



**HAL**  
open science

# Changes in parental feeding practices and preschoolers' food intake following a randomized controlled childhood obesity trial

Maria Somaraki, Karin Eli, Kimmo Sorjonen, Anna Ek, Pernilla Sandvik, Paulina Nowicka

## ► To cite this version:

Maria Somaraki, Karin Eli, Kimmo Sorjonen, Anna Ek, Pernilla Sandvik, et al.. Changes in parental feeding practices and preschoolers' food intake following a randomized controlled childhood obesity trial. *Appetite*, 2020, 154, pp.104746. 10.1016/j.appet.2020.104746 . hal-04332424

**HAL Id: hal-04332424**

**<https://hal.inrae.fr/hal-04332424v1>**

Submitted on 8 Dec 2023

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

## Title

### Changes in parental feeding practices and preschoolers' food habits following a randomized controlled childhood obesity trial

Maria Somaraki <sup>a\*</sup>, Karin Eli <sup>b,c</sup>, Kimmo Sorjonen <sup>d</sup>, Anna Ek <sup>e</sup>, Pernilla Sandvik <sup>a</sup>, Paulina Nowicka <sup>a,e</sup>

## Affiliations

<sup>a</sup> Department of Food Studies, Nutrition and Dietetics, Uppsala University, Uppsala, Sweden; [maria.somaraki@ikv.uu.se](mailto:maria.somaraki@ikv.uu.se); [pernilla.sandvik@ikv.uu.se](mailto:pernilla.sandvik@ikv.uu.se); [paulina.nowicka@ikv.uu.se](mailto:paulina.nowicka@ikv.uu.se).

<sup>b</sup> Unit for Biocultural Variation and Obesity, School of Anthropology and Museum Ethnography, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK; [karin.eli@anthro.ox.ac.uk](mailto:karin.eli@anthro.ox.ac.uk).

<sup>c</sup> Social Science and Systems in Health, Division of Health Sciences, Warwick Medical School, University of Warwick, Warwick, England; [karin.eli@warwick.ac.uk](mailto:karin.eli@warwick.ac.uk).

<sup>d</sup> Division of Psychology, Department of Clinical Neuroscience, Karolinska Institutet, Solna, Sweden; [kimmo.sorjonen@ki.se](mailto:kimmo.sorjonen@ki.se).

<sup>e</sup> Division of Pediatrics, Department of Clinical Science, Intervention and Technology (CLINTEC), Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden; [anna.ek@ki.se](mailto:anna.ek@ki.se); [paulina.nowicka@ki.se](mailto:paulina.nowicka@ki.se).

**\*Address correspondence to:** Maria Somaraki, Uppsala University, Department of Food Studies, Nutrition and Dietetics, Box 560, 751 22, Uppsala, Sweden; [maria.somaraki@ikv.uu.se](mailto:maria.somaraki@ikv.uu.se).

## **Abstract**

Childhood obesity treatment involving parents is most effective during the preschool age. However, the mechanisms of change are not known. The present study reports on secondary outcomes (changes in parental feeding practices and child food habits) of early obesity treatment. The More and Less study is a randomized controlled trial conducted in Stockholm County, Sweden. Children with obesity (n=174, mean BMI SDS 3.0, mean age 5 years, 56% girls) and their parents (60% with foreign background, 40% with a university degree) were randomized to: 1) standard treatment focusing on lifestyle recommendations (ST), 2) a parent support program with boosters (PGB), and 3) a parent support program without boosters (PGNB). The Child Feeding Questionnaire (CFQ) was used to measure parental feeding practices. Child food habits were assessed with a Food Frequency Questionnaire (FFQ). We calculated the monthly changes in CFQ practices and FFQ items based on four measurements. We did not find any significant between-group differences in parental feeding practices and child food habits over time. However, general linear models showed that changes in certain feeding practices predicted changes in child food habits. When ST was compared to the parent support groups, some associations moved in opposite directions. For example, increasing maternal restriction predicted increased consumption of cookies/buns in PGNB ( $b=2.3$ ,  $p<0.05$ ) and decreased consumption of cookies/buns in ST ( $b=-2.1$ ,  $p<0.05$ ). This is the first study to examine the effect of parental feeding practices on child food habits and weight status after obesity treatment among preschoolers. We found no evidence that changes in feeding practices or changes in child food habits mediated child weight loss. Future studies should consider other intermediary processes related to general parenting practices and parent-child interactions.

**Keywords:** Parental feeding practices, Child feeding questionnaire, Randomized controlled trial, Child eating, Family-based treatment

1  
2  
3 **1 Manuscript**

4  
5 **2 1. Introduction**

6  
7  
8 3 Successful interventions for early childhood obesity treatment typically involve parents and  
9  
10 4 integrate support in parenting skills with information on a healthy lifestyle (Golan, Kaufman,  
11  
12 5 & Shahar, 2006; Loveman, et al., 2015). These interventions seek to enhance the family  
13  
14 6 environment and thereby support changes in child behaviors indirectly (parent-child  
15  
16 7 interactions) and directly (child food intake and eating routines), with the aim of promoting  
17  
18 8 changes in child weight status. Few studies, however, have examined parental and child  
19  
20 9 behaviors as outcomes (Colquitt, et al., 2016; Duncanson, Shrewsbury, Collins, & Consortium,  
21  
22 10 2017; Loveman, et al., 2015). In addition, fathers have rarely been included in these studies  
23  
24 11 (Morgan, et al., 2017), despite the increasing involvement of fathers in cooking and feeding  
25  
26 12 (Neuman, Eli, & Nowicka, 2019). Thus, better insight into how family subsystems affect  
27  
28 13 behaviors that drive changes in child weight status may inform more effective and tailored  
29  
30 14 obesity interventions.

