medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.18.22275036; this version posted May 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

A longitudinal causal graph analysis investigating modifiable risk factors and obesity in a European cohort of children and adolescents

Ronja Foraita[1], Janine Witte[1,2], Claudia Börnhorst[1], Wencke Gwozdz[3,4], Valeria Pala[5], Lauren Lissner[6], Fabio Lauria[7], Lucia Reisch[4,8], Dénes Molnár[9], Stefaan De Henauw[10], Luis Moreno[11], Toomas Veidebaum[12], Michael Tornaritis[13], Iris Pigeot[1,2], Vanessa Didelez[1,2]

1 Leibniz Institute for Prevention Research and Epidemiology – BIPS, Bremen, Germany

2 University of Bremen, Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Science, Bremen, Germany

3 Department of Consumer Research, Communication and Food Sociology, Justus-Liebig-University, Gießen, Germany

4 Department of Management, Society and Communication, Copenhagen Business School, Frederiksberg, Denmark

5 Epidemiology and Prevention Unit, Fondazione IRCCS Istituto Nazionale dei Tumori di Milano, Milan, Italy

6 School of Public Health and Community Medicine, Institute of Medicine, Sahlgrenska Academy, University of Gothenburg, Gothenburg, Sweden

7 Institute of Food Sciences, CNR, Avellino, Italy

8 University of Cambridge, El-Erian Institute of Behavioural Economics and Policy, UK

9 Department of Paediatrics, Medical School, University of Pécs, Pécs, Hungary

10 Department of Public Health and Primary Care, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium

11 GENUD (Growth, Exercise, Nutrition and Development) Research Group, University of Zaragoza, Instituto Agroalimentario de Aragón (IA2), Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria de Aragón (IIS Aragón), Zaragoza, Spain

12 Department of Chronic Diseases, National Institute for Health Development, Tallinn, Estonia

13 Research and Education Institute for Child Health, Strovolos, Cyprus

Corresponding author:

Ronja Foraita, PhD
Leibniz Institute for Prevention Research and Epidemiology – BIPS
Achterstr. 30
28359 Bremen, Germany
Email: foraita@leibniz-bips.de
Phone: +49 (0)421 218-56-954

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.18.22275036; this version posted May 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Abstract

A Cohort Causal Graph (CCG) over the life-course from childhood to adolescence is estimated to identify potential causes of obesity and to determine promising targets for prevention strategies. We adapt a popular causal discovery algorithm to deal with missing values by multiple imputation and with temporal cohort structure. To estimate possible causal effects of modifiable risk factors at baseline on obesity six years later, we used the "Intervention-calculus when the Directed Acyclic Graph is Absent" and double machine learning with confounder adjustment based on the obtained CCG.

Causal relations among 51 variables were analysed including obesity, early life factors, lifestyle and cultural background of 5,112 children from the European IDEFICS/I.Family cohort across three waves (2007-2014). The resulting CCG shows some but not many and only indirect possible pathways from earlier modifiable risk factors such as audio-visual media consumption (AVM) to later obesity. The estimated causal effects suggested that promising interventions would encourage longer sleep or reduce AVM during childhood, both slightly decreasing expected body mass index six years later. But overall, no or only weak causal effects could be found for hypothetical interventions on individual behaviors in early childhood on later obesity.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.18.22275036; this version posted May 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Introduction

Childhood obesity is a serious public health problem in many countries [1] leading to severe co-morbidities in later life such as type 2 diabetes, cardiovascular diseases, certain types of cancer, depression and other psychosocial problems [2-4]. Some authors argue that individual behaviour is shaped by the history of an individual's life events, starting with one's foetal development, biological conditions and the social environment [5, 6]. Prevention of obesity in children and adolescents seems to be the "only feasible solution" to tackle the obesity epidemic [7]. But prevention strategies need promising targets to achieve any public health effect. However, childhood obesity is a complex disorder that appears to be influenced by an interacting system of individual, group and societal settings such as family, school or the country-specific infrastructure (e.g. public health system, built environment).

While most investigations focus on single exposure-outcome associations, our approach assesses the complex interplay of obesity-related factors over the transition from childhood to adolescence by estimating a "cohort causal graph" (CCG), i.e. a causal graph that allows for the cohort structure, including early life, individual, familial and social aspects using data from the European IDEFICS/I.Family cohort [8]. Our analysis accounts for the temporal order of the covariates and for missing values. Based on the CCG, we additionally investigate the effects of (separate) hypothetical interventions on classic modifiable risk factors as potential targets of obesity prevention such as diet, physical activity, media consumption and sleep in childhood on body mass index (BMI) six years later.

Methods

Study Population

The IDEFICS/I.Family cohort [8, 9] is a European cohort study initiated with the overall aims to identify and prevent dietary and lifestyle induced health effects in infants, children and adolescents. The baseline survey (B) was conducted in 2007/08 in eight European countries (Belgium, Cyprus, Estonia, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Spain and Sweden) with 16,229 participating children (2 to 9.9 years old).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.18.22275036; this version posted May 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

The first follow-up examinations (FU1, conducted in 2009/10) included 13,596 children and applied the same standardised assessments. The second follow-up examinations (FU2, conducted in 2013/14) enrolled 7,105 children who already participated at B or FU1. Further details are given in the supplement.

Covariates

We included variables reflecting eating behaviour, lifestyle, social, cultural and environmental factors that are assumed to be related to overweight and obesity across the early life-course. A detailed description of all measurements and their units used in our analysis is provided in Table 1 and in the supplement. Some of these variables are time-invariant, i.e. they cannot be changed by any intervention programme in later childhood, such as region of residence or migration background, reflecting a cultural area. Other time-invariant variables might impact a child's development during pregnancy and as an infant; we will refer to these as early life factors. All other variables are time-varying and were measured repeatedly. Age- and sex-specific BMI z-scores (zBMI) for children and adolescents were calculated [10]. The diet of the child was measured by an adapted version of the Youth Healthy Eating Index (YHEI) [11] which assesses the consumption frequencies of both healthy and unhealthy food as well as eating behaviours by a food frequency questionnaire, where a higher score indicates a healthier diet [12]. Physical activity (PA) was measured by questionnaire, and audio-visual media consumption (AVM) was used as proxy for sedentary behaviour. Total sleep duration including nocturnal and daytime sleep was estimated based on 24-h dietary recall data at B [13] and quantified by self-reports at FU1 and FU2. Multiple dimensions of psychosocial well-being were assessed by the KINDL® questionnaire which was developed for parents' response on behalf of children and adolescents [14].

