Taxation of foods high in fat, sugar, and sodium in India: A modelling study of health and economic impacts

5 March 2025

***** Draft paper, not peer reviewed *****

Maxime Roche[1,*], Jingmin Zhu[1,*], Jack Olney[1], Daniel J Laydon[1], William Joe[2], Manika Sharma[3], Lindsay Steele[4], Prof. Franco Sassi[1,†]

1. Centre for Health Economics & Policy Innovation, Department of Economics & Public Policy, Imperial College Business School, South Kensington Campus, Exhibition Rd, London, SW7 2AZ, UK

2. Institute of Economic Growth, Delhi University Enclave, North Campus, Delhi, 110007, India

3. Resolve to Save Lives Services PLC, Delhi, India, Regus, 4th Floor, Rectangle No 1, Commercial Complex, D4, Saket, New Delhi, 110017, India

4. Resolve to Save Lives, 1520 Belle Vista Blvd, Suite 4036, Alexandria, VA 22307, USA

* Shared first authorship
† Corresponding author: f.sassi@imperial.ac.uk

Abstract

Background

Consumption of foods high in fat, sugar, and sodium (HFSS), and obesity, are rapidly increasing in India. Taxing HFSS foods has been proposed to promote healthier diets. This study estimates the effect of this approach on nutrient intake, diet-related disease, and associated health burden and economic benefits.

Methods and findings

We use nationally representative household expenditure survey data, dietary requirements, and food composition tables to model individual nutrient intake. Consumer responsiveness to food price changes for three income terciles is estimated using an Almost Ideal Demand System model. Longer-term policy impacts are estimated through microsimulation (Health-GPS model). Modelled policy outcomes include changes in risk exposures, disease incidence and burden, and total health expenditure.

Applying the current highest Goods and Services Tax (GST) rate of 28% on HFSS foods is associated with a persistent average per capita decrease of 0.1kg/m2 in body mass index and 20mg in daily sodium intake. Over 30 years, this translates into a cumulative reduction of 9.4 million cases and 18.7 million DALYs from ischemic heart disease, chronic kidney disease, stroke, diabetes, and asthma and USD $15.3 billion averted in health expenditure. Effects are larger for higher-income households. The tax change generates a 20.8% increase in tax revenue and minor decreases in household spending. A 40% GST rate (i.e., current taxation of sugar-sweetened beverages) increases effects.

Conclusions

Taxation of HFSS foods could mitigate rising diet-related diseases and morbidity in India, reduce healthcare costs and represent an important source of revenue for the government.

Keywords: Dietary intake; Health taxes; Food demand systems; Foods high in fat, sugar, or salt (HFSS); Microsimulation; Obesity; Noncommunicable diseases

Introduction

Unhealthy diets and obesity are major risk factors for non-communicable diseases (NCDs), such as cardiovascular disease, cancer, and diabetes. These diseases account for substantial healthcare costs, as well as wider economic costs for governments and individuals.[1] In India, adult overweight and obesity levels have increased fourfold since 1975.[a] Of particular concern is the increasing consumption of highly industrially processed foods rich in energy, saturated fat, sugar, and sodium.[2]

Healthy diets can be promoted with fiscal policies, including taxation of foods high in fat, sugar, and sodium (HFSS), and subsidies on fruit and vegetables, along with food marketing regulation and front-of-pack nutrition labelling (FOPNL). There is a strong health and economic rationale for using fiscal policies to address the external costs of unhealthy diets and obesity (i.e. 'externalities', such as collectively borne health care costs linked with obesity) while "encouraging people to avoid acting against their own self-interest" (i.e., 'internalities').[3,4]

India currently applies a Goods and Services Tax (GST) on foods and beverages at five different rates: 0%, 5%, 12%, 18%, and 28%. The 28% rate was introduced for aerated and sugar-sweetened beverages (SSBs) in July 2017, with an additional 12% compensatory Cess (i.e. an additional temporary levy to compensate states for revenue loss incurred due to the introduction of the GST). Adjusting existing GST rates to align with nutrition and health objectives may improve diets by shifting food preferences.

Only a few countries have implemented taxes on HFSS foods, with limited scope, targeting either specific food categories (e.g., confectionery and ice cream in Finland or French Polynesia), non-essential energy-dense foods (e.g., in Mexico), or selected nutrients (e.g., sugar and salt in Hungary).[5] Identifying HFSS foods for taxation based on nutrient content, for example using a nutrient profile model (NPM), may capture unhealthy foods more broadly, and is less likely to apply high rates to healthier foods or incentivise negative substitutions from 'healthy' to 'less healthy' foods.[6] NPMs are increasingly used in nutrition policies, such as FOPNL and marketing restrictions. In 2023, Colombia became the first country to introduce a broad excise tax on HFSS foods based on a NPM, offering a promising example for other countries.[b]

This study estimates the potential impacts on nutrient intakes and diet-related diseases of aligning India's GST rate differentiation on foods and beverages to nutritional quality, placing a higher tax burden on HFSS foods. We first estimate baseline nutrient intakes and consumers' responsiveness to food price changes. We then calibrate a microsimulation model to measure the effects of alternative taxation scenarios on various health and economic outcomes, and their distribution across income groups over the next 30 years.

Simulation analyses in Chile, Costa Rica, and the UK have shown that NPM-based taxes can significantly improve diet.[7-9] A recent study investigated the potential impact of an excise tax on HFSS foods in India on consumption and tax revenue, without considering nutrition or health outcomes.[10] While others have simulated SSB taxes and their impact on NCDs in middle-income countries,[11] including in India,[12] our study fills this gap for broader HFSS food taxation.

---

[a] World Health Organization (2017). Global Health Observatory. Noncommunicable diseases. Risk factors. Overweight/Obesity. Accessible from: https://apps.who.int/gho/data/node.main.A896?lang=en (Accessed 27 Oct 2024)
[b] The Guardian. Colombia passes ambitious 'junk food law' to tackle lifestyle diseases. 10 Nov 2023 (Accessed 29 Oct 2024)

We contribute to the literature by applying a novel microsimulation model, Health-GPS, to evaluate the impacts of HFSS food taxation in India. The model's architecture involves a hierarchy of demographic and socio-economic characteristics, risk factors and health outcomes.[13] The range of health outcomes simulated includes disease incidence and disability-adjusted life years (DALYs) and associated health expenditure. Additionally, we provide the most recent estimates of macronutrient intakes in the Indian population as of December 2022. Finally, we present updated estimates of the price elasticity of demand for foods and beverages by income groups. These represent essential metrics to estimate the potential impact of alternative fiscal reforms.

Methods

Estimating nutrient and energy intakes

Our primary data source is the 68th round household consumption expenditure survey from the NSSO.[c] The 68th round collected quantity of foods and beverages purchased, and expenditure from a nationally representative sample of 101,651 households between July 2011 and June 2012 (**Table A1** provides household characteristics).[d,e] We project the data to December 2022 using the Consumption Pyramids dataset from CMIE, which provides monthly expenditure information from a nationally representative sample of more than 100,000 households (the exact number varies monthly) for aggregated food groups since January 2014.[f] We match each food item from NSSO 68th round with their corresponding CMIE food group and use detailed NSSO item-level consumer price indices to correct for inflation and recover trends in purchased quantities for 2014-2022.[g] We assume the same average linear trend to expand the adjustment from January 2012 (representing the mid-point of the NSSO 68th round) to December 2022.

CMIE's aggregated food groups are not well suited to capture consumption trends for specific items. We use the Euromonitor International Passport database and Tak et al (2022) to estimate trends for highly processed food items, including cakes and pastries, confectionery, ready-to-eat foods, salty snacks, sweet snacks, and other ultra-processed foods (UPF).[h,2] Trends in rice and wheat received by households through the Public Distribution System (PDS) are estimated using procurement data from the Ministry of Food, Consumer Affairs and Public Distribution and correcting for population growth.[i,j]

---

[c] NSSO 68th round represented the latest available household consumption expenditure survey data at the time of this analysis.
[d] The final sample size is 99,495 households after dropping 2% outliers based on daily energy intake per capita (1% lowest - lower than 503 kcal - and 1% highest - higher than 7,054 kcal).
[e] The NSSO 68th round microdata and corresponding documentation can be accessed from the National Data Archive of the Government of India at https://microdata.gov.in/nada43/index.php/catalog/126 (Accessed 4 April 2023).
[f] Centre for Monitoring the Indian Economy, Consumer Pyramids, accessible after registration and fee payment from https://consumerpyramidsdx.cmie.com/ (Accessed 15 May 2023).
[g] Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, Consumer Price Index, accessible from https://mospi.gov.in/dashboard/dashboard/cpi (Accessed 20 April 2023).
[h] Euromonitor International Passport database, accessible after registration and fee payment from https://www.euromonitor.com/ (Accessed 15 June 2023).
[i] Ministry of Food, Consumer Affairs and Public Distribution, Government of India, 2023. Public Distribution Service Procurement. Accessible from: https://dfpd.gov.in/ (Accessed 17 May 2023).
[j] Population data is extracted from the United Nations Population Division Data. Accessible from: https://population.un.org/dataportal/ (Accessed 17 May 2023).

Finally, we assume that 50kg of food is wasted yearly by the average Indian to better proxy dietary intake.[k]

We extract nutrient information (energy, sugar, sodium, saturated fat, total fat, carbohydrates, and protein) from the National Institute of Nutrition (NIN) Indian Food Composition Tables 2017,[l] complemented by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Food and Nutrient Database for Dietary Studies 2017-2018.[m,n] Lastly, we individualise household-level intake based on household members' age and sex using the daily NIN Nutrient Requirements for Indians, 2020.[o]

Estimating response to food price changes

We estimate consumer responses to food price changes, accounting for food substitutions (own- and cross-price elasticities of demand) using the NSS 68th round and an Almost Ideal Demand System (AIDS) model adjusting for quality shading and measurement error.[14] This model is extensively used to estimate the demand for food in low- and middle-income countries.[15] Details of the microeconomic foundations of Deaton's (1988) AIDS model as well as its derivation and the steps involved in its estimation have been described elsewhere.[16] More information is provided in **Appendix C**.

We estimate the model parameters for nine groups: cereals, dairy, pulses, edible oils and spices (including salt and raw sugar), fruits and vegetables (including nuts, hereafter referred to as F&V), animal meats (fresh), packaged processed foods, sweets, and non-alcoholic beverages. The latter could not be disaggregated into SSBs and non-SSBs in our main model specification due to the large number of households not purchasing any SSBs. Thus, we use estimates from John et al. (2022) for aerated sweetened beverages and tea as a proxy, also based on an AIDS model.[17] After dropping clusters not having at least two households consuming at least an item for each group, we are left with a total of 2,189 clusters and 99,067 households. The model is fitted for three income groups, defined by terciles of monthly per capita consumption expenditure.

Fiscal policy scenarios

The estimated income-group-specific own- and cross-price elasticities are used to simulate the impacts of two main scenarios consisting of increasing GST to the highest rate of 28% on foods and beverages classified as HFSS based on their nutrient composition, namely the proposed HFSS food definition from the Food Safety and Standards Authority of India (FSSAI) Labelling & Display Amendment Draft Regulations 2022 (scenario 1) as well as an additional 12% as to match the current level of indirect taxes applied to SSBs (scenario 2).[p] The FSSAI definition applies uniform sodium, sugar, and saturated

[k] UN Environment Programme. Food Waste Index Report 2021. Accessible from: https://www.unep.org/resources/report/unep-food-waste-index-report-2021 (Accessed 19 May 2023).
[l] National Institute of Nutrition, Indian Food Composition Tables 2017. Accessible from: https://www.ifct2017.com/frame.php?page=home (Accessed 22 May 2023).
[m] US Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrient Database for Dietary Studies 2017-2018. Accessible from: https://data.nal.usda.gov/dataset/food-and-nutrient-database-dietary-studies-fndds (Accessed 2 March 2023).
[n] As NSSO items do not differentiate between processing levels for meat and fish, we assume that 20% of purchased quantities are processed for these groups, based on expert opinion.
[o] National Institute of Nutrition, Guidelines Nutrient Requirements for Indians, 2020. Accessible from: https://www.nin.res.in/RDA_short_Report_2020.html (Accessed 22 May 2023).
[p] Since July 2017, SSBs have been subject to a 28% GST rate and a 12% compensatory Cess, equivalent in effect to a 40% tax rate.

fat thresholds across all processed food and beverage products.[q,r] The impact of using an alternative NPM to define HFSS foods, namely the one developed for the South East Asian Region by the World Health Organisation (WHO SEARO), based on category-specific nutrient thresholds for energy, sodium, sugar, saturated fat, and total fat content (**Table A2**), is tested in further simulations using the same tax rates as in scenarios 1 and 2 (scenarios 3 and 4, respectively).[18] **Figure A1** presents the baseline distribution of total energy intake by GST rate and food group.

The immediate impact of each policy scenario on individual nutrient intake, total household expenditure on foods and beverages, and government tax revenue is calculated based on the estimated price elasticities.[s] Key assumptions, which are subsequently relaxed in sensitivity analyses (**Table B1**), include a 100% tax passthrough to retail prices and no supply-side tax-induced product reformulation. Finally, we also test the impact of a 0% GST on F&V and pulses (equivalent to a subsidy). Results for scenarios 3 and 4 as well as sensitivity analyses are presented in **Appendix B**.

Health-GPS microsimulation model

Long-term nutrient intake projections and policy impacts are estimated using Health-GPS, a dynamic policy microsimulation model developed by the Centre for Health Economics & Policy Innovation (CHEPI)[t]. Health-GPS creates a synthetic population that reflects the socio-demographic structure and risk factor exposures in India.

In this study, 1% of the Indian population is simulated at the individual-level between 2022 and 2053. The synthetic population is modelled to reflect weight and height distributions from NCD-RisC,[19] baseline prevalence and incidence of diseases from the Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation (IHME),[u] as well as demographic estimates and forecasts from the United Nations World Population Prospects.[v] Individual nutrient intakes estimated from NSS are calibrated to weight and height distributions by age and gender before being utilised in Health-GPS simulations.

We use Health-GPS to consider two main diet-related risk-factor-to-disease pathways: the first reflects the impact of diet (and physical activity) on energy balance and thereafter body mass index (BMI)[w]; the second accounts for the impact of dietary sodium. With data on two risk factors and relative risk ratios

---

[q] Food Safety and Standards Authority of India, Labelling & Display Amendment Draft Regulations 2022 (44272/2022/REGULATION-FSSAI). Accessible from: https://fssai.gov.in/upload/uploadfiles/files/Draft_Notification_HFSS_20_09_2022.pdf (Accessed 25 June 2023).

[r] In this analysis, we assume processed products to be items not included in Schedule IV Category III Solid Foods/Liquid Foods exempted from FOPNL under Indian Nutrition Rating in the Labelling & Display Amendment Draft Regulations 2022 (44272/2022/REGULATION-FSSAI).