31  
32  
33  
34 15 In the present paper, we analyze secondary outcomes of the More and Less study (ML study),  
35  
36 16 a randomized controlled trial (RCT) assessing obesity interventions for preschool-age children  
37  
38 17 (Ek, et al., 2015). In the trial, the effect of three treatment conditions was evaluated: standard  
39  
40 18 treatment (ST), a parent support program with booster sessions (PGB), and a parent support  
41  
42 19 program without booster sessions (PGNB). The RCT's primary outcome results showed that  
43  
44 20 PGB was more effective in reducing child weight status over 12 months, compared to the other  
45  
46 21 conditions (Ek, et al., 2019). To understand what factors influenced the results, the present  
47  
48 22 paper evaluates changes in parental feeding practices and child food intake across the treatment  
49  
50 23 groups over 12 months. The parent support program focuses on parenting practices to change  
51  
52 24 child behaviors, therefore associations between changes in parental feeding practices and  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59

60  
61  
62 25 changes in child food intake are also examined through separate analyses for mother-child and  
63  
64 26 father-child dyads.  
65  
66

### 67 *1.1 Parental feeding practices and the Child Feeding Questionnaire* 68

69  
70 28 Parental feeding practices are the specific strategies parents use during mealtime interactions  
71  
72 29 (Blissett, 2011; Ventura & Birch, 2008), and have consistently been associated with child  
73  
74 30 weight and eating behaviors (Birch, Fisher, & Davison, 2003; E. Jansen, Williams, Mallan,  
75  
76 31 Nicholson, & Daniels, 2018; Rollins, Savage, Fisher, & Birch, 2016). Parental feeding practices  
77  
78 32 are embedded in broader parenting styles that have also been associated with child weight status  
79  
80 33 (Collins, Duncanson, & Burrows, 2014; Hubbs-Tait, Kennedy, Page, Topham, & Harrist, 2008;  
81  
82 34 Niermann, Gerards, & Kremers, 2018; Sleddens, et al., 2014). The development of the Child  
83  
84 35 Feeding Questionnaire (CFQ) (Birch, et al., 2001) has facilitated a systematic examination of  
85  
86 36 controlling parental feeding practices among large samples from diverse contexts (Birch, et al.,  
87  
88 37 2003; Blissett & Bennett, 2013; Derks, et al., 2017; B. Y. Rollins, E. Loken, J. S. Savage, & L.  
89  
90 38 L. Birch, 2014; Wehrly, Bonilla, Perez, & Liew, 2014). In the CFQ, controlling parental feeding  
91  
92 39 practices are divided into three categories: restriction, pressure to eat and monitoring (Birch, et  
93  
94 40 al., 2001; Nowicka, Sorjonen, Pietrobelli, Flodmark, & Faith, 2014). Restriction and pressure  
95  
96 41 to eat represent two coercive forms of parental control during feeding interactions (Vaughn, et  
97  
98 42 al., 2016) which may override a child's innate signals of hunger and/or satiety (DiSantis,  
99  
100 43 Hodges, Johnson, & Fisher, 2011; Rollins, et al., 2016). On the other hand, monitoring is  
101  
102 44 conceptualized as a more favorable form of control whereby parents are aware of child food  
103  
104 45 intake (Birch, et al., 2001; Gubbels, et al., 2011; Vaughn, et al., 2016).  
105  
106  
107  
108

109 46 In most studies, restriction and pressure to eat have been associated with higher and lower child  
110  
111 47 weight status, respectively; for monitoring, however, the findings have been less consistent  
112  
113 48 (Shloim, Edelson, Martin, & Hetherington, 2015; Ventura & Birch, 2008). In addition, parental  
114  
115 49 feeding practices have been associated with child behaviors pertaining to food intake. Parental  
116  
117  
118

119  
120  
121 50 restriction of palatable and energy-dense foods relates to increased liking for and intake of these  
122  
123 51 foods (Brandi Y. Rollins, Eric Loken, Jennifer S. Savage, & Leann L. Birch, 2014), while  
124  
125 52 pressuring a child to eat particular foods relates to decreased liking for and intake of these foods,  
126  
127  
128 53 typically fruits and vegetables which are not readily accepted at younger ages (Galloway,  
129  
130 54 Fiorito, Lee, & Birch, 2005; Galloway, Fiorito, Francis, & Birch, 2006). The majority of  
131  
132 55 studies, however, have been cross-sectional and the direction of the relationships is not clear,  
133  
134 56 although bi-directional relationships seem to be most plausible (Derks, et al., 2017; E. Jansen,  
135  
136 57 et al., 2018; P. W. Jansen, et al., 2017).

137  
138  
139 58 Parental feeding practices should also be considered in light of child appetitive traits. From an  
140  
141 59 early age, children with obesity have higher responsiveness to external food cues and lower  
142  
143 60 responsiveness to their internal satiety cues. Therefore, they present distinctive behavioral  
144  
145 61 profiles, which relate to increased food intake (Carnell & Wardle, 2008). Further, parents seem  
146  
147 62 more likely to adjust their feeding practices in response to child behaviors rather than to child  
148  
149 63 weight (e.g. pressure a child to eat if the child engages in picky eating behaviors, regardless of  
150  
151 64 weight) (Ek, et al., 2016; E. Jansen, et al., 2018), which may exacerbate obesity-related child  
152  
153 65 behaviors (Rodgers, et al., 2013). Thus, treatment efforts would benefit from addressing and  
154  
155 66 evaluating the role of parental feeding practices in samples of young children with obesity. In  
156  
157 67 these evaluations, separate analyses for mothers' and fathers' feeding practices are needed since  
158  
159 68 previous research suggests that fathers employ more coercive practices than mothers do (Pratt,  
160  
161 69 Hoffmann, Taylor, & Musher-Eizenman, 2017).