Statistical Analysis

For our analyses, only children who participated in all three surveys were considered. Multiple imputation (MI) was applied to avoid loss of study subjects and to reduce potential bias due to missing values [15]; specifically we used tenfold imputation with random forests as implemented in the R-package *mice* [16]. MI assumes that values were missing at random (MAR). The imputation model was

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.18.22275036; this version posted May 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

therefore enriched with more than 300 predictors not included in the graph to strengthen the plausibility of the MAR assumption.

To estimate the CCG, we applied a method of causal discovery known as PC-algorithm [17]. The algorithm outputs empirically plausible causal directed acyclic graphs (causal DAGs) suggesting direct and indirect causal relations, as shown by directed edges or directed paths. As a DAG represents certain conditional (in)dependencies between variables [18], the PC-algorithm proceeds by investigating conditional independencies in the data using statistical tests (we used a nominal level of 0.05), and then determining all DAGs that agree with these independencies. The result is not unique since different DAGs can represent the same conditional independencies, i.e. certain causal structures are not distinguishable. Instead, the algorithm outputs the equivalence class of all DAGs that represent the detected conditional independencies. This class can uniquely be represented by a completed partially directed acyclic graph (CPDAG) [19] containing directed and undirected edges, where an undirected edge means that both directions occur in the equivalence class. The causal validity of the PC-algorithm relies on the assumptions of causal sufficiency, i.e. absence of latent confounding, and of faithfulness, under which the PC-algorithm consistently selects the true underlying CPDAG [17].

The PC-algorithm had to be modified for application to multiply imputed cohort data[20-22]. To account for the cohort structure we used our temporal PC-algorithm *tPC* [22]; this was further combined with functions from *micd* [21] to deal with multiply imputed data containing a mix of categorical and continuous variables. The R packages *micd* and *tPC* are both extensions of *pcalg* [23]. The *tPC*-algorithm outputs a maximally oriented partially directed acyclic graph (MPDAG), which is similar to a CPDAG but can contain more directed edges due to prior knowledge (see supplement and Kalisch and Bühlmann [24]). *tPC* determines an MPDAG under the restriction that edges are prohibited from pointing backwards in time which also reduces the number of required statistical tests for conditional independencies. In our analysis we pre-specified the following ordering: region, sex and migration < ISCED and income at baseline < all early life factors < baseline variables < ISCED and income at FU1 < remaining FU1 variables < ISCED and income at FU2 < remaining FU2 variables. Additionally, specific directions between certain pairs of variables were prohibited, for example from breastfeeding

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.18.22275036; this version posted May 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

to birth weight. We carried out a number of sensitivity analyses to check the robustness of the resulting MPDAG: (a) MI with PC-algorithm at the nominal level of 0.1 (MI-0.1), (b) using test-wise deletion (TWD), (c) bootstrapping the whole analysis using 100 repeats, and (d) applying a different, likelihood-based, causal discovery algorithm which uses the EM algorithm for missing values [25].

As graphs only indicate presence or absence of causal relations, we supplemented the above analysis with an *exploratory* analysis quantifying some of the causal effects. Ideally, estimating the causal graph and estimation of any causal effects should be carried out on independent subsets of the data to avoid issues of post-selection inference. As this dramatically reduces the available sample size, we used the same data but did not provide confidence intervals or p-values for estimated effects. Moreover, as different DAGs in an MPDAG imply possibly different causal effects depending on the edge orientations, we estimated multisets of causal effects for each exposure and outcome pair according to the Intervention-calculus when the DAG is Absent (IDA) [26, 27]. We refer to these as "*possible*" effects to reflect the lack of a unique DAG. The interpretation of a multiset of effects is that each effect is compatible with at least one of the different empirically plausible causal DAGs. Specifically, we considered as exposures the modifiable baseline risk factors sleep, PA, YHEI, AVM and well-being with zBMI at FU2 as outcome. The estimation of the respective causal effects relied on the three key assumptions (cf. supplement): causal consistency, no unobserved confounding and the assumption that for each child any other exposure value could have been possible (positivity) – this can clearly only hold within a plausible range. To adjust for confounding we determined sets of covariates that form valid adjustment sets in the different DAGs in the estimated MPDAG. As adjustment sets are not unique in an MPDAG (or even in a DAG) we considered two types: local and optimal adjustment sets [27-29]. Moreover, we included region, sex and age at baseline in every adjustment set. Possible causal effects were then estimated with two approaches: (a) using linear main effect regressions; (b) a nonparametric approach which estimates the "*expected outcome under hypothetical interventions*" (EOHI) setting the exposure to different values, using kernel smoothing with double machine learning (DML) [30, 31], and outputs response curves for continuous exposures. DML is a doubly robust method that does not rely on pre-specified parametric models for the outcome

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.18.22275036; this version posted May 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

or the propensity score (cf. supplement). The estimated response curve at a specific level of the exposure is interpreted as the average zBMI (FU2) if all children were assigned to a hypothetical intervention programme fixing the exposure (at baseline) at this value.

Results

Study Sample

The study sample included 5,112 children who participated in all three surveys. Table 2 shows that children were on average aged 5.9 years at baseline and 11.7 years at FU2. BMI z-scores increased on average by approx. 0.2 standard deviations (SD) over the years (0.32 to 0.55). The overall number of missing values was 15 % with some variables exhibiting very large numbers of missings such as weeks of pregnancy (58.6 %) or PA at FU2 (50.1 %) (see Figure S1 and Table S1). Diagnostic plots of the multiply imputed data were satisfactory (see Figure S2).

