

***Triangulating Causality Between Childhood Obesity and
Neurobehavior: Twin and Longitudinal Evidence.***

Supplementary Information

Table S1

Exclusion of cases (baseline wave)

	N	%
Total available at baseline	11933	100
Excluded of missing important values (sex, puberty, race, ethnicity, age, %BMI _{p95})	1062	8.9
Excluded for Medical Condition (diabetes, brain injury, cancer, cerebral palsy, epilepsy)	412	3.5
Excluded for BMI calculation error	38	0.3
Excluded for underweight BMI	212	1.8
Excluded for taking birth control	2	<0.1
Excluded of inaccurate relatedness info	680	5.7
Total at baseline after exclusion	9527	79.8

Note. %BMI_{p95}, percentage of the sex- and age-specific 95th BMI percentile.

10 **Table S2**11 *Demographic information*

	Singletons (N = 7016)		Siblings (N = 2511)	
	M	SD	M	SD
Age (months)	118.6	7.3	119.8	7.9
%BMIp95	85.0	17.9	82.0	16.4
	n	%	n	%
Obese BMI	1239	17.7	334	13.3
Sex at birth				
-Male	3665	52.2	1288	51.3
-Female	3349	47.7	1223	48.7
-Other	2	0.1	0	-
Race				
-White	4449	63.4	1758	70.0
-Black/African American	1044	14.9	323	12.9
-Other/multiple	1523	21.7	430	17.1
Hispanic ethnicity	1589	22.6	348	13.9
Handedness				
-Right	5603	79.9	1993	79.4
-Left	475	6.8	197	7.8
-Mixed	938	13.4	321	12.8
College education of mother	5813	82.9	2235	89.0
Family income				
-Less than \$5,000	228	3.2	62	2.5
-\$5,000 through \$11,999	244	3.5	69	2.7
-\$12,000 through \$15,999	168	2.4	32	1.3
-\$16,000 through \$24,999	318	4.5	94	3.7
-\$25,000 through \$34,999	412	5.9	103	4.1
-\$35,000 through \$49,999	574	8.2	181	7.2
-\$50,000 through \$74,999	876	12.5	341	13.6
\$75,000 through \$99,999	959	13.7	362	14.1
-\$100,000 through \$199,999	1928	27.5	798	31.8
-\$200,000 and greater	735	10.5	324	12.9
-No information	574	8.2	145	5.8

Parent informant

-Childs Biological Mother	6012	85.7	2191	87.3
-Childs Biological Father	684	9.7	225	9.0
-Adoptive Parent	173	2.5	49	2.0
-Childs Custodial Parent	64	0.9	17	0.7
-Other	83	1.2	29	1.2

Note. Children were considered having obesity when their percentage of the sex- and age-specific 95th BMI percentile was equal or greater 100. %BMI_{p95}, percentage of the sex- and age-specific 95th BMI percentile.

16 **Table S3**17 *Composition of poly-phenotype scores*

	DoC	Random-Intercept CLPM	Traditional CLPM
Calculation method	Weights obtained from singletons, applied to siblings	Weights obtained from singletons (baseline) using 10-fold cross-validation, applied to singletons (all waves)	
Personality/psychopathology	CBCL (116 items), SDQ-PSB (3 items), UPPS-P (20 items), BIS/BAS (20 items)	CBCL (116 items), PSB (3 items)	CBCL (116 items), PSB (3 items), UPPS-P (20 items), BIS/BAS (20 items)
Eating behavior	overeating, doesn't eat well	overeating, doesn't eat well	overeating, doesn't eat well
Cognition	NIH-TB (7 scores), RAVLT (3 scores), LMT (2 score), WISC Matrix test (1 score)	-	NIH-TB (5 scores), RAVLT (3 scores), LMT (2 score), Matrix test (1 score)
Brain morphology factors	68 MRI regions of interest	-	68 MRI regions of interest

18 *Note.* For description of instruments see Data Dictionary at [https://nda.nih.gov/general-](https://nda.nih.gov/general-query.html)
19 [query.html](https://nda.nih.gov/general-query.html). BIS/BAS, Behavioral Inhibition System/Behavioral Activation System Scale
20 (Carver & White, 1994); CBCL, Child Behavior Checklist (Achenbach & Edelbrock, 1983);
21 CLPM, cross-lagged panel model; DoC, Direction of Causation; LMT, Little Man Task

(Ratcliff, 1979); NIH-TB, NIH Toolbox for the Assessment of Neurological and Behavioral
Function domain Cognition (Dimensional Change Card Sort Test and List Sorting Working
Memory Test unique to baseline wave; Weintraub et al., 2013); RAVLT, Rey Auditory
Verbal Learning Test (Lezak, 1976); SDQ-PSB, Strength and Difficulties Questionnaire
subscale Prosocial Behavior (Goodman, 1997); UPPS-P urgency-premeditation-perseverance-
sensation seeking-positive urgency Impulsive Behaviors Scale (Cyders et al., 2014); WISC,
Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (Wechsler, 1949).