162  
163  
164  
165 70 Feeding practices also relate to structural, socio-cultural, socioeconomic and other contextual  
166  
167 71 factors (Blissett & Bennett, 2013; Cardel, et al., 2012; Nowicka, Sorjonen, et al., 2014; C. G.  
168  
169 72 Russell, et al., 2018). In our previous research, mothers born in a country other than Sweden  
170  
171 73 reported higher levels of controlling feeding practices (Nowicka, Sorjonen, et al., 2014;  
172  
173 74 Somaraki, et al., 2016). The present study includes a diverse sample in terms of parental foreign  
174  
175  
176  
177

178  
179  
180 75 background, to overcome research limitations posed by studying homogeneous samples  
181  
182 76 (Catherine Georgina Russell, et al., 2016).  
183  
184

### 185 77 ***1.2 Changes in parental feeding practices after obesity treatment***

186  
187  
188 78 A few studies reporting on childhood obesity interventions have assessed parental feeding  
189  
190 79 practices and found them to be modifiable (Burrows, Warren, & Collins, 2010; Epstein, Paluch,  
191  
192 80 Beecher, & Roemmich, 2008; Holland, et al., 2014; Mazzeo, et al., 2014; Stark, et al., 2014;  
193  
194 81 Steele, Jensen, Gayes, & Leibold, 2014). In particular, family-based treatment demonstrated  
195  
196 82 that modifications in parental feeding practices influence child dietary intake, which in turn  
197  
198 83 affects weight outcomes (Holland, et al., 2014). Previous research, however, has only included  
199  
200 84 families with older children; the one exception was a smaller study with children aged 2-5 years  
201  
202 85 old, which showed no changes in parental feeding practices after treatment (Stark, et al., 2014).  
203  
204

### 205 86 ***1.3 Child food intake in obesity treatment research***

206  
207  
208 87 In childhood obesity treatment, the child, the parents, and often all nuclear family members are  
209  
210 88 advised to decrease intake of energy dense foods and opt for healthier options (Altman &  
211  
212 89 Wilfley, 2015). Such changes in eating patterns are associated with reduced child weight status,  
213  
214 90 suggesting that parents play an important role in shaping healthy eating patterns and weight  
215  
216 91 trajectories (Best, et al., 2016; Hayes, et al., 2016; Robson, et al., 2019). Parent-focused  
217  
218 92 interventions specifically seek to enhance evidence-based parenting practices in order to shift  
219  
220 93 feeding dynamics towards healthier food intake. However, child food intake has not been  
221  
222 94 consistently assessed and reported in interventions for younger children (Duncanson, et al.,  
223  
224 95 2017).  
225  
226

### 227 96 ***1.4 Aim and hypotheses***

228  
229  
230  
231 97 The present study reports on secondary outcomes of an RCT that evaluated a childhood obesity  
232  
233 98 intervention for families of preschoolers over a 12-month follow-up. Specifically, the study  
234  
235  
236

237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295

99 aims to investigate the role of parental feeding practices in child weight status and food intake  
100 according to the conceptual model proposed in Fig. 1.

101 The objectives of this study are:

- 102 1. To investigate changes in parental feeding practices and child food intake after early  
103 obesity treatment;
- 104 2. To examine the association between changes in parental feeding practices and changes  
105 in child food intake after early obesity treatment;
- 106 3. To examine the moderating effect of parental feeding practices at baseline on changes  
107 in child body mass index standard deviation scores (BMI SDS) after early obesity  
108 treatment.

109 Our hypotheses are informed by the results of the ML study (Ek, et al., 2015; Ek, et al., 2019).  
110 In ML, children whose parents participated in the PGB significantly decreased their BMI SDS  
111 after 12 months by 0.54 (95% CI -0.77 to -0.30) compared to children in the PGNB and in the  
112 ST groups (Ek, et al., 2019).

113 We hypothesize that parents enrolled in the PGB will experience a greater decrease in  
114 restriction and pressure to eat, along with a greater increase in monitoring, compared to  
115 parents enrolled in the other treatment conditions. Accordingly, we hypothesize that children  
116 in the PGB will consume obesogenic foods less often over time and increase their  
117 consumption frequency for healthier food options. In addition, we expect that changes in  
118 parental feeding practices will be associated with changes in child food intake over the  
119 follow-up period, in the PGB compared to the other groups. Moreover, we hypothesize that  
120 baseline levels of parental feeding practices will moderate treatment effects on child weight  
121 status over the 12-month follow-up, whereby receiving parenting training will most benefit



296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354

122 parents with higher baseline levels of restriction/pressure to eat and lower levels of  
123 monitoring. Regarding separate analyses for mother-child and father-child dyads, we expect  
124 that they will yield similar results according to the hypotheses stated above. In addition, we  
125 expect that changes in both mothers' and fathers' feeding practices will be associated with  
126 changes in child food intake.

127 PLEASE INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE

128 **Figure 1.** A conceptual illustration of the expected interrelations between parental feeding  
129 practices, child food intake and child weight status after early obesity treatment focusing on  
130 parenting. Panel A (above). The hypothesized moderation effect of baseline feeding practices  
131 on child weight status (primary treatment outcome). Panel B (below). The hypothesized  
132 intermediary role of parental feeding practices and child food intake in treatment  
133 effectiveness. Dashed arrows leading to the primary outcome of the RCT are not examined in  
134 the present paper.