Cohort Causal Graph

The CCG resulting from our main analysis was quite sparse (cf. Figure 1, Table S2, see https://bips-hb.github.io/ccg-childhood-obesity for an interactive graph). Three nodes, smoking during pregnancy, mother's BMI (FU1) and daily family meals (FU2), had no in- or outgoing edges meaning there was no evidence for dependencies with any other variables in the graph. Nodes with the highest connectivity within the graph (node degree = 8) included region, well-being (B) and AVM (FU1). The CCG (cf. Table 3) suggested that all exposures (sleep, AVM, YHEI, PA, well-being) were ancestors and hence possible causes of zBMI in both follow-ups, i.e. there was a semi-directed path between exposure and outcome. Further possible causes of zBMI (B, FU1, FU2) were sex, age (B), cultural (region, migration), perinatal (birthweight, week of pregnancy, mother's age at birth) and familial variables (mother's BMI (B, FU2), ISCED (B), income (B)). Interestingly, there were direct links from region, familial educational level, birthweight and mother's BMI (B, FU2) to any zBMI, but not from any exposures. Almost all indirect paths between exposures and zBMI (FU2) went through AVM (FU1) and HOMA (FU1, FU2), many also through well-being (FU1) and some through YHEI (B). The graph also showed that the exposures themselves were moderately interconnected within the same

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.18.22275036; this version posted May 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

tier and also across time, where the algorithm could not completely direct the edges between the exposures at FU1.

Table 4 displays the estimated possible total causal effects (IDA with linear model) and the nonparametric EOHI for two hypothetical interventions, setting the exposure to a given value or to its average value for everyone. More details can be seen from the response curve plots (Figure 2 and Figures S7-S10); these behave erratically at the extremes, presumable due to lack of positivity, so that we only interpret values in the middle range. Among others, the results suggested a slightly harmful effect of increasing AVM time (B) on zBMI (FU2) as the effect estimates based on the linear model range from 0.025 to 0.121. Considering the nonparametric approach, the interventional effect curves also suggested a (almost linear) decrease of average zBMI for shorter AVM times (cf. Figure S8). For instance, an intervention enforcing an AVM time of 60 minutes per day could reduce the average zBMI (FU2) from currently 0.55 to a value between 0.479 and 0.536 (minimum and maximum EOHI estimates for different adjustment sets). Considering the causal effect of baseline sleep duration, our results suggested one more hour could reduce average zBMI (FU2) (estimates ranging from -0.06 to -0.73 assuming linearity); nonparametrically we found that if all children were to sleep for 12 hours per day at baseline the average zBMI (FU2) could lie between 0.367 and 0.473 (cf. Figure S9). In contrast, we found neither for PA nor for healthy diet at baseline a discernible causal effect on zBMI measured six years later (PA: IDA est. 0.000 to 0.001; YHEI: IDA est. -0.003 to 0.000). The average effect curves for PA (Figure S7) supported this finding whereas all effect curves of the YHEI (Figure 2) showed a small decrease of zBMI (FU2) for the hypothetical intervention setting the YHEI score to a value between 50 and 80 %. Interventions improving well-being were estimated to have no effect on average zBMI (IDA est. -0.002 to 0.001). However, the average effect curves suggested a possible non-linearity such that an intervention setting well-being to 65% or lower could lead to a moderate to severe increase in expected zBMI (EOHI x = 65 %: 0.553 to 0.678, see Figure S10).

Sensitivity Analysis

The CCG MI-0.1 confirmed the core results from the main graph (Figure S4). The CCGs estimated using two alternative approaches (TWD and EM) have 40 to 50 % more edges than the main graph (cf.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.18.22275036; this version posted May 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Figures S3, S5). The overall picture regarding the connectivity of BMI in the graph remained similar for TWD (see Table S2). However, only 20 % of the edges in the main graph were also found in the TWD graph. This was also reflected by the Hamming distance which indicated that it would require 205, 114 and 19 edge insertions or deletions, for TWD, EM and MI-0.1 respectively, in order to transform the alternative graphs into the main graph. We also used the bootstrap graphs to assess how often an edge of the main graph was found in the 100 bootstrap graphs (BG, cf. Table S3, Figure S6). The average edge frequency was 56.8 %, whereby 22.7 % of the edges in the main graph were selected in more than 90 % of the BGs. These edges, however, were mostly edges between repeated measurements of the same variable (e.g. the edge between PA (B) and PA (FU1) was found in 98 %).

Discussion

The estimated CCG suggested rather sparse causal relationships between various variables around childhood obesity. Individually modifiable risk factors at baseline were found to be possible indirect causes of zBMI six years later via the HOMA index. We found some evidence that sleep and AVM at baseline have a small effect on zBMI at FU2. We found that sleep duration and AVM possibly causally affect insulin resistance (HOMA), which in turn causally affects BMI. Others also reported associations of media exposure [32-35] and sleep [36, 37] with insulin resistance, although the direction of the relationship between sleep and HOMA was inconsistent [38]. Although we found no clear evidence for a causal impact of physical activity, healthy diet or well-being on obesity, associations were previously found in the IDEFICS/I.Family cohort e.g. in a smaller subset using an objective accelerometer-based measure of PA [39-41]. Overall, our results suggested that cultural, perinatal and familial variables have direct links to obesity, unlike individually modifiable risk factors. We might hypothesise that an early life intervention primarily targeting the behaviour of the child seems to be insufficient to prevent childhood obesity. This may be taken as an indication that the causal structure governing childhood health behaviours and outcomes should be considered from a complex adaptive system's perspective [42-44]. Maitland et al. [45], for example, describe the practical implementation of a “whole of systems” approach.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.18.22275036; this version posted May 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Recently, Petersen, Osler [46] proposed also an extension of the PC-algorithm to include temporal information for inferring a graph from observational data. However, our work is the first application of causal discovery to real-world cohort data accounting formally for missing values, mixed discrete and continuous variables, and prior knowledge such as time-ordering. The required theory and software has only recently been developed [21, 22]. The analysis was further supplemented by causal effect estimation for selected exposure-outcome pairs. The results, however, must be interpreted with care since the PC-algorithm and causal estimation rely on strong assumptions such as causal sufficiency and no unmeasured confounding, respectively. While the IDEFICS/I.Family cohort provides a rich source of phenotypes capturing different dimensions of dietary and lifestyle related health aspects repeatedly measured over the early life-course, this may still not be sufficiently informative. Another challenge was the choice of variables included in the analysis; these needed to be sufficiently different (i.e. not measuring the same underlying construct) to find meaningful dependencies between the different dimensions of obesity. The sensitivity analyses showed that different choices yielded slightly different selected causal graphs, but the overall message remains the same: later BMI was not directly affected by earlier behavioural variables, but was usually indirectly affected through AVM (FU1) and HOMA (FU1, FU2).

