## **Supplementary Information**

## **Supplementary Text S1: Linear Mixed Models**

Results for Linear Mixed Models are reported in Table S15 (see Table S16 for model example). In addition to the (potential) exposure variables (Table S17), the treatment group indicator, and their interactions, the model controlled for test type, treatment by test type, and included the following random effects: participant intercepts, school intercepts, time intercepts plus random slopes for treatment status (i.e., heterogeneity across time that differs between control and treatment schools at the group level), and school by time intercepts.

We used the default settings in the R (1) packages 'lme4' (2) and 'lmerTest' (3). The majority of the models failed the default convergence criteria (based on absolute gradients). However, except for one model, the relative gradients were acceptable (<0.0002) and these models converged when using an alternative implementation of the optimizer. Consequently, we only treated one model as truly non-converged (see Table S16). The models were slightly misspecified in terms of the variance structure (there is lower variance for Reading than for the other tests, see Table 2), but we considered the models to be acceptable approximations. We did not succeed in running more complex models in other available software (e.g., due to memory limitation and software crash).

## **Supplementary Text S2: Bayes Factors**

As an alternative way of quantifying statistical uncertainty, we calculated Bayes Factors (BFs) for the main analyses (see (4)). These are included in the Supplementary Materials (Table S18). They were pre-specified as a comparison between the likelihood of a null effect (exact null) and the likelihood of a distribution of positive effect sizes. The distribution was a half t-distribution with 3 degrees of freedom. This distribution is close to a half-normal distribution (folded normal distribution) but with a slightly longer tail to accommodate potentially larger effect sizes. The mode of the distribution was 0 and the standard deviation was 0.03 for the continuous impact models (linear and non-linear effect) and 0.05 for the dummy impact model. These ranges of effect sizes cover the typical small effects observed in large RCTs on school interventions (see (5)). The BFs supported the conclusion that a positive impact of the main text because they are easily misunderstood in the context of negative results (they compare the likelihood of the null with the likelihood of a distribution of positive effect sizes, not negative).

	Dimin	ishing Impact		Numbe	r of fruit-years		Any fr	uit	
	В	[95% CI]	Р	В	[95% CI]	р	В	[95% CI]	p
Selective Sample									
Original Scale									
Phase-in	-0.39	[-0.81, 0.00]	.05	-0.18	[-0.35, -0.01]	.04	-0.66	[-1.44, 0.13]	.10
Phase-out	-0.14	[-0.71, 0.42]	.56	-0.07	[-0.39, 0.24]	.62	-0.22	[-1.01, 0.58]	.53
Test Year	0.49	[-0.37, 1.33]	.24	0.41	[-0.33, 1.18]	.28	0.52	[-0.37, 1.44]	.25
Standardized									
Phase-in	-0.04	[-0.09, 0.01]	.07	-0.02	[-0.04, 0.00]	.10	-0.08	[-0.17, 0.01]	.08
Phase-out	-0.01	[-0.07, 0.05]	.64	-0.00	[-0.04, 0.03]	.76	-0.02	[-0.11, 0.07]	.61
Test Year	0.05	[-0.06, 0.15]	.33	0.04	[-0.05, 0.13]	.35	0.05	[-0.06, 0.17]	.26
Full Sample									
Original Scale									
Phase-in	-0.31	[-0.55, -0.08]	.01	-0.14	[-0.24,-0.05]	.004	-0.50	[-0.99, -0.02]	.05
Phase-out	-0.25	[-0.68, 0.16]	.20	-0.15	[-0.42, 0.12]	.26	-0.36	[-1.02, 0.31]	.24
Test Year	0.32	[-0.12, 0.78]	.14	0.29	[-0.14, 0.71]	.15	0.33	[-0.15, 0.83]	.15
Standardized									
Phase-in	-0.03	[-0.06, -0.01]	.009	-0.01	[-0.02,-0.00]	.005	-0.06	[-0.11, -0.01]	.03
Phase-out	-0.02	[-0.07, 0.02]	.26	-0.01	[-0.04, 0.01]	.33	-0.04	[-0.11, 0.04]	.27
Test Year	0.03	[-0.02, 0.08]	.18	0.02	[-0.02, 0.07]	.27	0.03	[-0.02, 0.08]	.17

Table S1. Regression coefficients (B), confidence intervals (CI) and p-values (p) for analyses of raw scores and standardized scores, Selective and Full Samples, 5<sup>th</sup> grade tests.

*Note.* Analysis on selective sample (n=203,142) included fixed effects of school by test type (n=7388) and year (n=13); 342 fixed effects singletons omitted; CIs and *ps* from wild cluster bootstrapping (999 replications; null imposed; School [n=2483] and year [n=13] as cluster variables. Analysis on full Ssample (n=2,152,909) included fixed effects of school by test type (n=7981) and year (n=13); 76 fixed effects singletons omitted; CIs and *ps* from wild cluster bootstrapping (999 replications; null imposed; school [n=2,667] and year [n=13] as cluster variables).