[s] While we account for served processed foods (on-trade sector, i.e., food away from home, like bars, restaurants, etc.) in the estimation of total nutrient intake, we do not include this aggregate in our demand system nor simulate the impact of the policy scenarios on intake from this food group (consumption assumed to remain constant). The GST is applied differently to the on-trade sector in India, based on industry categorisation or types of premises rather than the specific type of food or beverage items served. Therefore, the GST scenarios simulated in this study only apply to the off-trade sector. In addition, food away from home is not well captured in the NSS 68th round, including only a limited number of broadly defined items (cooked meals purchased, cooked meals received free in the workplace, cooked meals received as assistance, cooked snacks purchased, other served processed food). While the simulated GST scenarios may impact the price of raw materials, it is not possible with the data at hand to estimate to which extent this may impact the price of served processed foods or potential substitutions in consumption with the off-trade sector.

[t] Centre for Health Economics & Policy Innovation, Health-GPS. Accessible from: https://imperialchepi.github.io/healthgps/ (Accessed 15 November 2023).

[u] Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation, Global Burden of Disease. Accessible from: https://www.healthdata.org/research-analysis/gbd (Accessed 20 November 2023).

[v] United Nations World Population Prospects, 2022. Accessible from: https://population.un.org/wpp/ (Accessed 26 November 2023).

[w] Following international standards, the body mass index (BMI) of an individual is defined as their weight (in kilogram) divided by the square of their height (in meters).

linking risk factors to diseases from the literature, health outcomes for five key diseases are estimated, including ischemic heart disease (IHD), chronic kidney disease (CKD), stroke, diabetes, and asthma. Hypertension prevalence is estimated independently with projected risk factor data from Health-GPS.

We apply two alternative assumptions on the time trend of nutrient intake. First, we assume no time trends in age-, sex- and income-group-specific nutrient intakes, which means that population-wide changes are solely driven by socio-demographic shifts. Microsimulation outcomes under this assumption thus represent a lower bound of estimates and policy impacts (hereafter referred to as the 'lower bound') given the expected increase in UPF intake in India.[20] The alternative assumption is an additive UPF trend in nutrient intakes over the coming 20 years, extrapolated from past trends, which gives an upper-bound estimate of policy impacts (the 'upper bound').[x]

Policy scenarios are applied at the beginning of 2024 (two years after the initial year) and their impact on health is estimated over 30 years. Economic benefits are also calculated as total health expenditures, including both government and household expenditures. Data on household health expenditure are converted to total health expenditure using the National Health Accounts Estimates for India 2019-20.[y]

A simplified diagram describing the Health-GPS model can be found in **Figure D1**. More details on the methods and data sources are listed in **Appendix D**.

Results

Nutrient intakes

Table 1 presents the estimated baseline average daily nutrient intake per capita. **Tables A3, A4, A5** show the results for low, middle, and high-income groups, respectively. The average daily energy intake is lower than previous NSS-based estimates, which did not account for waste.[21] Cereals represent approximately half of the total calorie intake. Total daily energy intake increases with income. While our estimated average daily sodium intake is slightly more conservative than subnational dietary recall estimates,[22] we find that 87.0% of adult males, 75.1% of adult females, and 80.0% of adolescents have daily sodium intakes above the WHO recommended level of 2,000mg/day. One in five adults also consume more saturated fat daily than WHO recommended levels (no more than 10% of total daily energy intake). For total sugars, more than 10% of adult males and 5% of adult females have daily total sugar intake above the National Health Service of the United Kingdom (NHS) recommended levels (no more than 90g per day) (**Figure A2**).[z]

[x] We use Euromonitor International Passport database and Tak et al (2022) to estimate past trends for highly processed food items, including cakes and pastries, confectionery, ready-to-eat foods, salty snacks, sweet snacks, and other UPF. Rather than speculating on what substitutions the population would make as they progressively increase their consumption of UPF, we have assumed that the increase in UPF intakes is simply additive, thus representing an upper bound.

[y] Ministry of Health & Family Welfare, Government of India. National Health Accounts. Estimates for India 2019-20. Accessible from: https://nhsrcindia.org/sites/default/files/2023-04/National%20Health%20Accounts-2019-20.pdf (Accessed 25 May 2024).

[z] WHO uses total free sugar intake for its recommendation on daily sugar intake. In this analysis, we are not able to differentiate free sugars from total sugar.

Table 1. Estimated daily per capita energy and nutrient intake as of December 2022, full sample

	Energy (kcal)	Sugar (g)	Sat. fat (g)	Sodium (mg)	Carbs (g)	Total fat (g)	Protein (g)
Served proc. food	193.4	1.4	2.2	246.0	24.6	8.4	4.9
Cereals	1,102.5	3.8	0.6	8.4	236.8	3.7	30.4
Dairy	151.6	8.2	6.4	45.4	10.6	9.7	5.6
Pulses	78.0	0.4	0.1	4.9	12.8	0.5	5.6
Oils & spices	296.9	24.5	2.9	3,056.1	26.0	21.1	0.7
F&V	125.2	5.1	4.0	14.0	13.3	6.7	3.0
Animal meats, fresh	12.8	0.0	0.2	8.6	0.0	0.7	1.7
Packaged proc. foods	27.5	0.2	0.3	36.5	3.0	1.2	1.1
Sweets	59.6	5.2	1.3	35.2	8.2	2.7	0.6
SSBs	1.7	0.3	0.0	0.7	0.3	0.0	0.0
Non-SSBs	1.6	0.0	0.0	3.4	0.4	0.0	0.0
Total	**2,050.8**	**49.2**	**17.9**	**3,459.1**	**336.1**	**54.7**	**53.6**

Notes: Survey weighted. Sat.: saturated; carbs: carbohydrates; kcal: kilo calorie; g: gram; mg: milligram. proc.: processed; F&V: fruits & vegetables; SSBs: sugar-sweetened beverages.

Price elasticities of demand

Table A6 shows the estimated average own- and cross-price elasticities of demand. Demand for most foods is inelastic (proportionate change in purchases smaller than proportionate change in price), except for dairy, fresh animal meat, and packaged processed food. The latter is the most price-sensitive, with an elasticity of -1.90 (a 10% price increase makes purchases fall by 19%). In line with previous studies,[23,24] cereals (staple foods) are the least price-sensitive, with an elasticity of -0.34. Results indicate significant substitution and complementarity patterns between groups. Dairy and sweets are complements (negative cross-price elasticities, $p<0.01$), as well as F&V and fresh animal meat. Packaged processed foods are substitutes with cereals, pulses, and fresh animal meat. **Figure 1** provides the own-price elasticity results by income group. In line with the international literature,[15] the demand from low-income households is more price-sensitive, except for sweets and non-SSBs.

Figure 1. Estimated average own-price elasticity estimates, by income group



Notes: Estimated using Deaton (1988)'s quality-adjusted Almost Ideal Demand System model.[14] Bootstrapped standard errors after 300 replications. Vertical segments represent the 95% confidence intervals. * Own-price elasticity estimates for SSBs and non-SSBs are extracted from John et al (2022) for aerated sweetened beverages and tea, respectively.[17] Pack.: Packaged; proc.: processed; SSBs: sugar-sweetened beverages.

Immediate policy impacts

Depending on the NPM used, HFSS foods account for 4.5% (FSSAI) or 5.5% (WHO SEARO) of average baseline total energy intakes by Indians **(Table A7)**. Most of the items in the sweets and packaged processed food groups are HFSS. The difference between the two approaches is mainly driven by the extensive list of items excluded from the proposed FOPNL by FSSAI. Immediate policy impacts on nutrient intake are presented in **Figure A3**. **Figure B1**, **Figure B4**, and **Figure B7** show the results for the sensitivity scenarios.

All scenarios would lead to a minor decrease in expenditure for all income groups, from -0.35% for low-income households for scenario 1 to -0.87% for high-income households for scenario 4 (**Figure A4**). These results are mainly driven by a significant decrease in HFSS food purchases – particularly packaged processed foods (price-elastic demand) – and substitutions from HFSS foods to cheaper cereals, pulses, and oils and spices. Results are similar for sensitivity scenarios (passthrough, subsidy, and reformulation) (**Appendix B**).

All scenarios would significantly increase tax revenue from foods and beverages, from +20.8% for scenario 1 to +52.0% for scenario 4 (**Figure A5**). This is due to a quantity effect with higher purchases of cereals, pulses, and oils and spices driven by substitutions from HFSS foods and a tax increase effect from sweets (price-inelastic demand). Tax revenue is predictably lower for the sensitivity scenario with GST 0% on F&V and pulses (**Figure B9**).

Long-term policy impacts

Figure 2 shows simulated impacts over 30 years after policy implementation. The upper bounds of reduction in sodium intake and BMI under two policy scenarios compared to baseline are reported for the entire population, and the three income groups (lower bound results available in **Figure A6**). The population average reduction in daily sodium intake is persistent and stable over the 30 years, at 19-20mg (bounds of -0.58% to -0.63%, compared to baseline sodium intake) for scenario 1. The reduction in BMI tends to be stable after 4 years of policy implementation. After 30 years of policy implementation, the reduction is 0.09-0.10kg/m^2 (-0.4% to -0.5% compared to baseline BMI) under scenario 1 in the entire population. Scenario 2 is associated with a larger impact on sodium intake and BMI than scenario 1. Sodium and BMI reductions are consistently larger for the high-income group compared to the lower-income group.

Figure 2. Reduction in sodium and body mass index compared to no policy change, by income group, 2022 to 2053



Notes: Upper bound estimates (lower bound estimates can be found in **Figure A6**). 95% confidence interval reported as shaded area.
In the top two plots on sodium, a unit of 32.3 in y-axis corresponds to 1% of adjusted baseline sodium intake (3,232mg after adjustment according to height and weight distributions). In the bottom two plots on BMI, a unit of 0.21 in y-axis corresponds to 1% of baseline average BMI (21.46kg/m^2). The highest percentage of the reduction in sodium or BMI in the baseline sodium or BMI is indicated in each plot.
Scenario 1: GST rate is increased to 28% for foods and beverages high in fat, sugar, and sodium (HFSS) based on the definition by the Food Safety and Standards Authority of India; Scenario 2: adding a 12% top-up to the tax rate applied on HFSS foods and beverages in Scenario 1. BMI: body mass index; GST: Goods and Services Tax. HFSS: High in fat, sodium, and sugar.

Over 30 years, the cumulative reduction in the incidence of IHD, CKD, stroke, diabetes, and asthma in the entire population is 5.0-9.4 million cases under scenario 1 and 8.8-16.8 million cases under scenario 2 (lower abound results in **Table A8** and upper bound results in **Table A9**). The cumulative reduction corresponds to 28-53% (scenario 1) and 49-94% (scenario 2) of the annual incidence of the five diseases in India at baseline. Similarly to risk factors, the cumulative reduction in the incidence of the five diseases is the highest in the high-income group (**Table 2**). The largest reductions are observed in IHD and diabetes, which made up 7.8% and 2.5% of DALYs in India in 2019 respectively.[aa] A lower prevalence of hypertension is also associated with the four scenarios. After 30 years of policy implementation, the number of people with hypertension in India decreased by up to 132,600 people (scenario 4, -0.062% compared to baseline national prevalence number) (**Figure A8**).

Table 2. Cumulative reduction in disease incidence (cases per 100,000 population) compared to no policy change, by income group, 2024 to 2053

Disease		**Scenario 1**			**Scenario 2**		
		Low income	Middle income	High income	Low income	Middle income	High income
IHD	LB	-85.07	-104.62	-132.62	-147.96	-185.45	-228.24
	UB	-134.03	-170.95	-194.23	-237.44	-296.79	-342.02
CKD	LB	-15.54	-23.85	-26.82	-29.68	-37.50	-48.40
	UB	-52.07	-65.76	-76.59	-94.74	-117.96	-139.84
Stroke	LB	-8.24	-10.77	-15.71	-18.05	-19.46	-22.61
	UB	-14.70	-16.83	-21.17	-27.95	-31.94	-36.65
Diabetes	LB	-86.82	-99.21	-121.52	-155.37	-182.47	-208.69
	UB	-181.37	-206.72	-235.88	-319.07	-374.43	-418.12
Asthma	LB	-54.93	-68.23	-85.42	-106.51	-124.17	-148.07
	UB	-112.15	-140.42	-154.60	-205.34	-243.01	-277.38
Total	**LB**	**-250.59**	**-306.67**	**-382.09**	**-457.57**	**-549.05**	**-656.01**
	UB	**-494.32**	**-600.68**	**-682.48**	**-884.54**	**-1,064.14**	**-1,214.01**

Notes: Cumulative reduction in incidence rate per 100,000 population over 30 years after policy implementation (2024-2053) is reported for five key diseases. IHD: Ischemic heart disease. CKD: Chronic kidney disease.
Scenario 1: GST rate is increased to 28% for foods and beverages high in fat, sugar, and sodium based on the definition by the Food Safety and Standards Authority of India; Scenario 2: adding a 12% top-up to the tax rate applied on HFSS foods and beverages in Scenario 1. GST: Goods and Services Tax. HFSS: High in fat, sugar, and sodium. LB: lower bound, UB: upper bound.

The tax scenarios generate a reduction in total health expenditure ranging US$ 8.1-15.3 billion under scenario 1 (**Table 3**). **Table A7** additionally includes the lower bound estimates for cumulative incidence reduction and total averted health expenditure for scenarios 3 and 4. Scenario 4 is associated with the largest benefits.

[aa] Based on data from the Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation, Global Burden of Disease. Accessible from: https://www.healthdata.org/research-analysis/gbd (Accessed 1 April 2024).

Table 3. Summary of results

			Immediate effect at implementation		Cumulative results for the five key diseases over 2024-2053		
			Change in HH expenditure on foods and beverages (%)	Change in tax revenue from foods and beverages (%)	Reduction in incidence rate per 100,000 population	Reduction in DALYs per 100,000 population	Reduction in total health expenditure (USD billion)
Scenario 1	Low income	LB	-0.35%	+20.82%	-251	-701	-8.1 (LB) -15.3 (UB)
		UB			-494	-1091	
	Middle income	LB	-0.33%		-307	-847	
		UB			-601	-1304	
	High income	LB	-0.31%		-382	-912	
		UB			-682	-1306	
Scenario 2	Low income	LB	-0.71%	+43.80%	-458	-1047	-14.4 (LB) -27.3 (UB)
		UB			-885	-1792	
	Middle income	LB	-0.69%		-549	-1321	
		UB			-1064	-2215	
	High income	LB	-0.70%		-656	-1625	
		UB			-1214	-2431	

Notes: Scenario 1: GST rate is increased to 28% for foods and beverages high in fat, sugar, and sodium based on the definition by the Food Safety and Standards Authority of India; Scenario 2: adding a 12% top-up to the tax rate applied on HFSS foods and beverages in Scenario 1. DALYs: Disability-adjusted life years. GST: Goods and Services Tax. HFSS: High in fat, sugar, and sodium. LB: Lower bound, UB: Upper bound, USD: US dollar.

