|  |
| --- |
| **Supplemental Table 1: Distribution of birth weight, maternal pre-pregnancy BMI and education among completers and non-completers1.** |
|  | **n** | **Completers** | **Non-completers** | **P-value** |
|  |  | **%** | **%** |  |
| **Birth weight above cutoff (≥4000)** |  |  |  |  |
| No | *160* | *28* | *31* | *0.45* |
| Yes | *383* | *72* | *69* |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Maternal pre-pregnancy BMI above cutoff (BMI > 28 kg/m2)** |  |  |  |  |
| No | *234* | *56* | *55* | *0.83* |
| Yes | *186* | *44* | *45* |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Maternal education** |  |  |  |  |
| Educational level ≤ 10 years | *31* | *3* | *16* | *<0.0001* |
| Educational level > 10 years | *300* | *97* | *84* |
| 1:Eligible family had to meet at least one of the criteria to be considered predisposed to overweight. The reason for variation in N is because most children were selected based on birth weight. Secondly, children were selected on maternal pre-pregnancy BMI. Low maternal socio economic status was used as selection criteria in one municipality and this information was not possible to obtain from the remaining municipalities.  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Supplemental Table 2: Effects of the intervention on intake of energy and macronutrients after 15 month1. Sensitivity analyses without siblings.** |
|  |  | **Intervention group** | **Control group** |  |
|  | **n** | **Mean (95% CI)** | **Mean (95% CI)** | **P-value** |
| **Total energy intake (MJ)**  |  |  |  |  |
| PP | *270* | *5.32 (5.14, 5.51)* | *5.58 (5.40, 5.76)* | *0.05* |
| ITT2 | *504* | *5.29 (5.10, 5.47)* | *5.49 (5.34, 5.64)* | *0.10* |
| **Fat (E%)** |  |  |  |  |
| PP | *285* | *31.0 (30.1, 31.8)* | *30.2 (29.4, 30.9)* | *0.15* |
| ITT2 | *504* | *31.9 (29.7, 32.0)* | *30.0 (29.2, 30.8)* | *0.21* |
| **Fat (MJ)** |  |  |  |  |
| PP | *270* | *1.66 (1.58, 1.74)* | *1.70 (1.62, 1.78)* | *0.52* |
| ITT2 | *504* | *1.64 (1.51, 1.77)* | *1.67 (1.58, 1.75)* | *0.69* |
| **Saturated fat (E%)** |  |  |  |  |
| PP | *270* | *11.2 (10.8, 11.6)* | *11.0 (10.6, 11.4)* | *0.44* |
| ITT2 | *504* | *11.2 (10.8, 11.6)* | *11.0 (10.5, 11.4)* | *0.32* |
| **Saturated fat (MJ)** |  |  |  |  |
| PP | *270* | *0.56 (0.57, 0.63)* | *0.62 (0.59, 0 65)* | *0.44* |
| ITT2 | *504* | *0.60 (0.55, 0.65)* | *0.61 (0.58, 0.64)* | *0.81* |
| **Carbohydrates (E%)** |  |  |  |  |
| PP | *270* | *53.3 (52.4, 54.3)* | *54.1 (53.3, 54.8)* | *0.23* |
| ITT2 | *504* | *53.2 (52.2, 54.1)* | *54.1 (53.4, 54.9)* | *0.10* |
| **Carbohydrates (MJ)** |  |  |  |  |
| PP | *270* | *2.96 (2.86, 3.07)* | *3.15 (3.05, 3.25)* | *0.01* |
| ITT2 | *504* | *2.92 (2.81, 3.03)* | *3.11 (3.01, 3.20)* | *0.003* |
| **Added sugar (E%)** |  |  |  |  |
| PP | *270* | *6.8 (6.1, 7.5)* | *7.4 (6.8, 8.0)* | *0.15* |
| ITT2 | *504* | *6.9 (5.9, 7.68)* | *7.4 (6.8, 8.0)* | *0.32* |
| **Added sugar (MJ)** |  |  |  |  |
| PP | *270* | *0.36 (0.32, 0.40)* | *0.43 (0.38, 0.47)* | *0.03* |
| ITT2 | *504* | *0.37 (0.31, 0.42)* | *0.41 (0.37, 0.46)* | *0.16* |
