sup>4</sup> and the number of outlets by  
90 business size in the UK<sup>5,6</sup> to calculate the proportion of out-of-home large businesses in Belgium and Germany.  
91 In Belgium, out-of-home large business outlets accounted for 3% of the total outlets and this type of business  
92 contributed to 10% of the turnover in 2019.<sup>4</sup> In Germany, large out-of-home businesses represented 9% of the  
93 number of food outlets and 21% of the turnover in this sector in 2020.<sup>4</sup>

Size of business	Belgium (2019)		Germany (2020)	
	Number of outlets	Turnover	Number of outlets	Turnover
Micro ( $<10$ employees)	48,174 (90%)	10,747 (57%)	171,103 (70%)	18,843 (30%)
Small (10-49 employees)	3,040 (6%)	4,547 (24%)	43,156 (18%)	19,738 (32%)
Medium (50-249 employees)	382 (1%)	1,528 (8%)	7,681 (3%)	10,651 (17%)
Large ( $\geq 250$ employees)	1,516 (3%)	1,944 (10%)	21,095 (9%)	12,811 (21%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>53,112 (100%)</b>	<b>18,766 (100%)</b>	<b>243,035 (100%)</b>	<b>62,044 (100%)</b>

94  
95 The “partial implementation” scenario estimated the impact of mandatory menu calorie labelling in large out-of-  
96 home food businesses (3% and 9% for Belgium and Germany, respectively). The “full implementation” scenario  
97 estimated the likely impact of this policy if it was applied to every out-of-home food business (100%). We  
98 assumed that the proportions of different businesses are equivalent to the proportions of out-of-home calories  
99 consumed from those businesses (as the coverage of the policy). For example, large businesses account for 3% in  
100 Belgium and 9% in Germany, and therefore, we assumed that 3% and 9% of the out-of-home calories consumed  
101 are from large businesses in Belgium and Germany, respectively. We opted for the number of businesses over  
102 turnover as it better reflects the exposure to menu calorie labelling. However, we conducted a sensitivity analysis  
103 for the partial implementation scenario using turnover (10% in Belgium and 21% in Germany).

104

105 ***Effect of mandatory menu calorie labelling on energy intake***

106 We modelled the likely impact of mandatory menu calorie labelling policy on energy intake through two  
107 pathways: 1) consumer response (i.e., customers opt for healthier or lower-calorie options) and 2) retailer  
108 response (i.e., food reformulation of out-of-home retailers) (e.g., as in <sup>1</sup>). For both scenarios (“partial” and “full”  
109 implementations), we estimated the impacts through these two separate and combined pathways. We assumed  
110 the consumer and reformulation effects were stable over the simulation horizon (e.g., as in <sup>1</sup>).

111 Consumer response to mandatory menu calorie labelling

112 To model the impact of menu calorie labelling on energy ordered or consumed, we followed two previous  
113 simulation modelling studies in the US<sup>7,8</sup> using an estimate from a meta-analysis of 19 intervention studies and  
114 randomized control trials (RCTs) conducted by Shangquan et al.<sup>9</sup> Based on this meta-analysis, exposure to  
115 menu calorie labelling led to a reduction in energy intake by a 7.3% (95% CI: [-10.1%, -4.4%]). The effect is  
116 similar to findings from a Cochrane meta-analysis of three RCTs by Crockett et al.<sup>10</sup> that estimated a reduction  
117 of 47 kcal (95% CI: [-78; -15]) per meal on average. This reduction is equivalent to 7.8% (95% CI: [-13.1%, -  
118 2.5%]) assuming an average meal of 600 kcal or 7% relative to the average baseline calories purchased in the  
119 included RCTs (675 kcal).<sup>10</sup> We used a relative proportional change in energy intake (7.3%) as we did not have  
120 information about the frequency of eating out-of-home in the countries studied. Thus, we assumed that  
121 implementing menu calorie labelling in out-of-home sectors would reduce out-of-home energy intake by 7.3%  
122 (95% CI: [-10.1%, -4.4%]). This assumption is evenly applied across sociodemographic characteristics, such as  
123 age, sex, and socioeconomic position, as current evidence suggests that there are no differences in the policy’s  
124 effects based on these characteristics.<sup>11,12</sup>

125 Consumers' reduction in energy intake in out-of-home settings in response to menu calorie labelling may be  
126 compensated for by consuming additional meals or products throughout the day.<sup>13,14</sup> Recent systematic reviews  
127 indicated levels of compensation of 42%<sup>13</sup> and 11%<sup>14</sup> later in the day after consuming less food (volume) and  
128 selecting lower energy-density meals, respectively and we used the average of both compensation levels (26.5%)  
129 in our main simulation modelling. Nevertheless, sensitivity analyses with 11 and 42% compensation levels were  
130 also conducted.

131 We assumed that everyone who purchased meals prepared out-of-home would be impacted by the policy. We  
132 calculated baseline out-of-home energy intake (in kcal) by multiplying energy intake and the proportion energy  
133 consumed from out of home (see section “Out-of-home energy intake”). The effect of calorie labeling,  
134 accounting for compensation behaviors, was applied to projected out-of-home energy intake to estimate annual  
135 changes in energy intake based on the policy's coverage (partial or full implementation), resulting in the post-  
136 implementation (or -intervention) energy intake.

137 Reformulation effect due to menu calorie labelling

138 We also followed the US simulation modelling studies on an average reduction of 5% in the calorie content of  
139 menu items due to mandatory menu calorie disclosure (reformulation).<sup>7,8</sup> This is based on a reformulation  
140 observed in the US chain restaurants following the implementation of menu calorie labelling policy.<sup>8,15-17</sup> The  
141 5% reformulation aligns with the findings from a meta-analysis by Zlatevska et al.,<sup>18</sup> suggesting an average  
142 reduction of 15 kcal (95% CI: [-23; -8]) in the calorie content of menu items or approximately 4% relative to  
143 average baseline calories of 400. We thus assumed that implementing the menu calorie labelling policy would  
144 lead to a 5% decrease in the energy content of the products offered in out-of-home businesses; corresponding to  
145 a 5% decrease in energy intake from out-of-home. We multiplied this reformulation-associated calorie reduction  
146 by the policy coverage according to the scenarios in each country.