The lower incidence of IHD, CKD, stroke, diabetes, and asthma is associated with significant reductions in DALYs. Over 30 years in the entire population, the cumulative reduction in DALYs is 12.7-18.7 million years under scenario 1. The cumulative reduction over 30 years is up to 1,091.0, 1,304.0 and 1,305.6 per 100,000 population (upper bound) in low-, middle-, and high-income groups, respectively, under scenario 1. Scenario 2 is associated with larger impacts (**Figure 3**).

Figure 3. Cumulative DALYs reduction compared to no policy change, by income group, 2022 to 2053



Notes: Upper bound estimates (lower bound estimates can be found in **Figure A7**). 95% Confidence Interval reported as shaded area.
One unit of 604 DALYs per 100,000 population in y-axis corresponds to approximately 10% of DALYs per 100,000 population in India in 2019 of five key diseases including IHD, CKD, stroke, diabetes and asthma. The highest percentage of the cumulative reduction in DALYs per 100,000 population in the baseline DALYs per 100,000 population of five key diseases in 2019 is indicated in each plot.
Scenario 1: GST rate is increased to 28% for foods and beverages high in fat, sugar, and sodium based on the definition by the Food Safety and Standards Authority of India; Scenario 2: adding a 12% top-up to the tax rate applied on HFSS foods and beverages in Scenario 1. DALYs: Disability-Adjusted Life Years. GST: Goods and Services Tax. HFSS: High in fat, sugar, and sodium.

Discussion

Applying a GST rate of 28% on HFSS items based on the draft FSSAI HFSS definition could reduce disease cases by up to 53% of baseline annual incidence, prevent 18.7 million DALYs, and avert US$ 15.3 billion in total healthcare expenditure on IHD, CKD, stroke, diabetes and asthma by 2053 (upper bound estimates). This reduction represents approximately 14.1% of the annual total health expenditure of India in 2021-22.[bb] It is also associated with an immediate increase in tax revenue from foods and beverages of 20.8% and a minor decrease in total household expenditure on foods and beverages for all income groups (-0.3%).

The largest absolute health benefits are observed among high-income, as this group consumes more energy and sodium from HFSS foods at baseline. Slightly higher health and economic benefits are obtained under a scenario using the WHO SEARO NPM to define HFSS foods as fewer items are exempted (Scenario 3, see **Table A2** and **Table A7**). We show the robustness of our results to potential strategic industry tax avoidance, namely tax under-shifting to prices and reformulation (**Appendix B**). Significantly stronger health and economic benefits are associated with an additional 12% tax on HFSS foods, up to 31.2 million DALYs prevented, US$ 27.3 billion in averted total health expenditure, and an immediate 43.8% increase in tax revenue from foods and beverages (Scenario 2).

Limitations

Our microsimulation assumes no underlying time trend of diseases, which might be inconsistent with the observed increasing risks of NCDs associated with, e.g., air pollution and climate change.[25] The analysis accounts for two pathways from diet to health, or two dietary risks: high sodium intake and high BMI (determined by energy imbalance). It does not consider the positive health impact of improving the source of energy (e.g., from F&V or pulses rather than HFSS foods) or increasing whole grain, F&V or legume intake.[26] For example, as a result, the subsidy scenarios that involve the zero-rating of F&V and pulses (under GST), are associated with a higher total energy intake as the intake of pulses increases (**Figure B7**).[cc]

Also, due to the large size of the Indian population and in order to ease computability, our microsimulation only simulates 1% of the Indian population and accounts for the five diseases most attributable to excess sodium intake and high BMI in terms of DALYs in India. Our health benefit estimates may thus represent an underestimate of the potential effect. The same epidemiological data on disease incidence, prevalence, mortality and remission were applied across income groups due to the dearth of granular data. Thus, differences in estimated absolute health benefits across income groups need to be interpreted with caution as NCDs are not necessarily diseases of affluence in India.[27] Finally, restricted by data availability, total health expenditure is extrapolated from household expenditure on health assuming equal contributions of diseases to total health expenditure, following the methods adopted by WHO.[28]

[bb] India's total health expenditure was approximately USD 108.6 billion for 2021-22. Source: Press Information Bureau, National Health Accounts (NHA) Estimates 2020-21 and 2021-22. A comprehensive overview. Accessible from: https://pib.gov.in/PressNoteDetails.aspx?NoteId=153237&ModuleId=3&reg=3&lang=1 (Accessed 16 Dec 2024).

[cc] Most F&V are already zero-rated at baseline so most of the effect comes from pulses of which many are taxed with a GST rate of 5% at baseline (**Figure A1**).

Policy implications

The 2024 Economic Survey of India and the WHO take cognizance of the increasing consumption of HFSS foods in India and outline the need to promote healthy diets.[20,dd] Implementation of the 28% GST and 12% Cess on SSBs, which represent only a fraction of HFSS food intake, has shown limited impacts in reducing consumption.[29] However, the 2016-2017 Kerala state-wise indirect tax of 14.5% on burgers, pizzas, tacos, doughnuts, sandwiches, pasta and bread fillings sold in restaurants was associated with reduced sales.[30,ee] Curbing HFSS food consumption may thus require a further expansion of the highest GST rate to all HFSS foods.

The value of adjusting taxes within the existing GST rate structure helps avoid multiple taxation schemes. Nevertheless, the tax administration challenges and companies' compliance costs associated with taxing foods based on their nutritional content should be assessed, particularly in a setting with a significant informal market. While there is no robust independent evidence for negative macroeconomic impacts of diet-related fiscal policies,[31] concerns may arise regarding the economic impact of the measure on the food industry and inflation. These potential challenges should be further studied.

This study informs potential reforms of the GST in India. We find that increasing GST rates on HFSS foods based on nutrient content may lead to significant dietary improvements, without increasing household spending. The latter is important since it is estimated that at least two-thirds of the rural poor could not afford a recommended healthy diet in 2011.[32]

As an increasing number of countries are contemplating the taxation of HFSS foods,[5] the results of this study may also contribute to the wider global discussion on the use of this policy.

Conclusions

India faces a rapid shift in diets towards HFSS foods. Tackling unhealthy diets is urgent. Other countries have highlighted the feasibility of regulating the marketing of unhealthy foods and beverages, the introduction of FOPNL, and shifts in relative prices to encourage significant changes towards healthier food purchases. Clear quantitative nutrient thresholds defining HFSS foods are crucial for the consistent development and implementation of these policies.

India has adopted a higher 28% GST rate and 12% Cess on SSBs in July 2017. Broader alignment of GST rates with nutrition and health objectives, targeting HFSS foods with higher rates, may represent the next critical step. This study has shown that it could result in meaningful reductions in the intake of nutrients of concern and significant long-run health benefits, yielding both lower health expenditure and higher tax revenue while having a limited impact on household expenditure.

[dd] Government of India, Ministry of Finance. Economic Survey 2023-2024. New Delhi: Government of India; 2024. Accessible from: https://www.indiabudget.gov.in/economicsurvey/ (Accessed 24 Sep 2024).

[ee] The Kerala tax on fast foods has existed from August 2016 to June 2017, when it was repealed following the launch of the nationwide GST by the federal government to replace all state-level indirect taxes.

Data sharing

Input data and statistical code as well as further information on the Health-GPS microsimulation model will be made available upon publication at https://imperialchepi.github.io/healthgps/. Following data use agreements, CMIE Consumer Pyramids data will not be made available and can be purchased via subscription at https://consumerpyramidsdx.cmie.com/. The other data sources used in this analysis are available publicly: NSS 68th round survey (2011-2012) microdata at https://microdata.gov.in/nada43/index.php/catalog/126; IHME and IARC relative risks, disease prevalence, and incidence data at https://ghdx.healthdata.org/ihme_data and https://gco.iarc.fr/; UN World Population Prospects database at https://population.un.org/wpp/; NCD-RisC data at https://www.ncdrisc.org/data-downloads.html.

Supplementary materials

Supplementary appendices can be found after the References section in this file.

Declaration of interests

LS and MS report being employed by Resolve to Save Lives (RTSL) supporting this work. RTSL is funded by Bloomberg Philanthropies, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, and Gates Philanthropy Partners, with support from the Chan Zuckerberg Foundation. Other authors declare having no competing interests.

Funding

This work was supported by funds from Resolve to Save Lives (RTSL, United States, https://resolvetosavelives.org/) under contract PR0414. The funders contributed to the study conceptualization, study design, and writing of the report. They had no role in data collection, data analysis, or data interpretation. The corresponding author had full access to all the data in the study and had final responsibility for the decision to submit for publication.

Acknowledgments

We thank Laura Cobb and the participants at two stakeholder meetings organized by the Institute for Economic Growth (IEG) in New Delhi, India, at the 'Delivering for Nutrition in South Asia: Equity and Inclusion' conference organized by the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) in Kathmandu, Nepal, and at the Indian Health Economics and Policy Association annual conference for their comments. We thank Belabess Alijadallah, Mahima Ghosh, and James Turner as well as his team members for their support with the calibration of the Health-GPS model. We thank Preeti Khanna for her assistance in matching food items with nutritional information. Finally, we thank Heather Lodge for administrative support.

Authors' contributions (based on CRediT taxonomy)

Conceptualization: FS, JO, MR, LS, MS, WJ. Data curation: MR, JZ. Formal Analysis: MR, JZ. Funding acquisition: FS, JO, LS, MS, WJ. Investigation: MR, JZ. Methodology: FS, MR, JZ, JO, DJL. Project administration: FS, JO, LS, MS, WJ. Resources: FS, JO, WJ. Software: JZ, JO, DJL. Supervision: FS, LS, MS, WJ. Validation: MR, JZ, JO. Visualization: MR, JZ, JO. Writing – original draft: MR, JZ. Writing – review & editing: MR, JZ, JO, DJL, MS, LS, WJ, FS.

References

1 Malik VS, Willett WC, Hu FB. Global obesity: trends, risk factors and policy implications. Nature Reviews Endocrinology. 2013 Jan;9(1):13-27.

2 Tak M, Law C, Green R, Shankar B, Cornelsen L. Processed foods purchase profiles in urban India in 2013 and 2016: a cluster and multivariate analysis. BMJ open. 2022 Oct 1;12(10):e062254.

3 Griffith R, O'Connell M, Smith K. Corrective taxation and internalities from food consumption. CESifo Economic Studies. 2018 Mar 1;64(1):1-4.

4 Adam, S., Besley, T., Blundell, R., Bond, S., Chote, R., Gammie, M., Johnson, P., Mirrlees, J., Myles, G. & Poterba, J. Mirrlees review. Tax by design. London: IFS; 2011. https://ifs.org.uk/books/tax-design

5 Pineda E, Gressier M, Li D, Brown T, Mounsey S, Olney J, Sassi F. Effectiveness and policy implications of health taxes on foods high in fat, salt, and sugar. Food Policy. 2024 Feb 1;123:102599.

6 Thow AM, Downs S, Jan S. A systematic review of the effectiveness of food taxes and subsidies to improve diets: understanding the recent evidence. Nutrition reviews. 2014 Sep 1;72(9):551-65.

7 Caro JC, Ng SW, Taillie LS, Popkin BM. Designing a tax to discourage unhealthy food and beverage purchases: The case of Chile. Food Policy. 2017 Aug 1;71:86-100.

8 Roche M. Can differentiated value-added tax rates promote healthier diets? The case of Costa Rica. Food Policy. 2025 Feb 1;131:102824.

9 Cornelsen L, Mazzocchi M, Smith RD. Fat tax or thin subsidy? How price increases and decreases affect the energy and nutrient content of food and beverage purchases in Great Britain. Social Science & Medicine. 2019 Jun 1;230:318-27.

10 Varghese B, Panicker R, Mukhopadhyay D, Backholer K, Sethi V, de Wagt A, Murira Z, Bhatia N, Arora M. Estimating the potential impact of a health tax on the demand for unhealthy food and beverages and on tax revenue in India. Health Policy and Planning. 2024 Apr 1;39(3):299-306.

11 Basto-Abreu A, Torres-Alvarez R, Barrientos-Gutierrez T, Pereda P, Duran AC. Estimated reduction in obesity prevalence and costs of a 20% and 30% ad valorem excise tax to sugar-sweetened beverages in Brazil: A modeling study. PLoS medicine. 2024 Jul 17;21(7):e1004399.

12 Basu S, Vellakkal S, Agrawal S, Stuckler D, Popkin B, Ebrahim S. Averting obesity and type 2 diabetes in India through sugar-sweetened beverage taxation: an economic-epidemiologic modeling study. PLoS Medicine. 2014 Jan 7;11(1):e1001582.

13 Zhu Z, Heng BH, Teow KL. Lifetime trajectory simulation of chronic disease progression and comorbidity development. Journal of Biomedical Informatics. 2018 Dec 1;88:29-36.

14 Deaton A. Quality, quantity, and spatial variation of price. The American Economic Review. 1988 Jun 1:418-30.

15 Green R, Cornelsen L, Dangour AD, Turner R, Shankar B, Mazzocchi M, Smith RD. The effect of rising food prices on food consumption: systematic review with meta-regression. BMJ. 2013 Jun 17;346.

16 Deaton A. The Analysis of Household Surveys: A Microeconometric Approach to Development Policy. Washington, D.C.: World Bank; 2019. http://hdl.handle.net/10986/30394

17 John RM, Tullu FT, Gupta R. Price elasticity and affordability of aerated or sugar-sweetened beverages in India: implications for taxation. BMC Public Health. 2022 Jul 17;22(1):1372.

18 World Health Organization, South East Asia Regional Office. WHO nutrient profile model for South-East Asia Region. WHO: New Delhi; 2017. https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789290225447

19 Rodriguez-Martinez A, Zhou B, Sophiea MK, Bentham J, Paciorek CJ, Iurilli ML, Carrillo-Larco RM, Bennett JE, Di Cesare M, Taddei C, Bixby H. Height and body-mass index trajectories of school-aged children and adolescents from 1985 to 2019 in 200 countries and territories: a pooled analysis of 2181 population-based studies with 65 million participants. The Lancet. 2020 Nov 7;396(10261):1511-24.

20 World Health Organization, Country Office for India. The growth of ultra-processed foods in India: an analysis of trends, issues and policy recommendations. WHO: New Delhi; 2023. https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789290210672

21 Sharma M, Kishore A, Roy D, Joshi K. A comparison of the Indian diet with the EAT-Lancet reference diet. BMC Public Health. 2020 Dec;20(1):1-3.

22 Johnson C, Praveen D, Pope A, Raj TS, Pillai RN, Land MA, Neal B. Mean population salt consumption in India: a systematic review. Journal of Hypertension. 2017 Jan 1;35(1):3-9.

23 Mittal S. Application of the QUAIDS model to the food sector in India. Journal of Quantitative Economics. 2010 Jan 1;8(1):42-54.

24 Kumar P, Kumar A, Shinoj P, Raju SS. Estimation of demand elasticity for food commodities in India. Agricultural Economics Research Review. 2011;24(1):1-4.