Further general sources of bias with observational data could also affect our results, such as reporting or selection bias. However, all participating countries adhered to a harmonised protocol and to quality control procedures ensuring high data quality.

Conclusion

A CCG was estimated to investigate the (causal) dependencies underlying childhood and adolescent obesity in 2 to 16 year old Europeans. The CCG suggested that cultural, perinatal and familial factors and HOMA played a more direct role than individually modifiable risk factors, which had at best small indirect causal effects on zBMI. We found no evidence that hypothetical interventions promoting more physical activity, healthier eating or higher well-being for children aged 2 to 10 would (in)directly affect zBMI six years later; our analysis suggested weak effects of longer sleep time

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.18.22275036; this version posted May 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

and reduced audio-visual media consumption to slightly reduce average zBMI. Our results are in line with the hypothesis that system approaches are more promising to address and prevent childhood obesity.

Supplementary data

Supplement.pdf

All CCGs are available as interactive graphs at https://bips-hb.github.io/ccg-childhood-obesity/

Ethics approval

Ethical approval was obtained from the responsible ethics committees in each country and all research was performed in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki principles. All children and their parents provided oral and written informed consent, respectively, before examinations and/or the collection of samples, subsequent analysis and storage of personal data and collected samples. Teens older than 12 years were asked to provide their written consent using a simplified version of the consent form. Study subjects and their parents could opt out of each single study component.

Funding

We gratefully acknowledge financial support by the German Research Foundation (DFG, DI 2372/1-1). The IDEFICS study was financially supported by the European Commission within the Sixth RTD Framework Programme Contract No. 016181 (FOOD); the I.Family study was funded by the European Commission within the Seventh RTD Framework Programme Contract No. 266044 (KBBE 2010-14). The GrowH! project is funded by the Joint Programming Initiative “A Healthy Diet for a Healthy Life” (JPI HDHL), a research and innovation initiative of EU member states and associated countries.

Acknowledgement

This work was done as part of the I.Family Study (http://www.ifamilystudy.eu/) and GrowH! (https://www.growh.eu) and is published on behalf of its consortia. We thank the IDEFICS and

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.18.22275036; this version posted May 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

I.Family children and their parents for taking the time to participate in this extensive examination programme. We are grateful for the support provided by school boards, headmasters, teachers, school staff and communities, and for the effort of all study nurses and our data managers, especially Claudia Brünings-Kuppe, Sandra Israel-Georgii and Ramona Siebels. We especially thank our colleagues Antje Hebestreit, Maike Wolters, Christoph Buck, Timm Intemann and Heide Busse for their valuable input to realise this interdisciplinary research.

Conflict of Interest

None declared.

References

1. NCD Risk Factor Collaboration (NCD-RisC) in collaboration with Pigeot I. Worldwide trends in body-mass index, underweight, overweight, and obesity from 1975 to 2016: a pooled analysis of 2416 population-based measurement studies in 128.9 million children, adolescents, and adults. *The Lancet* 2017; **390**: 2627-42.
2. Ahrens W, Moreno LA, Mårild S, et al. Metabolic syndrome in young children: definitions and results of the IDEFICS study. *Int J Obes* 2014; **38**: S4-S14.
3. Skinner AC, Perrin EM, Moss LA, Skelton JA. Cardiometabolic Risks and Severity of Obesity in Children and Young Adults. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2015; **373**: 1307-17.
4. Weihrauch-Blüher S, Wiegand S. Risk Factors and Implications of Childhood Obesity. *Curr Obes Rep* 2018; **7**: 254-9.
5. Glass TA, McAtee MJ. Behavioral science at the crossroads in public health: extending horizons, envisioning the future. *Social Science and Medicine* 2006; **62**: 1650-71.
6. Reisch LA, Gwozdz W. The impact of consumer behavior on the development of overweight in children. An overview. *Bundesgesundheitsbla* 2010; **53**: 725-32.
7. Lobstein T, Baur L, Uauy R. Obesity in children and young people: a crisis in public health. *Obes Rev* 2004; **5**: 4-85.
8. Ahrens W, Siani A, Adan R, et al. Cohort Profile: The transition from childhood to adolescence in European children–how I.Family extends the IDEFICS cohort. *International Journal of Epidemiology* 2017; **46**: 1394-5j.
9. Ahrens W, Bammann K, Siani A, et al. The IDEFICS cohort: design, characteristics and participation in the baseline survey. *Int J Obes* 2011; **35**: S3-S15.
10. Cole TJ, Lobstein T. Extended international (IOTF) body mass index cut-offs for thinness, overweight and obesity. *Pediatr Obes* 2012; **7**: 284-94.
11. Feskanich D, Rockett HRH, Colditz GA. Modifying the Healthy Eating Index to assess diet quality in children and adolescents. *J Am Diet Assoc* 2004; **104**: 1375-83.
12. Gwozdz W, Sousa-Poza A, Reisch LA, et al. Maternal employment and childhood obesity – A European perspective. *J Health Econ* 2013; **32**: 728-42.
13. Hense S, Barba G, Pohlabeln H, et al. Factors that Influence Weekday Sleep Duration in European Children. *Sleep* 2011; **34**: 633-9.
14. Ravens-Sieberer U, Bullinger M. Assessing health-related quality of life in chronically ill children with the German KINDL: first psychometric and content analytical results. *Qual Life Res* 1998; **7**: 399-407.
15. van Buuren S. *Flexible Imputation of Missing Data*. 2 ed. Boca Raton, Florida: Chapman and Hall/CRC; 2018.
16. van Buuren S, Groothuis-Oudshoorn K. mice: Multivariate Imputation by Chained Equations in R. *J Stat Softw* 2011; **45**: 1-67.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.18.22275036; this version posted May 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