	Dimin	iching Impact		Numbo	or of fruit years		A py fr	uit	
				NUMBE	er of fruit-years		АПУП	uit	
	В	[95% CI]	Р	В	[95% CI]	р	В	[95% CI]	р
Selective Sample									
Original Scale									
Phase-in	-0.39	[-0.82, 0.01]	.06	-0.18	[-0.37, -0.02]	.07	-0.68	[-1.44, 0.10]	.07
Phase-out	-0.16	[-0.69 <i>,</i> 0.39]	.55	-0.08	[-0.39, 0.23]	.57	-0.25	[-1.01, 0.59]	.48
Test Year	0.50	[-0.45, 1.41]	.22	0.43	[-0.31, 1.15]	.22	0.53	[-0.37, 1.44]	.20
Standardized									
Phase-in	-0.04	[-0.09, 0.01]	.09	-0.02	[-0.04, 0.00]	.08	-0.08	[-0.17, 0.01]	.07
Phase-out	-0.01	[-0.07, 0.04]	.66	-0.01	[-0.04, 0.03]	.74	-0.03	[-0.13, 0.08]	.56
Test Year	0.05	[-0.06, 0.16]	.29	0.04	[-0.05, 0.13]	.34	0.06	[-0.05, 0.16]	.25
Full Sample									
Original Scale									
Phase-in	-0.29	[-0.51, -0.07]	.02	-0.13	[-0.22,-0.05]	.005	-0.48	[-0.92, -0.04]	.04
Phase-out	-0.23	[-0.64, 0.18]	.23	-0.13	[-0.41, 0.12]	.28	-0.33	[-0.95, 0.29]	.26
Test Year	0.31	[-0.11, 0.74]	.13	0.28	[-0.14, 0.69]	.15	0.32	[-0.13, 0.79]	.13
Standardized									
Phase-in	-0.03	[-0.05, -0.00]	.02	-0.01	[-0.02,-0.00]	.01	-0.05	[-0.10, -0.00]	.03
Phase-out	-0.02	[-0.06, 0.02]	.30	-0.01	[-0.04, 0.02]	.37	-0.03	[-0.10, 0.04]	.28
Test Year	0.03	[-0.02 <i>,</i> 0.07]	.18	0.02	[-0.02, 0.07]	.27	0.03	[-0.02, 0.08]	.17

*Table S2. Demographic-adjusted regression coefficients (B), confidence intervals (CI) and p-values (p) for analyses of raw scores and standardized scores, Selective and Full Samples, 5<sup>th</sup> grade tests.* 

*Note.* Controlling for sex, mother's and father's birth country (Norwegian, other Western, Non-Western), year by centrality, mother's and father's educations (7 levels), mother's and father's incomes and squared incomes. Analysis on selective sample (n=198,965) included fixed effects of school by test type (n=7376) and year (n=13); 349 fixed effects singletons omitted; CIs and *ps* from wild cluster bootstrapping (999 replications; null imposed; School [n=2480] and year [n=13] as cluster variables. Analysis on full Ssample (n=1,988,582) included fixed effects of school by test type (n=7969) and year (n=13); 76 fixed effects singletons omitted; CIs and *ps* from wild cluster bootstrapping (999 replications; null imposed; school [n=2,662] and year [n=13] as cluster variables).

	Dimini	shing impact		Numbe	r of fruit-years		Any fruit		
	В	[95% CI]	р	В	[95% CI]	р	В	[95% CI]	р
Selective Sample									
Original Scale									
Phase-in	-0.31	[-0.78, 0.14]	.16	-0.14	[-0.34, 0.07]	.15	-0.54	[-1.30, 0.26]	.16
Phase-out	-0.05	[-0.71, 0.61]	.86	-0.02	[-0.41, 0.36]	.92	-0.08	[-1.14, 0.95]	.86
Test Year	0.40	[-0.49, 1.27]	.34	0.33	[-0.42, 1.12]	.36	0.42	[-0.50, 1.38]	.34
Standardized									
Phase-in	-0.04	[-0.09, 0.02]	.18	-0.01	[-0.04, 0.01]	.17	-0.07	[-0.17, 0.04]	.17
Phase-out	-0.00	[-0.09, 0.08]	.93	0.00	[-0.04, 0.05]	.96	-0.01	[-0.12, 0.11]	.86
Test Year	0.04	[-0.07, 0.15]	.39	0.03	[-0.06, 0.12]	.43	0.04	[-0.06, 0.15]	.38
Full Sample									
Original Scale									
Phase-in	-0.21	[-0.38, -0.03]	.03	-0.10	[-0.16, -0.03]	.01	-0.35	[-0.75, 0.03]	.07
Phase-out	-0.15	[-0.53, 0.23]	.37	-0.08	[-0.31, 0.15]	.42	-0.25	[-0.77, 0.29]	.31
Test Year	0.16	[-0.19, 0.54]	.33	0.15	[-0.22, 0.52]	.41	0.17	[-0.25, 0.58]	.35
Standardized									
Phase-in	-0.02	[-0.05, -0.00]	.05	-0.01	[-0.02,-0.00]	.04	-0.04	[-0.08, 0.00]	.05
Phase-out	-0.01	[-0.06, 0.03]	.44	-0.01	[-0.03, 0.02]	.54	-0.03	[-0.09, 0.04]	.36
Test Year	0.02	[-0.02, 0.06]	.37	0.01	[-0.03, 0.06]	.46	0.02	[-0.02, 0.06]	.36

*Table S3. Covariate-adjusted regression coefficients (B), confidence intervals (CI) and p-values (p) for analyses of the Selective and Full Samples, 5*<sup>th</sup> grade test.