147

## 148 **Sugar sweetened beverage (SSB) tax**

### 149 *Scenarios and coverages*

150 Different scenarios based on different effects of SSB taxes on SSB consumption from a meta-analysis was  
151 implemented (see “Consumer response to menu calorie labelling” below) in Belgium and Germany. These  
152 scenarios were compared to counterfactual (baseline) scenarios reflecting current situation on SSB taxes in each  
153 country. In Germany, “no intervention” served as a counterfactual scenario as the SSB tax has not yet been  
154 deployed. However, Belgium has implemented a volumetric SSB tax for all non-alcoholic drinks with added  
155 sugar of €0.03/L before 2016, €0.07/L from 2016, and €0.12/L from 2018.<sup>19</sup> As baseline SSB intakes came from  
156 a 2014 survey (see section “Non-diet SSB intake”), we use the SSB tax in place in 2014 as counterfactual  
157 scenario for Belgium (SSB tax of €0.03/L before 2016).

158 No data was available to determine the percentage increase in SSB prices due to the SSB tax in Belgium. Based  
159 on a recent study on SSB taxes in European countries,<sup>19</sup> a SSB tax of €0.07/L in France (introduced in 2012) was  
160 equivalent to 7%-10% increase in price. Taking the average percentage of the increase in SSB prices in France  
161 (8.5%) and assuming similar SSB prices in Belgium and France, a tax of €0.03/L in Belgium was equal to a  
162 3.6% ( $€0.03 \times 8.5\% / €0.07$ ) increase in price and a tax of €0.12/L was equivalent to a 14.6% ( $€0.12 \times 8.5\% /$   
163  $€0.07$ ) increase in price (assuming a stable inflation rate). Therefore, the new tax of €0.12/L (since 2018) equates  
164 to an 11% increase (from 3.6% to 14.6%) in SSB prices. Using the SSB tax of “€0.03/L” as the counterfactual  
165 scenario in Belgium, we modelled the effects of ad valorem taxes of 10%, 20%, and 30%. Even though SSB  
166 taxes in Belgium are in the form of a volumetric tax, we assumed the effect of increased price (10%) is similar to  
167 ad valorem tax at the same rate (10% SSB tax, excluding pass-through) due to lack of product-level ingredient,  
168 volume, and price data (see <sup>20,21</sup>). Thus, based on the counterfactual scenario of 0.03/L, our scenarios of  
169 increasing the SSB taxes by 10%, 20%, and 30% in Belgium would be equivalent to increased prices to 13.6%  
170 (an increase of 10% + 3.6% from counterfactual; the equivalent of a €0.11/L tax (calculated as  $13.6\% \times €0.03 /$   
171  $3.6\%$ ; **which is close to the current tax at €0.12/L**), 23.6% (or €0.20/L ( $23.6\% \times €0.03 / 3.6\%$ )), and 33.6%  
172 (€0.28/L ( $33.6\% \times €0.03 / 3.6\%$ )), respectively. In both countries, we assumed a 100% coverage of the SSB tax  
173 as it applies to all SSBs across all types of businesses and retail stores.

### 174 *Effect of SSB tax on SSB intake*

175 As for menu calorie labelling policy, we modelled the likely impact of the SSB tax policy on intake through two  
176 pathways: 1) consumer response (i.e., discouraging SSB consumption) and 2) reformulation (i.e., reducing the  
177 sugar content of SSBs). Even though the assumed effects above were derived from different SSB tax designs (ad  
178 valorem tax for consumer response, tiered tax for reformulation), we aimed to estimate the likely impacts  
179 through different pathways and hypothetical combined pathways. We assumed that the effects of the SSB tax on  
180 both consumer response and reformulation remained consistent throughout the simulation period.

### 181 Consumer response to SSB tax

182 We developed our modelling scenarios for the impact of SSB taxes based on an effect reported in a previous  
183 meta-analysis by Andreyeva et al.<sup>22</sup> We calculated changes in SSB intakes based on a demand price elasticity  
184 (i.e., % change in sales or consumption due to % change in price) of -1.59 (95% CI: [-2.11, -1.08]) and a pass-  
185 through rate (i.e., the extent of increase in price passed on to customers) of 82% (95% CI: [66%, 98%]) reported  
186 in a meta-analysis of 33-41 studies. Using this information, we modelled SSB taxes of 10%, 20%, and 30%.

187 We also conducted sensitivity analyses using two meta-analyses by Afhsin et al.<sup>23</sup> and Teng et al.<sup>24</sup> to model the  
188 effect of a 10% SSB tax. Afhsin et al.<sup>23</sup> reported that a 10% increase in SSB price was associated with a 6.7%  
189 reduction in SSB intake (95% CI: [-10.4, -3.1%]) calculated from a meta-analysis of three non-randomised  
190 interventions and two prospective cohort studies. In a meta-analysis of 17 pre-post intervention comparisons (the  
191 majority used interrupted time series analysis) by Teng et al.,<sup>24</sup> a 10.0% increase in SSB price was associated  
192 with a decline in intake and purchases by 10% (95% CI: [-14.7; -5.0]).

193 We assumed no substitution to non-SSBs or untaxed beverages (e.g., juice, milk) due to an increase in SSB  
194 prices as shown in a meta-analysis by Andreyeva et al.<sup>22</sup> The effect was modelled consistently across  
195 sociodemographic characteristics due to limited data on the heterogeneous effects of SSB tax in different sub-  
196 populations.<sup>22</sup> Everyone consuming non-diet SSBs was assumed to be impacted by the policy. We calculated

197 baseline non-diet SSB consumption by multiplying overall SSB intake (in mL or grams; 1 mL = 1 grams) with  
198 the proportion of non-diet SSB intake in Germany. Because almost all the participants from the survey on which  
199 the SSB intake was based were consumers of sugary drinks (99-100%) in Belgium, we assumed that all SSB  
200 intake was from non-diet SSBs (see section “Non-diet SSB intake”). The effects of different scenarios of SSB  
201 taxes were applied to the projected non-diet SSB intake to calculate annual changes in intake and post-  
202 intervention SSB intake.

### 203 Reformulation effect due to SSB tax

204 The soft drinks industry levy (SDIL) in the UK has been observed to reduce the sugar content of all SSB  
205 products sold by 28.5%<sup>25</sup> or the volume of sugars sold from all soft drinks by 30%.<sup>26</sup> Therefore, we assumed a  
206 30% lower sugar content due to (a tiered) SSB tax independently of change in consumption (e.g., as in<sup>20</sup>). We  
207 assumed that one SSB serving of 227.3045 mL (8 oz) contains 20 grams of sugar (e.g. as in<sup>20,27</sup>). Thus, the  
208 reformulation would reduce sugar content by 30% (or 6 out of 20 grams), and therefore, a post-intervention SSB  
209 serving will have 14 grams of sugar per 227.3045 mL.