17. Spirtes P, Glymour C, Scheines R. *Causation, Prediction, and Search*. 2 ed. Cambridge, Massachussetts: The MIT Press; 2001.
18. Didelez V. Causal concepts and graphical models In: Maathuis MH, Drton M, Lauritzen S, Wainwright M, editors. *Handbook of Graphical Models*. Boca Raton: CRC Press; 2018.
19. Andersson SA, Madigan D, Perlman MD. A characterization of Markov equivalence classes for acyclic dsigraphs. *The Annals of Statistics* 1997; **25**: 505-41.
20. Andrews RM, Foraita R, Didelez V, Witte J. A practical guide to causal discovery with cohort data. 2021. https://arxiv.org/abs/2108.13395
21. Foraita R, Friemel J, Günther K, et al. Causal discovery of gene regulation with incomplete data. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A (Statistics in Society)* 2020; **183**: 1747-75.
22. Witte J, Foraita R, Didelez V. Multiple imputation and test-wise deletion for causal discovery with incomplete cohort data. 2021. https://arxiv.org/abs/2108.13331
23. Kalisch M, Mächler M, Colombo D, Maathuis MH, Bühlmann P. Causal inference using graphical models with the R package pcalg. *J Stat Softw* 2012; **47**: 26.
24. Kalisch M, Bühlmann P. Estimating high-dimensional directed acyclic graphs with the PC-Algorithm. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 2007; **8**: 613–36.
25. Friedman N. Learning belief networks in the presence of missing values and hidden variables. *Proceedings of the Fourteenth International Conference on Machine Learning*: Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc.; 1997. p. 125–33.
26. Maathuis MH, Colombo D, Kalisch M, Bühlmann P. Predicting causal effects in large-scale systems from observational data. *Nat Methods* 2010; **7**: 247-8.
27. Maathuis MH, Kalisch M, Bühlmann P. Estimating high-dimensional intervention effects from observational data. *The Annals of Statistics* 2009; **37**: 3133-64.
28. Witte J, Didelez V. Covariate selection strategies for causal inference: Classification and comparison. *Biometrical Journal* 2019; **61**: 1270-89.
29. Witte J, Henckel L, Maathuis MH, Didelez V. On efficient adjustment in causal graphs. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 2020; **21**: 1-45.
30. Kennedy EH, Ma Z, McHugh MD, Small DS. Non-parametric methods for doubly robust estimation of continuous treatment effects. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* 2017; **79**: 1229-45.
31. Knaus MC. Double machine learning based program evaluation under unconfoundedness. 2021. https://arxiv.org/abs/2003.03191
32. Barker AR, Gracia-Marco L, Ruiz JR, et al. Physical activity, sedentary time, TV viewing, physical fitness and cardiovascular disease risk in adolescents: The HELENA study. *International Journal of Cardiology* 2018; **254**: 303-9.
33. Guzmán V, Lissner L, Arvidsson L, et al. Associations of sleep duration and screen time with incidence of overweight in European children: the IDEFICS/I.Family cohort. *Obesity Facts* 2021; **(accepted)**.
34. Sayin FK, Buyukinan M. Sleep duration and media time have a major impact on insulin resistance and metabolic risk factors in obese children and adolescents. *Childhood Obesity* 2016; **12**: 272-8.
35. Carson V, Hunter S, Kuzik N, et al. Systematic review of sedentary behaviour and health indicators in school-aged children and youth: an update. *Appl Physiol Nutr Me* 2016; **41**: S240-S65.
36. Peplies J, Börnhorst C, Günther K, et al. Longitudinal associations of lifestyle factors and weight status with insulin resistance (HOMA-IR) in preadolescent children: the large prospective cohort study IDEFICS. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity* 2016; **13**: 97.
37. Thumann BF, Michels N, Felső R, et al. Associations between sleep duration and insulin resistance in European children and adolescents considering the mediating role of abdominal obesity. *PLoS One* 2020; **15**: e0235049.
38. Fobian AD, Elliott L, Louie T. A systematic review of sleep, hypertension, and cardiovascular risk in children and adolescents. *Curr Hypertens Rep* 2018; **20**.
39. Sprengeler O, Pohlabeln H, Bammann K, et al. Trajectories of objectively measured physical activity and childhood overweight: longitudinal analysis of the IDEFICS/I.Family cohort. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity* 2021; **18**: 103.
40. Pala V, Lissner L, Hebestreit A, et al. Dietary patterns and longitudinal change in body mass in European children: a follow-up study on the IDEFICS multicenter cohort. *Eur J Clin Nutr* 2013; **67**: 1042-9.
41. Thumann BF, Börnhorst C, Ahrens W, et al. Cross-sectional and longitudinal associations between psychosocial well-being and cardiometabolic markers in European children and adolescents. *Psychosomatic Medicine* 2020; **82**: 764-73.
42. Lee BY, Bartsch SM, Mui Y, Haidari LA, Spiker ML, Gittelsohn J. A systems approach to obesity. *Nutrition Reviews* 2017; **75**: 94-106.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.18.22275036; this version posted May 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