*Note.* Controlling for sex, mother's and father's birth country (Norwegian, other Western, Non-Western), year by centrality, mother's and father's educations (7 levels), mother's and father's incomes and squared incomes, size of cohort at school, size of cohort at school by treatment status, proportion of pupils exempted from the test, proportion exempted by treatment status (sex and birth countries not included in analysis on selective sample of non-immigrant boys). Analysis on Selective Sample (n=198,929) included fixed effects of school by test type (n=7373) and year (n=13); 349 fixed effects singletons were omitted; School (n=2479) and year (n=13) were cluster variables. Analysis on full sample (n=1,987,939) included fixed effects of school by test type (n=7366) and Year (n=13); 76 fixed effects singletons omitted; School (n=2,661) and year (n=13) were cluster variables. CIs and *ps* from wild cluster bootstrapping.

	В	[95 % CI]	р
Sex			·
Male	Ref.		
Female	-0.02	[-0.051, 0.005]	.10
Mother's Birth Country <sup>1</sup>			
Norway	Ref.		
Western	0.031	[0.018, 0.045]	<.001
Non-Western	-0.098	[-0.119, 0.077]	.30
Father's Birth Country <sup>1</sup>			
Norway	Ref.		
Western	0.031	[0.018, 0.044]	<.001
Non-Western	-0.098	[-0.119, -0.077]	<.001
Mother's Education			
Elementary	Ref.		
Lower Secondary	0.127	[0.086, 0.169]	<.001
Upper Secondary (basic)	0.201	[0.153, 0.250]	<.001
Upper Secondary (completed)	0.273	[0.220,0.325]	<.001
Higher Education (lower lever)	0.458	[0.403, 0.514]	<.001
Higher Education (higher level)	0.579	[0.525, 0.632]	<.001
PhD	0.649	[0.601, 0.696]	<.001
Father's Education			
First Elementary	Ref.		
Lower Secondary	0.084	[0.035, 0.133]	0.003
Upper Secondary (basic)	0.159	[0.110, 0.209]	<.001
Upper Secondary (completed)	0.205	[0.153,0.256]	<.001
Higher Education (lower lever)	0.389	[0.340, 0.439]	<.001
Higher Education (higher level)	0.486	[0.435, 0.537]	<.001
PhD	0.556	[0.498, 0.613]	<.001
Mother's Income <sup>2</sup>			
Linear term	0.028	[0.024, 0.032]	<.001
Quadratic term	-0.000	[-0.001, -0.000]	<.001
Father's Income <sup>2</sup>			
Linear term	0.035	[0.032, 0.038]	<.001
Quadratic term	-0.001	[-0.001, -0.001]	<.001
Number of Fruit-Years <sup>3</sup>	_	•	
Phase-in	-0.013	[-0.023, -0.003]	.013
Phase-out	-0.011	[-0.039, 0.017]	.39
Fruit in Test Year <sup>3</sup>	0.024	[-0.022, 0.071]	.25

Table S4. Example of covariate-adjusted analysis, full sample, 5<sup>th</sup> grade, standardized scores.

*Note.* The model included fixed effect of year (n=13) and school by test type (7966). Standard errors were clustered at year (n=13) and school (2661). <sup>1</sup>Western = EU/EEA, USA, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand . <sup>2</sup>Income is trimmed at 0 and standardized for each year. <sup>3</sup>Wild cluster bootstrapped confidence intervals reported for effect estimates (default two-way cluster-robust confidence intervals reported for other effects).

	Control	Treatment	<b>Undetermined</b> <sup>a</sup>
	Ν	N	Ν
Years	12	12	12
Schools	1,841	1,109	NA
School-Years	20,936	8,685	NA
Pupils	496,058	139,038	104,177
Observations	1,470,989	410,157	301,163
Missing test score	53,094	14,197	12,240
Non-standard tests	42	45	0
Valid standard tests	1,417,855	385,923	288,923
	%	%	%
Female	49.2	49.7	49.3
Non-immigrant	77.0	76.7	80.2
Higher education, mother	48.5	47.2	40,6
Higher education, father	37.2	31.2	31.4
	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)
Mother's income <sup>b</sup>	370' (273')	343' (247')	304' (220')
Father's income <sup>b</sup>	579' (539')	515' (429')	484' (403')
Centrality <sup>c</sup>	836 (109)	757 (162)	873 (102)
Test scores			
Mathematics	28.6 (11.5)	27.9 (11.4)	29.4 (11.9)
English	28.5 (11.8)	28.1 (11.9)	24.6 (10.2)
Reading	26.4 (8.9)	26.0 (8.9)	27.3 (9.0)
Standardized scores			
Mathematics	0.02 (1.00)	-0.04 (0.99)	-0.03 (1.00)
English	0.01 (1.00)	-0.02 (1.01)	-0.02 (1.01)
Reading	0.01 (1.00)	-0.03 (1.00)	-0.02 (1.00)