25 Frumkin H, Haines A. Global environmental change and noncommunicable disease risks. Annual Review of Public Health. 2019 Apr 1;40(1):261-82.

26 Afshin A, Sur PJ, Fay KA, Cornaby L, Ferrara G, Salama JS, Mullany EC, Abate KH, Abbafati C, Abebe Z, Afarideh M. Health effects of dietary risks in 195 countries, 1990-2017: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2017. The Lancet. 2019 May 11;393(10184):1958-72.

27 Vellakkal S, Subramanian SV, Millett C, Basu S, Stuckler D, Ebrahim S. Socioeconomic inequalities in non-communicable diseases prevalence in India: disparities between self-reported diagnoses and standardized measures. PloS one. 2013 Jul 15;8(7):e68219.

28 Pan American Health Organization, World Health Organization, United Nations Inter-Agency Task Force, United Nations Development Programme. The Case for Investment in Prevention

and Control of Noncommunicable Diseases and Mental Disorders in Suriname: A return-on-investment analysis. Washington D.C.: PAHO; 2023. https://www.paho.org/en/node/93097

29 Law C, Brown KA, Green R, Venkateshmurthy NS, Mohan S, Scheelbeek PF, Shankar B, Dangour AD, Cornelsen L. Changes in take-home aerated soft drink purchases in urban India after the implementation of goods and services tax (GST): an interrupted time series analysis. SSM-population health. 2021 Jun 1;14:100794.

30 Agarwal S, Ghosh P, Zhan C. Association between a state-level fat tax and fast food purchases. JAMA Network Open. 2023 Oct 2;6(10):e2337983-.

31 Mounsey S, Veerman L, Jan S, Thow AM. The macroeconomic impacts of diet-related fiscal policy for NCD prevention: a systematic review. Economics & Human Biology. 2020 May 1;37:100854.

32 Raghunathan K, Headey D, Herforth A. Affordability of nutritious diets in rural India. Food Policy. 2021 Feb 1;99:101982.

Supplementary materials

Table of contents - supplementary materials

Appendix A. Additional tables and figures 24

Table A1. Household characteristics by income group, NSS 2011-2012 24

Table A2. Draft Food Safety and Standards Authority of India definition of HFSS foods and WHO South East Asia Region nutrient profile model category-specific thresholds 25

Figure A1. Baseline distribution of total energy intake by GST rate, by food group, full sample, as of December 2022 . 26

Table A3. Estimated daily per capita energy and nutrient intake as of December 2022, low-income group 27

Table A4. Estimated daily per capita energy and nutrient intake as of December 2022, middle-income group 28

Table A5. Estimated daily per capita energy and nutrient intake as of December 2022, high-income group 29

Figure A2. Estimated daily distribution of sodium, sugar, and saturated fat intake per capita compared to daily recommendations, for adult men, adult women, and adolescents (10-18 years old), as of December 2022 30

Table A6. Estimated average price elasticities, full sample 31

Table A7. The proportion of total energy intake from the off-trade sector defined as high in fat, sugar, and sodium, full sample, as of December 2022 32

Figure A3. Immediate impact of fiscal policy scenarios on nutrients (energy, sugar, saturated fat, and sodium), by income group33

Figure A4. Immediate impact of fiscal policy scenarios on total household expenditure on food and beverages, by income group34

Figure A5. Immediate impact of fiscal policy scenarios on government tax revenue from foods and beverages 35

Figure A6. Lower bound of reduction in sodium and body mass index compared to baseline, 2022-2053 36

Table A8. Lower bound cumulative reduction in incidence of five key diseases in the entire population, associated total health expenditure and DALYs over 30 years of policy implementation under four policy scenarios 37

Table A9. Upper bound cumulative reduction in incidence of five key diseases in the entire population, associated total health expenditure and DALYs over 30 years of policy implementation under two main policy scenarios 38

Figure A7. Lower bound of cumulative reduction in DALYs per 100,000 population compared to baseline, 2022-2053 39

Figure A8. Lower bound reduction in the prevalence number of hypertension in the entire population in 10, 20 and 30 years after policy implementation under four policy scenarios 40

References Appendix A 41

Appendix B. Sensitivity scenarios 42

Table B1. Sensitivity scenarios definition 42

Figure B1. Sensitivity scenario: Passthrough. Immediate impact of fiscal policy scenarios on nutrients (energy, sugar, saturated fat, and sodium), by income group 43

Figure B2. Sensitivity scenario: Passthrough. Immediate impact of fiscal policy scenarios on total household expenditure on food and beverages, by income group 44

Figure B3. Sensitivity scenario: Passthrough. Immediate impact of fiscal policy scenarios on government tax revenue from foods and beverages 45

Figure B4. Sensitivity scenario: Reformulation. Immediate impact of fiscal policy scenarios on nutrients (energy, sugar, saturated fat, and sodium), by income group 46

Figure B5. Sensitivity scenario: Reformulation. Immediate impact of fiscal policy scenarios on total household expenditure on food and beverages, by income group 47

Figure B6. Sensitivity scenario: Reformulation. Immediate impact of fiscal policy scenarios on government tax revenue from foods and beverages 48

Figure B7. Sensitivity scenario: Subsidy. Immediate impact of fiscal policy scenarios on nutrients (energy, sugar, saturated fat, and sodium), by income group 49

Figure B8. Sensitivity scenario: Subsidy. Immediate impact of fiscal policy scenarios on total household expenditure on food and beverages, by income group 50

Figure B9. Sensitivity scenario: Subsidy. Immediate impact of fiscal policy scenarios on government tax revenue from foods and beverages..... 51

References Appendix B 52

Appendix C. Almost Ideal Demand System (AIDS) demand model 53

C1. The model 53

References Appendix C 54

Appendix D. Health-GPS microsimulation model 55

D1. Overview 55

Figure D1. Health-GPS model diagram..... 56

D2. Demographic module..... 56

D2.1. Data 56

D2.2. Births and deaths 56

D2.3. Residual mortality 56

D2.4. Population..... 57

D2.5. Net migration..... 58

D3. Risk factor modules 58

Figure D2. Energy balance model layers and factors, used within Health-GPS. 59

D3.1. Energy balance model 59

D3.2. Sodium intake..... 59

D3.3. Risk factor initialization and propagation..... 60

D4. Disease modules 61

D5. Burden of disease module..... 62

D6. Health expenditure..... 63

References Appendix D..... 64

Appendix A. Additional tables and figures

Table A1. Household characteristics by income group, NSS 2011-2012

	Low income	Middle income	High income	Full sample
Sector (urban=0)	0.87	0.71	0.35	0.68
Size	5.18	4.37	3.43	4.45
Head sex (female=0)	0.89	0.88	0.88	0.88
Head primary education completed	0.39	0.59	0.82	0.57
HH religion (hindu=1; others=0)	0.83	0.83	0.83	0.83
MPCE (INR)	871.23	1,543.57	3,825.21	1,877.34

Notes: Primary education completed with at least 5 years of education. Income groups are defined by terciles of monthly per capita expenditure. Survey weighted. INR: Indian rupee. NSS: National Sample Survey.

Table A2. Draft Food Safety and Standards Authority of India definition of HFSS foods and WHO South East Asia Region nutrient profile model category-specific thresholds

Food Safety and Standards Authority of India, Labelling & Display Amendment Draft Regulations 2022

"High fat, sugar, salt (HFSS) food means a processed food product which has high levels of saturated fat or total sugar or sodium. The declared values of these ingredients are such that the product; does not satisfy the value of energy (kcal) from total sugar less than 10 percent of total energy, or from saturated fat 10 percent of total energy, and sodium less than 1 mg/1 kcal."

In this analysis, we assume processed products to be items not included in Schedule IV Category III Solid Foods/Liquid Foods exempted from FOPNL under INR in the Labelling & Display Amendment Draft Regulations 2022 (44272/2022/REGULATION-FSSAI).

WHO South East Asia Region nutrient profile model

In this analysis, we define items as HFSS if nutrient content exceeds the values per 100g (or 100ml) listed below.

Food category	Food category name	Total fat (g)	Saturated fat (g)	Total sugars (g)	Sodium (g)	Energy (kcal)
1	Confectionery	8.0	NA	6.0	NA	230
2	Fine bakery wares	8.0	NA	6.0	0.25	230
3	Bread & ordinary bakery wares	8.0	NA	6.0	0.25	NA
4	Cereals	12.0	NA	9.0	0.35	NA
5a	Ready-to-eat savouries: potato, cereal or starch-based	8.0	NA	NA	0.25	230
5b	Ready-to-eat savouries: processed nuts	NA	NA	NA	0.05	NA
5c	Ready-to-eat savouries: fish-based	NA	NA	6.0	0.25	230
6a	Beverages: juices	NA	NA	6.0	NA	NA
6b	Beverages: milk & dairy-based	7.0	NA	NA	NA	NA
6c	Beverages: water-based flavoured drink	NA	NA	2.0	0.3	NA
6d	Beverages: coffee, tea, herbal infusions	NA	NA	2.0	NA	NA
6e	Beverages: cereal, grain, & tree nut-based	NA	NA	6.0	0.2	NA
7	Frozen dairy-based desserts & edible ices	8.0	NA	12.0	0.1	230
8	Curded dairy-based desserts	7.0	NA	6.0	0.1	230
9	Cheese & analogues	20.0	NA	NA	0.6	NA
10	Composite foods (prepared foods)	8.0	3.5	9.0	0.35	NA
11	Fats, oils, & fat emulsions	NA	35.0	NA	0.1	NA
12	Pasta, noodles, & like products	3.0	NA	NA	0.25	NA
13	Fresh & frozen meat, poultry, game, fish & seafood products	15.0	NA	NA	NA	NA
14a	Processed meat, poultry, & game products	8.0	NA	NA	0.4	NA
14b	Processed fish & sea food products	8.0	3.0	NA	0.4	NA
15	Fresh & frozen fruits, vegetables, & legumes	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
16	Processed fruits & vegetables	NA	NA	NA	0.4	NA
17	Solid-form soybean products	12.0	NA	5.0	0.1	NA
18	Sauces, dips, & dressings	12.0	NA	10.0	0.3	NA

Source: Food Safety and Standards Authority of India, Labelling & Display Amendment Draft Regulations 2022 (44272/2022/REGULATION-FSSAI) and WHO South East Asia Region nutrient profile model.[1]

Notes: We omit the 'Added sugars (g)' column for the WHO South East Asia Region nutrient profile model as we lacked information on added sugars. FOPNL: front-of-pack nutritional labelling; HFSS: high in fat, sugar, and sodium; INR: Indian Nutrition Rating; NA: not applicable; WHO: World Health Organization.

Figure A1. Baseline distribution of total energy intake by GST rate, by food group, full sample, as of December 2022



Notes: On-trade food items are excluded from this analysis, i.e., NSS category 'served processed food'. All non-PDS cereals, fresh meat/fish, arhar, khesari, curd, and honey are assumed pre-packaged (GST rates: not pre-packaged 0% / pre-packaged 5%). Tea and coffee cups assumed GST rate 5%, i.e., service GST in non-air-conditioned restaurants/bars. Survey-weighted. Pack.: packaged; proc.: processed; F&V: fruits & vegetables; NSS: National Sample Survey; SSBs: sugar-sweetened beverages. GST: Goods and Services Tax; PDS: Public Distribution System. Not. cat.: NSS items defined as 'other' in their respective category, thus their GST rate is assumed as the quantity-weighted average GST rate among items in the category and not categorized in this figure.

Table A3. Estimated daily per capita energy and nutrient intake as of December 2022, low-income group

	Energy (kcal)	Sugar (g)	Sat. fat (g)	Sodium (mg)	Carbs (g)	Total fat (g)	Protein (g)
Served proc. food	120.8	0.7	1.1	152.7	17.1	4.7	2.6
Cereals	1,147.9	3.9	0.6	8.7	247.1	3.8	31.4
Dairy	105.4	5.8	4.4	32.0	7.6	6.6	3.9
Pulses	67.5	0.3	0.1	4.3	11.1	0.4	4.8
Oils & spices	245.8	19.9	2.1	2,938.1	21.2	17.6	0.6
F&V	82.8	3.4	1.8	12.2	11.1	3.2	2.3
Animal meats, fresh	8.5	0.0	0.1	5.6	0.0	0.4	1.1
Packaged proc. foods	15.7	0.1	0.2	20.9	1.6	0.7	0.7
Sweets	36.4	3.4	0.8	19.1	5.2	1.6	0.4
SSBs	0.4	0.1	0.0	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.0
Non-SSBs	1.1	0.0	0.0	2.4	0.2	0.0	0.0
Total	**1,832.1**	**37.7**	**11.1**	**3,196.0**	**322.3**	**39.0**	**47.9**

Notes: Survey weighted. Income groups are defined by terciles of monthly per capita expenditure. Sat.: saturated; carbs: carbohydrates; kcal: kilo calorie; g: gram; mg: milligram. proc.: processed; F&V: fruits & vegetables; SSBs: sugar-sweetened beverages.

Table A4. Estimated daily per capita energy and nutrient intake as of December 2022, middle-income group

	Energy (kcal)	Sugar (g)	Sat. fat (g)	Sodium (mg)	Carbs (g)	Total fat (g)	Protein (g)
Served proc. food	149.2	1.0	1.5	186.4	19.9	6.3	3.3
Cereals	1,156.3	4.0	0.6	8.9	248.1	4.0	32.0
Dairy	159.5	8.7	6.7	47.9	11.3	10.1	5.9
Pulses	80.7	0.4	0.1	5.1	13.2	0.5	5.8
Oils & spices	319.4	26.9	3.2	3,219.4	28.5	22.5	0.8
F&V	130.0	5.2	4.3	14.4	13.2	7.2	3.1
Animal meats, fresh	13.5	0.0	0.2	8.9	0.0	0.7	1.8
Packaged proc. foods	26.4	0.2	0.3	35.7	2.8	1.2	1.1
Sweets	55.4	5.0	1.2	32.1	7.8	2.5	0.6
SSBs	1.0	0.2	0.0	0.4	0.2	0.0	0.0
Non-SSBs	1.7	0.0	0.0	3.6	0.4	0.0	0.0
Total	**2,093.2**	**51.4**	**18.1**	**3,562.8**	**345.3**	**55.0**	**54.3**

Notes: Survey weighted. Income groups are defined by terciles of monthly per capita expenditure. Sat.: saturated; carbs: carbohydrates; kcal: kilo calorie; g: gram; mg: milligram. proc.: processed; F&V: fruits & vegetables; SSBs: sugar-sweetened beverages.