210

## 211 **Creating synthetic population**

212 We created a synthetic population of Belgium and a synthetic population of Germany to simulate and estimate  
213 the population-level impact of mandatory menu calorie labelling and SSB tax scenarios. Data that we used in our  
214 simulation model are outlined in **Appendix Table 1**. Key assumptions implemented in the model are listed in  
215 **Appendix Table 2**.

### 216 ***Population projection***

217 The population projections stratified by sex and age for Belgium were obtained from Statbel, the Belgian  
218 Statistical Office.<sup>28</sup> As Statbel does not have the population projections by education level (low, middle, high),  
219 we assumed that the relative difference in population estimates across education levels by age and sex for the  
220 simulation period from 2022 to 2041 was equal to the relative differences from the census in 2021.<sup>29</sup> We defined  
221 educational level as follows: low (from no education to lower secondary education), middle (upper secondary  
222 and post-secondary non-tertiary education), and high (from short-cycle tertiary education to doctoral degree level  
223 education). In Belgium, we excluded individuals with “unknown” and “not applicable” information on  
224 educational status. Therefore, our estimated impacts of the policy may be underestimated.

225 The German population projections by sex and age were derived from the German Federal Statistical Office.<sup>30</sup>

226 The population projections do not have stratification by educational level and we used population size and  
227 composition data from 2013-2019 to estimate relative differences by educational level.<sup>31</sup> We applied these  
228 differences to the population projections for the simulation period from 2022 to 2041. We defined educational  
229 level as described above for Belgium.

### 230 ***Cardiovascular disease (CVD) mortality projection***

231 Using the “demography” package,<sup>32</sup> we projected mortality trends to 2041, by age, sex, and education levels,  
232 based on the number of annual CVD deaths observed from 2012 to 2020 by Statbel for Belgium (*data provided*  
233 *upon request to Statbel*). For Germany, we projected mortality trends by age and sex using data from the German  
234 Information System of the Federal Health Monitoring (*Gesundheitsberichterstattung des Bundes*) based on  
235 annual CVD deaths from 1991 to 2019.<sup>20,33</sup> CVD death counts include coronary heart disease (CHD) (ICD-10:  
236 I20 to I25) and overall strokes (ICD-10: I60 to I69, I64, I69.4, and I69.8). Our mortality projection based on  
237 previous data would account for potential continuing declines in CVD mortality. This approach helps to avoid  
238 overestimating the benefits of any CVD intervention.<sup>1</sup> As the mortality projection for Germany was not stratified  
239 by education level, our simulation model incorporated information on sex- and education-specific relative risk  
240 (RR) from a previous study<sup>34</sup> to simulate CVD mortality by education level.

### 241 ***Body mass index (BMI)***

242 Our estimates for the exposures (BMI, energy and SSB intakes) used data from nationally representative  
243 surveys: National Food Consumption Survey (FCS) 2014-2015 for Belgium,<sup>35,36</sup> and Cooperative Health  
244 Research in the Region Augsburg (*Kooperative Gesundheitsforschung in der Region Augsburg*) (KORA) S4, F4,  
245 FF4 (1999, 2007, 2014) and German National Nutrition Survey (*Nationale Verzehrstudie*) (NVS) II (2006) for

246 Germany.<sup>37,38</sup> As we only used single-year survey data for Belgium (2014), we did not model any trends of the  
247 exposures.

248 For both country, we used generalised additive models for location, shape and scale (GAMLSS) (“gamlss”  
249 package<sup>39</sup>), flexible models that can handle complex relationships between different types of variables,<sup>40,41</sup> to  
250 estimate the distribution of BMI. GAMLSS created all parameters of an assumed distribution of BMI conditional  
251 on some function of some variables or predictors, such as year (for Germany only), age, sex and education level  
252 (for both Belgium and Germany). All the parameters of the assumed BMI distribution were applied to the  
253 population projections throughout the simulation period (2022 – 2041) to estimate BMI.

#### 254 *Out-of-home energy intake*

255 Due to the absence of out-of-home energy intake data in both countries, and as we do not have information on  
256 the frequency of out-of-home consumption in either Belgium or Germany, we calculated out-of-home energy  
257 intake by multiplying overall daily energy intake with the proportions of daily out-of-home energy intake  
258 reported by previous studies based on national survey data in 2004 in Belgium<sup>42</sup> and data collected in 2000 in  
259 two study centres (cities) in Germany.<sup>43</sup>

260 We used GAMLSS to create the parameters of the distribution of daily energy intake conditional on year (for  
261 Germany only), age, sex and education level (for both Belgium and Germany). We then applied the parameters  
262 to the population projections to estimate overall daily energy intake. To estimate out-of-home energy intake, we  
263 then multiplying overall daily energy intake from GAMLSS with the proportions of daily out-of-home energy  
264 intake specific by age group and sex.

265 These estimations of the out-of-home energy intake have some limitations. The study used in Belgium to assess  
266 the proportions of daily out-of-home energy intake also considered eating in a friend’s house as eating out-of-  
267 home,<sup>42</sup> and the study used for Germany may not be nationally representative as the data collected in two study  
268 centres only.<sup>43</sup> In addition, we did not estimate out-of-home energy intake by educational level as this  
269 information was not available in either study (only by age and sex). Finally, we assumed that the proportions of  
270 energy intake from eating out have remained stable since early 2000’s. We may underestimate the effect of the  
271 policy (mandatory menu calorie labelling) as eating out might be more common due to changes in food  
272 environments.<sup>44,45</sup>

#### 273 *Non-diet SSB intake*

274 We estimated overall SSB intake throughout the simulation period based on GAMLSS parameters of an assumed  
275 distribution of SSB intake conditional on year (for Germany only), age, sex and education level (for both  
276 Belgium and Germany). To calculate non-diet SSB intake, we multiplied overall SSB intake with the proportions  
277 of non-diet SSB intake by age and sex in Germany created using GAMLSS based on KORA FF4 (2014) study.<sup>20</sup>  
278 In Belgium, as almost all the participants from FCS 2014-2015 were consumers of non-alcoholic sugary drinks  
279 (99-100%), we assumed that all SSB intake was from non-diet SSBs.

