

BMC Medicine

Developing an integrated microsimulation model for the impact of fiscal policies on child health in Europe: the example of childhood obesity in Italy --Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	BMED-D-21-01486R2	
Full Title:	Developing an integrated microsimulation model for the impact of fiscal policies on child health in Europe: the example of childhood obesity in Italy	
Article Type:	Research article	
Section/Category:	Global, Public and Environmental Health	
Funding Information:	horizon 2020 framework programme (733206)	Not applicable
	horizon 2020 framework programme (774548)	Not applicable
Abstract:	<p>Background. We developed an integrated model called Microsimulation for Income and Child Health (MICH), that provides a tool for analysing the prospective effects of fiscal policies on childhood health in European countries. The aim of this first MICH study is to evaluate the impact of alternative fiscal policies on childhood overweight and obesity in Italy.</p> <p>Methods. MICH model is composed by three integrated modules. Firstly, module 1(M1) simulates the effects of fiscal policies on disposable household income using the tax-benefit microsimulation program EUROMOD fed with the Italian EU-SILC 2010 data. Secondly, module 2(M2) exploits data provided by the Italian NINFEA birth cohort study, and runs a series of concatenated regressions in order to estimate the prospective effects of income on child Body Mass Index(BMI) at different ages. Finally, module 3(M3) uses dynamic microsimulation techniques that combine the population structure and incomes obtained by M1, with regression model specifications and estimated effect sizes provided by M2, projecting BMI distributions according to the simulated policy scenarios .</p> <p>Results. Both universal benefits, such as Universal Basic Income (BI), and targeted interventions, such as Child Benefit (CB) for poorer households, have a significant effect on childhood overweight, with a Prevalence Ratio (PR) in 10-years-old children – in comparison with the baseline fiscal system - of 0.88 (95%CI:0.82-0.93) and 0.89 (95%CI:0.83-0.94), respectively. The impact of the fiscal reforms was even larger for child obesity, reaching PR of 0.67 (95%CI:0.50-0.83) for the simulated BI and 0.64 (95%CI:0.44-0.84) for CB at the same age. While both types of policies show similar effects, the estimated costs for 1% prevalence reduction in overweight and obesity with respect to the baseline scenario is much lower with more focalised benefit policy than with universal ones.</p> <p>Conclusions. Our results show that fiscal policies can have a strong impact on childhood health conditions. Focalised interventions that increase family income, especially in the most vulnerable populations, can help to prevent child overweight and obesity. Robust microsimulation models to forecast the effects of fiscal policies on health should be considered as one of the instruments to reach the Health in All Policies goals.</p>	
Corresponding Author:	Davide Rasella, PhD ISGLOBAL: Instituto de Salud Global de Barcelona Barcelona, Catalunya SPAIN	
Corresponding Author Secondary Information:		
Corresponding Author's Institution:	ISGLOBAL: Instituto de Salud Global de Barcelona	
Corresponding Author's Secondary Institution:		
First Author:	Davide Rasella, PhD	
First Author Secondary Information:		

Order of Authors:	Davide Rasella, PhD
	Lorenzo Richiardi, PhD
	Nicolai Brachowicz, MSc.
	H. Xavier Jara, PhD
	Mark Hanson, PhD
	Delia Boccia, PhD
	Matteo G. Richiardi, PhD
	Costanza Pizzi, PhD
Order of Authors Secondary Information:	
Response to Reviewers:	<p>Editor's Comments:</p> <p>1. We require confirmation of authorship from all co-authors, and have not yet received a response from the listed authors. I have resent them the verification email containing the confirmation link. May I kindly ask that you follow up on this or provide us with alternative email addresses, if necessary? Co-authors should contact us directly to confirm co-authorship if they have any problems. Still to confirm co-authorship</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delia Boccia • Matteo G. Richiardi <p>A: Both co-authors should have confirmed the coauthorship.</p> <p>2. Please include a figure legend. Figure legends should be no more than 300 words (advised but not mandatory). A: Now, all figures have the corresponding legend. Section Methods, Figure 1, lines 111-113, page 6, and lines 344-347 page 19.</p> <p>3. Each file (whether main or Additional) should be mentioned in the main manuscript text in order. A: Now, all files are mentioned in the main manuscript text in order. Section Methods, lines 104, page 5; line 125, page 6; and line 138, page 7.</p> <p>4. Please rename supplementary files as 'Additional file X', and cite explicitly by additional file name in the manuscript e.g. 'Additional file 1: Fig. S1'. Please ensure that if you have more than one additional file that they are cited in ascending order within the main body of text. A: Supplementary files were renamed in accordance with BMC Medicine guidelines. Supplementary information Section, lines 530, 532, 534, page 29.</p> <p>5. Please add a description of your additional file to the end of the manuscript. Legends to Combined Additional files should include a short description of the constituent parts, e.g. "Additional File 1: Figures S1-S3. FigS1- [short title]. FigS2 –[short title]. FigS3 – [short title]...".Please note that legends are advised to be no more than 300 words, though this is not mandatory. A: Description of additional files added in Supplementary information Section, lines 531, 533, 535, page 29.</p> <p>6. Please could you update the reference formatting to remove the extra details of</p>

Month of publication, date cited, and "Internet". References should follow the format: Smith JJ. The world of science. Am J Sci. 1999;36:234-5. Journal titles should be abbreviated as in the National Library of Medicine <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/nlmcatalog/journals>
A: Thank you for noticing that, we have changed the references style in accordance with BMC Medicine guidelines.

7. Please move all references to the main reference list (i.e. no additional references in Additional Files). These should be included in the main text when the Additional File is first introduced, for example "...see Additional File 1: Table S1) [XX-XX]"; please ensure the reference list is numbered in the order as they appear in the text.

A: References that were previously included in Supplementary material but not were mentioned in the main manuscript are now cited in Section Methods, lines 104-105, page 5.

8. Please make the following change to your section headings: change 'Introduction' to 'Background'.

A: We did it. Background Section, line 64, page 4.

9. Manuscripts should have the following subsections: Background/Methods/Results/Discussion/Conclusions. Please add a new subsection entitled Conclusions.

A: We added Conclusions subtitle before the already existing conclusion paragraph. Conclusions Section, line 431, page 24.

10. Please provide a list of all the abbreviations used in the manuscript. Please place this list just before the Declarations section. If abbreviations are used in the text, they should be defined in the text at first use and included in this list.

A: List of Abbreviations was added just before the Declarations section, lines 442-484, pages 24-26. For the sake of simplicity and clarity, the Microsimulation for Income and Child Health Outcomes (MICH) was renamed Microsimulation for Income and Child Health (MICH) along the text and in the additional files.

11. You should include a "Declarations" section, consisting of the following subsections: Acknowledgments; Consent for Publication; Funding; Availability of Data and Materials; Authors' Contributions; Competing interests; Ethics Approval and Consent to Participate. All of these subsections MUST be present.

- The "Authors' Contributions" section of the Declarations should include the text "All authors read and approved the final manuscript"
- The "Competing Interests" section of the Declarations should include any relevant competing interests, or state "The authors declare that they have no competing interests". See here for our editorial policies and a full explanation of competing interests. <https://www.biomedcentral.com/getpublished/editorial-policies#CompetingInterests>

A: As requested we added the Declarations Section, with all subsections present, from line 489 of page 26.

Reviewer reports:

Reviewer #1: This is a revised manuscript describing a microsimulation model testing

the impact of a range of fiscal policies on child weight in Italy. The authors have done a good job of addressing the issues raised by myself and the other reviewer. I just have two remaining comments.

The first relates to a comment in the response to reviewers: "To the best of our knowledge there are no randomized trials of fiscal interventions or increased total family disposable income with child BMI as the outcome. There are several quasi experimental studies on cash transfer, but those studies were conducted in a different population (United States) and did not include child BMI as one of the health outcomes." There are actually a handful of quasi experimental studies on cash transfers with BMI as the outcome, across several countries, and these have found mixed results - see review article: Cooper K, Stewart K. (2017) Does money affect children's outcomes? An update. Case paper 203; ISSN 1460-5023. Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion, London. <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/103494/1/casepaper203.pdf>. This should be acknowledged in light of the strong effects implied by the microsimulation.

A: We thank the reviewer for bringing to our attention the review from Cooper et al. In their work they only mention one study about EITC and obesity from Chia et al, 2013, which admittedly we did not know. As suggested by the reviewer, there are indeed a handful of studies on the effect of income support interventions and obesity among children; however, conclusions from these studies need to be interpreted cautiously, because: a. Only few come from high income countries (the vast majority are from middle income countries); b. results can be conflicting as in some cases these interventions have been associated with an increase of obesity among children. This seems to be dependent on the baseline income of the intervention recipients, the age of children at the time of transfer and also the context where the intervention is delivered). Interestingly, in LMICS results become more consistent in the direction of a positive impact when interventions are delivered in combination with health education and in context where food quality and availability is improved. Overall, these findings do not undermine the role of income-support interventions in addressing child obesity, but suggest that their maximum potential is achieved when delivered in combination with health education and within a food secure environment (in terms of food quality). We have added at page 22 line 391: "To the best of our knowledge there are no randomized trials of fiscal interventions or increased total family disposable income with child BMI as the outcome, but a few quasi-experimental studies have evaluated the impact of cash transfers on child obesity. [37] The overall impact of these interventions seems to be dependent on the baseline income of the intervention recipients, the age of children at the time of transfer and also the context where the intervention is delivered [38–40]."

Second, there was another comment in the response to reviewers, "response rates and attrition are at the standard level (after 10 years a lost of around 30% of the participants). Due to that reason, and that the attrition was not differential due to the overall characteristics of the remaining individuals, we didn't use any approach to correct for that." The table in the Supplementary Methods described the level of attrition - thank you - but I couldn't see evidence that the attrition was not differential, though perhaps I missed it. Can this be made clear and a brief comment included in the paper indicating that attrition was not differential?

A: We thank the reviewer for this comment. The sentence about non-differentiability was based on the comparison of the distribution of the weight measures at 18 months between those lost to the 4-year follow-up and those still in the study at that time: mean weight at 18 months in the two groups equal to 11130 and 11191 grams respectively (p-value from T-Student test=0.23). However, we agree with the reviewer that the statement about non-differentiability is too strong as several other factors might affect attrition, so we did not included such statement in the main text or in the additional files, and we have left in the limitations section (p.24 line 433):" We also acknowledge that the NINFEA cohort has attrition, even if within the standard magnitude for such kind of child cohorts."