Table S4

Estimates (below diagonal) and sample sizes (above diagonal) for correlation analyses between percentage of the sex- and age-specific 95th BMI percentile (%BMI_{p95}) and neurobehavior poly-phenotype scores

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. %BMI _{p95}	—	2469	2475	2296	2391	2391	2391
2. Personality/psychopathology	.09***	—	2469	2292	2386	2386	2386
3. Eating behavior	.36***	.16***	—	2295	2390	2390	2390
4. Cognition	.04*	.11***	.04	—	2219	2219	2219
5. Cortical thickness	.14***	-.02	.09***	.00	—	2391	2391
6. Cortical surface area	.06**	.02	.05**	.01	.12***	—	2391
7. Cortical volume	.07***	-.01	.03	-.01	.21***	.35***	—

Note. Weights were trained on singletons and applied to siblings using all available data per variable combination. Associations are shown for the sibling subset. All correlations controlled for family structure. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$.

38 **Table S5**

39 *Sibling pair sample sizes for twin modelling (including Direction of Causation)*

	N _{MZ}	N _{DZ}	N _{total}
Personality/psychopathology	259	954	1213
Eating behavior	259	959	1218
Cognition	228	828	1056
Cortical thickness	245	893	1138
Cortical surface area	245	893	1138
Cortical volume	245	893	1138

40 *Note.* MZ, monozygotic twin pairs; DZ, dizygotic twin or sibling pairs.

41

Table S6

Cholesky ACE model estimates of sex- and age-specific 95th BMI percentile (%BMI_{p95}) and neurobehavior poly-phenotype scores

Variable	A (%)	C (%)	E (%)	r _a	r _e
%BMI _{p95}	89.5	-	10.5	-	-
Personality/psychopathology	48.6	10.6	40.8	.11	.15
Eating behavior	6.6	-	93.4	>.99	.48
Cognition	31.4	-	68.6	.09	-.01
Cortical thickness	57.5	-	42.5	.22	.02
Cortical surface area	36.6	9.6	53.8	.11	.04
Cortical volume	44.6	0.8	54.6	.06	.16

Note. The sibling subset was used for twin modeling. A, additive genetic; C, common environment; E, unique environment; r_a, genetic correlation with %BMI_{p95}; r_e, unique environmental correlation with %BMI_{p95}.

49 **Table S7**50 *Comparison of Direction of Causation models*

PPS	Model	AIC	χ^2	Model comparison (χ^2 -test)		β Obesity-to-PPS [CI]	β PPS-to-Obesity [CI]
				vs. Cholesky (p)	vs. Reciprocal (p)		
Personality/ psychopathology	Cholesky	13068.58	46.77	-	-	-	-
	Reciprocal	13067.94	48.14	.242	-	.01 [-.09, .11]	.08 [-.01, .17]
	Obesity-to-PPS	13068.98	51.18	.110	.081	.09 [.05, .13]	-
	PPS-to-Obesity	13065.98	48.17	.496	.855	-	.09 [.05, .12]
Eating behavior	Cholesky	12862.60	77.99	-	-	-	-
	Reciprocal	12861.50	78.89	.342	-	.26 [.20, .32]	.16 [.11, .20]
	Obesity-to-PPS	12894.79	114.17	<.001	<.001	.40 [.36, .44]	-
	PPS-to-Obesity	12917.35	136.74	<.001	<.001	-	.31 [.28, .35]
Cognition	Cholesky	12780.38	29.10	-	-	-	-
	Reciprocal	12778.38	29.10	>.999	-	.06 [-.02, .13]	-.01 [-.07, .05]
	Obesity-to-PPS	12776.51	29.24	.935	.713	.05 [.00, .09]	-
	PPS-to-Obesity	12778.52	31.25	.342	.143	-	.03 [-.01, .06]
Cortical thickness	Cholesky	12873.78	24.75	-	-	-	-
	Reciprocal	12871.78	24.75	>.999	-	.20 [.10, .30]	-.04 [-.13, .04]
	Obesity-to-PPS	12870.70	25.66	.633	.339	.15 [.11, .20]	-
	PPS-to-Obesity	12884.42	39.39	<.001	<.001	-	.11 [.08, .15]

Cortical surface area	Cholesky	12942.59	21.02	-	-	-	-
	Reciprocal	12940.94	21.36	.559	-	.06 [-.02, .15]	.01 [-.06, .08]
	Obesity-to-PPS	12938.99	21.42	.822	.819	.07 [.03, .11]	-
	PPS-to-Obesity	12941.07	23.50	.290	.144	-	.05 [.02, .09]
Cortical volume	Cholesky	12966.38	41.20	-	-	-	-
	Reciprocal	12964.38	41.20	.981	-	.01 [-.08, .09]	.07 [.00, .14]
	Obesity-to-PPS	12966.30	45.13	.141	.048	.08 [.04, .12]	-
	PPS-to-Obesity	12962.42	41.25	.978	.833	-	.07 [.04, .11]

51 *Note.* The sibling subset was used for twin modeling. Estimated parameters per model: Cholesky 11, Reciprocal 10, Obesity-to-PPS and PPS-to-
52 Obesity 9. χ^2 , Chi-squared model fit; AIC, Akaike information criterion; CI, 95% confidence interval; PPS, poly-phenotype score.