*Table S5. Descriptive statistics according to treatment group, 8<sup>th</sup> grade tests.* 

*Note.* The table excludes data from 2007 where treatment status for all data is Undetermined (60,037 pupils and 172,853 observations). <sup>a</sup>The parameters for the Undetermined category are dominated by data from the earliest years (70% of the observations are from 2008-2009). <sup>b</sup>Income reported in NOK 1000; negative values trimmed at 0. <sup>c</sup>Urbanicity of the schools' municipalities, maximum = 1000. Abbreviations: NA= Not available; SD = Standard Deviation.

	Dimin	ishing impact		Numbe	r of fruit-years	
	В	[95% CI]	Р	В	[95% CI]	Р
Selective Sample						
Original Scale						
Phase-in	-1.04	[-1.88, -0.19]	.02	-0.17	[-0.32, -0.03]	.02
Phase-out	-1.01	[-1.90, -0.16]	.03	-0.16	[-0.35, 0.04]	.10
Standardized						
Phase-in	-0.10	[-0.17, -0.02]	.01	-0.02	[-0.02, -0.00]	.01
Phase-out	-0.10	[-0.19, -0.00]	.04	-0.01	[-0.03, 0.00]	.10
Full Sample						
Original Scale						
Phase-in	-0.39	-1.01, 0.21	.18	-0.07	-0.14,0.01	.08
Phase-out	-0.47	-1.18, 0.23	.15	-0.10	-0.23, 0.03	.10
Standardized						
Phase-in	-0.03	-0.08, 0.02	.21	-0.01	-0.01, 0.00	.16
Phase-out	-0.04	-0.10, 0.02	.16	-0.01	-0.02, 0.00	.10

*Table S6. Regression coefficients (B), confidence intervals (CI) and p-values (p) for analyses of 8<sup>th</sup> grade tests (no data in 2007).* 

*Note.* Selective Sample: Fixed effects of school by test type (n=7214) and year (n=12), clustered at school (n=2,423) and year (n=12), observations = 174,510. 517 fixed effects singletons omitted. Full sample: Fixed effects of school by test type (n=8334) and year (n=12), clustered at school (n=2801) and year (n=12), observations = 1,803,394. Bootstrapped, with null imposed, 999 replications. 384 fixed effects singletons omitted. There were 79,878 missing observations (exempted/not participated) 45,764 in control (3.1%) and 22,043 in treatment (5.4%). Apart from data on treatment status missing entirely for the year 2007, there were 289,092 observations with missing on treatment status (ranging from 2057 in 2017 to 144921 in 2009). The effect of having fruit in the test year and the impact model of having any fruit cannot be properly estimated for the 8<sup>th</sup> grade test (both treatment and control received fruit in the test year during the policy and all pupils in the treatment schools had received fruit at least one year).

	Dimin	ishing Impact		Numbe	r of fruit-years		Any fr	uit	
	В	[95% CI]	Р	В	[95% CI]	р	В	[95% CI]	р
Selective Sample									
Original Scale									
Phase-in	-0.01	[-0.64, 0.63]	.98	-0.05	[-0.21, 0.10]	.43	0.36	[-0.35, 1.07]	.32
Phase-out	-0.00	[-0.65, 0.65]	.99	-0.03	[-0.20, 0.13]	.62	0.32	[-0.28, 0.92]	.25
Standardized									
Phase-in	-0.00	[-0.07, 0.06]	.89	-0.01	[-0.02, 0.01]	.38	-0.03	[-0.04, 0.10]	.35
Phase-out	-0.00	[-0.06 <i>,</i> 0.06]	.95	-0.00	[-0.02, 0.01]	.61	-0.03	[-0.03, 0.08]	.30
Full Sample									
Original Scale									
Phase-in	0.02	[-0.28, -0.32]	.86	-0.03	[-0.12, 0.06]	.47	0.15	[-0.32, 0.63]	.53
Phase-out	-0.04	[-0.28, 0.20]	.73	-0.04	[-0.13, 0.05]	.29	0.03	[-0.34, 0.41]	.86
Standardized									
Phase-in	-0.00	[-0.03, 0.02]	.99	-0.00	[-0.01,-0.00]	.42	0.01	[-0.03, 0.05]	.76
Phase-out	-0.01	[-0.03, 0.01]	.43	-0.01	[-0.01, 0.00]	.22	-0.01	[-0.04, 0.02]	.66

Table S7. Regression coefficients (B), confidence intervals (CI) and p-values (p) for alternative analysis of 8<sup>th</sup> grade data (using current school as a proxy for elementary school treatment status).