Editorial Policies

Please read the following information and revise your manuscript as necessary. If your manuscript does not adhere to our editorial requirements, this may cause a delay while this is addressed. Failure to adhere to our policies may result in rejection of your manuscript.

In accordance with BioMed Central editorial policies and formatting guidelines, all manuscript submissions to BMC Medicine must contain a Declarations section which includes the mandatory sub-sections listed below.

Please refer to the journal's Submission Guidelines web page for information regarding the criteria for each sub-section (<https://bmcmmedicine.biomedcentral.com/>).

Where a mandatory Declarations section is not relevant to your study design or article type, please write 'Not applicable' in these sections.

For the 'Availability of data and materials' section, please provide information about where the data supporting your findings can be found.

We encourage authors to deposit their datasets in publicly available repositories (where available and appropriate), or to be presented within the manuscript and/or additional supporting files.

Please note that identifying/confidential patient data should not be shared.

Authors who do not wish to share their data must confirm this under this sub-heading and also provide their reasons.

For further guidance on how to format this section, please refer to BioMed Central's editorial policies page (see links below).

Declarations

-

Ethics approval and consent to participate

-

Consent to publish

-

Availability of data and materials

-

Competing interests

-

Funding

-

Authors' Contributions

-

Acknowledgements

Further information about our editorial policies can be found at the following links:

Ethical approval and consent:

<http://www.biomedcentral.com/about/editorialpolicies#Ethics>

Availability of data and materials section:

<http://www.biomedcentral.com/submissions/editorial-policies#availability+of+data+and+materials>

****Our flexible approach during the COVID-19 pandemic****

If you need more time at any stage of the peer-review process, please do let us know. While our systems will continue to remind you of the original timelines, we aim to be as flexible as possible during the current pandemic.

This letter contains confidential information, is for your own use, and should not be forwarded to third parties.

Recipients of this email are registered users within the Editorial Manager database for this journal. We will keep your information on file to use in the process of submitting, evaluating and publishing a manuscript. For more information on how we use your personal details please see our privacy policy at <https://www.springernature.com/production-privacy-policy>. If you no longer wish to receive messages from this journal or you have questions regarding database management, please contact the Publication Office at the link below.



[Click here to view linked References](#)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 **Developing an integrated microsimulation model for the impact of fiscal policies on child**
2 **health in Europe: the example of childhood obesity in Italy**

3 Davide Rasella, PhD ^{1,2}; Lorenzo Richiardi, PhD ²; Nicolai Brachowicz, MSc ¹, H. Xavier Jara,
4 PhD ³; Mark Hanson, PhD ⁴; Delia Boccia, PhD ^{2,5}; Matteo G. Richiardi, PhD ³; Costanza Pizzi,
5 PhD ²

6 ¹ ISGlobal, Hospital Clínic - Universitat de Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain

7 ² Department of Medical Sciences, University of Turin, Turin, Italy

8 ³ Centre for Microsimulation and Policy Analysis, Institute for Social and Economic Research,
9 University of Essex, Colchester, UK

10 ⁴ Institute of Developmental Sciences and NIHR Biomedical Research Centre, University of
11 Southampton and University Hospital Southampton, UK.

12 ⁵ Faculty of Population and Health Policy, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine,
13 London, United Kingdom

14 **Corresponding Author:**

15 Davide Rasella,

16 ISGlobal, Hospital Clínic - Universitat de Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain

17 Hospital Clínic - Universitat de Barcelona, Carrer Rosselló 132, Barcelona 08036, Spain

18 Email: davide.rasella@isglobal.org

19 Phone: +34679590927

20

21 **ABSTRACT**

22 **Background.** We developed an integrated model called Microsimulation for Income and Child
23 Health (MICH) that provides a tool for analysing the prospective effects of fiscal policies on
24 childhood health in European countries. The aim of this first MICH study is to evaluate the
25 impact of alternative fiscal policies on childhood overweight and obesity in Italy.

26 **Methods.** MICH model is composed by three integrated modules. Firstly, module 1 (M1)
27 simulates the effects of fiscal policies on disposable household income using the tax-benefit
28 microsimulation program EUROMOD fed with the Italian EU-SILC 2010 data. Secondly,
29 module 2 (M2) exploits data provided by the Italian birth cohort called Nascita e Infanzia: gli
30 Effetti dell'Ambiente (NINFEA), translated as Birth and Childhood: The Effects of the
31 Environment) study, and runs a series of concatenated regressions in order to estimate the
32 prospective effects of income on child Body Mass Index (BMI) at different ages. Finally,
33 module 3 (M3) uses dynamic microsimulation techniques that combine the population
34 structure and incomes obtained by M1, with regression model specifications and estimated
35 effect sizes provided by M2, projecting BMI distributions according to the simulated policy
36 scenarios.

37 **Results.** Both universal benefits, such as Universal Basic Income (BI), and targeted
38 interventions, such as Child Benefit (CB) for poorer households, have a significant effect on
39 childhood overweight, with a Prevalence Ratio (PR) in 10-years-old children - in comparison
40 with the baseline fiscal system - of 0.88 (95%CI:0.82-0.93) and 0.89 (95%CI:0.83-0.94),
41 respectively. The impact of the fiscal reforms was even larger for child obesity, reaching a PR
42 of 0.67 (95%CI:0.50-0.83) for the simulated BI and 0.64 (95%CI:0.44-0.84) for CB at the same
43 age. While both types of policies show similar effects, the estimated costs for 1% prevalence

1
2
3 44 reduction in overweight and obesity with respect to the baseline scenario is much lower with
4
5
6 45 more focalised benefit policy than with universal ones.

7
8
9 46 **Conclusions.** Our results show that fiscal policies can have a strong impact on childhood
10
11 47 health conditions. Focalised interventions that increase family income, especially in the most
12
13 48 vulnerable populations, can help to prevent child overweight and obesity. Robust
14
15 49 microsimulation models to forecast the effects of fiscal policies on health should be
16
17 50 considered as one of the instruments to reach the Health in All Policies goals (HiAP).

18
19 51 **Keywords:** Fiscal Policies; Poverty alleviation; Microsimulation; Child Health; Child
20
21
22 52 Overweight; Child Obesity.

23
24
25 53

26
27
28 54

29
30
31 55

32
33
34 56

35
36
37 57

38
39
40 58

41
42
43 59

44
45
46 60

47
48
49 61

50
51
52 62

53
54
55 63

56
57
58 64

59
60
61 65

64 **BACKGROUND**

1
2
3 65 Fiscal policies, including fiscal benefits and tax reductions, are interventions that can quickly
4
5
6 66 and effectively change income of poor households. Literature points to family income,
7
8
9 67 considered as a general indicator of socio-economic position (SEP) [1], as one of the strongest
10
11 68 socio-economic determinant of health [2, 3]. Increasing household income, especially among
12
13
14 69 the most vulnerable families, could prevent several health outcomes such as overweight and
15
16 70 obesity, that represent a serious public health concern in high-income countries and
17
18
19 71 increasingly in low and middle income countries [4].
20
21

22 72 On the one hand, some studies have shown strong negative associations between household
23
24
25 73 income and child obesity [5–7], suggesting that implementing income subsidies, especially
26
27 74 among those families that belong to the first deciles of the income distribution, could relax
28
29
30 75 their economic constraints and free resources that may be spent on improving their dietary
31
32
33 76 intake and adopting healthier physical activities. On the other hand, although several
34
35 77 mathematical models for obesity reduction have been developed, they all focus on postnatal
36
37
38 78 interventions on diet, physical activity and other lifestyle-related practices, ignoring income
39
40 79 and socio-economic position factors [8–10].
41
42

43 80 The aim of our study is twofold. Firstly, we developed a flexible three-part integrated
44
45
46 81 microsimulation model as a useful policy design tool for investigating the prospective effects
47
48
49 82 of poverty alleviation fiscal policies on child health outcomes, in line with the Health in All
50
51 83 Policies (HiAP) framework [11]. Secondly, we provided a case study for Italy that evaluates
52
53
54 84 the potential effects of eight different simulated fiscal policies on overweight and child
55
56
57 85 obesity. The simulated policies range from basic income policies that ensure a universal yearly
58
59 86 basic income, to more targeted policies such as monthly child benefits to low income families
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3 88 potential dose responses. Our aim is to contribute to the decision-making process by offering
4
5 89 an integrated approach that permits to evaluate prospective costs and effects of several fiscal
6
7
8 90 policy interventions on child health.
9

10
11 91


12 13 14 92 **METHODS**

15 16 17 93 **Study design**

18
19
20
21 94 The modelling strategy involves two phases and three integrated modules. The first phase
22
23 95 comprises two modules. Firstly, we simulate the prospective effects of a variation in benefit
24
25
26 96 policies on equivalised income using EUROMOD (Module 1 - M1). Secondly, we run a series
27
28
29 97 of concatenated regressions to estimate parameters of interest of several relationships using
30
31 98 NINFEA variables (Module 2 - M2). In the second phase we apply the estimated parameters
32
33
34 99 obtained from M2 to the simulated population obtained from M1 in order to get a simulated
35
36 100 BMI distribution (Module 3 – M3).
37

38
39 101 The overall structure of our Microsimulation for Income and Child Health (MICH) model, and
40
41
42 102 flow of inputs and outputs for each stage are shown in Figure 1. A more detailed description
43
44
45 103 of each phase and module is provided in the following paragraphs. Further information on
46
47
48 104 the modelling process and its parameters is provided in Additional file 1 [12–15], in
49
50 105 accordance with international reporting guidelines recommended by the International
51
52
53 106 Society for Pharmacoeconomics and Outcomes Research and the Society for Medical Decision
54
55 107 Making (ISPOR-SMDM) [16].
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

108 **Figure 1 Structure of the MICH Model: flow of input, output data, and parameters**
 109 **between M1, M2 and M3 modules**



110
 111 *Note: For M1: data provided by the Italian EU-SILC 2010 survey. Fiscal Policies simulated using EUROMOD*
 112 *software. For M2: data provided by NINFEA cohort. Concatenated regressions run in Stata. For M3: dynamic*
 113 *microsimulation using R.*

114
 115
 116 **Data sources**

117 EUROMOD is a tax-benefit microsimulation model for the European Union (EU) and the
 118 United Kingdom (UK). It is a software that allows to compute the effects of taxes and benefits
 119 on household incomes and work incentives for the population of each country and for the EU
 120 as a whole in a standardized and comparable manner [17].