136 **2. Methods**

137 **2.1 Study design**

138 The ML is a parallel open label RCT (NCT01792531) designed to evaluate the effects of two  
139 approaches (a parent support program with and without booster sessions and standard  
140 treatment) to treat obesity in preschoolers. A description of the study procedure and treatment  
141 groups has been published elsewhere (Ek, et al., 2015; Ek, et al., 2019), and a brief summary is  
142 provided below. The ML study was approved by the ethics committee in Stockholm, Sweden  
143 on November 16th 2011 (dnr: 2011/1329-31/4). All participating caregivers provided written  
144 informed consent.

355  
356  
357 145 **2.2 Participant recruitment**  
358

359  
360 146 Families were eligible to participate based on the following criteria:  
361

362  
363 147 The child:

364  
365 148 1) was 4 to 6 years old at baseline;  
366

367  
368 149 2) was classified as having obesity according to international age- and sex-specific criteria  
369

370  
371 150 (Cole, Bellizzi, Flegal, & Dietz, 2000; Cole & Lobstein, 2012);  
372

373  
374 151 3) did not have any known chronic or developmental conditions that could influence his/her  
375  
376 152 weight and height development;  
377

378  
379 153 4) was not already in treatment for obesity.  
380

381 154 Additionally, parents' knowledge of Swedish needed to be sufficient to answer questionnaires  
382  
383 155 and participate in treatment.  
384

385  
386 156 Families were mainly recruited from 68 child health care centers (primary care). In addition,  
387  
388 157 outpatient pediatric clinics (secondary care) and school health care offices in Stockholm  
389  
390 158 County, Sweden, contributed to recruitment.  
391

392  
393 159 After baseline measures, families were assigned (1:1:2) to one of three treatment groups (PGB,  
394  
395 160 PGNB, ST) using an electronic randomization program with permuted blocks. In the parent  
396  
397 161 support program, families and research group members remained blinded to group allocation  
398  
399 162 into booster and non-booster sessions until the ending of the parent group sessions. The study  
400  
401 163 statistician maintained the randomization sequence. Data were collected between May 2012  
402  
403 164 and October 2017.  
404

405  
406 165 **2.3 Sample size**  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413

414  
415  
416 166 Power calculations were based on the primary outcome, child BMI SDS (Kleber, et al., 2009),  
417  
418 167 adjusting for a dropout rate of 21% (Ek, et al., 2015; West, Sanders, Cleghorn, & Davies, 2010).  
419  
420 168 Seventy-five children were estimated to be needed in each of the treatment approaches (parent  
421  
422 169 support program and standard treatment) in order to identify a difference in BMI SDS between  
423  
424  
425 170 the groups at 12 months post-baseline.

#### 426 427 171 ***2.4 Standard treatment***

428  
429  
430 172 The ST group received the usual care offered in outpatient pediatric clinics, based on the action  
431  
432 173 plan for childhood obesity in Stockholm County (SLL, 2016). Individual families were offered  
433  
434 174 5.5 visits on average over one year (Ek, et al., 2019). The treatment sessions focused on lifestyle  
435  
436 175 modifications with respect to eating and activity habits. During the first visit families met with  
437  
438 176 a pediatrician. In follow-up visits, families usually met with a pediatric nurse. If required, some  
439  
440 177 families were also referred to a dietician, psychologist, physiotherapist or occupational  
441  
442 178 therapist.

#### 443 444 445 179 ***2.5 Parent support program (with and without booster sessions)***

446  
447  
448 180 The ML parent support program includes 10 group sessions (1.5 hours/week); each session  
449  
450 181 integrates a parenting component along with a lifestyle component (Ek, et al., 2015). The  
451  
452 182 treatment focuses on strengthening skills that help parents support and sustain a healthy lifestyle  
453  
454 183 and respond to child behaviors in an effective way. The lifestyle content addresses healthy food  
455  
456 184 choices that each family can incorporate into daily practice. Through the program's focus on  
457  
458 185 parenting skills, parents are prompted to implement responsive feeding – characterized by low  
459  
460 186 levels of coercive control and high levels of structure – which has been associated with positive  
461  
462 187 weight outcomes (Rollins, et al., 2016). Either alone or with their partners, mothers were more  
463  
464 188 likely to attend the group sessions than fathers were (58% vs. 42%). All attendees were  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472

473  
474  
475 189 encouraged to share relevant information with their co-parent or co-caregiver. A participant  
476  
477 190 manual facilitated this process.  
478  
479

480 191 Following the parent support program, families randomized to booster sessions received  
481  
482 192 individual support through 30-minute phone calls from the research team every 4 to 6 weeks  
483  
484 193 for up to 12 months post-baseline. The booster sessions revolved around encouraging parents  
485  
486 194 to maintain healthy habits and empowering them to face additional challenges that might have  
487  
488 195 emerged. During these phone calls, booster session facilitators referenced the content of the  
489  
490 196 treatment program and the group sessions.  
491  
492

## 493 197 ***2.6 Measurements***

494  
495  
496 198 All measures were administered at baseline, 3, 6 and 12 months post-baseline. Both mothers  
497  
498 199 and fathers reported on their feeding practices, while one parent (mother or father) reported on  
499  
500 200 child food intake. Mothers and fathers were defined as caregivers who identified as the child's  
501  
502 201 biological parent and who reported, through a questionnaire, that they were female or male,  
503  
504 202 respectively. None of the children in the sample were adopted or in the sole care of caregivers  
505  
506 203 other than their biological parents.  
507  
508