Note. Selective Sample: Fixed effects of school by test type (n=3669) and year (n=13), clustered at school (n=1,235) and year (n=13), observations = 229,011. Bootstrapped, with null imposed, 999 replications. 140 fixed effects singletons omitted. Full sample: Fixed effects of school by test type (n=3927) and year (n=13), clustered at school (n=1,318) and year (n=13), observations = 2,224,169. Bootstrapped, with null imposed, 999 replications. 40 fixed effects singletons omitted.

Table S8. Regression coefficients (B), confidence intervals (CI) and p-values (p) for analyses of 10<sup>th</sup> grade exams when Phase-out includes years 2015-2019 (exposure in the past but not the previous year after to policy after policy was repealed).

	Dimin	Diminishing impact			er of fruit-years	Any fruit			
	В	[95% CI]	Р	В	[95% CI]	Р	В	[95% CI]	р
Phase-In	-0.19	[-0.41, 0.03]	0.08	-0.13	[-0.24, -0.02]	.03	-0.23	[-0.59, 0.13]	0.19
Phase-Out	-0.27	[-0.40, -0.10]	0.007	-0.10	[-0.15, -0.04]	.002	-0.50	[-0.83, -0.18]	0.008

*Note.* Scaled as "school points" (grade multiplied by 10). Fixed effects of school by test type (n=2707) and year (n=18), clustered at school (n=954) and year (n=18), observations = 27,050. Cls and ps based on Wild Cluster Bootstrapping, null imposed, 999 replications. 216 fixed effects singletons omitted. Phase-In from Phase-Out from 2015 to 2019

Table S9. Regression coefficients (B), confidence intervals (CI) and p-values (p) for analyses of 10<sup>th</sup> grade exams when Phase-out is coded as decreasing years of exposure (years 2018-2019)

	Diminishing impact			Numbe	r of fruit-years	Any fruit			
	В	[95% CI]	Р	В	[95% CI]	Р	В	[95% CI]	р
Phase-In	-0.28	[-0.43, -0.12]	0.003	-0.12	[-0.17, -0.06]	.001	-0.40	[-0.71, -0.09]	0.02
Phase-Out	-0.17	[-0.40, 0.07]	0.12	-0.06	[-0.14, 0.02]	.11	-0.29	[-0.71, 0.15]	0.18

Note. Fixed effects of school by test type (n=2707) and year (n=18), clustered at school (n=954) and year (n=18), observations = 27,050. CIs and ps based on Wild Cluster Bootstrapping, null imposed, 999 replications. 216 fixed effects singletons omitted.

*Table S10. Regression coefficients (B), confidence intervals (CI) and p-values (p) for analyses of 9<sup>th</sup> grade national tests.* 

	Dimin	ishing impact		Numb	er of fruit-years	
	В	[95% CI]	Р	В	[95% CI]	Р
Selective Sample						
Original Scale						
Phase-in	-1.46	[-3.11, 0.20]	.08	-0.18	[-0.38 <i>,</i> 0.02]	.09
Phase-out	-1.53	[-3.32, 0.23]	.08	-0.19	[-0.37, -0.00]	.04
Standardized						
Phase-in	-0.14	[-0.30, 0.02]	.09	-0.02	[-0.04 <i>,</i> 0.00]	.08
Phase-out	-0.15	[-0.31, 0.02]	.08	-0.02	[-0.04 <i>,</i> 0.00]	.06
Full Sample						
Original Scale						
Phase-in	-1.19	-1.86, -0.53	.002	-0.10	-0.18, -0.02	.02
Phase-out	-1.29	-2.07, -0.50	.001	-0.13	-0.21, -0.06	.006
Standardized						
Phase-in	-0.11	-0.17, -0.05	.002	-0.01	-0.02, 0.00	.05
Phase-out	-0.12	-0.18, -0.06	<.001	-0.01	-0.02, -0.00	.007

*Note.* Selective Sample: Fixed effects of school by test type (n=2319) and year (n=10), clustered at school (n=1,167) and year (n=10), observations = 111,728. Bootstrapped, with null imposed, 999 replications. 99 fixed effects singletons omitted. Full sample: Fixed effects of school by test type (n=2495) and year (n=10), clustered at school (n=1252) and year (n=10), observations = 1,140,858. Bootstrapped, with null imposed, 999 replications. 19 fixed effects singletons omitted.