### 281 **Estimating the effect of change in energy and SSB intake on BMI and CVD mortality**

#### 282 *Estimating the effect of change in energy intake on BMI*

283 Following a previous approach,<sup>1</sup> we calculated the reduction in energy intake (in kcal) due to the implementation  
284 of mandatory menu calorie labelling by subtracting the level of energy intake post-intervention from baseline  
285 intake for each year. We assumed that menu calorie labelling would immediately affect energy intake, and this  
286 effect would remain consistent throughout the simulation horizon (2022 – 2041).

287 Changes in energy intake would have a subsequent immediate impact on BMI. To transform a change in energy  
288 intake into an equivalent change in body weight, we used a formula developed by Christiansen & Garby<sup>46</sup> based  
289 on energy conservation principles:

$$290 \quad \Delta BW = k * \Delta \left( \frac{\text{Energy intake}}{\text{Physical activity level}} \right)$$

291 Change in body weight ( $\Delta BW$ ) is in kilogram (kg) and energy intake is in MegaJoule (MJ). Physical activity level  
292 (PAL) is computed as the total energy expenditure divided by the resting energy expenditure. A constant value ( $k$ )

293 is calculated based on both fundamental principles of energy conservation and directly measured data (constant  
294 values of 17.7 and 20.7 are assigned for men and women, respectively).<sup>46</sup>

295 We assumed that the policy has no impact on physical activity levels, and therefore, PAL was kept constant at 1.5  
296 <sup>46</sup> to represent limited physical activity.<sup>47</sup> We calculated the equivalent change in BMI based on the estimated  
297 change in body weight assuming constant individuals' height.

### 298 ***Estimating the effect of change in BMI on CVD mortality***

299 The increased risk of CVD mortality for one standard deviation (SD) increase in BMI (4.56 kg/m<sup>2</sup>) for those with  
300 a BMI  $\geq$  20 kg/m<sup>2</sup> was informed by the Emerging Risk Factors Collaboration (ERFC).<sup>48</sup> A risk of 1 was assigned  
301 for individuals with a BMI  $<$  20 kg/m<sup>2</sup>, while the risks for other individuals with a BMI  $\geq$  20 kg/m<sup>2</sup> were  
302 determined based on sex- and smoking-adjusted age-specific estimates for CVD mortality from the ERFC <sup>48</sup>,  
303 taking into account the new change in BMI.

304 We calculated the population-attributable risk fraction (PARF) which represents the proportion of CVD mortality  
305 attributable to a specific risk factor (BMI  $\geq$  20 kg/m<sup>2</sup>). In microsimulation modelling where individuals have  
306 different risks due to their risk factor (BMI) and characteristics (e.g., age), PARF can be calculated as follows (see  
307 <sup>49</sup> for detailed information including mortality calculation).

$$308 \quad PARF = \frac{n}{\sum_{i=1}^n RR_{BMI,i}} \quad [1]$$

309  $n$  refers to the total number of (synthetic) individuals in the simulation modelling and  $RR_{BMI}$  represents the unique  
310 individual relative risk of CVD mortality due to BMI as the risk factor.

311 We then calculated the proportion of CVD mortality not attributable to the risk factor using the following formula.

$$312 \quad M_{Theoretical\ minimum} = M_{Observed} \times (1 - PARF) \quad [2]$$

313  $M_{Theoretical\ minimum}$  is the estimated CVD mortality if the risk factor is optimal, derived from multiplying the observed  
314 CVD mortality ( $M_{Observed}$ ) and the proportion not attributable to the risk factor (1- PARF). Assuming the PARF is  
315 consistent after the initial (or baseline) year,  $M_{Theoretical\ minimum}$  is calculated by age, sex, and SES for all years of the  
316 simulation period.

317 Finally, we can calculate the individualised annual probability of CVD mortality due to their risk factor (BMI) and  
318 other varying characteristics (e.g., age, sex, SES) by assuming that  $M_{Theoretical\ minimum}$  is the annual baseline  
319 probability of CVD mortality not because the modelled risk factors (other risk factors than BMI).

$$320 \quad P(CVD|age, sex, SES, BMI) = M_{Theoretical\ minimum} \times (RR_{BMI,i}) \quad [3]$$

321 We used the formulas above for CHD and stroke separately and then calculated CVD mortality as the sum of CHD  
322 and stroke. We calculated the number of CVD deaths prevented or postponed (DPPs) by subtracting the total  
323 number of CVD deaths in a policy scenario from the total number of CVD deaths in the counterfactual scenario.  
324 For each different scenario, we present corresponding aggregated CVD DPPs across the simulation period. It is  
325 important to note that, we assumed no lag time between energy intake and BMI as the change in energy intake has  
326 an immediate effect ( $<$  one year) on BMI. However, we used a 5-year lag time (e.g., as in <sup>50</sup>) for the impact of the  
327 change in BMI on CVD mortality risk. Therefore, the policy has no impact on CVD mortality in the first 5 years  
328 of implementation (2022-2026), but it impacts the population from 2027 up to the simulation period to 2041.

### 329 ***Estimating the effect of change in SSB intake on BMI and CVD mortality***

330 We assumed that a change in SSB intake will have simultaneous impact on CVD mortality through BMI  
331 (indirect effect) and without BMI (direct effect). Therefore, our main findings consider both indirect and direct  
332 effects of SSB intake on CVD mortality.

333 To calculate the indirect effect of change in SSB intake on CVD mortality, through BMI, we used BMI-specific  
334 estimates from a meta-analysis of three prospective cohorts by Micha et al.<sup>51</sup> Assuming linearity, a decrease in  
335 one serving of SSB ( $\sim$  227.3045 mL) will lead to a decrease in BMI of 0.10kg/m<sup>2</sup> (0.05–0.15) in individuals with  
336 BMI  $<$  25 kg/m<sup>2</sup> and of 0.23 kg/m<sup>2</sup> (0.14–0.32) in individuals with BMI  $\geq$  25 kg/m<sup>2</sup>. We assumed the immediate  
337 effect of change in SSB intake on change in BMI (no lag time). The change in BMI due to SSB intake was then



338 transformed into the equivalent change or increase in CVD mortality risk using the estimates from the ERFC<sup>48</sup>  
339 as described above.