509  
510 204

### 511 512 205 ***2.6.1 Parental feeding practices***

513  
514  
515 206 We used the CFQ to examine key obesity-related feeding practices employed by parents  
516  
517 207 (mothers and fathers) (Birch, et al., 2001; Nowicka, Sorjonen, et al., 2014). The CFQ consists  
518  
519 208 of 3 subscales - restriction, pressure to eat and monitoring (Shloim, et al., 2015; Ventura &  
520  
521 209 Birch, 2008). Restriction (Cronbach's alpha for mothers 0.7, for fathers 0.8) consists of 6 items  
522  
523 210 (e.g. "I have to be sure that my child does not eat too many high-fat foods"), and pressure to eat  
524  
525 211 (Cronbach's alpha for mothers 0.5; for fathers 0.5) consists of 4 items (e.g. "My child should  
526  
527 212 always eat all of the food on her plate"), with responses ranging from 1 (disagree) to 5 (agree).  
528  
529  
530  
531

532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590

213 Monitoring (Cronbach’s alpha for mothers 0.8; for fathers 0.9) consists of 3 items (e.g. “How  
214 much do you keep track of the sweets (candy, ice-cream cake, pies, pastries) that your child  
215 eats?”) with responses ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (always). The “reward items” for restriction  
216 were excluded in the Swedish sample after a validation of the questionnaire (Nowicka,  
217 Sorjonen, et al., 2014). The total score for each feeding practice is the mean score of its  
218 component items. Higher mean scores indicate greater endorsement of the respective practice.

219 **2.6.2 Child food intake**

220 A Food Frequency Questionnaire (FFQ) assessed child food intake relevant to obesity treatment  
221 (Ek, et al., 2015). The FFQ was part of a more extensive questionnaire about background  
222 characteristics of the child (e.g. child’s birth date, siblings) along with current information about  
223 the child’s health (e.g. health conditions and lifestyle). At each time point, one parent reported  
224 on the child’s usual food intake. The FFQ assessed the consumption frequency of 10 food items  
225 (fresh fruits, vegetables, pizza/hamburger, fish, ice-cream, cookies/buns, soft drinks, juice,  
226 sweets & chocolate, chips & snacks), with the response categories ranging from once per month  
227 or less to four times per day or more (13 response options in total). Frequency equivalents were  
228 calculated for monthly consumption. The food items listed in the FFQ have been used in several  
229 international studies (Byrne, et al., 2019; Golley, et al., 2017). In the Swedish context, the items  
230 have been included in a national survey administered by the National Food Agency  
231 (Livsmedelsverket) to monitor population trends (Enghardt Barbieri, Pearson, & Becker, 2006).  
232 In addition, the items have been validated using food diaries in a nation-wide obesity prevention  
233 study in young children (Doring, et al., 2014).

234 **2.6.3 Child BMI SDS**

235 Child height and weight were measured by trained health care professionals. Height was  
236 measured to the nearest 0.1 cm using a fixed stadiometer and weight was measured to the

591  
592  
593 237 nearest 0.1 kg in underwear. BMI was calculated based on weight and height. The primary  
594  
595 238 outcome of the RCT, BMI SDS, was computed based on age- and sex-specific reference data  
596  
597 239 (Cole & Lobstein, 2012).  
598  
599

## 600 240 **2.7 Statistical analysis**

601  
602

603 241 Background characteristics were compared across the three treatment groups (PGB, PGNB, ST)  
604  
605 242 at baseline using one-way ANOVA (for continuous variables) and chi-squared test (for  
606  
607 243 categorical variables). Moreover, baseline characteristics were compared across mothers and  
608  
609 244 fathers using paired samples t-test (for continuous variables) and McNemar's test (for  
610  
611 245 categorical variables). Mean change per month (for maternal/paternal feeding practices -  
612  
613 246 restriction, pressure to eat and monitoring, child food intake and child BMI SDS) was computed  
614  
615 247 for each individual child/parent (Pfister, Schwarz, Carson, & Jancyzk, 2013). In linear  
616  
617 248 regression models, all measurements of each variable (dependent variable) for the individual  
618  
619 249 child/parent were regressed on an independent time variable (0, 3, 6, and 12 months). The  
620  
621 250 extracted mean change per month in each variable was utilized to carry out standard  
622  
623 251 significance tests and statistical procedures. Mean changes were not calculated for individuals  
624  
625 252 who had missing data at two measurement points, and these individuals are not included in the  
626  
627 253 analyses. Moreover, individuals who had invariable measurements at all measurements points  
628  
629 254 were assigned the value zero and were included in the analytical sample.  
630  
631  
632

633 255 One-way ANOVAs were used to compare the mean change of maternal and paternal feeding  
634  
635 256 practices across treatment groups (objective 1), and one-sample t-tests were used to compare  
636  
637 257 the mean change within each treatment group against zero change. Moreover, paired samples  
638  
639 258 t-tests were employed to compare the mean change between maternal and paternal feeding  
640  
641 259 practices. General linear models were used to explore the effect of change in parental feeding  
642  
643 260 practices (independent variable) on change in child food intake (dependent variable) (objective  
644  
645 261 2). The models included a 'treatment group x change in feeding practices' interaction term to  
646  
647  
648  
649

650  
651  
652 262 evaluate differences between groups. The analyses were separate for mother-child and father-  
653  
654 263 child dyads. When the interaction was found significant, we proceeded to explore the  
655  
656 264 associations of changes in parental feeding practices with changes in child eating patterns in  
657  
658 265 each treatment group separately. If no significant interaction was found, the associations were  
659  
660  
661 266 explored using the total sample.

662  
663 267 Moreover, the moderating effect (objective 3) of baseline feeding practices on changes in child  
664  
665 268 BMI SDS was examined using general linear models. Change in BMI SDS was the dependent  
666  
667  
668 269 variable and we added the interaction term ‘treatment group x baseline feeding practices’. The  
669  
670 270 analyses were separate for mother-child and father-child dyads.

671  
672  
673 271 The significance levels for all analyses were set at 0.05. The software package IBM SPSS  
674  
675 272 Statistics 24 was used for all statistical analyses.