121 EUROMOD covers the 28 member states and is updated to recent policy systems using data
 122 from the European Union Statistics on Income and Living Conditions (EU-SILC) as the input
 123 database [18], supported by Directorate-General for Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion
 124 (DG EMPL) of the European Commission [19][20]. A more detailed description of EUROMOD
 125 is provided in the Additional file 2 [21].

126 We use the Italian EU-SILC 2010 data as the input population for EUROMOD, in order to be
1
2
3 127 consistent with the income values of Italian NINFEA 2011 cohort, given that Italian EU-SILC
4
5 128 2011 data for EUROMOD was not available. Baseline scenario is based on the tax-benefit
6
7 129 system corresponding to June 2018, given that this was the most recent system when this
8
9
10 130 study was carried out.

131 The Nascita e Infanzia: gli Effetti dell’Ambiente (NINFEA, translated as Birth and Childhood:
14
15
16 132 The Effects of the Environment) project [22, 23], is an Italian birth cohort study that aims at
17
18 133 investigating the effect of several exposures acting during pre-natal and early post-natal life
19
20
21 134 on later health. Individuals of the cohorts are children whose mothers voluntarily accepted to
22
23
24 135 participate and had enough knowledge of the Italian language to complete the online
25
26 136 questionnaires. The first baseline questionnaire on general health and exposures was fulfilled
27
28
29 137 before and during pregnancy. A more detailed description of NINFEA is provided in the
30
31
32 138 Additional file 3 [24]. We used NINFEA database version 02.2019. This database consists of
33
34 139 6625 mothers and 7423 pregnancies. Data on demographic and socioeconomic factors of
35
36
37 140 each household were collected using the baseline questionnaire completed during
38
39 141 pregnancy. Using these aforementioned variables, namely parental age, cohabitation status,
40
41
42 142 education, country of birth, occupation, house size and type, and family size, and external
43
44 143 data from the Italian EU-SILC 2011 survey, the Equivalised Household Income Indicator (EHII)
45
46
47 144 [22] (an indicator of the equivalised total disposable household income at baseline) was
48
49
50 145 constructed for the NINFEA participants.

51
52
53 146 Children’s birth weight and gestational age at birth were registered at birth. Weight at 6
54
55 147 months of age were ascertained from the 6-month questionnaire, and weight at 18 months
56
57
58 148 of age were obtained from the 18-month questionnaire. From the corresponding follow-up
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

149 questionnaires at 4, 7, and 10 years of age, our NINFEA dataset includes 4232, 2152 and 973
150 measurements of children’s weight and height, respectively. These two measurements were
151 used to calculate each children’s body mass index (BMI) at each follow-up. Body mass index
152 (BMI) is computed as the ratio between weight (in kg) and squared height (in meters).
153 Overweight and Obesity for each age were defined according to the official International
154 Obesity Task Force (IOTF) cut-offs [25].

155 M1: EUROMOD and the Fiscal Reform Scenarios

156 The first module (M1 – the tax-benefit microsimulation model) uses EUROMOD capabilities
157 to simulate the prospective effects of eight benefit policies on household disposable income.
158 EUROMOD produces an output dataset that contains a population that is the same as the
159 Italian EU-SILC 2010 sample (46788 individuals), but with added information on disposable
160 income for each individual, based on the specific, actual or hypothetical, policy system
161 considered. This aforementioned output dataset provided individual disposable income data
162 that was aggregated for each household in order to compute firstly, the equivalised
163 household size, and later on, the equivalised household income. This adjustment was done in
164 compliance with the modified equivalence scale suggested by the Organisation for Economic
165 Cooperation and Development (OECD) [26]. For reasons of comparability between the Italian
166 EU-SILC 2010 and Italian NINFEA 2011 cohort analyses, we excluded families with more than
167 7 members or families with no children less than 5 years old.

168 The simulated fiscal interventions are shown in Table 1. Each pair of simulated policies were
169 implemented with two different levels of intensity regarding benefit amounts, but keeping
170 the same rules for eligibility and recipients among them, with the aim to evaluate potential
171 dose-response effects.

172 **Table 1 Simulated tax-benefit scenarios**

	Baseline (BS)	Basic Income (BI)		Poverty Reduction (PR)		New-borns Benefit (NB)		Child Benefit (CB)	
		BI1	BI2	PR1	PR2	NB1	NB2	CB1	CB2
Eligibility	-	all	all	households with per capita income < €500 month	households with per capita income < €500 month	households with per capita income < €500 month	households with per capita income < €500 month	households with per capita income < €500 month	households with per capita income < €500 month
Benefit Amount	-	€ 100	€ 100	€ 100	€ 100	€ 500	€ 500	€ 500	€ 500
Periodicity	-	yearly	monthly	yearly	monthly	yearly	monthly	yearly	monthly
Recipients	-	all household members	all household members	all household members	all household members	every child < 1 year old	every child < 1 year old	every child < 5 years old	every child < 5 years old

173 *Note: Each simulated fiscal policy has two levels of intensity keeping other features fixed. The same benefit*
 174 *amount is given once a year or once a month.*

175
 176 Baseline scenario (BS) was simulated applying the actual 2018 Italian fiscal system on the
 177 Italian EU-SILC 2010 data. Basic Income Scenarios, BI1 and BI2, consist of benefit amounts of
 178 €100 per year, or per month, respectively, to all citizens without eligibility requirements.
 179 Poverty Reduction scenarios, PR1 and PR2, simulate poverty-relief interventions of €100 per
 180 year, or per month, respectively, for each member of a household with an per capita
 181 disposable income of less than €500 per month. New-borns Benefit scenarios, NB1 and NB2,
 182 simulate more targeted fiscal interventions of €500 per year, or per month, respectively, for
 183 each child less than one year old in households with an equivalised disposable income of less
 184 than €500 per month. Child Benefit scenarios, CB1 and CB2, simulate the New-borns Benefits
 185 scenarios but with the only difference being that the eligibility rule regarding age threshold
 186 for recipients is raised from less than one year of age to five years of age. Consequently, these
 187 CB1 and CB2 simulated policies reach a larger number of households than the New-borns
 188 Benefit scenarios.

189 These eight simulated policies with two different intensities allowed to compute marginal
 190 benefits, which are a normalised measure of the effectiveness of the different policy
 191 instruments, and can be used to compare among the prospective health effects of each
 192 alternative.

193 EUROMOD also provides the overall cost for the public budget, and therefore, after
 194 comparison with the baseline, the cost of the changes implemented in the counterfactual
 195 scenarios, which can be used to calculate the marginal benefit (health outcome gain
 196 compared with the policy cost) of the reforms.

197 M2: The Concatenated Regression Models in the NINFEA birth cohort

198 The aim of this module is to estimate regression parameters of interest and the corresponding
 199 variance-covariance matrix, that are required later in the third module.

200 The structure of the concatenated regressions models fitted on the NINFEA data is described
 201 in the following equations:

$$202 \quad 1) \quad GA = \alpha_{ga} + \delta_{ga}EHII + \sum \beta_{ga5}X_s + \varepsilon$$

$$203 \quad 2) \quad BW = \alpha_{bw} + \beta_{bw}GA + \delta_{bw}EHII + \sum \beta_{bw_s}X_s + \varepsilon$$

$$204 \quad 3) \quad WT_{6m} = \alpha_{wt6} + \beta_{wt6_1}BW + \beta_{wt6_2}GA + \delta_{wt6}EHII + \sum \beta_{wt6_s}X_s + \varepsilon$$

$$205 \quad 4) \quad WT_{18m} = \alpha_{wt18} + \beta_{wt18_1}WT_{6m} + \beta_{wt18_2}BW + \delta_{wt18}EHII + \sum \beta_{wt18_s}X_s + \varepsilon$$

$$206 \quad 5) \quad BMI_{48m} = \alpha_{b48} + \beta_{b48_1}WT_{18m} + \beta_{b48_2}WT_{6m} + \delta_{b48}EHII + \sum \beta_{b48_s}X_s + \varepsilon$$

$$207 \quad 6) \quad BMI_{84m} = \alpha_{b84} + \beta_{b84_1}BMI_{48m} + \beta_{b84_2}WT_{18m} + \delta_{b84}EHII + \sum \beta_{b84_s}X_s + \varepsilon$$

$$208 \quad 7) \quad BMI_{120m} = \alpha_{b120} + \beta_{b120_1}BMI_{84m} + \beta_{b120_2}BMI_{48m} + \delta_{b120}EHII + \sum \beta_{b120_s}X_s + \varepsilon$$

209 *GA* and *BW* stand for gestational age and child's birth weight, respectively. WT_{6m} and WT_{18m}
1
2
3 210 stand for child's weight at 6 and 18 months after being born, respectively. BMI_{48m} , BMI_{84m} ,
4
5 211 and BMI_{120m} , stand for child's body mass index (BMI) at 4, 7 and 10 years of age. As described
6
7 212 in detail in the paper by Pizzi et al. [22], an indicator of the EU-SILC-based equivalised total
8
9
10 213 disposable household income (the Equivalised Household Income Indicator - EHII) was
11
12
13 214 constructed for the NINFEA participants within the framework of the H2020 LifeCycle project
14
15 215 [27]. In brief, the EHII was constructed using external data provided by the Italian EU-SILC
16
17
18 216 2011 survey, and individual and household characteristics available in the NINFEA cohort,
19
20
21 217 namely parental age, cohabitation status, education, country of birth and occupation, house
22
23 218 size and type, and family size. The EHII is the log transformation of the equivalised household
24
25
26 219 disposable income as used in Pizzi et al. [22]. In all equations EHII is the income indicator (log-
27
28 220 transformed), with δ being the estimated coefficient of interest for the income indicator.
29
30
31
32 221 Moreover, α is the intercept - different for each regression -, $\sum \beta_s X_s$ is the sum of sex of child,
33
34 222 maternal country of birth, and age at delivery. ε is the error component. The underlying
35
36
37 223 assumption is that all outcomes analysed are influenced by the two previous ones and by the
38
39 224 other factors cited above. For each independent variable, these models provide estimated
40
41
42 225 effect sizes, confidence intervals, and the corresponding variance-covariance matrix required
43
44
45 226 by module 3 (M3).