340 To calculate the direct effect, we also used an estimate from Micha et al.<sup>51</sup> that calculated age-specific BMI-  
341 adjusted relative risk of one SSB serving per day on CVD mortality from four cohort studies. Similar to  
342 mandatory menu calorie labelling, we assumed a lag time of 5 years between exposure (SSB intake) and the  
343 outcome (CVD mortality risk) (e.g., as in<sup>50</sup>).

344 Using the estimated individual post-policy CVD mortality risk due to the decreased SSB intake through both  
345 pathways, we estimated PARF, CVD mortality, and CVD DPPs for each SSB tax scenario using the approach  
346 described above for the mandatory menu calorie labelling policy (see<sup>49</sup>). We also present CVD DPPs-related  
347 SSB intake estimated through BMI pathway alone (indirect effect) as part of the sensitivity analyses.

348

### 349 **Estimating model uncertainty**

350 The Monte Carlo approach<sup>52</sup> with 200 iterations was used to estimate the uncertainty from different model  
351 parameters incorporated in the simulation modelling. There are different potential sources of uncertainty,  
352 including the sampling errors of baseline data, the uncertainty of GAMLSS parameters to predict BMI, energy,  
353 and SSB intakes by age, sex, and SES (see “Creating synthetic population”), mortality forecasts, the relative risk  
354 of BMI on the outcomes (CHD, stroke), and the uncertainty of the assumed policy (menu calorie labelling, SSB)  
355 effects.

**Appendix Table 1. Data sources used in the model**

Parameters	Outcome	Details	Differences by sociodemographic groups	Source	Projection distribution of the mean	Uncertainty
<b>Population data</b>						
Population projection	Population	Belgium: Population projection 1992-2071 Germany: Population projection 2019-2060	Stratified by year, age, sex	Belgium: Statbel <sup>28</sup> Germany: The Federal Statistical Office <sup>30</sup>	-	Population projection
Population size and composition	Population	Belgium: Census 2021 Germany: Official population data 2013-2019	Stratified by age, sex, education level	Belgium: Statbel <sup>29</sup> Germany: The Federal Statistical Office <sup>31</sup>	-	-
Mortality	Deaths from CVD (CHD, stroke)	Belgium: CVD deaths 2012-2020 Germany: CVD deaths 1991-2019	Stratified by year, age, sex, education (in Belgium only), cause of death	Belgium: Statbel ( <i>data provided upon request</i> ) Germany: German Information System of the Federal Health Monitoring <sup>33</sup> Information on sex- and education-specific RR from a previous study <sup>34</sup> was incorporated to simulate CVD mortality by education level.	Log normal	Mean ± SD
<b>Exposures</b>						
BMI	BMI	Belgium: FCS 2014-2015 Germany: KORA S4, F4, FF4 (1999, 2007, 2014) and NVS II (2006) for Germany	Stratified by year (in Germany only), age, sex, education	Belgium: FCS 2014-2015 <sup>35,36</sup> Germany: KORA S4, F4, FF4 (1999, 2007, 2014) and NVS II (2006) for Germany <sup>37,38</sup>	GAMLSS	GAMLSS parameters
Energy intake	Energy intake	Belgium: FCS 2014-2015 Germany: KORA S4, F4, FF4 (1999, 2007, 2014) and NVS II (2006) for Germany	Stratified by year (in Germany only), age, sex, education	Belgium: FCS 2014-2015 <sup>35,36</sup> Germany: KORA S4, F4, FF4 (1999, 2007, 2014) and NVS II (2006) for Germany <sup>37,38</sup>	GAMLSS	GAMLSS parameters
SSB intake	SSB intake	Belgium: FCS 2014-2015 Germany: KORA S4, F4, FF4 (1999, 2007, 2014) and NVS II (2006) for Germany	Stratified by year (in Germany only), age, sex, education	Belgium: FCS 2014-2015 <sup>35,36</sup> Germany: KORA S4, F4, FF4 (1999, 2007, 2014) and NVS II (2006) for Germany <sup>37,38</sup>	GAMLSS	GAMLSS parameters
Proportions of out-of-home energy intake	Energy out-of-home	Belgium: Based on national survey data in 2004 Germany: Based on data collected in two study centres in 2000	Stratified by age and sex	Belgium: Vandevijvere et al. <sup>42</sup> Germany: Orfanos et al. <sup>43</sup>	-	-

Proportions of non-diet SSB	Non-diet SSB	Belgium: Assuming all SSB intake from non-diet SSB based on FCS 2014-2015 Germany: KORA FF4 (2014)	(in Germany only) Stratified by age and sex	Belgium: FCS 2014-2015 <sup>35,36</sup> Germany: KORA FF4 (2014) <sup>38</sup>	GAMLSS	GAMLSS parameters
<b>Effect estimates</b>						
Effect of menu calorie labelling	Change in energy intake	An estimate from a meta-analysis of 19 intervention studies and randomised control trials	No differential effect	Shangguan et al. <sup>9</sup>	-	Mean ± SD
Effect of menu calorie labelling on product reformulation	Change in energy intake	An estimate reported in the US following the implementation of menu calorie labelling policy	No differential effect	Bleich et al. <sup>15-17</sup> , Du et al. <sup>8</sup>	-	Mean
Effect of SSB tax	Change in SSB intake	An estimate of demand price elasticity (i.e., % change in sales or consumption due to % change in price) and a pass-through rate (i.e., the extent of increase in price passed on to customers) from a meta-analysis of 33-41 studies	No differential effect	Andreyeva et al. <sup>22</sup>	-	Mean ± SD
Effect of SSB tax on product reformulation	Change in sugar intake	Findings from studies on the impact of the soft drinks industry levy (SDIL) in the UK on a reduction in the sugar content of all SSB products sold.	No differential effect	von Philipsborn et al., <sup>25</sup> Bandy et al., <sup>26</sup> Emmert-Fees et al. <sup>20</sup>	-	
Effect of change in energy intake on BMI	Change in BMI	A formula based on energy conservation principles	Stratified by sex	Christiansen & Garby <sup>46</sup>	-	-
Effect of change in SSB or sugar intake on BMI	Change in BMI	An estimate from a meta-analysis of three prospective cohorts	Stratified by age and baseline BMI	Micha et al. <sup>51</sup>	Log normal	Mean ± SD
Effect of change in BMI on CVD mortality risk	Change in CVD mortality	A collaborative analysis of 58 prospective studies	Stratified by age and baseline BMI	Emerging Risk Factors Collaboration <sup>48</sup>	Log normal	Mean ± SD
Effect of change in SSB or sugar intake on CVD mortality risk	Change in CVD mortality	A BMI-adjusted estimate from a meta-analysis of four prospective cohorts	Stratified by age	Micha et al. <sup>51</sup>	Log normal	Mean ± SD