### 676 677 273 *2.7.1 Missing data*

678  
679  
680 274 We used an intention-to-treat (ITT) approach, as far as missing data allowed, and listwise  
681  
682 275 deletion was applied. Thus, we analyzed the available data without imputing the unknown  
683  
684 276 values.

## 685 686 687 277 **3. Results**

688  
689 278 No significant differences in baseline characteristics were found across the treatment conditions  
690  
691 279 (Table 1). On average, children were 5.2 years old and had a BMI SDS of 3.0 at baseline. Their  
692  
693 280 mothers and fathers reported higher restriction (3.8 and 3.5) and monitoring (4.0 and 3.8)  
694  
695 281 compared to pressure to eat (2.1 and 2.3) at baseline, respectively. As compared to mothers,  
696  
697 282 fathers reported lower levels of restriction (3.5 vs. 3.8) and monitoring (3.8 vs. 4.0). However,  
698  
699 283 at baseline neither maternal nor paternal feeding practices differed across treatment groups.  
700  
701 284 Foreign background and education level did not differ between mothers and fathers.

702  
703  
704  
705 285 Table 1. Characteristics of the study sample at baseline

	N	Total sample	Parent program		Standard treatment
		N=174	With boosters n=44	Without boosters n=43	n=87
		no.(%) or mean (SD)	no.(%) or mean (SD)		no.(%) or mean (SD)
<b>Child</b>					
Girl	174	98 (56.3)	19 (43.2)	23 (53.5)	56 (64.4)
Living with both parents	143	113 (79)	25 (78.1)	31 (81.6)	57 (78.1)
First born	147	72 (49)	15 (41.7)	21 (51.2)	36 (51.4)
Age at baseline	174	5.2 (0.78)	5.2 (0.83)	5.2 (0.86)	5.3 (0.71)
BMI SDS at baseline	174	2.97 (0.61)	2.99 (0.55)	3.01 (0.69)	2.91 (0.59)
<b>Mother</b>					
Age	139	36.6 (5.5)	38 (5.1)	36 (5.4)	36 (5.7)
BMI	141	28.1 (5.7)	28.2 (6)	29.1 (6.5)	27.6 (5.1)
Foreign background	145	89 (61.4)	21 (63.6)	21 (56.8)	47 (62.7)
University degree	143	58 (40.6)	14 (42.4)	15 (41.7)	29 (39.2)
<b>Father</b>					
Age	124	39.8 (7.1)	43 (7.9)	39 (7.4)	39 (6.3)
BMI	126	29.4 (4.4)	29.1 (4.20)	30.02 (4.59)	29.34 (4.46)
Foreign background	130	75 (57.7)	17 (54.8)	21 (63.6)	37 (56.1)
University degree	128	49 (38.3)	11 (36.7)	12 (37.5)	26 (39.4)

### 3.1 Changes in parental feeding practices

Table 2 shows the mean changes in mothers' and fathers' feeding practices over time. We found no difference between or within treatment groups. Moreover, no significant differences were found between mothers and fathers in mean change in feeding practices in the total sample.

Table 2. Baseline parental feeding practices and mean monthly changes after a randomized controlled childhood obesity trial

CFQ Child Feeding Questionnaire	n	Parent group with boosters (PGB)		Parent group without booster (PGBN)		Standard treatment (ST)		p-value*
		Baseline <sup>‡</sup>	Mean monthly change <sup>‡</sup>	Baseline <sup>‡</sup>	Mean monthly change <sup>‡</sup>	Baseline <sup>‡</sup>	Mean monthly change <sup>‡</sup>	
<i>Maternal Feeding Practices<sup>a</sup></i>								
Restriction	123	3.8 (0.9)	0.02	3.8 (0.8)	0.01	3.8 (0.7)	0.01	0.69
Pressure to eat	121	2.2 (0.8)	-0.01	2.0 (0.9)	-0.03	2.0 (0.9)	-0.03	0.61
Monitoring	126	4.0 (0.6)	0.02	4.0 (0.8)	0.01	4.1 (0.9)	0.03	0.77
<i>Paternal Feeding Practices<sup>a</sup></i>								
Restriction	110	3.5 (0.8)	0.01	3.4 (0.8)	-0.003	3.5 (0.9)	0.01	0.80
Pressure to eat	113	2.2 (0.8)	0.01	2.4 (0.8)	0.01	2.3 (0.8)	-0.02	0.53
Monitoring	112	3.7 (0.6)	0.02	3.5 (1.0)	0.02	3.9 (0.8)	-0.002	0.14

<sup>‡</sup> Mean monthly changes were computed for each parent in the study based on measurements at all four time points (baseline, 3, 6 and 12 months)

\*p-values for comparisons of changes in feeding practices across treatment groups; one-way ANOVA

<sup>‡</sup> maternal/paternal feeding practices at baseline did not differ across treatment groups (p>0.05); one-way ANOVA

<sup>a</sup> no significant within-group mean monthly changes (p>0.05); one sample t-test with test value set to zero



768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826

294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306

**3.2 Changes in child eating patterns**

Changes in reported intake of food items did not differ between the children in the different treatment conditions (Table 3). Some within-group changes, however, were found to be significant. The average monthly consumption of cookies/buns decreased over time among children in two treatment groups (PGBN: by 0.2,  $p < 0.05$ , and ST: by 0.2,  $p < 0.05$ ). Moreover, children in ST decreased their reported consumption of sweets and chocolate (by 0.2 per month,  $p < 0.05$ ).