Table A5. Estimated daily per capita energy and nutrient intake as of December 2022, high-income group

	Energy (kcal)	Sugar (g)	Sat. fat (g)	Sodium (mg)	Carbs (g)	Total fat (g)	Protein (g)
Served proc. food	357.3	3.1	4.5	459.4	41.6	16.7	10.1
Cereals	970.0	3.4	0.5	7.5	208.1	3.3	27.0
Dairy	214.2	11.3	9.1	63.4	14.6	13.9	7.7
Pulses	91.3	0.4	0.1	5.8	14.9	0.6	6.6
Oils & spices	350.6	28.8	4.0	3,051.7	30.7	24.9	0.9
F&V	185.4	7.8	7.0	16.4	16.7	11.5	3.8
Animal meats, fresh	18.6	0.0	0.3	12.7	0.0	1.0	2.4
Packaged proc. foods	47.1	0.5	0.4	61.7	5.5	2.0	1.8
Sweets	100.5	8.2	2.3	63.6	13.4	4.7	1.0
SSBs	4.5	0.8	0.0	1.8	0.9	0.1	0.1
Non-SSBs	2.4	0.0	0.0	4.8	0.5	0.0	0.1
Total	**2,341.8**	**64.4**	**28.3**	**3,748.9**	**347.1**	**78.6**	**61.5**

Notes: Survey weighted. Income groups are defined by terciles of monthly per capita expenditure. Sat.: saturated; carbs: carbohydrates; kcal: kilo calorie; g: gram; mg: milligram. proc.: processed; F&V: fruits & vegetables; SSBs: sugar-sweetened beverages.

Figure A2. Estimated daily distribution of sodium, sugar, and saturated fat intake per capita compared to daily recommendations, for adult men, adult women, and adolescents (10-18 years old), as of December 2022



Notes: NHS: National Health Service, here referring to the NHS daily recommendation for total sugar intake in the United Kingdom (90g), which used instead of the WHO daily recommendation for free sugars as we missed information on free sugars; Sat.: saturated; WHO: World Health Organization, here referring to the WHO daily recommendations for the intake of sodium and saturated fat (no more than 2,000mg for sodium and 10% of total energy intake for saturated fat); kcal: kilo calorie; g: gram; mg: milligram.

Table A6. Estimated average price elasticities, full sample

	Cereals	Dairy	Pulses	Oils & spices	F&V	Animal meats, fresh	Packaged proc. foods	Sweets	SSBs[a]	Non-SSBs[a]
Cereals	**-0.340*** **	-0.007	-0.130***	-0.267***	-0.219***	0.153***	0.086***	0.032***	0.076***	0.076***
	(0.017)	(0.009)	(0.008)	(0.012)	(0.011)	(0.012)	(0.011)	(0.010)	(0.013)	(0.013)
Dairy	-0.100***	**-1.100*** **	-0.087***	-0.155***	-0.066***	0.100***	-0.016***	-0.127***	0.078***	0.078***
	(0.007)	**(0.012)**	(0.003)	(0.006)	(0.005)	(0.007)	(0.005)	(0.006)	(0.014)	(0.014)
Pulses	-0.307***	-0.160***	**-0.931*** **	-0.048***	0.072***	0.120***	0.212***	0.075***	-0.041***	-0.041***
	(0.020)	(0.008)	**(0.018)**	(0.019)	(0.012)	(0.015)	(0.013)	(0.011)	(0.009)	(0.009)
Oils & spices	-0.216***	-0.080***	-0.015**	**-0.483*** **	0.024***	0.042***	0.044***	-0.035***	0.047***	0.047***
	(0.010)	(0.006)	(0.007)	**(0.014)**	(0.007)	(0.008)	(0.007)	(0.006)	(0.007)	(0.007)
F&V	-0.227***	-0.008	0.033***	0.029***	**-0.587*** **	-0.248***	-0.072***	0.055***	-0.037***	-0.037***
	(0.011)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.009)	**(0.011)**	(0.009)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.008)	(0.008)
Animal meats, fresh	0.323***	0.315***	0.106***	0.074***	-0.594***	**-1.235*** **	0.210***	0.095***	-0.148***	-0.148***
	(0.029)	(0.022)	(0.015)	(0.023)	(0.021)	**(0.025)**	(0.018)	(0.015)	(0.028)	(0.028)
Packaged proc. foods	0.382***	-0.008	0.413***	0.213***	-0.349***	0.424***	**-1.903*** **	0.131***	0.034	0.034
	(0.051)	(0.030)	(0.027)	(0.043)	(0.032)	(0.037)	**(0.031)**	(0.021)	(0.030)	(0.030)
Sweets	0.252***	-0.531***	0.177***	-0.165***	0.297***	0.250***	0.163***	**-0.504*** **	0.072**	0.072**
	(0.053)	(0.035)	(0.022)	(0.036)	(0.034)	(0.033)	(0.023)	**(0.035)**	(0.030)	(0.030)
SSBs[a]	0.359***	0.449***	0.010	0.224***	0.022	-0.041***	0.063***	0.050***	**-0.944*** **	0.271***
	(0.025)	(0.019)	(0.008)	(0.014)	(0.016)	(0.015)	(0.010)	(0.011)	**(0.073)**	(0.054)
Non-SSBs[a]	0.359***	0.449***	0.010	0.224***	0.022	-0.041***	0.063***	0.050***	0.541***	**-0.989*** **
	(0.025)	(0.019)	(0.008)	(0.014)	(0.016)	(0.015)	(0.010)	(0.011)	(0.107)	**(0.116)**

Notes: Estimated using Deaton (1988)'s quality-adjusted Almost Ideal Demand System model.[2] Own-price elasticities and their standard errors are denoted in bold. Bootstrapped standard errors after 300 replications. [a]Price elasticity estimates for SSBs and Non-SSBs are extracted from John et al (2022) for aerated sweetened beverages and tea, respectively.[3] Pack.: Packaged; proc.: processed; F&V: fruits & vegetables; SSBs: sugar-sweetened beverages. * p<0.1, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01.

Table A7. The proportion of total energy intake from the off-trade sector defined as high in fat, sugar, and sodium, full sample, as of December 2022

	FSSAI HFSS	WHO SEARO NPM
Cereals	0.000	0.000
Dairy	0.004	0.061
Pulses	0.000	0.000
Oils & spices	0.000	0.024
F&V	0.030	0.000
Animal meats, fresh	0.000	0.000
Packaged proc. foods	0.897	0.877
Sweets	0.896	0.999
SSBs	0.444	1.000
Non-SSBs	0.000	0.000
Total	**0.045**	**0.055**

Notes: On-trade food items are excluded from this analysis, i.e., NSS category 'served processed food'. Survey-weighted. FSSAI HFSS: definition of foods and beverages high in fat, sugar, and sodium by the Food Safety and Standards Authority of India; WHO SEARO NPM: items with nutrient content above at least one of the respective thresholds set by the World Health Organization South East Asia Region nutrient profile model.[1] proc.: processed; F&V: fruits & vegetables; NSS: National Sample Survey; SSBs: sugar-sweetened beverages.

Figure A3. Immediate impact of fiscal policy scenarios on nutrients (energy, sugar, saturated fat, and sodium), by income group



Notes: Vertical segments represent the 95% confidence intervals. Survey weighted. Scenario 1: defining items for which GST rate is increased to 28% based on the definition of foods and beverages high in fat, sugar, and sodium by the Food Safety and Standards Authority of India; Scenario 2: adding a 12% top-up to the tax rate applied on HFSS foods and beverages in Scenario 1. Scenario 3: scenario defining items for which GST rate is increased to 28% if their nutrient content is above at least one of the respective thresholds set by the World Health Organization South East Asia Region nutrient profile model;[1] Scenarios 4: adding a 12% top-up to the tax rate applied on HFSS foods and beverages in Scenario 3. GST: Goods and Services Tax. HFSS: High in fat, sugar, and sodium.

Figure A4. Immediate impact of fiscal policy scenarios on total household expenditure on food and beverages, by income group



Notes: Vertical segments represent the 95% confidence intervals. Survey weighted. Scenario 1: defining items for which GST rate is increased to 28% based on the definition of foods and beverages high in fat, sugar, and sodium by the Food Safety and Standards Authority of India; Scenario 2: adding a 12% top-up to the tax rate applied on HFSS foods and beverages in Scenario 1. Scenario 3: scenario defining items for which GST rate is increased to 28% if their nutrient content is above at least one of the respective thresholds set by the World Health Organization South East Asia Region nutrient profile model;[1] Scenarios 4: adding a 12% top-up to the tax rate applied on HFSS foods and beverages in Scenario 3. GST: Goods and Services Tax. HFSS: High in fat, sugar, and sodium.

Figure A5. Immediate impact of fiscal policy scenarios on government tax revenue from foods and beverages



Notes: Vertical segments represent the 95% confidence intervals. Survey weighted. Scenario 1: defining items for which GST rate is increased to 28% based on the definition of foods and beverages high in fat, sugar, and sodium by the Food Safety and Standards Authority of India; Scenario 2: adding a 12% top-up to the tax rate applied on HFSS foods and beverages in Scenario 1. Scenario 3: scenario defining items for which GST rate is increased to 28% if their nutrient content is above at least one of the respective thresholds set by the World Health Organization South East Asia Region nutrient profile model;[1] Scenarios 4: adding a 12% top-up to the tax rate applied on HFSS foods and beverages in Scenario 3. GST: Goods and Services Tax. HFSS: High in fat, sugar, and sodium.

Figure A6. Lower bound of reduction in sodium and body mass index compared to baseline, 2022-2053



Notes: Lower bound estimates (upper bound estimates can be found in **Figure 3**). 95% confidence interval reported as shaded area.
In the top two plots on sodium, a unit of 32.3 in y-axis corresponds to 1% of adjusted baseline sodium intake (3,232mg after adjustment according to height and weight distributions). In the bottom two plots on BMI, a unit of 0.21 in y-axis corresponds to 1% of baseline average BMI (21.46kg/m^2).
Scenario 1: defining items for which GST rate is increased to 28% based on the definition of foods and beverages high in fat, sugar, and sodium by the Food Safety and Standards Authority of India; Scenario 2: adding a 12% top-up to the tax rate applied on HFSS foods and beverages in Scenario 1. BMI: body mass index; GST: Goods and Services Tax. HFSS: High in fat, sugar, and sodium.

Table A8. Lower bound cumulative reduction in incidence of five key diseases in the entire population, associated total health expenditure and DALYs over 30 years of policy implementation under four policy scenarios

Disease	Annual incidence at baseline* (million cases)	Scenario 1		Scenario 2		Scenario 3		Scenario 4	
		CR[a] (million cases, %)	THE[b] (USD billion)	CR[a] (million cases, %)	THE[b] (USD billion)	CR[a] (million cases, %)	THE[b] (USD billion)	CR[a] (million cases, %)	THE[b] (USD billion)
IHD	6.45	-1.68 (-26)	-3.46	-2.96 (-46)	-6.09	-2.02 (-31)	-4.16	-3.52 (-54)	-7.23
CKD	2.10	-0.34 (-16)	-0.76	-0.60 (-29)	-1.36	-0.40 (-19)	-0.90	-0.71 (-34)	-1.61
Stroke	1.20	-0.15 (-12)	-0.39	-0.27 (-23)	-0.71	-0.18 (-15)	-0.47	-0.31 (-26)	-0.82
Diabetes	3.40	-1.70 (-50)	-2.16	-3.02 (-89)	-3.86	-2.03 (-60)	-2.59	-3.53 (-104)	-4.50
Asthma	4.77	-1.10 (-23)	-1.32	-1.98 (-41)	-2.36	-1.42 (-30)	-1.70	-2.36 (-50)	-2.82
Total	**17.92**	**-4.97 (-28)**	**-8.09**	**-8.83 (-49)**	**-14.38**	**-6.05 (34)**	**-9.82**	**-10.43 (-58)**	**-16.98**
Cumulative reduction in DALYs (million)		**-12.70**		**-21.96**		**-14.48**		**-23.57**	

Notes: Cumulative reduction in incidence of five key diseases in the entire population and associated total health expenditure over 30 years of policy implementation is reported, lower bound estimates, under four policy scenarios. *Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation (IHME), Global Burden of Disease Study 2019 (GBD 2019) results. [a]CR: Cumulative reduction, in million cases. Percentage of annual baseline incidence number (2019) in India in parenthesis. [b]THE: Total health expenditure, in billion US dollar 2024. IHD: Ischemic heart disease. CKD: Chronic kidney disease. Scenario 1: defining items for which GST rate is increased to 28% based on the definition of foods and beverages high in fat, sugar, and sodium by the Food Safety and Standards Authority of India; Scenario 2: adding a 12% top-up to the tax rate applied on HFSS foods and beverages in Scenario 1. Scenario 3: defining items for which GST rate is increased to 28% if their nutrient content is above at least one of the respective thresholds set by the World Health Organization South East Asia Region nutrient profile model;[1] Scenarios 4: adding a 12% top-up to the tax rate applied on HFSS foods and beverages in Scenario 3. GST: Goods and Services Tax. HFSS: High in fat, sugar, and sodium.

Table A9. Upper bound cumulative reduction in incidence of five key diseases in the entire population, associated total health expenditure and DALYs over 30 years of policy implementation under two main policy scenarios

Disease	Annual incidence at baseline* (million cases)	Scenario 1		Scenario 2	
		CR[a] (million cases, %)	THE[b] (USD billion)	CR[a] (million cases, %)	THE[b] (USD billion)
IHD	6.45	-2.62 (-41)	-5.38	-4.62 (-72)	-9.49
CKD	2.10	-1.09 (-52)	-2.47	-1.91 (-91)	-4.31
Stroke	1.20	-0.27 (-23)	-0.71	-0.48 (-40)	-1.25
Diabetes	3.40	-3.28 (-96)	-4.19	-5.93 (-174)	-7.57
Asthma	4.77	-2.16 (-45)	-2.58	-3.87 (-81)	-4.63
Total	**17.92**	**-9.42 (-53)**	**-15.32**	**-16.81 (-94)**	**-27.25**
Cumulative reduction in DALYs (million)		**-18.70**		**-31.16**	

Notes: Cumulative reduction in incidence of five key diseases in the entire population and associated total health expenditure over 30 years of policy implementation is reported, upper bound estimates, under four policy scenarios. *Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation (IHME), Global Burden of Disease Study 2019 (GBD 2019) results. [a]CR: Cumulative reduction, in million people. Percentage of annual baseline incidence number (2019) in India in parenthesis. [b]THE: Total health expenditure, in billion US dollar 2024. IHD: Ischemic heart disease. CKD: Chronic kidney disease. Scenario 1: defining items for which GST rate is increased to 28% based on the definition of foods and beverages high in fat, sugar, and sodium by the Food Safety and Standards Authority of India; Scenario 2: adding a 12% top-up to the tax rate applied on HFSS foods and beverages in Scenario 1. GST: Goods and Services Tax. High in fat, sugar, and sodium.