	Dimini	shing impact		Numb	er of fruit-year	S	Any fr	uit	
	В	[95% CI]	Ρ	В	[95% CI]	Ρ	В	[95% CI]	р
Original Scale									
5 <sup>th</sup> grade	-0.31	[-0.50, -0.11]	.005	-0.14	[-0.24, -0.05]	.006	-0.49	[-0.86, -0.13]	0.01
8 <sup>th</sup> grade	-0.38	[-0.82 <i>,</i> 0.06]	.08	-0.07	[-0.14, -0.01]	.02	NA	NA	NA
8 <sup>th</sup> grade (alt.)	0.05	[-0.18, 0.29]	.62	-0.02	[-0.08 <i>,</i> 0.04]	.53	0.20	[-0.26 <i>,</i> 0.66]	0.36
9 <sup>th</sup> grade	-1.35	[-2.14, -0.55]	.005	-0.12	[-0.21, -0.03]	.01	NA	NA	NA
10 <sup>th</sup> grade	-0.27	[-0.41, -0.13]	.001	-0.11	[-0.15, -0.06]	<.001	-0.44	[-0.73, -0.15]	.005
All	-0.30	[-0.40, -0.19]	<.001	-0.11	[-0.14, -0.08]	<.001	-0.46	[-0.68, -0.24]	<.001
All (w/8 <sup>th</sup> alt.)	-0.24	-0.37, -0.11	<.001	-0.09	[-0.13, -0.06]	<.001	-0.38	-0.63, -0.13	.005
Standardized									
5 <sup>th</sup> grade	-0.03	[-0.05, -0.01]	.003	-0.02	[-0.03, -0.01]	.005	-0.06	[-0.09, -0.02]	0.01
8 <sup>th</sup> grade	-0.03	[-0.07, 0.01]	.11	-0.01	[-0.01, 0.00]	.06	NA	[NA]	NA
8 <sup>th</sup> grade (alt.)	0.00	[-0.02, 0.02]	.90	-0.00	[-0.01, 0.00]	.48	0.01	[-0.03 <i>,</i> 0.05]	0.65
9 <sup>th</sup> grade	-0.13	[-0.21, -0.04]	.01	-0.01	[-0.02, -0.00]	.02	NA	[NA]	NA
10 <sup>th</sup> grade	-0.03	[-0.04, -0.01]	.001	-0.01	[-0.02, -0.01]	<.001	-0.04	[-0.07, -0.02]	.005
All	-0.03	[-0.04, -0.02]	<.001	-0.01	[-0.01, -0.01]	<.001	-0.05	[-0.07, -0.03]	<.001
All (w/8 <sup>th</sup> alt.)	-0.03	[-0.04, -0.01]	<.001	-0.01	[-0.01, -0.01]	<.001	-0.04	[-0.07, -0.02]	.002

Table S11. Associations between differences in fruit exposure and aggregated differences in test scores (yearly mean differences between control and treatment), regardless of phase-in/phase-out.

Note "All" includes grade indicators and clustering on cohort (n=106, cluster n=23). No individual-level standard deviations were available for 10<sup>th</sup> grade, therefore the standardized scores were approximated by using grades (school points divided by 10) instead of school points (this approximates a standardized scaling because the standard deviations in national test results with similar means were close to 10).

Table S12. Within-subject analyses for cohorts 2001 to 2004.

	Dimini	shing impact		Number	Number of fruit-years			
	В	[95% CI]	р	В	[95% CI]	p		
Selective Sample								
Original Scale	-2.45	[-6.74, 1.84]	.26	-0.11	[-0.27, 0.05]	.18		
Standardized	-0.12	[-0.57, 0.34]	.62	-0.003	[-0.02, 0.01]	.70		
Full Sample								
Original Scale	-2.45	[-4.65, -0.24]	.03	-0.12	[-0.20, -0.03]	.007		
Standardized	-0.23	[-0.48, 0.02]	.08	-0.008	[-0.017, 0.002]	.11		

*Note.* Selective Sample: Observations 152,768, Fixed effects (56,890) of person (21,397) by test-type (3); 7,471 singleton observations omitted. Full sample: Observations 1,635,564, Fixed effects (607,736) of person (224,338) by test-type (3); 69,707 singleton observations omitted. Cluster-robust standard errors clustered at School in 5<sup>th</sup> grade (N= 2,404 full sample and N=2,237 for selective sample). The effect estimates represent the interaction of the change from 5<sup>th</sup> grade scores to 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> with the level of exposure to free fruit in elementary school (controlled for the changes of each cohort and the overall difference of change for the treatment group).

Table S13. Within-subject analyses for cohorts 1997 to 2006

	Diminis	hing impact		Numbe	Number of fruit-years			
	В	[95% CI]	р	В	[95% CI]	р		
Selective Sample								
Original Scale	-0.72	[-1.65, 0.21]	.11	-0.07	[-0.16, 0.02]	.10		
Standardized	-0.03	[-0.14, 0.10]	.60	-0.002	[-0.012, 0.009]	.72		
Full Sample								
Original Scale	-0.52	[-1.27, 0.20]	.13	-0.06	[-0.12, 0.01]	.08		
Standardized	-0.003	[-0.05, 0.04]	.86	-0.001	[-0.006, 0.004]	.66		

*Note.* Selective Sample: Observations 423,085, Fixed effects (163,397) of person (58,425) by test-type (3); 13,053 singleton observations omitted. Full sample: Observations 4,179,661, Fixed effects (1,616,951) of person (570,769) by test-type (3); 110,223 singleton observations omitted. Cluster-robust standard errors clustered at School in 5<sup>th</sup> grade (n= 2,651 full sample and n=2,542 for selective sample) and cohort (n=10). The effect estimates represent the interaction of the change from 5<sup>th</sup> grade scores to 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> with the level of exposure to free fruit in elementary school (controlled for the changes of each cohort and the overall difference of change for the treatment group).