| **Protein (E%)** |  |  |  |  |
| PP | *270* | *15.7 (15.3, 16.2)* | *15.8 (15.4, 16.1)* | *0.92* |
| ITT2 | *504* | *15.8 (15.4, 16.3)* | *15.8 (15.4, 16.2)* | *0.81* |
| **Protein (MJ)** |  |  |  |  |
| PP | *270* | *0.84 (0.80, 0.87)* | *0.88 (0.84, 0.91)* | *0.12* |
| ITT2 | *504* | *0.84 (0.79, 0.87)* | *0.86 (0.83, 0.90)* | *0.25* |
| PP, Per Protocol.ITT, Intention-To-Treat analyses unadjusted model.1:The difference between groups was tested using linear regression modeling. Results presented as mean (95%CI).2: Imputations on allocated group municipality, BMI z-score, gender, age at baseline, number of months breast fed without supplements, physical activity level at baseline, total energy intake (KJ) at baseline, macronutrients (protein, carbohydrates and fat intake (E%)) at baseline, food groups (fish, SSB, fruit and vegetables intake (g/day) at baseline), maternal ethnicity, paternal ethnicity, maternal education, paternal education, maternal BMI at baseline and paternal BMI at baseline. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Supplemental Table 3: Effects of the intervention on DQI§, and intakes of fruit, vegetables, fish and Sugar sweetened beverages after 15 month1. Sensitivity analyses without siblings.** |
|  |  | **Intervention group** | **Control group** |  |
|  | **n** | **Mean (95% CI)** | **Mean (95% CI)** | **P-value** |
| **Fruit (g/day)**  |  |  |  |  |
| PP | *270* | *102 (91, 113)* | *104 (95, 113)* | *0.79* |
| ITT2 | *504* | *100 (89, 111)* | *98 (87, 109)* | *0.81* |
| **Vegetables (g/day)** |  |  |  |  |
| PP | *270* | *117 (104, 131)* | *118 (108, 127)* | *0.95* |
| ITT2 | *504* | *115 (100, 130)* | *116 (106, 125)* | *0.98* |
| **Fish (g/day)** |  |  |  |  |
| PP | *270* | *20 (16, 25)* | *16 (13, 18)* | *0.10* |
| ITT2 | *504* | *20 (17, 24)* | *15 (11, 20)* | *0.06* |
| **Sugar sweetened beverages (g/day)** |  |  |  |  |
| PP | *270* | *71 (57, 86)* | *78 (64, 93)* | *0.50* |
| ITT2 | *504* | *69 (45, 93)* | *79 (65, 93)* | *0.47* |
| **DQI (units)** |  |  |  |  |
| PP | *270* | *4.4 (4.3, 4.5)* | *4.4 (4.3, 4.5)* | *0.43* |
| ITT2 | *504* | *4.3 (4.2, 4.4)* | *4.4 (4.3, 4.5)* | *0.24* |
| PP, Per ProtocolITT, Intention-To-Treat analyses unadjusted model.1: The difference between groups was tested using linear regression modeling. Results presented as mean (95%CI).2: Imputations on allocated group municipality, BMI z-score, gender, age at baseline, number of months breast fed without supplements, physical activity level at baseline, total energy intake (KJ) at baseline, macronutrients (protein, carbohydrates and fat intake (E%)) at baseline, food groups (fish, SSB, fruit and vegetables intake (g/day) at baseline), maternal ethnicity, paternal ethnicity, maternal education, paternal education, maternal BMI at baseline and paternal BMI at baseline. §: Diet quality index. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Supplemental Table 4: Effects of the intervention on changes in energy intake and macronutrients after 15 month1.**  |