Figure A7. Lower bound of cumulative reduction in DALYs per 100,000 population compared to baseline, 2022-2053



Notes: Lower bound estimates (upper bound estimates can be found in **Figure 3**). 95% Confidence Interval reported as shaded area.
One unit of 604 DALYs per 100,000 population in y-axis corresponds to approximately 10% of DALYs per 100,000 population in India in 2019 of five key diseases including IHD, CKD, stroke, diabetes and asthma. The highest percentage of the cumulative reduction in DALYs per 100,000 population in the baseline DALYs per 100,000 population of five key diseases in 2019 is indicated in each plot.
Scenario 1: defining items for which Goods and Services Tax (GST) rate is increased to 28% based on the definition of foods and beverages high in fat, sugar, and sodium by the Food Safety and Standards Authority of India; Scenario 2: adding a 12% top-up to the tax rate applied on HFSS foods and beverages in Scenario 1.
DALYs: Disability-Adjusted Life Years. HFSS: High in fat, sugar, and sodium.

Figure A8. Lower bound reduction in the prevalence number of hypertension in the entire population in 10, 20 and 30 years after policy implementation under four policy scenarios



Notes: Reduction in the prevalence number of hypertension is calculated after microsimulation, with the reduction in sodium intake and BMI from Health-GPS microsimulation and relative risks of sodium and BMI on the incidence of hypertension from the literature. Results are reported for the lower bound estimates.
One unit of 21,520 people in y-axis corresponds to approximately 0.01% of national prevalence number of hypertension in India according to National Family Health Survey (NFHS-5), 2019-2021.[4]
Scenario 1: defining items for which GST rate is increased to 28% based on the definition of foods and beverages high in fat, sugar, and sodium by the Food Safety and Standards Authority of India; Scenario 2: adding a 12% top-up to the tax rate applied on HFSS foods and beverages in Scenario 1. Scenario 3: defining items for which GST rate is increased to 28% if their nutrient content is above at least one of the respective thresholds set by the World Health Organization South East Asia Region nutrient profile model;[1] Scenarios 4: adding a 12% top-up to the tax rate applied on HFSS foods and beverages in Scenario 3. GST: Goods and Services Tax. HFSS: High in fat, sugar, and sodium.

References Appendix A

1 World Health Organization, South East Asia Regional Office. WHO nutrient profile model for South-East Asia Region. WHO: New Delhi; 2017. https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789290225447

2 Deaton A. Quality, quantity, and spatial variation of price. The American Economic Review. 1988 Jun 1:418-30.

3 John RM, Tullu FT, Gupta R. Price elasticity and affordability of aerated or sugar-sweetened beverages in India: implications for taxation. BMC Public Health. 2022 Jul 17;22(1):1372.

4 Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Government of India, 2022. National Family Health Survey (NFHS-5), 2019-2021. https://mohfw.gov.in/sites/default/files/NFHS-5_Phase-II_0.pdf

Appendix B. Sensitivity scenarios

Table B1. Sensitivity scenarios definition

Name of sensitivity scenario	Definition of scenario
Passthrough	Tax under-shifting with a uniform tax passthrough of 80%, based on the meta-analysis of SSB tax evaluation studies by Andreyeva et al (2022).[1] Example: If 0% GST rate originally applies on an HFSS item priced at $1.00. After the policy change, the GST rate applied will be increased to 28%, but the price of the item will only increase by 28% * 80% = 22.4%, leading to a price of $1.22 (vs. $1.28 under full tax passthrough).
Reformulation	If the nutrient content of an HFSS item is less than 50% above the FSSAI HFSS or WHO SEARO NPM threshold for one or several nutrients (among sugar, sodium, and saturated fat), the industry is assumed to reduce the nutrient content of the item for it not to be considered HFSS and avoid the tax. This reformulation is modelled to take place before the introduction of the tax. Example: Under the FSSAI HFSS definition, if an item contains 1.2mg of sodium per kcal, we assume that the industry would reformulate the item to 1.0mg/kcal to avoid the tax. Further assumptions: - If the sugar content of an item is reduced to meet the HFSS definition threshold, its energy content is proportionally reduced (following the 1g = 4 kcal conversion rate) - If the total fat content of an item is reduced to meet the HFSS definition threshold, its energy content is proportionally reduced (following the 1g = 9 kcal conversion rate) - If the saturated fat content of an item is reduced to meet the HFSS definition threshold, it is assumed to be replaced by other forms of fat and thus its energy content is not reduced - If the energy content of an item is reduced to meet the HFSS threshold, and the sugar, saturated fat, and total fat content are below their respective HFSS threshold, the content of sugar, saturated fat, and total fat is assumed not to be modified
Subsidy	GST rate of 0% on F&V and pulses.

Notes: F&V: fruits & vegetables, FSSAI: Food Safety and Standards Authority of India, HFSS: high in fat, sugar, and sodium, GST: Goods and Services Tax, NPM: nutrient profile model, SSB: sugar-sweetened beverages, WHO SEARO: World Health Organization South East Asia Region.[2] Each of the four main scenarios of the analysis are re-simulated under the three assumptions listed in the table.

Figure B1. Sensitivity scenario: Passthrough. Immediate impact of fiscal policy scenarios on nutrients (energy, sugar, saturated fat, and sodium), by income group



Notes: This is a sensitivity analysis using an incomplete passthrough of tax rate changes to prices of 80%. Vertical segments represent the 95% confidence intervals. Survey weighted. Scenario 1: defining items for which GST rate is increased to 28% based on the definition of foods and beverages high in fat, sugar, and sodium by the Food Safety and Standards Authority of India; Scenario 2: adding a 12% top-up to the tax rate applied on HFSS foods and beverages in Scenario 1. Scenario 3: defining items for which GST rate is increased to 28% if their nutrient content is above at least one of the respective thresholds set by the World Health Organization South East Asia Region nutrient profile model;[2] Scenarios 4: adding a 12% top-up to the tax rate applied on HFSS foods and beverages in Scenario 3. GST: Goods and Services Tax. HFSS: High in fat, sugar, and sodium.

Figure B2. Sensitivity scenario: Passthrough. Immediate impact of fiscal policy scenarios on total household expenditure on food and beverages, by income group



Notes: This is a sensitivity analysis using an incomplete passthrough of tax rate changes to prices of 80%. Vertical segments represent the 95% confidence intervals. Survey weighted. Scenario 1: defining items for which GST rate is increased to 28% based on the definition of foods and beverages high in fat, sugar, and sodium by the Food Safety and Standards Authority of India; Scenario 2: adding a 12% top-up to the tax rate applied on HFSS foods and beverages in Scenario 1. Scenario 3: defining items for which GST rate is increased to 28% if their nutrient content is above at least one of the respective thresholds set by the World Health Organization South East Asia Region nutrient profile model;[2] Scenarios 4: adding a 12% top-up to the tax rate applied on HFSS foods and beverages in Scenario 3. GST: Goods and Services Tax. HFSS: High in fat, sugar, and sodium.

Figure B3. Sensitivity scenario: Passthrough. Immediate impact of fiscal policy scenarios on government tax revenue from foods and beverages



Notes: This is a sensitivity analysis using an incomplete passthrough of tax rate changes to prices of 80%. Vertical segments represent the 95% confidence intervals. Survey weighted. Scenario 1: defining items for which GST rate is increased to 28% based on the definition of foods and beverages high in fat, sugar, and sodium by the Food Safety and Standards Authority of India; Scenario 2: adding a 12% top-up to the tax rate applied on HFSS foods and beverages in Scenario 1. Scenario 3: defining items for which GST rate is increased to 28% if their nutrient content is above at least one of the respective thresholds set by the World Health Organization South East Asia Region nutrient profile model;[2] Scenarios 4: adding a 12% top-up to the tax rate applied on HFSS foods and beverages in Scenario 3. GST: Goods and Services Tax. HFSS: High in fat, sugar, and sodium.

Figure B4. Sensitivity scenario: Reformulation. Immediate impact of fiscal policy scenarios on nutrients (energy, sugar, saturated fat, and sodium), by income group



Notes: This is a sensitivity analysis assuming the reformulation of HFSS food items by the industry. If the nutrient content of an HFSS item is less than 50% above the FSSAI HFSS or WHO SEARO NPM threshold for one or several nutrients (among sugar, sodium, and saturated fat), the industry is assumed to reduce the nutrient content of the item for it not to be considered HFSS and avoid the tax. This reformulation is modeled to take place before the introduction of the tax. Vertical segments represent the 95% confidence intervals. Survey weighted. Scenario 1: defining items for which GST rate is increased to 28% based on the definition of foods and beverages high in fat, sugar, and sodium by the Food Safety and Standards Authority of India; Scenario 2: adding a 12% top-up to the tax rate applied on HFSS foods and beverages in Scenario 1. Scenario 3: defining items for which GST rate is increased to 28% if their nutrient content is above at least one of the respective thresholds set by the World Health Organization South East Asia Region nutrient profile model;[2] Scenarios 4: adding a 12% top-up to the tax rate applied on HFSS foods and beverages in Scenario 3. GST: Goods and Services Tax. HFSS: High in fat, sugar, and sodium.

Figure B5. Sensitivity scenario: Reformulation. Immediate impact of fiscal policy scenarios on total household expenditure on food and beverages, by income group

Notes: This is a sensitivity analysis assuming the reformulation of HFSS food items by the industry. If the nutrient content of an HFSS item is less than 50% above the FSSAI HFSS or WHO SEARO NPM threshold for one or several nutrients (among sugar, sodium, and saturated fat), the industry is assumed to reduce the nutrient content of the item for it not to be considered HFSS and avoid the tax. This reformulation is modeled to take place before the introduction of the tax. Vertical segments represent the 95% confidence intervals. Survey weighted. Scenario 1: defining items for which GST rate is increased to 28% based on the definition of foods and beverages high in fat, sugar, and sodium by the Food Safety and Standards Authority of India; Scenario 2: adding a 12% top-up to the tax rate applied on HFSS foods and beverages in Scenario 1. Scenario 3: defining items for which GST rate is increased to 28% if their nutrient content is above at least one of the respective thresholds set by the World Health Organization South East Asia Region nutrient profile model;[2] Scenarios 4: adding a 12% top-up to the tax rate applied on HFSS foods and beverages in Scenario 3. GST: Goods and Services Tax. HFSS: High in fat, sugar, and sodium.

Figure B6. Sensitivity scenario: Reformulation. Immediate impact of fiscal policy scenarios on government tax revenue from foods and beverages



Notes: This is a sensitivity analysis assuming the reformulation of HFSS food items by the industry. If the nutrient content of an HFSS item is less than 50% above the FSSAI HFSS or WHO SEARO NPM threshold for one or several nutrients (among sugar, sodium, and saturated fat), the industry is assumed to reduce the nutrient content of the item for it not to be considered HFSS and avoid the tax. This reformulation is modeled to take place before the introduction of the tax. Vertical segments represent the 95% confidence intervals. Survey weighted. Scenario 1: defining items for which GST rate is increased to 28% based on the definition of foods and beverages high in fat, sugar, and sodium by the Food Safety and Standards Authority of India; Scenario 2: adding a 12% top-up to the tax rate applied on HFSS foods and beverages in Scenario 1. Scenario 3: defining items for which GST rate is increased to 28% if their nutrient content is above at least one of the respective thresholds set by the World Health Organization South East Asia Region nutrient profile model;[2] Scenarios 4: adding a 12% top-up to the tax rate applied on HFSS foods and beverages in Scenario 3. GST: Goods and Services Tax. HFSS: High in fat, sugar, and sodium.

Figure B7. Sensitivity scenario: Subsidy. Immediate impact of fiscal policy scenarios on nutrients (energy, sugar, saturated fat, and sodium), by income group



Notes: This is a sensitivity analysis additionally zero-rating F&V and pulses (GST rate = 0%). Vertical segments represent the 95% confidence intervals. Survey weighted. Scenario 1: defining items for which GST rate is increased to 28% based on the definition of foods and beverages high in fat, sugar, and sodium by the Food Safety and Standards Authority of India; Scenario 2: adding a 12% top-up to the tax rate applied on HFSS foods and beverages in Scenario 1. Scenario 3: defining items for which GST rate is increased to 28% if their nutrient content is above at least one of the respective thresholds set by the World Health Organization South East Asia Region nutrient profile model;[2] Scenarios 4: adding a 12% top-up to the tax rate applied on HFSS foods and beverages in Scenario 3. GST: Goods and Services Tax. HFSS: High in fat, sugar, and sodium.

Figure B8. Sensitivity scenario: Subsidy. Immediate impact of fiscal policy scenarios on total household expenditure on food and beverages, by income group



Notes: This is a sensitivity analysis additionally zero-rating F&V and pulses (GST rate = 0%). Vertical segments represent the 95% confidence intervals. Survey weighted. Scenario 1: defining items for which GST rate is increased to 28% based on the definition of foods and beverages high in fat, sugar, and sodium by the Food Safety and Standards Authority of India; Scenario 2: adding a 12% top-up to the tax rate applied on HFSS foods and beverages in Scenario 1. Scenario 3: defining items for which GST rate is increased to 28% if their nutrient content is above at least one of the respective thresholds set by the World Health Organization South East Asia Region nutrient profile model;[2] Scenarios 4: adding a 12% top-up to the tax rate applied on HFSS foods and beverages in Scenario 3. GST: Goods and Services Tax. HFSS: High in fat, sugar, and sodium.

Figure B9. Sensitivity scenario: Subsidy. Immediate impact of fiscal policy scenarios on government tax revenue from foods and beverages



Notes: This is a sensitivity analysis additionally zero-rating F&V and pulses (GST rate = 0%). Vertical segments represent the 95% confidence intervals. Survey weighted. Scenario 1: defining items for which GST rate is increased to 28% based on the definition of foods and beverages high in fat, sugar, and sodium by the Food Safety and Standards Authority of India; Scenario 2: adding a 12% top-up to the tax rate applied on HFSS foods and beverages in Scenario 1. Scenario 3: defining items for which GST rate is increased to 28% if their nutrient content is above at least one of the respective thresholds set by the World Health Organization South East Asia Region nutrient profile model;[2] Scenarios 4: adding a 12% top-up to the tax rate applied on HFSS foods and beverages in Scenario 3. GST: Goods and Services Tax. HFSS: High in fat, sugar, and sodium.

References Appendix B

1 Andreyeva T, Marple K, Marinello S, Moore TE, Powell LM. Outcomes following taxation of sugar-sweetened beverages: a systematic review and meta-analysis. JAMA Network Open. 2022 Jun 1;5(6):e2215276-.