	Diminishing impact			Numbe	er of fruit-years		Any fruit		
	В	[95% CI]	р	В	[95% CI]	р	В	[95% CI]	р
Selective Sample									
Raw score									
Phase-in	-0.34	[-0.83, 0.14]	.15	-0.16	[-0.35, 0.03]	.10	-0.57	[-1.54, 0.43]	.20
Phase-out	-0.03	[-0.70 <i>,</i> 0.65]	.91	-0.01	[-0.39 <i>,</i> 0.36]	.93	-0.03	[-0.99, 0.91]	.94
Test Year	0.59	[-0.51, 1.74]	.27	0.52	[-0.38, 1.49]	.24	0.62	[-0.58, 1.86]	.27
Standardized									
Phase-in	-0.04	[-0.09, 0.02]	.16	-0.02	[-0.04, 0.01]	.17	-0.07	[-0.19, 0.06]	.22
Phase-out	0.00	[-0.08, 0.08]	.98	0.00	[-0.04, 0.04]	.87	-0.00	[-0.11, 0.11]	.98

0.05

Test Year

0.06

[-0.07, 0.18] .29

*Table S14. Regression coefficients (B), confidence intervals (CI) and p-values (p) for analyses of Selective and Full Samples, 5<sup>th</sup> grade tests, excluding the year 2019 (original pre-registered analyses).* 

Full Sample									
Raw score									
Phase-in	-0.24	[-0.44, -0.04] .	02	-0.12	[-0.20, -0.04]	.01	-0.36	[-0.78, 0.04]	.07
Phase-out	-0.09	[-0.34, 0.14] .	37	-0.06	[-0.20, 0.08]	.34	-0.10	[-0.40, 0.19]	.41

[-0.05, 0.15] .28

0.06

[-0.08, 0.21] .26

Test Year	0.45	[-0.05, 0.93]	.07	0.42	[0.00, 0.82]	.05	0.46	[-0.07, 0.97]	.07
Standardized									
Phase-in	-0.02	[-0.05, -0.00]	.03	-0.01	[-0.02,-0.00]	.02	-0.04	[-0.09, 0.00]	.05
Phase-out	-0.01	[-0.02, 0.01]	.57	-0.00	[-0.01, 0.01]	.61	-0.01	[-0.04, 0.02]	.53
Test Year	0.04	[-0.00, 0.09]	.06	0.04	[-0.00 <i>,</i> 0.08]	.06	0.05	[-0.00, 0.10]	.07

*Note*. Analysis on Selective Sample (n=191,720) included fixed effects of school by test type (n=7359) and year (n=12); 353 fixed effects singletons omitted; CIs and *p*s from wild cluster bootstrapping (999 replications; null imposed; School [n=2472] and year [n=12] as cluster variables. Analysis on full sample (n=1,986,945) included fixed effects of school by test type (n=7969) and year (n=12); 71 fixed effects singletons omitted; CIs and *p*s from wild cluster bootstrapping; school [n=2663] and year [n=12] as cluster variables).

	Dimini	shing impact		Number of fruit-years Any fruit				uit	
	В	[95% CI]	Р	В	[95% CI]	Р	В	[95% CI]	р
Selective Samp	ole								
Phase-in	-0.42	[-0.67, -0.18]	0.01	-0.19	[-0.30, -0.08]	.01	-0.71	[-1.22, -0.19]	0.03
Phase-out	-0.19	[-0.54, 0.16]	0.31	-0.10	[-0.32, 0.13]	.41	-0.29	[-0.87 <i>,</i> 0.28]	0.34
Test Year	0.54	[0.10, 0.98]	0.04	0.47	[0.05 <i>,</i> 0.89]	.06	0.55	[0.03, 1.08]	0.07
Full Sample									
Phase-in	No cor	nvergence		-0.14	[-0.22, -0.06]	.007	-0.49	[-0.89, -0.09]	.04
Phase-out	No cor	nvergence		-0.17	[-0.32, -0.02]	.06	-0.40	[-0.83, 0.02]	.10
Test Year	No cor	nvergence		0.32	[0.02, 0.62]	.06	0.36	[-0.04, 0.76]	.11

Table S15. Results from Linear Mixed Models, 5<sup>th</sup> grade tests.

Abbreviations: CI = (Wald) Confidence Intervals. B = unstandardized regression coefficient.

Fixed Effect	Coef	SE	Df	t	р
Constant	24.33	0.95	9.37	82.35	<.001
Treatment	-1.06	0.15	17.73	-7.19	<.001
Phase-in	0.33	0.10	8.99	3.45	0.007
Phase-out	0.29	0.18	8.99	1.58	0.15
Phase-in*Treatment	-0.14	0.04	9.12	-3.48	0.007
Phase-out*Treatment	-0.17	0.08	9.00	-2.17	0.06
Reading	-6.59	0.01	1,403,016.63	-571.00	<.001
Mathematics	-0.02	0.01	1,405,621.97	-1.59	0.11
Reading: Treatment	0.33	0.03	1,236,477.75	12.90	<.001
Mathematics*Treatment	0.51	0.03	1,247,251.88	-19.90	<.001
Test Year Fruit	0.58	0.36	8.99	1.64	0.14
Test Year Fruit*Treatment	0.32	0.15	9.17	2.12	0.06
Random Effects	Ν		SD		
Pupil (intercept)	760,234		5.62		
School (intercept)	2,691		1.69		
Time (intercept)	13		0.50		
Time (Treatment slope)	13		0.18 (intercep	t-slope corr.	: -0.63)
School*Time (intercept)	29,437		1.69		
Residual	2,153,978		6.03		

Table S16. Example of regression results from a Linear Mixed Model of all 5<sup>th</sup> grade tests, linear impact variable.