47 M3: Integrating outputs from modules 1 and 2 and creating microsimulation scenarios

50
51 228 The last module of MICH model applies effects sizes from M2 to the population obtained from
52
53
54 229 M1. The effects of EHII on health outcomes, used to simulate the impact of fiscal policies was
55
56 230 estimated by the δ coefficients of the multivariable regressions described above. From M1
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

231 output we select the population of children less than 5 years old, and expand it using the
1
2
3 232 Italian EU-SILC 2011 survey sample weights, obtaining a study population of 30910 children.
4
5
6 233 Using the same set of concatenated multivariable linear regressions shown above, with the
7
8
9 234 outputs from M1 and M2 used as inputs and the estimated alphas, betas and standard errors
10
11 235 of the regressions from M2, the integrated model estimates the distribution of gestational
12
13
14 236 age (GA) for the population of children under 1 year old using regression equation 1. The
15
16 237 obtained distribution of gestational age (GA) is successively introduced in regression equation
17
18
19 238 2 together with the same set of demographic and socioeconomic variables, including the
20
21 239 equivalised household disposable income from M1. Regressions equations from 3 to 7 use
22
23
24 240 the same principle, creating a flow of outputs used as inputs for the next regression model
25
26 241 and allowing us to simulate the final Body Mass Index (BMI) distributions at 18, 48 and 84
27
28
29 242 months, in a sequential order.
30
31
32 243 For each outcome and each scenario, 1000 simulations were performed using the Monte
33
34
35 244 Carlo sampling method [28]. This allows the main parameter values, in our case the estimated
36
37
38 245 alphas and betas of the regression equations, to vary in each simulation cycle according to
39
40 246 their assumed underlying distributions and their variance-covariance matrix. The number of
41
42
43 247 simulations was chosen after verifying that the estimates were stable and further runs were
44
45 248 neither modifying our point estimates, corresponding standard errors, nor other aspects of
46
47
48 249 the simulation.
49
50
51 250 Because the intercepts were obtained from the regression models applied to the NINFEA
52
53
54 251 cohort, which is not representative of the Italian population, for M2 we needed to calibrate
55
56 252 their values. The calibration was achieved varying the alpha of the regression model 1
57
58
59 253 described above, in order to obtain the lower sum of squared errors (SSE) in comparison with
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 254 the Italian national prevalence of premature births, and for regression model 2 with the
2
3 255 average birth weight, both from the “Certificato di Assistenza al Parto” (CEDAP , translated as
4
5 256 Italian birth registry) of the year 2011 [29].
6
7

8 257 All scenarios were compared in terms of prevalence ratios, using the selected scenario as
9
10
11 258 numerator and the real fiscal scenario as denominator. Marginal benefits were obtained by
12
13 259 dividing the cost of the fiscal intervention, provided by EUROMOD in M1, by the prevalence
14
15
16 260 difference between scenarios.
17
18

19 261 M1 was executed in EUROMOD version 3.0.0, and its output processed in STATA version 14.
20
21

22 262 M2 and M3 were coded and implemented in R version 3.6.3.
23
24

25 263
26
27

28 264 **RESULTS**

29
30

31
32 265 Table 2 shows baseline values corresponding to health outcomes, demographic and
33
34 266 socioeconomic variables, as well as simulated parameters, that were used to build our three-
35
36
37 267 part MICH model.
38
39

40 268 The mean of log of the household equivalised income at baseline in the Italian EU-SILC 2010
41
42
43 269 population is lower than in the NINFEA cohort (7.02 and 7.38, respectively). However, the
44
45 270 percentage of mothers not born in Italy in the Italian EU-SILC 2010 dataset is higher than in
46
47
48 271 the NINFEA cohort (16.8% and 4.2%, respectively). Modules 1 and 2 portrait similar values for
49
50
51 272 the remaining demographic and socioeconomic variables.
52
53

54 273 Table 3 shows estimated coefficients for each regression model in the series of concatenated
55
56 274 regressions included in M2.
57
58
59

60 275
61
62
63
64
65

Table 2 Estimated means, percentages and parameters used in the M1, M2 and M3 modules of the MICH model

	M1	M2	M3
	EUROMOD (EU-SILC)	NINFEA Cohort	Baseline Simulated Values*
Health Outcomes			
Gestational Age (weeks)	-	39.5 [1.8]	39.6 [0.28]
Birth Weight (kg)	-	3,237 [499]	3,218 [66]
Weight at 6 months (kg)	-	7,539 [942]	7,774 [241]
Weight at 18 months (kg)	-	11,162 [1,285]	11,286 [256]
BMI at 48 months	-	15.6 [1.7]	15.5 [0.2]
BMI at 84 months	-	15.9 [2.1]	16.0 [0.5]
BMI at 120 months	-	17.3 [2.6]	17.9 [1.0]
Demographic and Socioeconomic Predictors			
Female gender	51.60%	49.30%	-
Log of Equivalised income	7.02 [0.67]	7.38 [0.26]	-
Foreign citizenship of the mother	16.80%	4.20%	-
Age of the mother	33.6 [5.2]	33.3 [4.4]	-

*Note: Weight in kg. Estimated mean values (with standard deviations in brackets), or percentages. *Distribution of the means of the total runs.*

276

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

277 **Table 3 Estimated coefficients of the concatenated multivariable regressions from Module 2 (M2)**

VARIABLES	(1) Gestational age at birth (weeks)	(2) Birth weight (kg)	(3) Weight at 6 months (kg)	(4) Weight at 18 months (kg)	(5) BMI at 48 months	(6) BMI at 84 months	(7) BMI at 120 months
EHI	0.31 [0.11 - 0.51]	-0.55 [-0.99 - -0.10]	-0.60 [-1.58 - 0.39]	1.36 [0.07 - 2.65]	-0.31 [-0.57 - -0.05]	-0.52 [-0.93 - -0.10]	-0.85 [-1.58 - -0.12]
Mother's age	-0.05 [-0.06 - -0.04]	0.03 [0.01 - 0.06]	-0.05 [-0.11 - -0.00]	-0.02 [-0.09 - 0.05]	-0.00 [-0.02 - 0.01]	0.00 [-0.02 - 0.03]	-0.01 [-0.05 - 0.03]
Mother's country of birth	0.02 [-0.19 - 0.22]	0.65 [0.11 - 1.19]	1.88 [0.66 - 3.09]	-1.30 [-2.82 - 0.23]	-0.20 [-0.54 - 0.14]	-0.01 [-0.62 - 0.61]	0.17 [-0.87 - 1.22]
Sex	-0.05 [-0.13 - 0.04]	-1.39 [-1.58 - -1.19]	-4.46 [-4.90 - -4.02]	-1.47 [-2.07 - -0.86]	0.29 [0.18 - 0.41]	0.16* [-0.01 - 0.34]	-0.12 [-0.40 - 0.17]
Gestational age at birth (weeks)		1.70 [1.63 - 1.76]	-0.46 [-0.62 - -0.29]				
Birth weight (kg)			0.89 [0.83 - 0.94]	0.23 [0.16 - 0.30]			
Weight at 6 months (kg)				0.83 [0.79 - 0.87]	0.01 [0.00 - 0.02]		
Weight at 18 months (kg)					0.05 [0.05 - 0.06]	0.02 [0.01 - 0.03]	
Body Mass Index at 48 months						0.55 [0.48 - 0.63]	0.27 [0.15 - 0.39]
Body Mass Index at 84 months							0.77 [0.67 - 0.88]
Constant	38.83 [37.39 - 40.27]	-31.01 [-34.98 - -27.03]	73.19 [64.52 - 81.86]	32.69 [22.92 - 42.47]	10.70 [8.75 - 12.66]	8.73 [5.55 - 11.92]	7.62 [2.03 - 13.22]
Observations	6,387	6,202	5,173	4,141	2,923	1,621	658
R-squared	0.01	0.37	0.28	0.46	0.20	0.26	0.49

278 *Note: 95% Confidence Intervals in brackets. EHI stands for Equivalised Household Income Indicator. Sex (0=Male; 1=Female). Mother's country of birth (0=Italy; 1= others)*

279 The significant reduction in terms of number of observations over ages was not due to cohort
 280 attrition, but to the dynamic recruitment of the children from the year 2004 onwards, as
 281 result most of children recruited in more recent years have not attained the oldest ages, as
 282 explained in the Additional file 3.

283 Table 4 shows prevalence ratios of overweight and obesity between the baseline scenario and
 284 the eight combinations of fiscal interventions according to Table 1, for children of 48, 84 and
 285 120 months of age. Reductions in terms of population prevalence for the results of Table 4
 286 are reported in the Additional file 1: Table S3.

287

288 **Table 4 Prevalence Ratios and prediction intervals for children overweight and obesity at**
 289 **48, 84 and 120 months**

	Basic Income		Poverty Reduction		New-borns Benefit		Child Benefit	
	BI1	BI2	PR1	PR2	NB1	NB2	CB1	CB2
<i>48 months:</i>								
<i>Children Overweight</i>	0.994 [0.987-1.000]	0.946 [0.895-0.998]	0.996 [0.991-1.000]	0.967 [0.934-1.001]	0.999 [0.998-1.000]	0.993 [0.985-1.000]	0.993 [0.985-1.001]	0.952 [0.904-1.000]
<i>Children Obesity</i>	0.986 [0.966-1.005]	0.907 [0.809-1.004]	0.988 [0.971-1.006]	0.936 [0.861-1.012]	0.998 [0.994-1.002]	0.987 [0.971-1.004]	0.982 [0.957-1.008]	0.912 [0.813-1.011]
<i>84 months:</i>								
<i>Children Overweight</i>	0.991 [0.985-0.996]	0.913 [0.858-0.968]	0.994 [0.99-0.998]	0.946 [0.911-0.982]	0.999 [0.997-1.000]	0.988 [0.979-0.996]	0.989 [0.982-0.996]	0.921 [0.869-0.974]
<i>Children Obesity</i>	0.968 [0.94-0.995]	0.807 [0.67-0.945]	0.972 [0.947-0.997]	0.854 [0.734-0.974]	0.996 0.991-1.002]	0.973 [0.949-0.997]	0.957 [0.918-0.995]	0.805 [0.654-0.957]
<i>120 months:</i>								
<i>Children Overweight</i>	0.988 [0.982-0.993]	0.876 [0.819-0.933]	0.992 [0.988-0.996]	0.925 [0.888-0.961]	0.998 [0.997-0.999]	0.982 [0.972-0.992]	0.986 [0.98-0.993]	0.887 [0.831-0.943]
<i>Children Obesity</i>	0.946 [0.918-0.975]	0.666 [0.501-0.83]	0.951 [0.924-0.979]	0.721 [0.562-0.881]	0.993 [0.985-1.001]	0.950 [0.917-0.982]	0.920 [0.875-0.965]	0.639 [0.439-0.838]

289 Note: 95% Confidence intervals in brackets. Ratios and prediction intervals according to the different fiscal reform scenarios in comparison with the baseline.