Table 3. Baseline child food intake and monthly changes after a randomized controlled childhood obesity trial

FFQ Food Frequency Questionnaire (per month)	n	Parent group with boosters (PGB)		Parent group without booster (PGBN)		Standard treatment (ST)		p-value *
		Baseline <sup>‡</sup>	Mean monthly change <sup>‡</sup>	Baseline <sup>‡</sup>	Mean monthly change <sup>‡</sup>	Baseline <sup>‡</sup>	Mean monthly change <sup>‡</sup>	
Fruit	128	45 (34)	-0.5	57 (24)	-1.4	48 (28)	0.004	0.40
Vegetables	128	40 (29)	-0.2	49 (26)	-0.3	50 (30)	-0.3	0.97
Pizza & hamburgers	128	2.1 (1.6)	0.02	2.4 (1.6)	-0.05	2.1 (1.5)	-0.01	0.38
Fish	129	6.2 (4.3)	0.3	8.6 (9.8)	-0.3	7.7 (10)	-0.2	0.15
Ice-cream	129	5 (7)	-0.1	3.6 (2.3)	0.1	4.1 (3.9)	-0.1	0.20
Cookies/buns	128	4.2 (3.1)	-0.1	5.5 (3.5)	-0.2 <sup>a</sup>	5.1 (5.6)	-0.2 <sup>a</sup>	0.78
Soft drinks	127	5.8 (5.1)	-0.2	4.3 (3.5)	-0.03	6.7 (12.5)	-0.5	0.32
Juice	126	11.6 (22.3)	-0.3	8.4 (9.9)	-0.2	7.7 (10.7)	-0.2	0.93
Sweets & chocolate	128	4.5 (2.5)	-0.05	4.7 (1.8)	-0.01	5.3 (5.2)	-0.2 <sup>a</sup>	0.10
Snacks	128	3.5 (2.2)	-0.02	3.6 (3.1)	-0.1	3.4 (4)	-0.1	0.80

<sup>‡</sup> Mean monthly changes were computed for each parent in the study based on measurements at all four time points (baseline, 3, 6 and 12 months)

\*p-values for between-group comparisons of mean changes in child food intake; one-way ANOVA

<sup>‡</sup> child food intake at baseline did not differ across treatment groups ( $p > 0.05$ ); one-way ANOVA

<sup>a</sup> significant within-group mean monthly changes ( $p < 0.05$ ); one sample t-test with test value set to zero

827  
828  
829 307 **3.3 Associations between changes in parental feeding practices and changes in child eating**  
830  
831 308 **patterns over 12 months of follow-up**  
832  
833

834 309 For the total sample, increased monthly consumption of cookies/buns was associated with  
835  
836 310 increasing maternal pressure to eat ( $b=1.1, p<0.05$ ) and decreased monthly consumption of  
837  
838 311 sweets and chocolate was associated with increasing maternal monitoring ( $b=-1.4, p<0.05$ ). The  
839  
840 312 associations between changes in parental feeding practices and changes in the monthly  
841  
842 313 consumption of certain foods diverged between treatment groups (Table 4). In ST, mothers'  
843  
844 314 and fathers' increased restriction was associated with a decrease in child intake of pizza and  
845  
846 315 hamburgers per month ( $b=-1.4, p<0.001$  and  $b=-1.1, p<0.001$ , respectively); the same pattern  
847  
848 316 was shown for mothers' increased monitoring ( $b=-1.1, p<0.001$ ). By contrast, increased levels  
849  
850 317 of mothers' restriction in PGNB were associated with increased monthly intake of pizza and  
851  
852 318 hamburgers ( $b=0.7, p<0.05$ ), and cookies/buns ( $b=2.3, p<0.05$ ). Increased levels of restriction  
853  
854 319 among both mothers and fathers in ST were associated with a decrease in the child's monthly  
855  
856 320 intake of ice-cream ( $b=-3.6, p<0.001$  and  $b=-3.3, p<0.001$ , respectively).  
857  
858 321 Moreover, increasing maternal pressure to eat was associated with increased ice-cream  
859  
860 322 consumption in PGB ( $b=1.3, p<0.05$ ) and decreased ice-cream consumption in PGNB ( $b=-3.1,$   
861  
862 323  $p<0.001$ ). Interestingly, increased maternal restriction and pressure to eat were associated with  
863  
864 324 increased monthly consumption of fruits and vegetables in PGNB only.  
865  
866  
867  
868

869 325 Table 4. Associations between mean changes in parental feeding practices with mean changes  
870 326 in child food intake

	MOTHERS			FATHERS		
	Restriction ‡	Pressure to eat ‡	Monitoring‡	Restriction ‡	Pressure to eat ‡	Monitoring ‡
<b>Fruits ‡</b>	× PGNB: $b=20.4^*$	× PGNB: $b=25.1^*$	ns	ns	ns	ns
<b>Vegetables ‡</b>	ns	× PGNB: $b=12.1^*$	ns	ns	ns	ns
<b>Pizza &amp; hamburgers ‡</b>	× PGNB: $b=0.7^*$ ST: $b=-1.4^*$	$b=0.5^*$	× ST: $b=-1.1^*$	× PGNB: $b=0.6^*$ ST: $b=-1.1^*$	× PGNB: $b=-0.4^*$	ns
<b>Fish ‡</b>	ns	ns	ns	n.s	ns	× PGNB: $b=6.7^*$
<b>Icecream ‡</b>	× ST: $b=-3.6^*$	× PGB: $b=1.3^*$ PGNB: $b=-3.1^*$	× ST: $b=-1.8^*$	× ST: $b=-3.3^*$	ns	ns

<b>Cookies/buns ‡</b>	× PGNB: b=2.3* ST: b=-2.1*	b=1.1*	ns	ns	ns	ns
<b>Sweet drink ‡</b>	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
<b>Juice ‡</b>	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
<b>Sweets &amp; chocolate ‡</b>	ns	ns	b=-1.4*	ns	ns	ns
<b>Snacks ‡</b>	ns	× PGNB: b=2.1*	ns	ns	ns	ns

PGB: Parent group with boosters; PGNB: Parent group without boosters; ST: Standard treatment

‡ Mean monthly changes were computed based on all four measurements (baseline, 3, 6 and 12 months) for each family in the study

× Food items for which divergent associations were found between treatment groups (significant interaction between treatment group and changes in feeding practices); otherwise associations were examined in the total sample

\*p<0.05; ns: not statistically significant, null association

Mean monthly change for individuals with the same measurements over time were assigned the value zero.