357 BMI = body mass index; CHD = coronary heart disease; CVD = cardiovascular disease; FCS = Food Consumption Survey; GAMLSS = generalised additive models for  
358 location, shape and scale; KORA = Cooperative Health Research in the Region Augsburg (*Kooperative Gesundheitsforschung in der Region Augsburg*); NVS = German  
359 National Nutrition Survey (*Nationale Verzehrstudie*); Statbel = Belgian Statistical Office; SSB = sugar-sweetened beverage; SD = standard deviation; RR = relative risk

360 **Appendix Table 2. Assumptions implemented in the model**

<b>Components</b>	<b>Key assumptions</b>
Population data	We do not consider social mobility (i.e., individuals remain at the same educational level) and therefore, the population composition by educational level is stable throughout the simulation period.
Exposures	The surveys on which exposures were based were truly representative of the population.
	The distribution of exposures by sex, age, and education for which we did not include time trends (e.g., in Belgium) remains the same over the simulation period.
	Energy and SSB purchased are equivalent to intake (or consumption)
	The proportion of out-of-home large businesses corresponds to the proportion of out-of-home calories consumed from these businesses (for mandatory menu calorie labelling).
Effect estimates	There are no differential effects of the policies across sociodemographic characteristics (age, sex, education level).
	The effect of the policies on intake or consumption remains stable over time.
	We assume multiplicative risk effects.

361

362

363 **Appendix Table 3. Estimates of baseline population, out-of-home energy, SSB intake,**  
 364 **and obesity status (in 2022)**

Characteristics	Belgium	Germany
Population size estimate (aged 30-89) ( <i>total</i> )	7,010,188	58,050,700
Low education	2,463,001 (35.13%)	6,928,617 (11.94%)
Middle education	2,306,847 (32.91%)	32,393,488 (55.80%)
High education	2,240,340 (32.96%)	18,728,595 (32.26%)
Out-of-home energy intake estimate (kcal) ( <i>mean; median</i> )	408.60; 347.78	475.61; 420.62
Low education	348.64; 268.04	458.54; 395.27
Middle education	440.97; 377.77	454.23; 396.92
High education	441.20; 386.40	518.81; 468.20
Non-diet SSB intake estimate (ml) ( <i>mean; median</i> )	109.03; 0	79.04; 15.15
Low education	116.94; 0	117.00; 18.50
Middle education	138.12; 0	73.60; 14.60
High education	70.36; 0	74.41; 15.10
Obesity status estimate ( $\geq 30$ kg/m <sup>2</sup> ) (%)	27.38%	18.44%
Low education	33.77%	24.90%
Middle education	30.96%	19.75%
High education	17.78%	13.79%

365

366

367 **Appendix Table 4. Ratios of DPP rates (per 100,000 population) between low- and high-**  
 368 **education groups for mandatory menu calorie labelling and the SSB tax, based on**  
 369 **combined consumer response and reformulation scenarios**

Scenarios	Belgium		Germany	
	Ratio	Probability of Ratio > 1	Ratio	Probability of Ratio > 1
<b>Mandatory menu calorie labelling</b>				
Partial implementation	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.33
Full implementation	0.86	0.49	0.76	0.29
<b>SSB taxes</b>				
10%	2.59	0.90	1.91	0.87
20%	2.59	0.91	1.91	0.89
30%	3.31	0.91	2.00	0.91

370 A ratio (in median) of > 1 indicates greater rates of DPPs in low than high education groups.

371 **Appendix Table 5. Sensitivity analyses for mandatory menu calorie labelling using minimum (11%) and maximum compensation (42%)**

Scenarios	Belgium		Germany	
	Changes in obesity prevalence	CVD DPPs	Changes in obesity prevalence	CVD DPPs
<b>Minimum compensation (11%)</b>				
<i>Consumer response</i>				
Partial implementation	-0.07 (-0.11, -0.04)	30 <sup>a</sup> (0, 200)	-0.27 (-0.39, -0.17)	1500 (0, 5000)
Full implementation	-2.33 (-3.26, -1.29)	1000 (200, 2600)	-2.79 (-3.81, -1.95)	18000 (5500, 38000)
<i>Combined</i>				
Partial implementation	-0.13 (-0.18, -0.09)	59 <sup>a</sup> (0, 400)	-0.49 (-0.61, -0.38)	2800 (500, 7000)
Full implementation	-3.96 (-4.76, -2.99)	1600 (400, 3800)	-4.67 (-5.56, -3.94)	32000 (12000, 64000)
<b>Maximum compensation (42%)</b>				
<i>Consumer response</i>				
Partial implementation	-0.05 (-0.08, -0.02)	24 <sup>a</sup> (0, 200)	-0.18 (-0.26, -0.11)	1000 (0, 4000)
Full implementation	-1.57 (-2.11, -0.88)	600 (0, 1800)	-1.89 (-2.59, -1.28)	12000 (3000, 26000)
<i>Combined</i>				
Partial implementation	-0.11 (-0.14, -0.08)	43 <sup>a</sup> (0, 400)	-0.39 (-0.48, -0.32)	2500 (500, 6000)
Full implementation	-3.23 (-3.85, -2.58)	1400 (200, 3600)	-3.88 (-4.54, -3.35)	26000 (9000, 51000)

372 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-year lag time.

373 <sup>a</sup>Estimates are presented as mean because the median is 0 (zero).

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

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

376

377 **Appendix Table 6. Sensitivity analyses for mandatory menu calorie labelling using percentages of turnover of large out-of-home**  
 378 **businesses**

Scenarios	Belgium		Germany	
	Changes in obesity prevalence	CVD DPPs	Changes in obesity prevalence	CVD DPPs
Percentages of turnover (Belgium = 10% ; Germany = 21%)				
<i>Consumer response</i>				
Partial implementation	-0.20 (-0.30, -0.11)	90 <sup>a</sup> (0, 400)	-0.52 (-0.74, -0.34)	3000 (500, 8000)
<i>Combined</i>				
Partial implementation	-0.39 (-0.49, -0.29)	200 (0, 610)	-1.00 (-1.23, -0.82)	6000 (1500, 13000)

379 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-year lag time.

380 <sup>a</sup>Estimates are presented as mean because the median is 0 (zero).