43. Rutter H, Savona N, Glonti K, et al. The need for a complex systems model of evidence for public health. *Lancet* 2017; **390**: 2602-4.
44. Swinburn BA, Kraak VI, Allender S, et al. The global syndemic of obesity, undernutrition, and climate change: the Lancet Commission report. *Lancet* 2019; **393**: 791-846.
45. Maitland N, Wardle K, Whelan J, et al. Tracking implementation within a community-led whole of system approach to address childhood overweight and obesity in south west Sydney, Australia. *BMC Public Health* 2021; **21**: 1233.
46. Petersen AH, Osler M, Ekstrøm CT. Data-driven model building for life-course epidemiology. *Am J Epidemiol* 2021; **190**: 1898-907.
47. Bammann K, Gwozdz W, Lanfer A, et al. Socioeconomic factors and childhood overweight in Europe: results from the multi-centre IDEFICS study. *Pediatr Obes* 2013; **8**: 1-12.
48. UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS). *International Standard Classification of Education: ISCED 2011*. Montreal, Quebec: UIS; 2012.
49. Vanaelst B, De Vriendt T, Ahrens W, et al. Prevalence of psychosomatic and emotional symptoms in European school-aged children and its relationship with childhood adversities: results from the IDEFICS study. *Eur Child Adoles Psy* 2012; **21**: 253-65.
50. Marshall WA, Tanner JM. Variations in pattern of pubertal changes in girls. *Arch Dis Child* 1969; **44**: 291-303.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.18.22275036; this version posted May 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Figure Legends



Figure 1: Causal graph of childhood obesity based on N = 5,112 European children and adolescents born between 1997 and 2006 estimated by the temporal PC-algorithm for multiple imputed datasets. The nodes colours correspond to the different stages of the life-course. Edges without arrowheads could not be orientated by the algorithm.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.18.22275036; this version posted May 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



Figure 2: Estimated average outcome response curves for the Youth Healthy Eating Score (YHEI) at baseline on BMI z-scores (FU2). Curves were estimated for each adjustment set (cf. Table 4), arranged in a down, then right pattern, and for each of ten multiply imputed datasets. For example, using the first adjustment set (top left), one would expect a zBMI of ~0.54 with an intervention at baseline that sets the YHEI to 80%.

Tables

Table 1: Variables used in the analysis with units and further explanations. Prior knowledge was used to order them into different tiers. Units of continuous variables are given in italics.

Tiers	Variable/Node	Unit	Comments
Context	Sex	female, male	Sex of child
Context	Region	North, Central, South	Place of residence in one of the following European countries: North (Estonia, Sweden), Central (Belgium, Germany, Hungary), South (Cyprus, Spain)
Context	Migrant	no, yes	Children were assumed to have a migrant background if they usually speak with their parents in a language other than the national language of the corresponding country
Early life	Mother's age at birth	*years*	
Early life	Total breastfeeding	*months*	Months of breastfeeding, also in combination with other food, prior child's diet was fully integrated into usual household diet
Early life	Birthweight	*Gram*	
Early life	Weeks of pregnancy	*weeks*	
Early life	Formula milk	no, yes	Type of feeding prior child's diet was fully integrated into the usual household diet
Early life	HH diet	*months*	Month when the child was introduced into the household's diet
Early life	Smoking during pregnancy	no, yes	Mother consumed tobacco during pregnancy
B, FU1, FU2	Age	*months*	
B, FU1	School	kindergarten, school, neither one	Child attended kindergarten/pre-school, school or neither one
B, FU1, FU2	AVM	*h/day*	Audio-visual media consumption score: average hours per day spent with TV, videos, or DVDs, accounting for weekdays and weekends. Hours using the internet per week were only assessed at FU2.
B, FU1, FU2	zBMI	*z-score*	Z-scores of the body mass index [kg/m²]. Body weight was measured in fasting state in light underwear on a calibrated scale accurate to 0.1 kg (adapted Tanita BC 420 MA for children ≤6 years, Tanita BC 418 MA for children >6 years, Tanita Europe GmbH, Sindelfingen, Germany); height was measured to the nearest 0.1 cm by a SECA 225 Stadiometer (Seca GmbH & Co. KG., Hamburg, Germany)
B, FU1, FU2	Mother's BMI	*kg/m²*	Body mass index of the mother, derived from self-reported weight and height

Tiers	Variable/Node	Unit	Comments
B, FU1, FU2	Daily family meals	no, yes	The family has a meal together at least once a day
B, FU1, FU2	Income	low, middle, high	Country-specific parental income categories, harmonised between countries [47]
B, FU1, FU2	ISCED	low, middle, high	International Standard Classification of Education, highest parental education [48]
B, FU1, FU2	PA	*h/day*	Physical activity measured by questionnaire based on the reported average time spent playing outdoors (hours/week) and the time being in recreation areas or doing sports in a sport club (hours/week).
B, FU1, FU2	Sleep	*h/day*	Total sleep (includes nocturnal and daytime sleep). Total sleep in hours was assessed by self-reports in FU1 and FU2. The average nocturnal sleep (hours/night) was calculated as the weighted average of reported usual weekday and weekend sleeping times. At baseline, total sleep was derived based on 24-h dietary recall data where the parents were asked 'What time did your child go to bed?' and 'What time did your child get up?'
B, FU1, FU2	Well-being	*%*	Composite sum score, based on the KINDL® quality of life questionnaire [14], sums up the answers of 16 items reporting emotional well-being, self-esteem, family relations and peer contacts during the last week, where each item ranges from 0 to 3 points [49]
B, FU1, FU2	YHEI	*%*	Youth healthy eating score [12]
B, FU1, FU2	HOMA	*z-score*	Z-score of the HOmeostatic Model Assessment index to quantify insulin resistance; the HOMA-IR index [pg/ml*mg/dl] was calculated from insulin and glucose obtained from blood samples.
FU2	Alcohol	no, yes	Ever alcohol drinking in teen's life-time
FU2	Puberty	pre- or early pubertal, pubertal	Pubertal status based on development of voice (boys) and menarche (girls) [50]. Different pubertal stages were displayed in the questionnaire to assist the self-assessment.
FU2	Smoking	no, yes	Ever smoking tobacco in teen's life-time