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
5 <sup>th</sup> grade													
Fruit-Years (Phase-in)	0	1	2	3	4	4	4	4	0	0	0	0	0
Fruit-Years (Phase-out)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	1	0	0
Fruit in Test Year	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Non-linear (Phase-in)	0	1	1.5	1.75	1.88	1.88	1.88	1.88	0	0	0	0	0
Non-linear (Phase-out)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.75	1.5	1	0	0
Non-linear (Phase-out Alt.)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.88	0.38	0.13	0	0
Any Fruit (Phase-in)	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Any fruit (Phase-out)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0
8 <sup>th</sup> grade													
Fruit-Years (Phase-in)	NA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	0	0	0	0	0
Fruit-Years (Phase-out)	NA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	4	3	2
Non-linear (Phase-in)	NA	1	1.5	1.75	1.88	1.94	1.97	1.98	0	0	0	0	0
Non-linear (Phase-out)	NA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.97	1.94	1.89	1.75	1.5

Table S17. Coding of the Variables Used for the three different impact models.

Note. The Fruit-Years variables indicate the number of years the pupils received free fruit in the school-years preceeding the test (i.e., the learning years). The Fruit in Test Year variable indicate whether the pupils received fruit in the year the test took place (the test is in the beginning of the school year). The Non-linear Impact variables reflect the authors' a priori best guess of the potential impact of number of years of free fruit (diminishing impact of additional years). Abbreviations: NA = Not available (data for past year's school missing);

Table S18. Bayes Factors comparing null effects against a distribution of positive effect sizes, 5<sup>th</sup> grade.

	Diminishing impact	Number of fruit-years	Any fruit
Selective Sample	0.14	0.12	0.21
Full Sample	0.06	0.03	0.11

	Non-linear impact			Numbe	er of fruit-years		Any fruit			
	В	[95% CI]	<i>P B</i> [95% CI]		[95% CI]	р	В	[95% CI]	р	
Selective Sample										
Phase-in	-0.37	[-0.60, -0.14]	.004	-0.16	[-0.28, -0.05]	.009	-0.63	[-1.02, -0.23]	.005	
Phase-out	-0.07	[-0.38, 0.24]	.63	-0.03	[-0.21, 0.15]	.74	-0.12	[-0.60, 0.36]	.61	
Test year	0.40	[-0.03, 0.84]	.07	0.32	[-0.09, 0.74]	.11	0.43	[-0.01, 0.87]	.052	
Full Sample										
Phase-in	-0.32	[-0.48, -0.16]	.001	-0.14	[-0.21, -0.07]	.001	-0.54	[-0.84, -0.24]	.002	
Phase-out	-0.22	[-0.51, 0.08]	.14	-0.11	[-0.29, 0.06]	.19	-0.35	[-0.80, 0.09]	.11	
Test year	0.35	[0.07, 0.63]	.02	0.31	[0.02, 0.61]	.04	0.36	[0.07, 0.65]	.02	

Table S19. Regression coefficients (B), confidence intervals (CI) and p-values (p) for analyses of the Selective and Full Samples when controlling for municipality-specific year effects, 5<sup>th</sup> grade tests.

*Note.* Analysis on Selective Sample (n=203,112) included fixed effects of School by Test Type (n=7388) and Year by School Municipality (n=5242); 372 fixed effects singletons omitted; CIs and *p*s from default robust standard errors clustered on School (n=2483) and Year (n=13). Analysis on Full Sample (n=2,152,903) included fixed effects of School by Test Type (n=7981) and Year by School Municipality (n=5570); 69 fixed effects singletons omitted; CIs and *p*s from default robust standard errors clustered on School (n=2,667) and Year (n=13).



**Figure S1**. Standardized scores, selective sample, 5<sup>th</sup> grade tests. Error bars are 95% confidence intervals of means.



**Figure S2.** Standardized scores, full sample, 5<sup>th</sup> grade tests. Error bars are 95% confidence intervals of means.

## References

 Team RC. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna, Austria2020 [Available from: https://www.R-project.org/.

2. Bates D, Mächler M, Bolker B, Walker S. Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models Using lme4. Journal of Statistical Software. 2015;67(1):48.

 Kuznetsova A, Brockhoff PB, Christensen RHB. ImerTest Package: Tests in Linear Mixed Effects Models. Journal of Statistical Software. 2017;82(13):1-26.

 Dienes Z. Using Bayes to get the most out of non-significant results. Frontiers in Psychology. 2014;5.

Kraft M. Interpreting Effect Sizes of Education Interventions. Educational Researcher.
2019.