290

291 Firstly, we observe that Child benefit intervention CB2, consisting of a monthly benefit
1
2
3 292 amount of €500 for each child younger than 5 years in families with household equivalised
4
5 293 disposable income lower than €500, has very strong effects on overweight (-11%) and obesity
6
7 294 (-36%) for children of 120 months of age, with a prevalence rate of 0.89 (95%CI: 0.83-0.94)
8
9
10 295 and 0.64 (95%CI: 0.44-0.84), respectively. Secondly, Basic Income intervention BI2, consisting
11
12 296 of a monthly benefit amount of €100 for each family member and no further eligibility
13
14 297 requirements, again for children of 120 months of age, shows quite important effects on
15
16 298 overweight (-12%) and obesity (-33%) with a prevalence rate of 0.88 (95%CI: 0.82-0.93) for
17
18 299 the former outcome variable of interest, and 0.67 (95%CI: 0.50-0.83) for the latter.
19
20
21
22
23

24 300 Figure 2 shows the distribution of the equivalised disposable income in logarithmic units, and
25
26 301 the distribution of Body Mass Index (BMI) at different ages. First column of figures portraits
27
28 302 the less focalized intervention, Basic Income BI2, whereas second column depicts the more
29
30 303 focalized intervention, Child Benefit CB2. Black curve represents distribution at baseline
31
32 304 scenario, whereas the red curve represents the distribution after the benefit policy
33
34 305 simulation.
35
36
37
38
39

40 306 Basic Income BI2 simulation shows a similar pattern to Child Benefit CB2 simulation, although
41
42 307 shifts for the latter seem to be more distinct than those for the former. Child Benefit CB2
43
44 308 simulation shows a correspondence between the shift to the right on the equivalised income
45
46 309 distribution and the subsequent shift to the left on BMI distributions at all ages.
47
48
49
50

51 310
52
53
54 311 Finally, Table 5 shows estimated costs for 1% prevalence reduction in overweight and obesity
55
56 312 at 48, 84 and 120 months of age with respect to the baseline scenario. It's noteworthy to
57
58 313 mention that another salient feature of EUROMOD is that it automatically computes and
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 314 provides the prospective cost of each simulated scenario. Given the different characteristics
2
3 315 of the simulated benefit policies, our estimated costs computations for 1% prevalence
4
5 316 reduction show a wide range of values. At 48 months after birth, NB1 and CB1 policies are the
6
7 317 most efficient scenarios for both, overweight and obesity, with estimated costs of €6.4 and
8
9 318 €27.6 billion, respectively, for NB1, and €4.7 and €15.0 billion, respectively, for CB1. At 84
10
11 319 months after birth the most favourable policies are the same as those at 48 months after
12
13 320 birth. NB1 shows costs of €2.4 and €10.7 billion for overweight and obesity, respectively,
14
15 321 whereas CB1 depicts costs of €2.0 and €5.5 billion for the aforementioned variables,
16
17 322 respectively. Finally, at 120 months after birth, again, NB1 and CB1 scenarios are the most
18
19 323 efficient in order to reduce prevalence in 1% with respect to baseline scenario. For overweigh
20
21 324 and obesity, NB1 shows costs of €1.4 and €4.6 billion, respectively, whereas CB1 scenario
22
23 325 shows costs of €1.2 and €2.7 billion, respectively.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 326 It is worthy to point out that, according to results shown in Table 4 and Table 5, we observe
32
33 327 that at 48, 84, and 120 months after birth, cost estimates for NB1 and NB2 are distinctly
34
35 328 smaller than those corresponding to Basic Income scenarios BI1 and BI2. However, estimated
36
37 329 reductions in prevalence ratios among BI1 and New-borns Benefit scenarios, NB1 and NB2,
38
39 330 are rather similar.
40
41
42
43
44

45 331

46 332

47 333

48 334

49 335

50

51

52


53

54

55

56

336 **Figure 2 Kernel Density plots of the distribution of the logarithm of equivalised disposable**
 337 **income, and BMI at 48, 84, and 120 months of age**



339
 340 *Note: Black curve = distribution at baseline. Red curve= distribution after corresponding benefit policy simulation.*
 341 *BI2= Simulated Fiscal Policy of Basic Income for all families with a cash transfer of € 100 per month to each family*
 342 *member. CB2= Simulated Fiscal Policy of Child Benefit given to households with per capita income < €500 month,*
 343 *being the cash transfer of €500 monthly for each child < 5 years old.*

345 **Table 5 Estimated costs for 1% prevalence reduction in overweight and obesity**

	Basic Income		Poverty Reduction		New-borns Benefit		Child Benefit	
	BI1	BI2	PR1	PR2	NB1	NB2	CB1	CB2
48 months:								
Overweight	79.8	109.9	20.6	32.5	6.4	8.7	4.7	8.4
Obesity	272.1	505.0	60.7	133.2	27.6	40.5	15.0	36.4
84 months:								
Overweight	33.7	43.1	9.0	12.7	2.4	3.3	2.0	3.3
Obesity	109.0	217.1	22.7	51.5	10.7	17.0	5.5	14.6
120 months:								
Overweight	19.7	23.3	5.6	7.0	1.4	1.8	1.2	1.8
Obesity	59.3	110.2	11.9	23.8	4.6	7.9	2.7	6.9

346 *Note: Prevalence reduction with respect to baseline scenario. Figures in billions of euros.*

348 DISCUSSION

349 This study shows how simulated fiscal reforms, and in particular poverty-reduction fiscal
 350 policies, could strongly reduce overweight and childhood obesity in a high-income European
 351 country, such as Italy. Our findings quantify also the dose-response relationship between
 352 increased benefits and impact on overweight and obesity for each of the eight simulated fiscal
 353 interventions. Moreover, focalising the simulated interventions on households with new-
 354 borns or children, instead of on all households, seemed to be particularly efficient in terms of
 355 marginal benefits.

356 To our knowledge this is the first study that creates a comprehensive microsimulation model
 357 to evaluate the effects of fiscal policies on health, taking advantage of a consolidated platform
 358 such as EUROMOD, and integrating it with microsimulation algorithms that project the effects
 359 of the equalised disposable household income on the chosen health outcome. Ultimately,
 360 our approach allows to forecast the effectiveness and efficiency of large fiscal interventions
 361 on a representative sample of the population.

1
2
3 362 Besides its methodological sophistication and comprehensiveness, the MICH model
4
5 363 constitutes an unprecedented attempt to provide evidence of how fiscal policies could affect
6
7 364 health outcomes in the population, and could be a systematically used tool in fiscal and health
8
9 365 policy-making. Only another recently published study used EUROMOD to evaluate the impact
10
11 366 of fiscal policies on overall mortality in Scotland, showing that policies targeting the poorest
12
13 367 populations were the most effective to reduce inequalities [30]. However, while its fiscal
14
15 368 simulations were comprehensive, the association between income and mortality - used to
16
17 369 develop all forecasting scenarios - was not obtained through individual-level longitudinal
18
19 370 data, but it was estimated by a cross-sectional regression model based only on population
20
21 371 quintiles.

22
23
24
25
26 372 Fiscal reforms have historically been evaluated only in terms of their economic effects, while
27
28 373 their impact on other dimensions of society have been neglected [31]. The MICH model could
29
30 374 provide evidence of such effects at the time of decision-making, allowing a more balanced
31
32 375 and informed choice and implementation of fiscal policies. Moreover, the model is
33
34 376 particularly relevant in high-income countries where poverty-alleviation policies are mainly
35
36 377 based on fiscal reforms and are often required to demonstrate effective targeting and
37
38 378 efficiency of fiscal benefits to the poorest populations. Finally, being based on data from the
39
40 379 EUROMOD platform and from the EU-SILC surveys, which are available for several European
41
42 380 countries, and being the EHII available for several European birth cohort studies (almost all
43
44 381 LifeCycle cohorts [27]), the MICH model could be used to evaluate and compare the effect of
45
46 382 a broad range of fiscal policies on childhood health across different European countries.

47
48
49
50 383 The choice of the fiscal policies in the simulation has been based on the most common
51
52 384 universal and targeted poverty-reduction interventions currently implemented by the
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

385 majority of EU governments. Household disposable income is among the strongest social
386 determinant of health, because it is a direct measure of material resources, and changes in
387 its levels could have an effect on several health outcomes for the members of the family [2,
388 32–34]. Previous studies have shown an association between household income and child
389 obesity [35, 36], suggesting the implementation of income subsidies to reduce the economic
390 restrictions of those individuals with lesser economic means. To the best of our knowledge
391 there are no randomized trials of fiscal interventions or increased total family disposable
392 income with child BMI as the outcome, but a few quasi-experimental studies have evaluated
393 the impact of cash transfers on child obesity. [37] The overall impact of these interventions
394 seems to be dependent on the baseline income of the intervention recipients, the age of
395 children at the time of transfer and also the context where the intervention is delivered [38–
396 40].

397 Other mathematical modelling studies have attempted to evaluate the effects of different
398 interventions on childhood obesity. A recent microsimulation study showed the combined
399 effectiveness of after-school physical activities, sugar-sweetened beverage taxes, and a ban
400 on child-directed fast-food advertising [8]; another study created a specific microsimulation
401 model called Early Prevention of Obesity in Childhood (EPOCH) which was able to model BMI
402 trajectories from early childhood to adolescence [10]. Several other simulation models
403 included behavioural and environmental contributors, and focused policy interventions [9].
404 However, none of these foregoing studies included income, and its variations due to poverty-
405 reduction interventions, as one of the explanatory variables of childhood obesity.