B: Baseline, FU1: first follow-up, FU2: second follow-up

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.18.22275036; this version posted May 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 2: Characteristics of children in the IDEFICS/I.Family cohort participating in all three surveys from 2007 to 2014

Time-invariant variables	N = 5,112[1]
Region	
Central (Belgium, Germany, Hungary)	1,378 (27%)
North (Estonia, Sweden)	1,475 (29%)
South (Cyprus, Italy, Spain)	2,259 (44%)
Female	2,505 (49%)
Migration background	319 (6.7%)
missing	385
Completed weeks of pregnancy	39.08 (1.88)
missing	2,995
Tobacco smoking during pregnancy	
never	4,285 (89%)
rarely	171 (3.5%)
several occasions a week	150 (3.1%)
daily	226 (4.7%)
Missing	280
Mother's age at birth	29.8 (5.0)
missing	494
Birthweight [g]	3,345 (574)
missing	180
Total breastfeeding [months]	6.8 (6.3)
missing	247
Was fed with formula milk	2,640 (52%)
missing	0
Fully integrated into household's diet [month]	14.5 (6.5)
missing	722

Time-varying variables	**Baseline** N = 5,112[1]	**FU1** N = 5,112[1]	**FU2** N = 5,112[1]
Age	5.89 (1.78)	7.87 (1.79)	11.69 (1.81)
School			
kindergarten	2,452 (52%)	1,100 (23%)	-
school	2,250 (47%)	3,584 (76%)	-
neither	41 (0.9%)	8 (0.2%)	-
missing	369	420	-
BMI z-score	0.32 (1.17)	0.43 (1.17)	0.55 (1.11)
Well-being [%]	84 (10)	82 (10)	82 (11)
missing	636	552	625
Audiovisual media consumption [h/day]	1.57 (0.89)	1.89 (0.94)	2.94 (1.83)
missing	306	394	654
Physical activity [h/week]	18 (11)	18 (10)	17 (9)
missing	252	357	2,561
Total sleep [h/day]	10.19 (0.96)	10.01 (0.90)	9.29 (1.03)
missing	2,130	781	449
Youth healthy eating index [%]	63 (11)	63 (11)	57 (11)
missing	343	446	350
Daily family meals	3,488 (74%)	3,548 (77%)	2,662 (67%)
missing	367	476	1,147
Homa index z-score	0.02 (1.10)	0.40 (0.97)	0.13 (1.15)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.18.22275036; this version posted May 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

missing	2,902	2,466	1,911
Pubertal	-	-	1,931 (41%)
missing	-	-	423
Ever alcohol drinking	-	-	738 (33%)
missing	-	-	2,852
Ever tobacco smoking	-	-	213 (9.3%)
missing	-	-	2,812
Mother's BMI	23.8 (4.2)	24.0 (4.3)	25.5 (5.1)
missing	271	384	2,732
Household's income			
low	1,612 (36%)	1,410 (31%)	1,197 (28%)
middle	1,179 (26%)	1,130 (25%)	1,451 (34%)
high	1,693 (38%)	1,949 (43%)	1,559 (37%)
Missing	628	623	905
ISCED			
low	254 (5.1%)	232 (4.8%)	248 (4.9%)
middle	2,085 (42%)	2,004 (42%)	2,147 (42%)
high	2,600 (53%)	2,590 (54%)	2,681 (53%)
Missing	173	286	36

[1]n (%); Mean (standard deviation)

FU1: first follow-up; FU2: second follow-up

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.18.22275036; this version posted May 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 3: Possible ancestors of BMI at baseline, first and second follow up

Tier	Ancestors of zBMI (B)	Ancestors of zBMI (FU1)	Ancestors of zBMI (FU2)
C	Sex	Sex	Sex
C	Region	Region	Region
C	Migrant	Migrant	Migrant
ELF	Mother's age at birth	Mother's age at birth	Mother's age at birth
ELF	Birthweight	Birthweight	Birthweight
ELF	Weeks of pregnancy	Weeks of pregnancy	Weeks of pregnancy
ELF		Formula milk	Formula milk
B	Income	Income	Income
B	ISCED	ISCED	ISCED
B	Mother's BMI	Mother's BMI	Mother's BMI
B	Age	Age	Age
B		School	School
B		AVM	AVM
B		BMI	BMI
B		PA	PA
B		Sleep	Sleep
B		Well-being	Well-being
B		YHEI	YHEI
B		HOMA	HOMA
FU1		AVM (FU1)	AVM (FU1)
FU1			BMI (FU1)
FU1		PA (FU1)	PA (FU1)
FU1		Well-being (FU1)	Well-being (FU1)
FU1		HOMA (FU1)	HOMA (FU1)
FU2			Mother's BMI (FU2)
FU1			HOMA (FU2)

C: Context variables, ELF: Early life factors, B: Baseline, FU1: first follow-up, FU2: second follow-up, zBMI: BMI z-scores

Cells are shaded grey if a path between a pair of vertices was forbidden a priori (e.g. due to time constraints).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.18.22275036; this version posted May 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 4: Estimated intervention effects of selected modifiable risk factors at baseline on BMI z-score at FU2 using linear regression and nonparametric doubly robust estimation evaluated at mean $\bar{x}$ and at a self-chosen level $X = x$ with different choices of adjustment sets.