2 World Health Organization, South East Asia Regional Office. WHO nutrient profile model for South-East Asia Region. WHO: New Delhi; 2017. https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789290225447

Appendix C. Almost Ideal Demand System (AIDS) demand model

C1. The model

As with most other household budget surveys, the NSSO 68th round does not provide price information, thus we rely on unit values (i.e., expenditure divided by quantity). However, unit values are subject to measurement errors in both expenditure and quantity and may lead to quality shading, where consumers may not only adjust quantity but also the quality of the goods they buy as a response to price changes. We thus estimate consumer responses to food price changes (technically, own- and cross-price elasticities of demand) using Deaton (1988)'s Almost Ideal Demand System (AIDS) model adjusting for quality shading and measurement error.[1]

$$w_{jic} = \alpha_j^0 + \beta_j^0 \ \ln x_{ic} \ + \gamma_j^0 \boldsymbol{z_{ic}} + \sum_k \theta_{jk} \ln p_{kc} + f_{jc} + u_{jic}^0 \qquad (1)$$

$$\ln v_{jic} = \alpha_j^1 + \beta_j^1 \ \ln x_{ic} \ + \gamma_j^1 \boldsymbol{z_{ic}} + \sum_k \psi_{jk} \ln p_{kc} + u_{jic}^1 \qquad (2)$$

where w_{jic} represents the share of total expenditure on food and beverages (x_{ic}) that household *i* in cluster *c* spends on good *j*; p_{kc} is the price of good *k* which does not vary in cluster *c*; f_{jc} are unobservable cluster fixed effects; v_{jic} is the unit value of good *j*; and u_{jic} are idiosyncratic error terms. $\boldsymbol{z_{ic}}$ is a vector of household characteristics, including the logarithm of household size, the sector of the household (urban vs. rural), the sex of the head of household and a dummy for completion of primary education, and dummies capturing the religion of the household. We remove regional and seasonal effects using dummies for the six Indian administrative zones and the quarter of the year in which the household reports information.

The model assumes spatially varying prices, where all households within a near geographical area face the same price. As defined by NSO 68th, a cluster is equivalent to a village, or an urban block, surveyed during the same period. Any within-cluster variation in unit values is due to differences in the quality of the purchased items. Spatial variations in unit values between clusters provide an identification strategy to avoid the endogeneity of prices and address quality shading.[1] We argue this assumption is justified in a middle-income country like India where transport is more difficult and relatively costlier, and markets are not always well-integrated.[2] To abide by our main assumption of spatially varying prices, we force households in each income group to face the same price if they are drawn from the same cluster.

We recover uncompensated price elasticity of demand estimates at the means through a three-step method including demeaned within-cluster regressions, between-cluster regressions of adjusted budget share on adjusted unit values estimated in the first step using an error-in-variable estimator, and finally separating quality and price effects.

$$\varepsilon_{jk} = \frac{\hat{\theta}_{jk}}{\overline{w}_j} - \delta_{jk} \qquad (3)$$

where δ_{jk} is the Kronecker delta equal to one if $j = k$ (i.e., for own-price elasticities) or zero otherwise.

This approach has been extensively used to model the demand for food in low- and middle-income countries.[3] Details regarding the microeconomic foundations of Deaton (1988)'s AIDS model as well as its derivation and the steps involved in its estimation have been described elsewhere.[2] The paper use uncompensated price elasticities as opposed to compensated price elasticities as uncompensated elasticities measure the effect of a price change for one good while keeping income and the prices of other goods constant, thereby reflecting both income and substitution effects.

The use of this model with NSSO 68th round data has some limitations. Using household budget survey data, the underlying demand model cannot account for cross-price effects within food groups. Future research using detailed consumer panel data (e.g., home-scan) could estimate demand systems using more disaggregated groups, for example by bundling items based on nutritional impact.[4] The NSSO also lacks information on household disposable income, which is commonly used as an instrumental variable to address the endogeneity in total expenditure arising from simultaneity bias.[5]

References Appendix C

1 Deaton A. Quality, quantity, and spatial variation of price. The American Economic Review. 1988 Jun 1:418-30.

2 Deaton A. The Analysis of Household Surveys: A Microeconometric Approach to Development Policy. Washington, D.C.: World Bank; 2019. http://hdl.handle.net/10986/30394

3 Green R, Cornelsen L, Dangour AD, Turner R, Shankar B, Mazzocchi M, Smith RD. The effect of rising food prices on food consumption: systematic review with meta-regression. BMJ. 2013 Jun 17;346.

4 Muth MK, Okrent AM, Zhen C, and Karns SA. Using scanner data for food policy research. Amsterdam: Academic Press; 2020.

5 Banks J, Blundell R, Lewbel A. Quadratic Engel curves and consumer demand. Review of Economics and statistics. 1997 Nov 1;79(4):527-39.

Appendix D. Health-GPS microsimulation model

D1. Overview

Health-GPS is a microsimulation model that simulates individuals over time, estimating their risks of developing a variety of NCDs (e.g., stroke) given their exposure to particular risk factors (e.g., excessive sodium intake). Health-GPS then models possible health policies (e.g., changes in taxation on foods high in sodium), that might affect these risk factors, and therefore may impact the incidence and outcomes of NCDs at the population level.

The model creates a synthetic population of individuals that broadly reproduces demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of the population of a given country, or sub-national jurisdiction, and simulates individual life histories from birth to death. Because it simulates a population at the individual level, Health-GPS can capture heterogeneity in risk exposures, diseases, and multi-morbidity patterns. Correlations between risk factor exposures and between diseases are reflected in simulated populations. Health-GPS is calibrated to real-world data to capture relationships between variables while matching to estimated and projected demographic and epidemiological metrics from international databases.

In Health-GPS, a baseline scenario is simulated reflecting expected demographic and epidemiological changes over a time horizon in a given population, to match current demographic projections over that same time horizon. Intervention scenarios are then simulated, reflecting the introduction of health policies applied to targeted individuals and risk factors. Changes in risk exposures will, in turn, impact other risk factors, diseases, and mortality through the model equations. Outcomes simulated through the model typically include, but are not limited to, the prevalence of risk factors, the incidence of, and mortality from, NCDs, years of life lost (YLLs), disability-adjusted life years (DALYs), and life expectancy. Policy impacts are estimated as the difference in these outcomes between the baseline and intervention scenarios. Given the random variation in model outputs due to Health-GPS' stochastic nature, the model repeats these steps five times and averages the differences to obtain the effect of a given health policy. Another way of limiting the impact of stochastic variation on simulation results is to model large population samples. The analyses on which this paper is based model a sample of 1% of the population of India, repeated five times for each scenario and sensitivity analysis.

This appendix is divided into the following sections describing **four key Health-GPS component modules**, illustrated in **Figure D1**:

1. **Demographic module:** births, deaths, immigration, population and socioeconomic status.
2. **Risk factor modules:** including energy balance and high dietary sodium intake in the version used for the study described in this paper.
3. **Disease modules:** we explicitly model the following diseases: asthma; chronic kidney disease; diabetes; ischemic heart disease; and stroke (including intracerebral haemorrhage, ischemic stroke, and subarachnoid haemorrhage). Other diseases are accounted for in a residual mortality aggregate.
4. **Disease burden module:** including metrics used to estimate population-level outcomes of interventions, specifically YLLs, YLDs, and DALYs.

In the last section, we additionally include sources and methods used to estimate the health expenditure impact of interventions.

Figure D1. Health-GPS model diagram



Notes: GBD: Global burden of disease.

D2. Demographic module

The demographic module manages the yearly numbers of births, deaths, and migrations, as well as socioeconomic status. This module aims to produce a baseline scenario consistent with projected demographic data.

D2.1. Data

Health-GPS uses the United Nations (UN)'s World Population Prospects projections for yearly births, deaths, total population, and net migration, for all countries, by age and sex.[1] In the next sections, we explain how these data are calibrated in the demographic module.

D2.2. Births and deaths

The demographic module reproduces historical and projected births and deaths in a baseline scenario. The UN estimates and projects birth and death rates for all countries from 1950 until 2100. These estimates and projections are available in five-year intervals, and the module interpolates the data linearly to account for missing years.

These data determine the number of births at the beginning of each year of the simulation, assigning sex based on a sex ratio. Newborns are disease-free at the beginning of the simulation, and their initial risk factor exposures are generated using the initialisation equations of the risk factor modules. For all individuals in Health-GPS, risk and disease profiles are updated yearly until they either die or migrate.

Similarly, UN data provide estimates of the number of deaths in each year of the simulation. Health-GPS calculates an individual's probability of death each year based on their sex, age and disease profile. The model simulates multiple diseases but allows for death from other non-modelled causes, i.e. residual mortality.

D2.3. Residual mortality

Let the ith person (who has neither died nor emigrated) have age a_i and sex g_i. Let $m_{dag}(t)$ be the annual 'excess mortality' associated with disease d, for age a, and sex g, during calendar year t. We use the Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation (IHME) definition of excess mortality,[2] that is disease-specific mortality divided by disease prevalence. Then let $m^*_{id}(t)$ denote

$$m^*_{id}(t) = \begin{cases} m_{da_ig_i}(t) & \text{if person } i \text{ has disease } d \text{ at time } t \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where $0 \leq m^*_{id}(t) \leq 1$. Then the probability $s_i(t)$ that the ith person survives diseases $1, \ldots, N_D$ in year t is given by

$$s_i(t) = \prod_{d=1}^{N_D} 1 - m^*_{id}(t)$$

Then the number of people $N_{sag}(t)$ of age a, and sex g who survive diseases $1, \ldots, N_D$ in year t is given by

$$N_{sag}(t) = \sum_{\substack{i:a_i=a \\ i:\, g_i=g}} s_i(t)$$

and so the proportion of people $S_{ag}(t)$ of age a, and sex g who survive diseases $1, \ldots, N_D$ in year t is given by

$$S_{ag}(t) = {N_{sag}(t)}/{N_{ag}(t)}$$

where N is the number of people in the population, and $N_{ag}(t)$ denotes the number of people of age a and sex g at time t.

If $M_{ag}(t)$ and $RM_{ag}(t)$ respectively denote the population-level mortality rate and residual mortality rate (of diseases *not* modelled in Health-GPS), for people of age a and sex g, then we have

$$1 - M_{ag}(t) = (1 - RM_{ag}(t))S_{ag}(t)$$

and so rearranging gives

$$RM_{ag}(t) = 1 - \left({(1 - M_{ag}(t))}/{S_{ag}(t)}\right)$$

This equation is used throughout the model. It is calculated in the baseline scenario, and the corresponding values are then used in the simulation of intervention scenarios. This assumes that mortality from non-modelled causes of death is constant across scenarios. However, diseases are not always assumed to be independent in Health-GPS, which means that variations in morbidity from modelled diseases that are produced by an intervention may impact non-modelled causes of death, and therefore residual mortality. Therefore, the assumption that residual mortality is constant across scenarios is an approximation and may lead to a (small) underestimation of the effects of an intervention when such an intervention produces a reduction in morbidity from modelled diseases.

At any given time *t*, each individual *i* is exposed to a specific risk of death in connection with the diseases they have, plus a residual risk in connection with causes of death that are not explicitly modelled in the simulation. Individuals who reach age 110 (i.e., the maximum attainable age in Health-GPS) are assumed to die at the next time step.

In the simulation, each year individuals die with probability $(1 - s_i(t))\, RM_{a_ig_i}(t)$.

D2.4. Population

The demographic module uses historical and projected population changes by year, sex, and age. UN population projections are available in 5-year age groups, and we linearly interpolate the population for each age group between two years. Similarly to deaths, population numbers are smoothed. This conserves the total annual population by sex.

D2.5. Net migration

While data on births and deaths are publicly available in several databases, finding accurate data on migration is more challenging. We model migration using the following formula:

$$P(a+1, y+1) = P(a, y) + B(a, y) - D(a, y) + I(a, y)$$

where $P(a, y), B(a, y), D(a, y)$ and $I(a, y)$ respectively denote the total population, number of births, number of deaths, and net migration for age a in year y.Therefore, migration is simulated indirectly to replicate expected numbers from the UN World Population Prospects database.[1] Consequently, depending on the sign of net migration, individuals will be added or removed from the population. In particular, the attributes of migrants are bootstrapped (i.e., sampled with replacement) from the distributions of the existing individuals of the same sex and age.

D3. Risk factor modules

Health-GPS models risk factor exposures accounting for hierarchical dependencies. For instance, characteristics of the living environment (e.g., neighbourhood deprivation) may influence individual behaviours (e.g., dietary intake), and this in turn, may influence the likelihood of conditions (e.g., obesity, hypertension) typically linked with the incidence of NCDs. Diseases themselves can be risk factors for other diseases. Diabetes, for example, is associated with a higher incidence of cardiovascular disease or chronic kidney disease.[3,4] The associations between risk factors are complex and dynamic. They can change due to exogenous shocks such as changes in food prices, or the implementation of new interventions and policies. As individuals age in the simulation, their risk exposures are updated in line with the latest observed age- and sex-specific prevalences (those used to initialise the synthetic population at the start of the simulation). Such age- and sex-specific prevalences are typically held constant throughout the projection period unless specific underlying trends are assumed (in some of the analyses in this project, for instance, a future trend in ultra-processed food consumption has been assumed). Future trends over time in risk factor exposures may apply uniformly for the entire population, or differently for different individuals or population sub-groups.

In the version of the Health-GPS model used for the evaluation of food tax policy scenarios in India, the most upstream risk exposure is food prices, which are assumed to influence food purchases and eventually nutrient intakes. All of the above risk exposures are modelled at the household level outside Health-GPS, using a separate demand system model, described in the paper. Individual nutrient intakes are calculated based on household food purchases and are used as inputs into Health-GPS microsimulations. Nutrient intakes are assumed to generate health impacts through two main pathways: energy and sodium. These two pathways are described in the following sections, 3.1 and 3.2.

Figure D2. Energy balance model layers and factors, used within Health-GPS.



D3.1. Energy balance model

Health-GPS models body weight dynamics through an energy balance model (EBM) following the mathematical framework developed by Hall et al (2022).[5] The purpose of this model is to understand and predict how various factors, such as diet and physical activity, influence an individual's body weight over time. In this section, we provide an overview of how Health-GPS incorporates the Hall et al (2022)[5] model. Full details can be found in Hall et al (2022)[5] and all Health-GPS model codes (including the implementation of the Hall et al (2022) model) can be found at https://github.com/imperialCHEPI/healthgps .

The Hall et al (2022) model takes into account the principles of energy balance, which is the relationship between the calories consumed through food and beverages and the calories expended through metabolism and physical activity.[5] The model incorporates complex physiological processes and feedback mechanisms to provide a more realistic representation of weight dynamics than simpler, linear models.

In this framework, energy intake and expenditure are the result of diet, physical activity and metabolic patterns. Body weight changes in the microsimulation are associated with dynamic imbalances between energy intake (EI, the calories consumed from food and beverages), and energy expenditure (EE, the energy expended throughout the day). When an individual is in a steady state energy balance (i.e., "energy in" equals "energy out"), body weight is assumed to remain stable. A surplus of energy is stored as fat, leading to weight gain. Conversely, an energy deficit leads to weight loss.

Energy intake and expenditure are determined by nutrient intakes (fat, carbohydrates, protein), physical activity, and prior body mass index (BMI) as a proxy for metabolic energy requirements, which in turn are determined by individual characteristics including age, sex and socioeconomic status (**Figure D2**). The output of the energy balance model is a (time-dependent) change in BMI.

Each layer in **Figure D2** influences subsequent layers. Risk factors are simulated in two steps: 1) initialisation, using static risk factor equations; 2) projection, which updates values for each risk factor at every time cycle during the simulation using dynamic risk factor equations.