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

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

383



384 **Appendix Table 7. Sensitivity analyses for SSB tax using different effects reported in other meta-analyses**

Scenarios	Belgium		Germany	
	Changes in obesity prevalence	CVD DPPs	Changes in obesity prevalence	CVD DPPs
<b>Effects from different meta-analyses</b>				
<i>Consumer response</i>				
10% tax (Afsin et al.)	-0.03 (-0.07, -0.01)	400 (0, 1000)	-0.03 (-0.06, -0.01)	2500 (0, 6000)
10% tax (Teng et al.)	-0.05 (-0.09, -0.02)	400 (0, 1600)	-0.05 (-0.09, -0.01)	3500 (500, 9000)
<i>Combined</i>				
10% tax (Afsin et al.)	-0.17 (-0.26, -0.11)	1400 (400, 4000)	-0.17 (-0.23, -0.11)	12000 (4000, 20000)
10% tax (Teng et al.)	-0.18 (-0.28, -0.12)	1600 (400, 4200)	-0.17 (-0.25, -0.11)	12000 (4500, 22000)

385 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-year lag time.

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

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

388

389 **Appendix Table 8. Sensitivity analyses for the indirect effect of SSB tax on CVD**  
 390 **mortality through BMI only**

Scenarios	Belgium	Germany
	CVD DPPs	CVD DPPs
<b>Consumer response</b>		
10% tax	33 <sup>a</sup> (0, 200)	280 <sup>a</sup> (0, 1000)
20% tax	64 <sup>a</sup> (0, 400)	500 (0, 2000)
30% tax	100 <sup>a</sup> (0, 600)	500 (0, 2500)
<b>Reformulation</b>		
30% decrease in sugar	83 <sup>a</sup> (0, 410)	500 (0, 2000)
<b>Combined</b>		
10% tax	99 <sup>a</sup> (0, 600)	500 (0, 2500)
20% tax	130 <sup>a</sup> (0, 600)	1000 (0, 3500)
30% tax	150 <sup>a</sup> (0, 610)	1000 (0, 3500)

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

393 <sup>a</sup>Estimates are presented as mean because the median is 0 (zero).

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

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

396

397

398

399

400

401

402

403

404

405 **References**

- 406 1. Colombet Z, Robinson E, Kypridemos C, Jones A, O'Flaherty M. Effect of calorie labelling in the out-of-  
 407 home food sector on adult obesity prevalence, cardiovascular mortality, and social inequalities in England:  
 408 a modelling study. *Lancet Public Health*. Mar 2024;9(3):e178-e185. doi:10.1016/s2468-2667(23)00326-2  
 409 2. Pearson-Stuttard J, Bandosz P, Rehm CD, et al. Reducing US cardiovascular disease burden and disparities  
 410 through national and targeted dietary policies: A modelling study. *PLOS Medicine*. 2017;14(6):e1002311.  
 411 doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1002311  
 412 3. Department of Health and Social Care. Guidance: Calorie labelling in the out of home sector. Accessed 10  
 413 October 2024,  
 414 7. Liu J, Mozaffarian D, Sy S, et al. Health and Economic Impacts of the National Menu Calorie Labeling  
 415 Law in the United States. *Circulation: Cardiovascular Quality and Outcomes*. 2020/06/01  
 416 2020;13(6):e006313. doi:10.1161/CIRCOUTCOMES.119.006313  
 417 8. Du M, Griecci CF, Cudhea F, et al. What is the cost-effectiveness of menu calorie labelling on reducing  
 418 obesity-associated cancer burdens? An economic evaluation of a federal policy intervention among 235  
 419 million adults in the USA. *BMJ Open*. 2023;13(4):e063614. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2022-063614  
 420 9. Shangguan S, Afshin A, Shulkin M, et al. A Meta-Analysis of Food Labeling Effects on Consumer Diet  
 421 Behaviors and Industry Practices. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*. 2019/02/01/ 2019;56(2):300-  
 422 314. doi:  
 423 10. Crockett RA, King SE, Marteau TM, et al. Nutritional labelling for healthier food or non-alcoholic drink  
 424 purchasing and consumption. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. Feb 27 2018;2(2):Cd009315.  
 425 doi:10.1002/14651858.CD009315.pub2  
 426 11. Robinson E, Boyland E, Christiansen P, et al. Is the effect of menu energy labelling on consumer behaviour  
 427 equitable? A pooled analysis of twelve randomized control experiments. *Appetite*. 2023/03/01/  
 428 2023;182:106451. doi:  
 429 12. Robinson E, Polden M, Langfield T, et al. Socioeconomic position and the effect of energy labelling on  
 430 consumer behaviour: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition  
 431 and Physical Activity*. 2023/02/06 2023;20(1):10. doi:10.1186/s12966-023-01418-0  
 432 13. Robinson E, McFarland-Lesser I, Patel Z, Jones A. Downsizing food: a systematic review and meta-  
 433 analysis examining the effect of reducing served food portion sizes on daily energy intake and body weight.  
 434 *British Journal of Nutrition*. 2023;129(5):888-903. doi:10.1017/S0007114522000903  
 435 14. Robinson E, Khuttan M, McFarland-Lesser I, Patel Z, Jones A. Calorie reformulation: a systematic review  
 436 and meta-analysis examining the effect of manipulating food energy density on daily energy intake.  
 437 *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*. 2022/04/22 2022;19(1):48.  
 438 doi:10.1186/s12966-022-01287-z  
 439 15. Bleich SN, Wolfson JA, Jarlenski MP. Calorie Changes in Large Chain Restaurants: Declines in New  
 440 Menu Items but Room for Improvement. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*. 2016/01/01/  
 441 2016;50(1):e1-e8. doi:  
 442 20. Emmert-Fees KMF, Amies-Cull B, Wawro N, et al. Projected health and economic impacts of sugar-  
 443 sweetened beverage taxation in Germany: A cross-validation modelling study. *PLOS Medicine*.  
 444 2023;20(11):e1004311. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1004311  
 445 21. Cawley J, Thow AM, Wen K, Frisvold D. The Economics of Taxes on Sugar-Sweetened Beverages: A  
 446 Review of the Effects on Prices, Sales, Cross-Border Shopping, and Consumption. *Annu Rev Nutr*. Aug 21  
 447 2019;39:317-338. doi:10.1146/annurev-nutr-082018-124603  
 448 22. Andreyeva T, Marple K, Marinello S, Moore TE, Powell LM. Outcomes Following Taxation of Sugar-  
 449 Sweetened Beverages: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Network Open*.  
 450 2022;5(6):e2215276-e2215276. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2022.15276  
 451 23. Afshin A, Peñalvo JL, Del Gobbo L, et al. The prospective impact of food pricing on improving dietary  
 452 consumption: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS One*. 2017;12(3):e0172277.  
 453 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0172277  
 454 24. Teng AM, Jones AC, Mizdrak A, Signal L, Genç M, Wilson N. Impact of sugar-sweetened beverage taxes  
 455 on purchases and dietary intake: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *Obesity Reviews*. 2019/09/01  
 456 2019;20(9):1187-1204. doi:  
 457 25. von Philipsborn P, Huizinga O, Leibinger A, et al. Interim Evaluation of Germany's Sugar Reduction  
 458 Strategy for Soft Drinks: Commitments versus Actual Trends in Sugar Content and Sugar Sales from Soft  
 459 Drinks. *Annals of Nutrition and Metabolism*. 2023;79(3):282-290. doi:10.1159/000529592  
 460 26. Bandy LK, Scarborough P, Harrington RA, Rayner M, Jebb SA. Reductions in sugar sales from soft drinks  
 461 in the UK from 2015 to 2018. *BMC Medicine*. 2020/01/13 2020;18(1):20. doi:10.1186/s12916-019-1477-4  
 462 27. Huang Y, Kypridemos C, Liu J, et al. Cost-Effectiveness of the US Food and Drug Administration Added  
 463 Sugar Labeling Policy for Improving Diet and Health. *Circulation*. Jun 4 2019;139(23):2613-2624.  
 464 doi:10.1161/circulationaha.118.036751