406 This study and its microsimulation model are particularly relevant during the current COVID-
407 19 pandemic, which has triggered the worst global economic crisis since the Great

1
2
3 408 Depression, with a World GDP contraction of 4.5% and dramatic increases in unemployment
4
5
6 409 and poverty rates in almost all nations [41, 42].
7
8
9 410 One of the main instruments used by most governments to increase the resilience of their
10
11 411 populations has been extended fiscal benefits, but is still unclear how much these
12
13 412 interventions have been able to mitigate the increase in household poverty levels. In fact, the
14
15 413 strict or partial lockdowns applied in almost all countries could have increased sedentary
16
17 414 behaviours, and the dramatic income losses could have forced some families to buy cheaper
18
19 415 and more obesogenic foods, especially for children. While physical activity interventions
20
21 416 would be difficult and slow to implement due to lockdown measures, fiscal poverty-reduction
22
23 417 interventions could be a fast and effective instrument to curb this tendency.
24
25
26
27 418 One of the main limitations of this study regards the estimated marginal effects. Fiscal
28
29 419 reforms have a wide range of effects, spanning from socioeconomic to health outcomes, and
30
31 420 the objective of our study is to show their - mostly unintended - impact only on a specific
32
33 421 health outcome, child overweight and obesity. As a consequence, the exercise of evaluating
34
35 422 the marginal benefits cannot be interpreted as a cost-effectiveness evaluation. Another
36
37 423 limitation of our study is that, while our statistical associations, obtained from a cohort study,
38
39 424 are respecting many of the traditional conditions of causality (strength of the associations,
40
41 425 consistency, specificity, temporality and plausibility), and have the advantage of being specific
42
43 426 for the population in which the simulations were conducted, the observational nature of the
44
45 427 study cannot rule out the possibility that they are not causal. We also acknowledge that the
46
47 428 NINFEA cohort has attrition, even if within the standard magnitude for such kind of child
48
49 429 cohorts. Moreover, we did not include all the variables associated with overweight and
50
51 430 obesity in the concatenated regression models of MICH M2 module. This is because we
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

431 included confounding factors only of the association between EHII and BMI, and not
432 mediators of such association (such as childhood diet, physical activity, etc.) that would have
433 affected the real effect estimates of EHII. However, due to the complexity of the overweight
434 and obesity theoretical framework, we acknowledge that we cannot completely rule out the
435 possibility of remaining omitted variable bias.

436 CONCLUSIONS

437 In conclusion, our study illustrates the construction of an unprecedented integrated
438 microsimulation model – based on the consolidated EUROMOD platform - able to forecast
439 the effect of a broad range of fiscal interventions on childhood obesity, with algorithms and
440 codes potentially flexible to be used for other health outcomes and for other European
441 countries. While the impact of fiscal policies is usually measured on economic outcomes, our
442 study was the first to quantify their effects on one of the most concerning child health
443 problems in high-income countries. Potential impacts of fiscal interventions on health of the
444 population should be taken into account during the process of policy-making, and should be
445 considered in the framework of the Health in All policies (HiAP) [11] .

446

447

448

449

450

451

452	<u>LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS</u>
453	<u>BI: Universal Basic income</u>
454	<u>BI1: Baseline Income scenario 1</u>
455	<u>BI2: Baseline Income scenario 2</u>
456	<u>BMI: Body Mass Index</u>
457	<u>BMI_{48m}: Child's body mass index at 4 years of age</u>
458	<u>BMI_{84m}: Child's body mass index at 7 years of age</u>
459	<u>BMI_{120m}: Child's body mass index at 10 years of age</u>
460	<u>BS: Baseline Scenario</u>
461	<u>BW: Child's birth weight</u>
462	<u>CB: Child Benefit</u>
463	<u>CB1: Child Benefit scenario 1</u>
464	<u>CB2: Child Benefit scenario 2</u>
465	<u>CEDAP: Certificato di Assistenza al Parto (translated as Italian birth registry)</u>
466	<u>COVID-19: Coronavirus Disease 2019</u>
467	<u>DG EMPL: Directorate-General for Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion</u>
468	<u>EHI: Equivalised Household Income Indicator</u>
469	<u>EPOCH: Early Prevention of Obesity in Childhood</u>
470	<u>EU: European Union</u>
471	<u>EU-SILC: European Union Statistics on Income and Living Conditions</u>
472	<u>GA: Gestational Age</u>
473	<u>GDP: Gross Domestic Product</u>
474	<u>H2020: Horizon 2020</u>
475	<u>HiAP: Health in All Policies</u>
476	<u>IOTF: International Obesity Task Force</u>
477	<u>ISPOR-SMDM: International Society for Pharmacoeconomics and Outcomes Research and the</u>
478	<u>Society for Medical Decision Making</u>
479	<u>MICH: Microsimulation for Income and Child Health</u>
480	<u>M1: Module 1</u>
481	<u>M2: Module 2</u>
482	<u>M3: Module 3</u>

483 **NINFEA:** Nascita e Infanzia: gli Effetti dell’Ambiente (translated as Birth and Childhood: The
484 Effects of the Environment)

485 **NB1:** New-borns Benefit scenario 1

486 **NB2:** New-borns Benefit scenario 2

487 **OECD:** Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development

488 **PR:** Prevalence Ratio

489 **PR1:** Poverty Reduction scenario 1

490 **PR2:** Poverty Reduction scenario 2

491 **SEP:** Socio-Economic Position

492 **UK:** United Kingdom

493 **WT_{6m}:** Child's weight at 6 months after being born

494 **WT_{18m}:** Child's weight at 18 months after being born

495 **DECLARATIONS**

496 **Acknowledgments**

497 The authors are grateful to all participants of the NINFEA cohort. EUROMOD is maintained,
498 developed and managed jointly by the Institute for Social and Economic Research (ISER) at
499 the University of Essex and the Joint Research Centre of the European Commission, in
500 collaboration with national teams from the EU member states. We are indebted to the many
501 people who have contributed to the development of EUROMOD. The process of extending
502 and updating EUROMOD is financially supported by the European Union Programme for
503 Employment and Social Innovation ‘Easi’ (2014-2020). The results and their interpretation are
504 the authors’ responsibility. We are grateful for the valuable comments of Prof. Franco Sassi.
505 DR and NB acknowledge support from the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation and
506 State Research Agency through the “Centro de Excelencia Severo Ochoa 2019-2023” Program
507 (CEX2018-000806-S), and support from the Generalitat de Catalunya through the CERCA
508 Program.

509 **Consent for Publication**

510 Not applicable.

511 **Funding**

512 LIFECYCLE. The LIFE-CYCLE project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon
513 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 733206. This
514 publication reflects only the author's views and the European Commission is not liable for any
515 use that may be made of the information contained therein. STOP. The STOP project
516 (<http://www.stopchildobesity.eu/>) received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020
517 research and innovation programme under Grant Agreement No.774548. The STOP
518 Consortium is coordinated by Imperial College London and includes 24 organisations across
519 Europe, the United States and New Zealand. The content of this publication reflects only the
520 views of the authors, and the European Commission is not liable for any use that may be made
521 of the information it contains. NINFEA. The NINFEA cohort was partially funded by the
522 Compagnia San Paolo Foundation and by the Piedmont Region. MAH is supported by the British
523 Heart Foundation.

524 **Availability of Data and Materials**

525 Anonymus individual data from the NINFEA Cohort could be provided upon request to the
526 authors. EU-SILC dataset used as input for EUROMOD are available upon request to Eurostat
527 (<https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat>) and to EUROMOD (<https://euromod-web.jrc.ec.europa.eu/>)

528

529

530 **Authors' contributions**

531 LR, MGR, CP and DR developed the study concept. LR, MGR, CP and DR designed the study.

532 DR developed the simulation models with the support of MGR. All authors contributed to data

533 interpretation and analysis. DR, CP and NB wrote the final draft of the manuscript. All authors

534 read and approved the final manuscript.

535 **Competing Interest (check if there are competing interests)**

536 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

537 **Ethics Approval and Consent to Participate**

538 The Ethical Committee of the San Giovanni Battista Hospital and CTO/CRF/Maria Adelaide

539 Hospital of Turin approved the NINFEA study (approval N. 0048362, and subsequent

540 amendments) and all the participants gave informed consent at enrolment.

541 **Supplementary Information**

542 Additional file 1.

543 Additional description of the modelling process.

544 Additional file 2.

545 Additional information about the European tax-benefit model EUROMOD.

546 Additional file 3.

547 Additional information about the NINFEA cohort.

548 **REFERENCES**

- 1
2
3 549 1. Phipps SA, Burton PS, Osberg LS, Lethbridge LN. Poverty and the extent of child obesity in
4 550 Canada, Norway and the United States. *Obes Rev Off J Int Assoc Study Obes.* 2006;7:5–12.
- 5
6
7 551 2. Marmot M, Friel S, Bell R, Houweling TA, Taylor S. Closing the gap in a generation: health
8 552 equity through action on the social determinants of health. *The Lancet.* 2008;372:1661–9.
- 9
10 553 3. Lenhart O. The effects of income on health: new evidence from the Earned Income Tax
11 554 Credit. *Rev Econ Househ.* 2019;17:377–410.
- 12
13
14 555 4. Trends in adult body-mass index in 200 countries from 1975 to 2014: a pooled analysis of
15 556 1698 population-based measurement studies with 19·2 million participants. *The Lancet.*
16 557 2016;387:1377–96.
- 17
18
19 558 5. Greves Grow HM, Cook AJ, Arterburn DE, Saelens BE, Drewnowski A, Lozano P. Child
20 559 obesity associated with social disadvantage of children’s neighborhoods. *Soc Sci Med.*
21 560 2010;71:584–91. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2010.04.018.
- 22
23
24 561 6. Gable S, Lutz S. Household, Parent, and Child Contributions to Childhood Obesity. *Fam*
25 562 *Relat.* 2000;49:293–300. doi:https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3729.2000.00293.x.
- 26
27
28 563 7. Ogden CL, Carroll MD, Fakhouri TH, Hales CM, Fryar CD, Li X, et al. Prevalence of Obesity
29 564 Among Youths by Household Income and Education Level of Head of Household — United
30 565 States 2011–2014. *Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2018;67:186–9.
31 566 doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6706a3.
- 32
33
34 567 8. Kristensen AH, Flottemesch TJ, Maciosek MV, Jenson J, Barclay G, Ashe M, et al. Reducing
35 568 childhood obesity through U.S. federal policy: a microsimulation analysis. *Am J Prev Med.*
36 569 2014;47:604–12.
- 37
38
39 570 9. Levy DT, Mabry PL, Wang YC, Gortmaker S, Huang TT-K, Marsh T, et al. Simulation models
40 571 of obesity: a review of the literature and implications for research and policy. *Obes Rev.*
41 572 2011;12:378–94.
- 42
43
44 573 10. Hayes A, Tan EJ, Lung T, Brown V, Moodie M, Baur L. A New Model for Evaluation of
45 574 Interventions to Prevent Obesity in Early Childhood. *Front Endocrinol.* 2019;10.
46 575 doi:10.3389/fendo.2019.00132.
- 47
48
49 576 11. World Health Organization, Finland, Sosiaali- ja terveystieteiden ministeriö, Global Conference on
50 577 Health Promotion. Health in all policies: Helsinki statement, framework for country action :
51 578 the 8th Global Conference on Health Promotion jointly organized by. 2014.
52 579 http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/112636/1/9789241506908_eng.pdf. Accessed 15
53 580 Apr 2021.
- 54
55
56 581 12. Bargain O, Orsini K, Peichl A. Comparing Labor Supply Elasticities in Europe and the
57 582 United States New Results. *J Hum Resour.* 2014;49:723–838. doi:10.3368/jhr.49.3.723.