Table S8

Cross-lagged panel model (CLPM) path estimates

		Autoregressive path (a)		“Causal” path (c)	
	N	Obesity	PPS	Obesity-to-PPS	PPS-to-Obesity
<i>Random-intercept CLPM (three waves)</i>					
Personality/psych opathology	3482	.47 [.40, .54] ***	.13 [.07, .19] ***	.03 [-.05, .11]	.04 [.02, .07] **
Eating behavior	3497	.46 [.39, .53] ***	.11 [.06, .17] ***	.11 [.03, .19] **	.02 [.00, .05]
<i>Traditional CLPM (two waves)</i>					
Personality/psych opathology	3416	.82 [.80, .84] ***	.50 [.47, .53] ***	.07 [.04, .10] ***	.03 [.01, .05] **
Eating behavior	3442	.80 [.78, .83] ***	.38 [.34, .43] ***	.22 [.18, .26] ***	.05 [.02, .08] **
Cognition	2952	.83 [.81, .85] ***	.18 [.14, .22] ***	-.04 [-.08, -.01] *	-.01 [-.03, .02]
Cortical thickness	3215	.82 [.80, .84] ***	.66 [.63, .68] ***	.08 [.05, .11] ***	.00 [-.02, .02]
Cortical surface area	3215	.82 [.80, .84] ***	.91 [.90, .92] ***	.02 [.01, .03] **	.00 [-.02, .02]
Cortical volume	3215	.82 [.80, .84] ***	.90 [.89, .91] ***	.02 [.00, .03] *	.00 [-.02, .02]

Note. The singleton subset was used for longitudinal modeling. N, sample size; * p <.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001.

57 **Table S9**


58 Main R (R Core Team, 2020) packages used

Analysis	Package
Twin analysis including Direction of Causation	umx (Bates et al., 2019)
Cross-lagged panel modelling	lavaan (Rosseel, 2012)
Figures	ggplot2 (Wickham, 2016), ggseg (Mowinckel & Vidal-Piñeiro, 2019)

59

Figure S1


Standardized regression coefficients for the associations between the percentage of the sex- and age-specific 95th BMI percentile and control variables



Note. Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals. FDR, false discovery rate.

Figure S2

2D mapped associations between the percentage of the sex- and age-specific 95th BMI percentile and region of interest cortical thickness (A), cortical surface area (B) as well as cortical volume (C)



References

- Achenbach, T. M., & Edelbrock, C. S. (1983). *Manual for the Child Behavior Checklist and Revised Child Behavior Profile*. University Associates in Psychiatry.
- Bates, T. C., Maes, H., & Neale, M. C. (2019). umx: Twin and Path-Based Structural Equation Modeling in R. *Twin Research and Human Genetics*, 22(1), 27–41. <https://doi.org/10.1017/thg.2019.2>
- Carver, C. S., & White, T. L. (1994). Behavioral inhibition, behavioral activation, and affective responses to impending reward and punishment: The BIS/BAS Scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67(2), 319–333.
- Cyders, M. A., Littlefield, A. K., Coffey, S., & Karyadi, K. A. (2014). Examination of a short English version of the UPPS-P Impulsive Behavior Scale. *Addictive Behaviors*, 39(9), 1372–1376. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2014.02.013>
- Goodman, R. (1997). The Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire: A Research Note. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 38(5), 581–586. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.1997.tb01545.x>
- Lezak, M. D. (1976). *Neuropsychological assessment*. Oxford University Press.
- Mowinckel, A. M., & Vidal-Piñeiro, D. (2019). *Visualisation of Brain Statistics with R-packages ggseg and ggseg3d*. arXiv.
- R Core Team. (2020). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing.
- Ratcliff, G. (1979). Spatial thought, mental rotation and the right cerebral hemisphere. *Neuropsychologia*, 17(1), 49–54. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0028-3932\(79\)90021-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0028-3932(79)90021-6)
- Rosseel, Y. (2012). lavaan : An R Package for Structural Equation Modeling. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 48(2). <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v048.i02>
- Wechsler, D. (1949). *Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children*. Psychological Corporation.
- Weintraub, S., Dikmen, S. S., Heaton, R. K., Tulsky, D. S., Zelazo, P. D., Bauer, P. J., Carlozzi, N. E., Slotkin, J., Blitz, D., Wallner-Allen, K., Fox, N. A., Beaumont, J. L., Mungas, D., Nowinski, C. J., Richler, J., Deocampo, J. A., Anderson, J. E., Manly, J. J., Borosh, B., ... Gershon, R. C. (2013). Cognition assessment using the NIH Toolbox. *Neurology*, 80(11 Suppl 3), S54-64. <https://doi.org/10.1212/WNL.0b013e3182872ded>
- Wickham, H. (2016). *ggplot2: Elegant Graphics for Data Analysis*. Springer.