|  |  | **Intervention group** | **Control group** |  |
|  | **n** | **Mean (95% CI)** | **Mean (95% CI)** | **P-value** |
| **Total energy intake (MJ)**  |  |  |  |  |
| PP | *285* | *0.4 (0.2, 0.6)* | *0.7 (0.5, 0.9)* | *0.02* |
| ITT2 | *543* | *0.5 (0.2, 0.7)* | *0.7 (0.6, 0. 9)* | *0.04* |
| **Fat (E%)** |  |  |  |  |
| PP | *285* | *1.8 (1.0, 2.7)* | *1.0 (0.2, 1.7)* | *0.12* |
| ITT2 | *543* | *1.6 (0.7, 2.5)* | *0.7 (-0.2, 1.5)* | *0.07* |
| **Fat (MJ)** |  |  |  |  |
| PP | *285* | *0.22 (0.14, 030)* | *0.27 (0.19, 0.34)* | *0.39* |
| ITT2 | *543* | *0.25 (0.16, 0.34)* | *0.27 (0.19, 0.35)* | *0.73* |
| **Saturated fat (E%)** |  |  |  |  |
| PP | *285* | *0.3 (-0.1, 0.7)* | *0.2 (-0.2, 0.5)* | *0.70* |
| ITT2 | *543* | *0.2 (-0.2, 0.6)* | *0.01 (-0.4, 0.4)* | *0.60* |
| **Saturated fat (MJ)** |  |  |  |  |
| PP | *285* | *0.06 (0.03, 0.09)* | *0.09 (0.06, 0.12)* | *0.18* |
| ITT2 | *543* | *0.07 (0.03, 0.11)* | *0.09 (0.06, 0.13)* | *0.42* |
| **Carbohydrates (E%)** |  |  |  |  |
| PP | *285* | *-2.0 (-3.0, -1.0)* | *-1.1 (-1.8, -0.4)* | *0.14* |
| ITT2 | *543* | *-1.9 (-2.8, -0.9)* | *-0.9 (-1.6, -0.1)* | *0.07* |
| **Carbohydrates (MJ)** |  |  |  |  |
| PP | *285* | *0.12 (0.01, 0.20)* | *0.34, 0.24, 0.43)* | *0.002* |
| ITT2 | *543* | *0.17 (0.02, 0.31)* | *0.38 (0.28, 0.47)* | *0.01* |
| **Added sugar (E%)** |  |  |  |  |
| PP | *285* | *-0.6 (-1.3, 0.1)* | *0.2 (-0.4, 0.8)* | *0.09* |
| ITT2 | *543* | *-0.3 (-1.0, 0.4)* | *0.3 (-0.4, 1.0)* | *0.24* |
| **Added sugar (MJ)** |  |  |  |  |
| PP | *285* | *-0.005 (-0.005, 0.04)* | *0.07 (0.03, 0.11)* | *0.01* |
| ITT2 | *543* | *0.02 (-0.04, 0.08)* | *0.08 (0.04, 0.12)* | *0.06* |
| **Protein (E%)** |  |  |  |  |
| PP | *285* | *0.2 (-0.3, 0.7)* | *0.1 (-0.2, 0.5)* | *0.78* |
| ITT2 | *543* | *0.1 (-0.3, 0.5)* | *0.2 (-0.2, 0.5)* | *0.84* |
| **Protein (MJ)** |  |  |  |  |
| PP | *285* | *0.08 (0.04, 0.11)* | *0.12 (0.08, 0.15)* | *0.12* |
| ITT2 | *543* | *0.08 (0.02, 0.14)* | *0.12 (0.08, 0.16)* | *0.18* |
| PP, Per Protocol.ITT, Intention-To-Treat analyses unadjusted model.1:The difference between groups was tested using linear regression modeling. Results presented as mean (95%CI).2: Imputations on allocated group municipality, BMI z-score, gender, age at baseline, number of months breast fed without supplements, physical activity level at baseline, total energy intake (KJ) at baseline, macronutrients (protein, carbohydrates and fat intake (E%)) at baseline, food groups (fish, SSB, fruit and vegetables intake (g/day) at baseline), maternal ethnicity, paternal ethnicity, maternal education, paternal education, maternal BMI at baseline and paternal BMI at baseline. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Supplemental Table 5: Effects of the intervention on changes in DQI§, and intakes of fruit, vegetables, fish and sugar sweetened beverages after 15 month1.**  |
|  |  | **Intervention group** | **Control group** |  |
|  | **n** | **Mean (95% CI)** | **Mean (95% CI)** | **P-value** |
| **Fruit (g/day)**  |  |  |  |  |
| PP | *285* | *0 (-10, 11)* | *2 (-7, 11)* | *0.31* |