- 465 28. Statbel (Belgian Statistical Office). Perspectives de la population. Accessed 30 September 2024,  
466 34. Grigoriev P, Scholz R, Shkolnikov VM. Socioeconomic differences in mortality among 27 million  
467 economically active Germans: a cross-sectional analysis of the German Pension Fund data. *BMJ Open*.  
468 2019;9(10):e028001. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2018-028001  
469 35. Sciensano. FCS - National Food Consumption Survey.  
470 36. Bel S, Van den Abeele S, Lebacqz T, et al. Protocol of the Belgian food consumption survey 2014:  
471 objectives, design and methods. *Archives of Public Health*. 2016/05/16 2016;74(1):20. doi:10.1186/s13690-  
472 016-0131-2  
473 37. Heuer T, Krems C, Moon K, Brombach C, Hoffmann I. Food consumption of adults in Germany: results of  
474 the German National Nutrition Survey II based on diet history interviews. *Br J Nutr*. May 28  
475 2015;113(10):1603-14. doi:10.1017/s0007114515000744  
476 38. Holle R, Happich M, Löwel H, Wichmann HE. KORA--a research platform for population based health  
477 research. *Gesundheitswesen*. Aug 2005;67 Suppl 1:S19-25. doi:10.1055/s-2005-858235  
478 39. Stasinopoulos M, Rigby R, Voudouris V, et al. Package ‘gamlss’.  
479 40. Stasinopoulos MD, Rigby RA, Heller GZ, Voudouris V, De Bastiani F. *Flexible Regression and*  
480 *Smoothing: Using GAMLSS in R (1st ed.)*. Chapman and Hall/CRC; 2017.  
481 41. Rigby RA, Stasinopoulos MD, Heller GZ, De Bastiani F. *Distributions for Modeling Location, Scale, and*  
482 *Shape: Using GAMLSS in R (1st ed.)*. Chapman and Hall/CRC; 2019.  
483 42. Vandevijvere S, Lachat C, Kolsteren P, Van Oyen H. Eating out of home in Belgium: current situation and  
484 policy implications. *British Journal of Nutrition*. 2009;102(6):921-928. doi:10.1017/S0007114509311745  
485 43. Orfanos P, Naska A, Trichopoulou A, et al. Eating out of home: energy, macro- and micronutrient intakes  
486 in 10 European countries. The European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition. *Eur J Clin*  
487 *Nutr*. Nov 2009;63 Suppl 4:S239-62. doi:10.1038/ejcn.2009.84  
488 44. Robinson E, Jones A, Whitelock V, Mead BR, Haynes A. (Over)eating out at major UK restaurant chains:  
489 observational study of energy content of main meals. *BMJ*. 2018;363:k4982. doi:10.1136/bmj.k4982  
490 45. Gesteiro E, García-Carro A, Aparicio-Ugarriza R, González-Gross M. Eating out of Home: Influence on  
491 Nutrition, Health, and Policies: A Scoping Review. *Nutrients*. 2022;14(6):1265.  
492 46. Christiansen E, Garby L. Prediction of body weight changes caused by changes in energy balance. *Eur J*  
493 *Clin Invest*. Nov 2002;32(11):826-30. doi:10.1046/j.1365-2362.2002.01036.x  
494 47. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). Human energy requirements: Report of a  
495 Joint FAO/ WHO/ UNU Expert Consultation.  
496 48. The Emerging Risk Factors C. Separate and combined associations of body-mass index and abdominal  
497 adiposity with cardiovascular disease: collaborative analysis of 58 prospective studies. *The Lancet*.  
498 2011;377(9771):1085-1095. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(11)60105-0  
499 49. Head A, Watt T, Raymond A, Rached-Jacquet L, Birkett M, Kypridemos C. *The IMPACTNCD technical*  
500 *appendix*. n.d.  
501 50. Kypridemos C, Allen K, Hickey GL, et al. Cardiovascular screening to reduce the burden from  
502 cardiovascular disease: microsimulation study to quantify policy options. *BMJ*. 2016;353:i2793.  
503 doi:10.1136/bmj.i2793  
504 51. Micha R, Peñalvo JL, Cudhea F, Imamura F, Rehm CD, Mozaffarian D. Association Between Dietary  
505 Factors and Mortality From Heart Disease, Stroke, and Type 2 Diabetes in the United States. *JAMA*.  
506 2017;317(9):912-924. doi:10.1001/jama.2017.0947  
507 52. Koerkamp BG, Stijnen T, Weinstein MC, Hunink MGM. The Combined Analysis of Uncertainty and  
508 Patient Heterogeneity in Medical Decision Models. *Medical Decision Making*. 2011;31(4):650-661.  
509 doi:10.1177/0272989x10381282

510