- 583 13. Barrios S, Dolls M, Maftai A, Peichl A, Riscado S, Varga J, et al. Dynamic Scoring of Tax
1 584 Reforms in the European Union. *J Policy Anal Manage*. 2019;38:239–62.
2 585 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1002/pam.22105>.
3
4
5 586 14. The design of fiscal consolidation measures in the European Union: distributional effects
6 587 and implications for macroeconomic recovery - Institute for Social and Economic Research
7 588 (ISER). <https://www.iser.essex.ac.uk/research/publications/working-papers/euromod/em5->
8 589 15. Accessed 22 Apr 2021.
- 10
11 590 15. Decoster A, Jukka Pirttilä J, Holly Sutherland H, Gemma Wright G. SOUTHMOD:
12 591 Modelling tax-benefit systems in developing countries. *Int J Microsimulation*. 2019;12:1–12.
- 14
15 592 16. Caro JJ, Briggs AH, Siebert U, Kuntz KM, Force I-SMGRPT. Modeling good research
16 593 practices—overview: a report of the ISPOR-SMDM Modeling Good Research Practices Task
17 594 Force-1. *Med Decis Mak Int J Soc Med Decis Mak*. 2012;32:667–77.
- 19
20 595 17. Sutherland H, Figari F. EUROMOD: the European Union tax-benefit microsimulation
21 596 model. *Int J Microsimulation*. 2012;6:4–26. doi:10.34196/ijm.00075.
- 23 597 18. Eurostat. U - Statistics on Income and Living Conditions microdata 2004-2018, release
24 598 2020, version 1. 2020.
25 599 <https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/203647/203704/EU+SILC+DOI+2020v1.pdf>.
26 600 Accessed 15 Apr 2021.
- 28
29 601 19. Ceriani L, Figari F, Fiorio C. EUROMOD Country Report ITALY (IT) 2017-2020. 2020.
30 602 <https://euromod-web.jrc.ec.europa.eu/using-euromod/country-reports/latest>. Accessed 15
31 603 Apr 2021.
- 33
34 604 20. Deza M, Jara HX, Oliva N, Torres J. Simulating Personal Income Tax Reforms and Fiscal
35 605 Gains in the Andean Region. Inter-American Development Bank; 2020.
36 606 doi:10.18235/0002493.
- 38
39 607 21. EUROMOD. Centre for Microsimulation and Policy Analysis.
40 608 <https://www.microsimulation.ac.uk/euromod/>. Accessed 20 Sep 2021.
- 42
43 609 22. Pizzi C, Richiardi M, Charles M-A, Heude B, Lanoe J-L, Lioret S, et al. Measuring Child
44 610 Socio-Economic Position in Birth Cohort Research: The Development of a Novel
45 611 Standardized Household Income Indicator. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2020;17:1700.
- 47
48 612 23. Richiardi L, Baussano I, Vizzini L, Douwes J, Pearce N, Merletti F, et al. Feasibility of
49 613 recruiting a birth cohort through the Internet: the experience of the NINFEA cohort. *Eur J*
50 614 *Epidemiol*. 2007;22:831–7.
- 52
53 615 24. Progetto NINFEA | Index. <https://www.progettoninfea.it/>. Accessed 22 Apr 2021.
- 54
55 616 25. Cole TJ, Lobstein T. Extended international (IOTF) body mass index cut-offs for thinness,
56 617 overweight and obesity. *Pediatr Obes*. 2012;7:284–94.

618 26. Glossary:Equivalised disposable income. [https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-](https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Glossary:Equivalised_disposable_income)
619 [explained/index.php?title=Glossary:Equivalised_disposable_income](https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Glossary:Equivalised_disposable_income). Accessed 20 Sep 2021.

620 27. LifeCycle. LifeCycle. <https://lifecycle-project.eu/>. Accessed 15 Apr 2021.

621 28. Mooney CZ. Monte Carlo Simulation. SAGE; 1997.

622 29. Salute della M. Certificato di assistenza al parto (CeDAP). Analisi dell'evento nascita -
623 Anno 2017.
624 http://www.salute.gov.it/portale/documentazione/p6_2_2_1.jsp?lingua=italiano&id=2931.
625 Accessed 16 Nov 2020.

626 30. Richardson E, Fenton L, Parkinson J, Pulford A, Taulbut M, McCartney G, et al. The effect
627 of income-based policies on mortality inequalities in Scotland: a modelling study. *Lancet*
628 *Public Health*. 2020;5:e150–6.

629 31. Fair Society Healthy Lives (The Marmot Review). Institute of Health Equity.
630 [http://www.instituteofhealthequity.org/resources-reports/fair-society-healthy-lives-the-](http://www.instituteofhealthequity.org/resources-reports/fair-society-healthy-lives-the-marmot-review)
631 [marmot-review](http://www.instituteofhealthequity.org/resources-reports/fair-society-healthy-lives-the-marmot-review). Accessed 15 Apr 2021.

632 32. Stronks K, van de Mheen H, van den Bos J, Mackenbach JP. The interrelationship
633 between income, health and employment status. *Int J Epidemiol*. 1997;26:592–600.

634 33. Mackenbach JP, Looman CW. Life expectancy and national income in Europe, 1900-
635 2008: an update of Preston's analysis. *Int J Epidemiol*. 2013;42:1100–10.

636 34. Cole BL, Shimkhada R, Morgenstern H, Kominski G, Fielding JE, Wu S. Projected health
637 impact of the Los Angeles City living wage ordinance. *J Epidemiol Community Health*.
638 2005;59:645–50.

639 35. Costa-Font J, Gil J. Intergenerational and socioeconomic gradients of child obesity. *Soc*
640 *Sci Med*. 2013;93:29–37.

641 36. Eagle TF, Sheetz A, Gurm R, Woodward AC, Kline-Rogers E, Leibowitz R, et al.
642 Understanding childhood obesity in America: Linkages between household income,
643 community resources, and children's behaviors. *Am Heart J*. 2012;163:836–43.

644 37. Cooper K, Stewart K. Does Money Affect Children's Outcomes? An update. :41.

645 38. Watson B, Guettabi M, Reimer M. Universal Cash Transfers Reduce Childhood Obesity
646 Rates. SSRN Scholarly Paper. Rochester, NY: Social Science Research Network; 2019.
647 doi:10.2139/ssrn.3380033.

648 39. Akee R, Simeonova E, Copeland W, Angold A, Costello EJ. Young Adult Obesity and
649 Household Income: Effects of Unconditional Cash Transfers. *Am Econ J Appl Econ*. 2013;5:1–
650 28.

651 40. Akee R, Simeonova E, Copeland W, Angold A, Costello J. Does More Money Make You
652 Fat? The Effects of Quasi-Experimental Income Transfers on Adolescent and Young Adult

653 Obesity. SSRN Scholarly Paper. Rochester, NY: Social Science Research Network; 2010.
1 654 <https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=1663175>. Accessed 29 Sep 2021.

3
4 655 41. Han J, Meyer BD, Sullivan JX. Income and Poverty in the COVID-19 Pandemic. National
5 656 Bureau of Economic Research; 2020. doi:10.3386/w27729.

6
7 657 42. OECD Economic Outlook, Interim Report September 2020. 2020.
8 658 <http://www.oecd.org/economic-outlook/september-2020>.

9
10
11 659
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

BMED-D-21-01486R1

Developing an integrated microsimulation model for the impact of fiscal policies on child health in Europe: the example of childhood obesity in Italy

Davide Rasella; Lorenzo Richiardi; Nicolai Brachowicz; H. Xavier Jara; Mark Hanson; Delia Boccia; Matteo G. Richiardi; Costanza Pizzi
BMC Medicine

Dear Prof. Rasella,

Your manuscript 'Developing an integrated microsimulation model for the impact of fiscal policies on child health in Europe: the example of childhood obesity in Italy' (BMED-D-21-01486R1) has been assessed by our reviewers. Based on these reports, and my own assessment as Editor, I am pleased to inform you that it is potentially acceptable for publication in BMC Medicine, once you have carried out some essential revisions suggested by our reviewers.

Their reports, together with any other comments, are below. Please also take a moment to check our website at

<https://www.editorialmanager.com/bmed/l.asp?i=492207&l=8NUGQF0T> for any additional comments that were saved as attachments. Once you have made the necessary corrections, please submit a revised manuscript online at:

<https://www.editorialmanager.com/bmed/>

If you have forgotten your username or password please use the 'Send Login Details' link to get your login information. For security reasons, your password will be reset.

We request that a point-by-point response letter accompanies your revised manuscript. This letter must provide a detailed response to each reviewer/editorial point raised, describing what amendments have been made to the manuscript text and where these can be found (e.g. Methods section, line 12, page 5). If you disagree with any comments raised, please provide a detailed rebuttal to help explain and justify your decision.

Please also ensure that your revised manuscript conforms to the journal style, which can be found in the Instructions for Authors on the journal homepage.

A decision will be made once we have received your revised manuscript, which we expect by 28 Sep 2021.

Please note that you will not be able to add, remove, or change the order of authors once the editor has accepted your manuscript for publication.

Any proposed changes to the authorship must be requested during peer-review, and adhere to our criteria for authorship as outlined in BioMed Central's policies.