Adjustment sets	Type	IDA Est.	DML EHOI	DML EHOI
Sleep			$\bar{x}$ = 10 h	x = 12 h
1: Sex, Region, Formula milk, Age (B), School (B)	local	-0.06	0.556	0.386
2: Sex, Region, Age (B)	optimal	-0.09	0.555	0.367
3: Sex, Region, Age (B), Mother's BMI (B), HOMA (B), AVM (FU1), zBMI (FU1), Mother's BMI (FU2)	optimal	-0.33	0.557	0.470
4: Sex, Region, Age (B), AVM (B), Mother's BMI (B), Well-being (B), YHEI (B), HOMA (B), zBMI (FU1), PA (FU1), Mother's BMI (FU2)	optimal	-0.32	0.557	0.471
5: Sex, Region, Age (B), AVM (B), Mother's BMI (B), Well-being (B), YHEI (B), HOMA (B), zBMI (FU1), Mother's BMI (FU2)	optimal	-0.31	0.557	0.473
6: Sex, Region, Age (B), Mother's BMI (B), HOMA (B), zBMI (FU1), Mother's BMI (FU2)	optimal	-0.35	0.557	0.464
7: Sex, Region, Age (B), Mother's BMI (B), HOMA (B), AVM (FU1), Mother's BMI (FU2)	optimal	-0.65	0.558	0.437
8: Sex, Region, Age (B), AVM (B), Mother's BMI (B), Well-being (B), YHEI (B), HOMA (B), PA (FU1), Mother's BMI (FU2)	optimal	-0.68	0.558	0.430
9: Sex, Region, Age (B), AVM (B), Mother's BMI (B), Well-being (B), YHEI (B), HOMA (B), Mother's BMI (FU2)	optimal	-0.67	0.558	0.436
10: Sex, Region, Age (B), Mother's BMI (B), HOMA (B), Mother's BMI (FU2)	optimal	-0.73	0.559	0.421
Physical activity			$\bar{x}$ = 18 h/week	x = 35 h/week
1: Sex, Region, Income, Age (B)	local	0.001	0.533	0.606
2: Sex, Region, Age (B)	optimal	0.001	0.526	0.637
3: Sex, Region, Migrang, Mother's age at birth, Age (B), School (B), AVM (B), Mother's BMI (B), sleep (B), HOMA (B), zBMI (FU1), Mother's BMI (FU2)	optimal	0.001	0.545	0.546
4: Sex, Region, Migrang, Mother's age at birth, Age (B), School (B), AVM (B), Mother's BMI (B), sleep (B), HOMA (B), Mother's BMI (FU2)	optimal	0.000	0.540	0.582
Audiovisual AVM consumption			$\bar{x}$ = 96 min/d	x = 60 min/d
1: Sex, Region, Age (B)	local	0.121	0.554	0.479
Sex, Region, Age (B)	optimal	0.121	0.554	0.479
2: Sex, Region, Age (B), Mother's BMI (B), PA (B), sleep (B), Well-being (B), HOMA (B), zBMI (FU1), Mother's BMI (FU2)	optimal	0.025	0.550	0.536
3: Sex, Region, Age (B), Mother's BMI (B), PA (B), sleep (B), Well-being (B), HOMA (B), zBMI (FU1), Well-being (FU1), Mother's BMI (FU2)	optimal	0.025	0.550	0.536
4: Sex, Region, Age (B), Mother's BMI (B), PA (B), sleep (B), Well-being (B), HOMA (B), Mother's BMI (FU2)	optimal	0.072	0.554	0.506
5: Sex, Region, Age (B), Mother's BMI (B), PA (B), sleep (B), Well-being (B), HOMA (B), Well-being (FU1), Mother's BMI (FU2)	optimal	0.071	0.554	0.507
Youth Healthy Eating Index			$\bar{x}$ = 63 %	x = 80 %
1: Sex, Region, Age (B), AVM (B), PA (B), Well-being (B)	local	-0.001	0.542	0.544
2: Sex, Region, Age (B)	optimal	-0.003	0.545	0.532
3: Sex, Region, Age (B), AVM (B), Mother's BMI (B), sleep (B), HOMA (B), zBMI (FU1), Mother's BMI (FU2)	optimal	-0.002	0.549	0.503
4: Sex, Region, Age (B), AVM (B), Mother's BMI (B), sleep (B), HOMA (B), zBMI (FU1), Well-being (FU1), Mother's	optimal	-0.002	0.549	0.503

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.18.22275036; this version posted May 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

BMI (FU2)				
5: Sex, Region, Age (B), AVM (B), Mother's BMI (B), sleep (B), HOMA (B), Mother's BMI (FU2)	optimal	-0.000	0.545	0.542
6: Sex, Region, Age (B), AVM (B), Mother's BMI (B), sleep (B), HOMA (B), Well-being (FU1), Mother's BMI (FU2)	optimal	-0.000	0.546	0.543
Well-being			$\bar{x}$ = 84 %	x = 65 %
1: Sex, Region, Migrang, Mother's age at birth, Age (B), School (B), PA (B)	local	-0.002	0.533	0.646
2: Sex, Region, Age (B)	optimal	-0.002	0.532	0.678
3: Sex, Region, Age (B), AVM (B), Mother's BMI (B), PA (B), sleep (B), HOMA (B), zBMI (FU1), Mother's BMI (FU2)	optimal	0.000	0.540	0.553
4: Sex, Region, Age (B), AVM (B), Mother's BMI (B), PA (B), sleep (B), HOMA (B), zBMI (FU1), PA (FU1), Mother's BMI (FU2)	optimal	0.000	0.540	0.557
5: Sex, Region, Age (B), AVM (B), Mother's BMI (B), PA (B), sleep (B), HOMA (B), Mother's BMI (FU2)	optimal	0.001	0.534	0.582
6: Sex, Region, Age (B), AVM (B), Mother's BMI (B), PA (B), sleep (B), HOMA (B), PA (FU1), Mother's BMI (FU2)	optimal	0.001	0.534	0.586

DML: double machine learning; EHOI: expected outcome under hypothetical interventions; IDA: Intervention calculus when the DAG is Absent (see Supplement)