| ITT2 | *543* | *3 (-8, 14)* | *4 (-8, 17)* | *0.90* |
| **Vegetables (g/day)** |  |  |  |  |
| PP | *285* | *20 (7, 33)* | *20 (11, 29)* | *0.96* |
| ITT2 | *543* | *15 (1, 28)* | *18 (7, 29)* | *0.62* |
| **Fish (g/day)** |  |  |  |  |
| PP | *285* | *5 (0, 10)* | *0 (-2, 2)* | *0.07* |
| ITT2 | *543* | *4 (0, 9)* | *0 (-5, 5)* | *0.24* |
| **Sugar sweetened beverages (g/day)** |  |  |  |  |
| PP | *285* | *-2 (-16, 13)* | *8 (-7, 22)* | *0.33* |
| ITT2 | *543* | *0 (-15, 16)* | *16 (-2, 34)* | *0.21* |
| **DQI (units)** |  |  |  |  |
| PP | *285* | *0.04 (-0.05, 0.14)* | *0.09 (0.01, 0.18)* | *0.41* |
| ITT2 | *543* | *0.05 (-0.05, 0.14)* | *0.09 (-0.01, 0.20)* | *0.45* |
| PP, Per ProtocolITT, Intention-To-Treat analyses unadjusted model.1: The difference between groups was tested using linear regression modeling. Results presented as mean (95%CI).2: Imputations on allocated group municipality, BMI z-score, gender, age at baseline, number of months breast fed without supplements, physical activity level at baseline, total energy intake (KJ) at baseline, macronutrients (protein, carbohydrates and fat intake (E%)) at baseline, food groups (fish, SSB, fruit and vegetables intake (g/day) at baseline), maternal ethnicity, paternal ethnicity, maternal education, paternal education, maternal BMI at baseline and paternal BMI at baseline. §: Diet quality index. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Supplemental Table 6: Effects of the intervention on intakes of fruit, vegetables, fish and sugar sweetened beverages after 15 month. Adjusted for total energy intake 1.**  |
|  |  | **Intervention group** | **Control group** |  |
|  | **n** | **Mean (95% CI)** | **Mean (95% CI)** | **P-value** |
| **Fruit (g/day)**  |  |  |  |  |
| PP | *285* | *99 (89, 109)* | *101 (92, 110)* | *0.77* |
| ITT2 | *543* | *98 (87, 109)* | *97 (84, 109)* | *0.89* |
| **Vegetables (g/day)** |  |  |  |  |
| PP | *285* | *115 (103, 128)* | *115.6 (106, 125)* | *0.96* |
| ITT2 | *543* | *110 ( 97, 123)* | *113 (102, 122)* | *0.75* |
| **Fish (g/day)** |  |  |  |  |
| PP | *285* | *20 (16, 26)* | *15 (13, 178)* | *0.07* |
| ITT2 | *543* | *19 (15, 24)* | *15 (11, 19)* | *0.21* |
| **Sugar sweetened beverages (g/day)** |  |  |  |  |
| PP | *285* | *71 (56, 86)* | *819 (67, 95)* | *0.32* |
| ITT2 | *543* | *72 (54, 89)* | *90 (745, 105)* | *0.16* |
| PP, Per ProtocolITT, Intention-To-Treat analyses unadjusted model.1: The difference between groups was tested using linear regression modeling. Results presented as mean (95%CI).2: Imputations on allocated group municipality, BMI z-score, gender, age at baseline, number of months breast fed without supplements, physical activity level at baseline, total energy intake (KJ) at baseline, macronutrients (protein, carbohydrates and fat intake (E%)) at baseline, food groups (fish, SSB, fruit and vegetables intake (g/day) at baseline), maternal ethnicity, paternal ethnicity, maternal education, paternal education, maternal BMI at baseline and paternal BMI at baseline.  |