D3.2. Sodium intake

Sodium intake is modelled alongside nutrient intake that contribute to the EBM. Sodium intake affects disease incidence directly, through relative risks derived from existing studies. Most of the sodium-attributable risk of disease is generated through an increase in blood pressure caused by excessive sodium intakes, however, the individual steps of this causal chain are not modelled in Health-GPS. The relative risks used to model increases

in disease risk linked with sodium intake account for the increased blood pressure that mediates the effect of sodium intake on diseases. On the other hand, changes in hypertension prevalence are calculated in parallel as a function of sodium intake.

D3.3. Risk factor initialization and propagation

We use a two-stage approach to initialize risk factors within each person in Health-GPS that combines regression modelling, data transformation, and stochastic variation.

Nutrient initialisation

First, we use a regression model to determine average values of nutrient intake by age, sex, income (i.e., high, middle and low) and sector (i.e., rural or urban). Second, for each person and each nutrient, we add a stochastic variation term to these average values to generate the required population heterogeneity. This stochastic variation term is sampled from the residuals of the regression performed in the first step.

To ensure normality of the nutrient intake variables, a Box-Cox transformation is applied:

$$\acute{y} = \begin{cases} \dfrac{y^{\lambda} - 1}{\lambda} & , \lambda \neq 0 \\ ln(y) & , \lambda = 0 \end{cases}$$

where, $\acute{y}$ is the transformed variable, y is the dependent variable (nutrient intake) and λ is the transformation variable.

After transforming the variables, average daily nutrient intake $\acute{y}_{\mathrm{k}}$ is initialized using the equation below for each of the following four nutrients: fat, protein and carbohydrates (measure in grams per day); and sodium (measured in milligrams per day). For nutrient $k = 1, \ldots, 4$, we have

$$\acute{y}_{\mathrm{k}} = \beta_{k0} + \beta_{k1}.\mathrm{Sex} + \beta_{k2}.\mathrm{Age} + \beta_{k3}.\mathrm{Age}^2 + \beta_{k4}.\mathrm{Age}^3 + \beta_{k5}.\mathrm{Sector} + \beta_{k6}.\mathrm{Income} + \varepsilon_k$$

where β_{k0} is the intercept and ε_k is the error term for nutrient k. Data input for socio-economic variables and nutrient intake are based on NSS 68th round 2011-2012 and adjusted to December 2022 using the methods detailed in the Methods section of the paper.

To capture realistic variation and maintain correlations between nutrients, stochastic residuals (ε) are generated using Cholesky decomposition.

Energy intake and energy expenditure initialisation

After daily nutrient intake values have been assigned for each person, they are inputted into the Hall et al (2022) model,[5] together with each person's Physical Activity Level (PAL), to determine each person's energy intake (EI), and energy expenditure (EE). Physical Activity Level (PAL) is the ratio between energy expended through physical activity and the person's baseline metabolic rate. Individual PAL values are initialized from a normal distribution

$$PAL \sim Normal(1.6, 0.06)$$

and subsequently adjusted to maintain population-level expected values. Energy expenditure (EE) is calculated as a function of body composition and several metabolic parameters, integrating multiple physiological processes, including resting metabolic rate, thermic effect of food, adaptive thermogenesis, and energy partitioning. Further details can be found in Hall et al (2022).[5]

Energy intake (EI) quantifies the total caloric content consumed and is a function of the daily nutrient intakes calculated above.

BMI calculation

Body Mass Index (BMI) is calculated using the standard definition

$$BMI_i(t) = \frac{W_i(t)}{(H_i(t))^2}$$

where $W_i(t)$ and $H_i(t)$ respectively denote individual i's weight and height at time t.

$W_i(t)$ is initialized as a function of age, sex, energy intake and physical activity. H_i is calculated based on population-level expected values given a person's age and sex, their weight, as well as randomly sampled individual variation. Height is assumed to remain constant after age 19. Individual BMI values are calibrated to the BMI distribution for India in the NCD-RisC database through an adjustment of weight and nutrient intake values.[6]

Using the initialized values for weight, height, energy intake and physical activity, the Hall et al (2022) model is used to initialize values of body fat, lean tissue, glycogen, extracellular fluid and energy expenditure for each person.[5] The changes in these values (governed by changes in nutrient intake and energy intake) are then used to update each individual's weight, and thus their BMI.

D4. Disease modules

Health-GPS is calibrated to match empirical disease distributions. Changes in the distributions of risk factors and diseases are then transferred to other diseases. Although we assume the associations of risk factors to diseases to be constant throughout the simulation, any deviation of a risk factor from its initial distribution will translate into increased or decreased disease incidence through relative risk equations (the epidemiological literature does not always distinguish clearly between relative risks and hazard ratios; when it is not possible to identify values for both, available values are used interchangeably in Health-GPS). Therefore, any change in the prevalence of a disease is solely caused by changes in risk factor distributions, alongside the ageing of the population.

The disease module uses multiple data sources, including IHME for prevalence, incidence, mortality and remission rates for non-cancerous diseases.[2] When cancers are modelled, Health-GPS uses data from the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC)[7] for prevalence at 1, 3 and 5 years (from diagnosis), incidence, and mortality rates. Relative risks from BMI to diseases are derived from IHME attributable risk data, while those for sodium to ischaemic heart disease, stroke and chronic kidney disease are derived from specific studies.[8,9]

Probabilities of disease for each individual are updated throughout the simulation to reflect changes in risk exposures and disease profiles. Prevalence in the initial population is used to calibrate Health-GPS parameters. However, as time progresses, risk factor distributions and demographics are the sole drivers of prevalence.

The excess mortality rate is the proportion of excess deaths within a designated population of "cases" (people with a medical condition) over the course of the disease. These rates are kept constant over time in the simulation. Remission is the rate at which people with a disease revert to a state with the same survival prospect as those without the disease. Remission rates, when they apply, are kept constant over time in Health-GPS.

Disease is modelled through 3 types of events: onset, remission and fatality. An individual's probability of acquiring a disease is calculated based on their risk exposures, existing conditions, and the population-level incidence of each disease. Therefore, this incidence is adjusted for each individual to account for their sex, age, risk and disease profiles. For each individual in the population and for each disease, we compute an Individual Relative Risk (IRR), which reflects the aggregate change in disease incidence associated with the individual's risk factors and diseases. After disease onset, the individual may either go into remission or die, over time.

Let RR_{dfag} be the relative risk of disease d associated with risk factor $f = 1, \dots, N_f$ for age a and sex g. Let DR_{dagj} be the relative risk of disease d associated with the presence of another disease j (where $j = 1, \dots, N_D$). for age a and sex g. If

$$RR^*_{id}(t) = \begin{cases} RR_{dfa_ig_i} & \text{if person } i \text{ has risk factor f at time } t \\ 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and

$$DR^*_{idj}(t) = \begin{cases} DR_{dja_ig_i} & \text{if person } i \text{ has disease } j \text{ at time } t \\ 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

then individual i's overall relative risk IRR_{id}(t) of disease d is given by

$$IRR_{id}(t) = \prod_{f=1}^{N_f} RR^*_{id}(t). \prod_{j=1}^{N_D} DR^*_{idj}\,(t)$$

At the beginning of the simulation, each individual's disease status is assigned based on: (a) their $IRR_{id}(t_0)$; (b) the mean value of this quantity among people of the same age and sex; and (c) the prevalence of disease d in the same age and sex group. Therefore, individual i is assigned disease d with probability equal to

$$\frac{IRR_{id}(t_0)}{|IRR_d|_{a_ig_i}(t_0)} \times P_{da_ig_i}(t_0)$$

where $P_{dag}(t_0)$ and $|IRR_d|_{ag}$ respectively denote the population level prevalence, and the average relative risk of disease d for age a and sex g, at the beginning of the simulation. Note that this formulation assumes relative risks combine multiplicatively and are independent.

Similarly, if $I_{dag}(t_0)$ denotes the population level incidence of disease d for age a and sex g, as currently observed empirically (at t_0), then individual i develops disease d at time t with probability equal to

$$IRR_{id}(t) \times I^*$$

where

$$I^* = \frac{I_{da_ig_i}(t_0)}{|IRR_{id}|_{a_ig_i}(t_0)}$$

I^* is calculated in the baseline scenario and is held constant throughout the simulation. It is also used throughout the simulation of intervention scenarios.

Finally, each person of age a and sex g with disease d has probability ρ_{dag} of going into remission each year, and dies with probability $(1 - s_i(t))\, RM_{a_ig_i}(t)$ each year (see above section on Residual Mortality).

D5. Burden of disease module

If DW_d represents the disability weight associated with disease d, let

$$DW^*_{id}(t) = \begin{cases} DW_d & \text{if person } i \text{ has disease } d \text{ at time } t \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Now define the product $X_i(t)$ of the compliment of disability weights $X_i(t)$ by

$$X_i(t) = \prod_{d=1}^{N_D} (1 - DW^*_{id}(t))$$

and the average of this product for age a and sex g is

$$|X|_{ag}(t) = \sum_{\substack{i:a_i=a \\ i:\, g_i=g}} X_i(t) \Big/ N_{ag}(t)$$

where $N_{ag}(t)$ denotes the number of people of age a and sex g at time t. If $YLD_{ag}(0)$ is the empirically observed years lived with disability for age a and sex g over all diseases at the time of initialization, and if RDW_{ag} is the residual disability weight for diseases *not* included in Health-GPS for age a and sex g, then at time $t = 0$, we have

$$(1 - YLD_{ag}(0)) = (1 - RDW_{ag})|X|_{ag}(0)$$

Rearranging gives

$$RDW_{ag} = 1 - \left({(1 - YLD_{ag}(0))}/{|X|_{ag}(0)} \right)$$

RDW_{ag} is initialized as above at the beginning of the simulation and unchanged after. More generally, across diseases (modelled in Health-GPS or otherwise) at time t, each person i has disability weight $DW_i(t)$ given by

$$DW_i(t) = 1 - (X_i(t)(1 - RDW_{ag}))$$

Disability-adjusted life years ($\text{DALYs}_{ag}(t)$) are calculated as the sum of the years lost due to premature mortality ($YLL_{ag}(t)$) and the years lived with a disability $YLD_{ag}(t)$ over the time horizon of the simulation, for age a and sex g. $YLD(t)$ at time t is given by

$$YLD_{ag}(t) = \frac{100{,}000}{N_{ag}(t)} \sum_{\substack{i:a_i=a \\ i:\, g_i=g}} DW_i(t)$$

The contribution of person i to years of life lost at time t is given by

$$YLL_i(t) = \begin{cases} LE(t) - a_i & \text{if } TD_i = t \text{ and } LE(t) > a_i \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where a_i is their age, TD_i gives their time of death, and $LE(t) = \max\{LE_{\text{Male}}(t), LE_{\text{Fenale}}(t)\}$ is the life expectancy at time t. Then

$$YLL_{ag}(t) = \frac{100{,}000}{N_{ag}(t)} \sum_{\substack{i:a_i=a \\ i:\, g_i=g}} YLL_i(t)$$

The DALYs at time t are then given by

$$\text{DALYs}_{ag}(t) = YLL_{ag}(t) + YLD_{ag}(t)$$

D6. Health expenditure

Total health expenditure (THE) consists of current health expenditure (CHE) and capital expenditure. According to National Health Accounts Estimates for India 2019-20, CHE is 90.52% of THE, and in CHE, households' share is 59.24% (including the share of households' out-of-pocket expenditure on health (OOPE) in CHE as 52.0%).[10] Therefore, households' expenditure on health and OOPE accounts for 53.62% and 47.07% of THE, respectively.

For each disease in asthma, chronic kidney disease, diabetes, ischemic heart disease, and stroke (including ischemic stroke, intracerebral haemorrhage, and subarachnoid haemorrhage), either household health expenditure, or OOPE, per person per year in India is derived from previous studies,[11-13] depending on availability, and is then converted into THE per case. Finally, the averted annual THE of each disease under intervention is calculated as the product of reduced cases under intervention and THE per case.

References Appendix D

1 United Nations. World Population Prospects. World Population Prospects. New York: UN; 2019. https://population.un.org/wpp/

2 Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation. Global Burden of Disease. Seattle: IHME; 2021. https://www.healthdata.org/research-analysis/gbd

3 Matheus AS, Tannus LR, Cobas RA, Palma CC, Negrato CA, Gomes MD. Impact of diabetes on cardiovascular disease: an update. International Journal of Hypertension. 2013;2013(1):653789.

4 Koye DN, Magliano DJ, Nelson RG, Pavkov ME. The global epidemiology of diabetes and kidney disease. Advances in Chronic Kidney Disease. 2018 Mar 1;25(2):121-32

5 Hall KD, Sacks G, Chandramohan D, Chow CC, Wang YC, Gortmaker SL, Swinburn BA. Quantification of the effect of energy imbalance on bodyweight. The Lancet. 2011 Aug 27;378(9793):826-37.

6 Rodriguez-Martinez A, Zhou B, Sophiea MK, Bentham J, Paciorek CJ, Iurilli ML, Carrillo-Larco RM, Bennett JE, Di Cesare M, Taddei C, Bixby H. Height and body-mass index trajectories of school-aged children and adolescents from 1985 to 2019 in 200 countries and territories: a pooled analysis of 2181 population-based studies with 65 million participants. The Lancet. 2020 Nov 7;396(10261):1511-24.

7 International Agency for Research on Cancer. Global Cancer Observatory. Lyon: IARC; 2022. https://gco.iarc.who.int/en

8 Tuomilehto J, Jousilahti P, Rastenyte D, Moltchanov V, Tanskanen A, Pietinen P, Nissinen A. Urinary sodium excretion and cardiovascular mortality in Finland: a prospective study. The Lancet. 2001 Mar 17;357(9259):848-51.

9 Liu N, Sun W, Xing Z, Ma F, Sun T, Wu H, Dong Y, Xu Z, Fu Y, Yuan H. Association between sodium intakes with the risk of chronic kidney disease: evidence from a meta-analysis. International Journal of Clinical and Experimental Medicine. 2015;8(11):20939.

10 Ministry of Health and Family Welfare. Government of India. National Health Accounts Estimates for India 2019-20. New Delhi: MHFW; 2023. https://nhsrcindia.org/sites/default/files/2023-04/National%20Health%20Accounts-2019-20.pdf

11 Yadav J, Menon GR, John D. Disease-specific out-of-pocket payments, catastrophic health expenditure and impoverishment effects in India: an analysis of National Health Survey data. Applied Health Economics and Health Policy. 2021 Sep;19:769-82.

12 Kwatra G, Kaur P, Toor G, Badyal DK, Kaur R, Singh Y, Pandian JD. Cost of stroke from a tertiary center in northwest India. Neurology India. 2013 Nov 1;61(6):627-32.

13 Kansra P, Oberoi S. Cost of diabetes and its complications: results from a STEPS survey in Punjab, India. Global Health Research and Policy. 2023 Apr 7;8(1):11.