To request a change in authorship, please download the 'Request for change in authorship form' which can be found here

- <http://www.biomedcentral.com/about/editorialpolicies#authorship>.

Please note that incomplete forms will be rejected.

Your request will be taken into consideration by the editor, and you will be advised whether any changes will be permitted.

Please be aware that we may investigate, or ask your institute to investigate, any

unauthorized attempts to change authorship or discrepancies in authorship between the submitted and revised versions of your manuscript.

Once you have completed and returned the form, your request will be considered and you will be advised whether the requested changes will be allowed.

By resubmitting your manuscript you confirm that all author details on the revised version are correct, that all authors have agreed to authorship and order of authorship for this manuscript and that all authors have the appropriate permissions and rights to the reported data.

We look forward to receiving your revised manuscript and please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any questions.

Best wishes,

Ming Yang, PhD
BMC Medicine
<https://bmcmmedicine.biomedcentral.com/>

Editor's Comments:

1. We require confirmation of authorship from all co-authors, and have not yet received a response from the listed authors. I have resent them the verification email containing the confirmation link. May I kindly ask that you follow up on this or provide us with alternative email addresses, if necessary? Co-authors should contact us directly to confirm co-authorship if they have any problems.

Still to confirm co-authorship

- Delia Boccia
- Matteo G. Richiardi

A: Both co-authors should have confirmed the coauthorship.

2. Please include a figure legend. Figure legends should be no more than 300 words (advised but not mandatory).

A: Now, all figures have the corresponding legend. Section Methods, Figure 1, lines 111-113, page 6, and lines 344-347 page 19.

3. Each file (whether main or Additional) should be mentioned in the main manuscript text in order.

A: Now, all files are mentioned in the main manuscript text in order. Section Methods, lines 104, page 5; line 125, page 6; and line 138, page 7.

4. Please rename supplementary files as 'Additional file X', and cite explicitly by additional file name in the manuscript e.g. 'Additional file 1: Fig. S1'. Please ensure that

if you have more than one additional file that they are cited in ascending order within the main body of text.

A: Supplementary files were renamed in accordance with BMC Medicine guidelines. Supplementary information Section, lines 530, 532, 534, page 29.

5. Please add a description of your additional file to the end of the manuscript. Legends to Combined Additional files should include a short description of the constituent parts, e.g. "Additional File 1: Figures S1-S3. FigS1- [short title]. FigS2 – [short title]. FigS3 – [short title]...". Please note that legends are advised to be no more than 300 words, though this is not mandatory.

A: Description of additional files added in Supplementary information Section, lines 531, 533, 535, page 29.

6. Please could you update the reference formatting to remove the extra details of Month of publication, date cited, and "Internet". References should follow the format: Smith JJ. The world of science. Am J Sci. 1999;36:234-5. Journal titles should be abbreviated as in the National Library of Medicine <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/nlmcatalog/journals>

A: Thank you for noticing that, we have changed the references style in accordance with BMC Medicine guidelines.

7. Please move all references to the main reference list (i.e. no additional references in Additional Files). These should be included in the main text when the Additional File is first introduced, for example "...see Additional File 1: Table S1) [XX-XX]"; please ensure the reference list is numbered in the order as they appear in the text.

A: References that were previously included in Supplementary material but not were mentioned in the main manuscript are now cited in Section Methods, lines 104-105, page 5.

8. Please make the following change to your section headings: change 'Introduction' to 'Background'.

A: We did it. Background Section, line 64, page 4.

9. Manuscripts should have the following subsections: Background/Methods/Results/Discussion/Conclusions. Please add a new subsection entitled Conclusions.

A: We added Conclusions subtitle before the already existing conclusion paragraph. Conclusions Section, line 431, page 24.

10. Please provide a list of all the abbreviations used in the manuscript. Please place this list just before the Declarations section. If abbreviations are used in the text, they should be defined in the text at first use and included in this list.

A: List of Abbreviations was added just before the Declarations section, lines 442-484, pages 24-26. For the sake of simplicity and clarity, the Microsimulation for Income and

Child Health Outcomes (MICHO) was renamed Microsimulation for Income and Child Health (MICH) along the text and in the additional files.

11. You should include a “Declarations” section, consisting of the following subsections: Acknowledgments; Consent for Publication; Funding; Availability of Data and Materials; Authors’ Contributions; Competing interests; Ethics Approval and Consent to Participate. All of these subsections MUST be present.

- The “Authors’ Contributions” section of the Declarations should include the text “All authors read and approved the final manuscript”
- The “Competing Interests” section of the Declarations should include any relevant competing interests, or state “The authors declare that they have no competing interests”. See here for our editorial policies and a full explanation of competing interests. <https://www.biomedcentral.com/getpublished/editorial-policies#CompetingInterests>

A: As requested we added the Declarations Section, with all subsections present, from line 489 of page 26.

Reviewer reports:

Reviewer #1: This is a revised manuscript describing a microsimulation model testing the impact of a range of fiscal policies on child weight in Italy. The authors have done a good job of addressing the issues raised by myself and the other reviewer. I just have two remaining comments.

The first relates to a comment in the response to reviewers: "To the best of our knowledge there are no randomized trials of fiscal interventions or increased total family disposable income with child BMI as the outcome. There are several quasi experimental studies on cash transfer, but those studies were conducted in a different population (United States) and did not include child BMI as one of the health outcomes." There are actually a handful of quasi experimental studies on cash transfers with BMI as the outcome, across several countries, and these have found mixed results - see review article: Cooper K, Stewart K. (2017) Does money affect children's outcomes? An update. Case paper 203; ISSN 1460-5023. Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion, London. <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/103494/1/casepaper203.pdf>. This should be acknowledged in light of the strong effects implied by the microsimulation.

A: We thank the reviewer for bringing to our attention the review from Cooper et al. In their work they only mention one study about EITC and obesity from Chia et al, 2013, which admittedly we did not know. As suggested by the reviewer, there are indeed a handful of studies on the effect of income support interventions and obesity among children; however, conclusions from these studies need to be interpreted cautiously, because: a. Only few come from high income countries (the vast majority are from middle income countries); b. results can be conflicting as in some cases these interventions have been associated with an increase of obesity among children. This seems to be dependent on the baseline income of the intervention recipients, the age of children at the time of transfer and also the context where the intervention is delivered). Interestingly, in LMICS results become more consistent in the direction of a positive impact when interventions are delivered in combination with health education and in context where food quality and availability is improved. Overall, these findings

do not undermine the role of income-support interventions in addressing child obesity, but suggest that their maximum potential is achieved when delivered in combination with health education and within a food secure environment (in terms of food quality).

We have added at page 22 line 391: "To the best of our knowledge there are no randomized trials of fiscal interventions or increased total family disposable income with child BMI as the outcome, but a few quasi-experimental studies have evaluated the impact of cash transfers on child obesity. [37] The overall impact of these interventions seems to be dependent on the baseline income of the intervention recipients, the age of children at the time of transfer and also the context where the intervention is delivered [38–40]."

Second, there was another comment in the response to reviewers, "response rates and attrition are at the standard level (after 10 years a lost of around 30% of the participants). Due to that reason, and that the attrition was not differential due to the overall characteristics of the remaining individuals, we didn't use any approach to correct for that." The table in the Supplementary Methods described the level of attrition - thank you - but I couldn't see evidence that the attrition was not differential, though perhaps I missed it. Can this be made clear and a brief comment included in the paper indicating that attrition was not differential?

A: We thank the reviewer for this comment. The sentence about non-differentiability was based on the comparison of the distribution of the weight measures at 18 months between those lost to the 4-year follow-up and those still in the study at that time: mean weight at 18 months in the two groups equal to 11130 and 11191 grams respectively (p-value from T-Student test=0.23). However, we agree with the reviewer that the statement about non-differentiability is too strong as several other factors might affect attrition, so we did not included such statement in the main text or in the additional files, and we have left in the limitations section (p.24 line 433):" We also acknowledge that the NINFEA cohort has attrition, even if within the standard magnitude for such kind of child cohorts."

Editorial Policies

Please read the following information and revise your manuscript as necessary. If your manuscript does not adhere to our editorial requirements, this may cause a delay while this is addressed. Failure to adhere to our policies may result in rejection of your manuscript.

In accordance with BioMed Central editorial policies and formatting guidelines, all manuscript submissions to BMC Medicine must contain a Declarations section which includes the mandatory sub-sections listed below.

Please refer to the journal's Submission Guidelines web page for information regarding the criteria for each sub-section (<https://bmcmmedicine.biomedcentral.com/>).

Where a mandatory Declarations section is not relevant to your study design or article type, please write 'Not applicable' in these sections.

For the 'Availability of data and materials' section, please provide information about

where the data supporting your findings can be found.

We encourage authors to deposit their datasets in publicly available repositories (where available and appropriate), or to be presented within the manuscript and/or additional supporting files.

Please note that identifying/confidential patient data should not be shared.

Authors who do not wish to share their data must confirm this under this sub-heading and also provide their reasons.

For further guidance on how to format this section, please refer to BioMed Central's editorial policies page (see links below).

Declarations

-

Ethics approval and consent to participate

-

Consent to publish

-

Availability of data and materials

-

Competing interests

-

Funding

-

Authors' Contributions

-

Acknowledgements

Further information about our editorial policies can be found at the following links:

Ethical approval and consent:

<http://www.biomedcentral.com/about/editorialpolicies#Ethics>

Availability of data and materials section:

<http://www.biomedcentral.com/submissions/editorial-policies#availability+of+data+and+materials>


****Our flexible approach during the COVID-19 pandemic****

If you need more time at any stage of the peer-review process, please do let us know. While our systems will continue to remind you of the original timelines, we aim to be as flexible as possible during the current pandemic.


This letter contains confidential information, is for your own use, and should not be


forwarded to third parties.

Recipients of this email are registered users within the Editorial Manager database for this journal. We will keep your information on file to use in the process of submitting, evaluating and publishing a manuscript. For more information on how we use your personal details please see our privacy policy at <https://www.springernature.com/production-privacy-policy>. If you no longer wish to receive messages from this journal or you have questions regarding database management, please contact the Publication Office at the link below.





Click here to access/download
Supplementary Material
Additional_file_1.docx





Click here to access/download
Supplementary Material
Additional_file_2.docx





Click here to access/download
Supplementary Material
Additional_file_3.docx