327

### 328 3.4 Moderating effects of parental feeding practices on changes in child BMI SDS

329 Changes in parental feeding practices did not differ across treatment groups. Further, parental  
 330 feeding practices at baseline did not moderate the treatment effect on changes in child BMI  
 331 SDS between treatment groups (Table 5).

332 Table 5. Effects of baseline levels of parental feeding practices on changes in child BMI SDS

	Parental feeding practices at baseline	MOTHERS			FATHERS		
		n	Child BMI SDS mean monthly change ‡	p-value	n	Child BMI SDS mean monthly change ‡	p-value
PGB	Restriction	25	0.013	0.11 <sup>a</sup>	23	0.006	0.50 <sup>a</sup>
	Pressure to eat	24	0.004	0.64 <sup>a</sup>	25	0.009	0.28 <sup>a</sup>
	Monitoring	25	0.020	0.07 <sup>a</sup>	25	0.007	0.53 <sup>a</sup>
PGNB	Restriction	31	-0.002 (0.013-0.015) <sup>*</sup>	0.17 <sup>b</sup>	27	-0.007 (0.006-0.013) <sup>*</sup>	0.29 <sup>b</sup>
	Pressure to eat	31	0.01 (0.004+0.006) <sup>*</sup>	0.60 <sup>b</sup>	28	0.003 (0.009-0.006) <sup>*</sup>	0.62 <sup>b</sup>
	Monitoring	32	0.001 (0.020-0.019) <sup>*</sup>	0.17 <sup>b</sup>	28	-0.002 (0.007-0.009) <sup>*</sup>	0.50 <sup>b</sup>
ST	Restriction	57	-0.01 (0.013-0.022) <sup>*</sup>	0.03 <sup>b</sup>	54	0.001 (0.006-0.005) <sup>*</sup>	0.62 <sup>b</sup>
	Pressure to eat	56	-0.01 (0.004-0.014) <sup>*</sup>	0.18 <sup>b</sup>	54	-0.001 (0.009-0.010) <sup>*</sup>	0.33 <sup>b</sup>
	Monitoring	59	0.003 (0.020-0.017) <sup>*</sup>	0.16 <sup>b</sup>	53	0.005 (0.007-0.003) <sup>*</sup>	0.84 <sup>b</sup>

‡ Mean monthly changes were computed for each parent in the study based on measurements at all four time points (baseline, 3, 6 and 12 months)

PGB: Parent group with boosters; PGNB: Parent group without boosters; ST: Standard

Reference group: Parent group with boosters (PGB)

<sup>a</sup>significance level for the coefficient in the reference group

<sup>\*</sup> the coefficient in the parent group with boosters and standard treatment as the output of the function in parenthesis

<sup>b</sup>significance level for the difference in coefficients compared to the reference group

Treatment group interactions with mothers' feeding practices at baseline: 1) restriction ( $p=0.08$ ), 2) pressure to eat ( $p=0.07$ ), 3) monitoring ( $p=0.32$ )

Treatment group interactions with fathers' feeding practices at baseline: 1) restriction ( $p=0.57$ ), 2) pressure to eat ( $p=0.61$ ), 3) monitoring ( $p=0.70$ )

333

945  
946  
947 334  
948 335 **4. Discussion**  
949  
950

951 336 This is among the few studies to examine changes in parental feeding practices and changes in  
952  
953 337 child food intake in the context of obesity treatment for preschoolers. We analyzed secondary  
954  
955 338 outcomes from the ML study, in which a parent support program with boosters (PGB) was  
956  
957 339 shown to be more effective than the program without boosters (PGNB) as well as standard  
958  
959 340 treatment (ST) in decreasing child weight status. Contrary to our hypotheses, we found that  
960  
961 341 PGB was no more effective in changing parental feeding practices or child food intake than  
962  
963 342 PGNB or ST. Associations between changes in parental feeding practices and changes in child  
964  
965 343 food intake were identified mainly in PGNB and ST. Moreover, we did not find that different  
966  
967 344 levels of parental feeding practices at baseline moderated treatment effectiveness.

969  
970  
971 345 We conducted this study to understand whether the greater decrease in child weight status in  
972  
973 346 the PGB group (Ek, et al., 2019) could be explained by changes in parental feeding practices.  
974  
975 347 To our disappointment, our hypothesis was not confirmed. Previous studies like ours have  
976  
977 348 provided mixed evidence (Okely, et al., 2010; Stark, et al., 2014). A pilot US study comparing  
978  
979 349 family-based behavioral obesity treatment with home visits and pediatrician counseling found  
980  
981 350 greater decrease in child weight after family-based behavioral treatment, although changes in  
982  
983 351 parental feeding practices did not differ between the groups (Stark, et al., 2014). However, in  
984  
985 352 the Australian study HICKUPS, participants in a parent group intervention arm with a focus on  
986  
987 353 diet decreased their restriction more than parents whose intervention did not include the diet  
988  
989 354 component; the former group was also more successful in decreasing child weight status  
990  
991 355 (Burrows, et al., 2010; Okely, et al., 2010). The differences between these groups regarding  
992  
993 356 feeding practices were driven by changes in the two reward items of the CFQ restriction scale  
994  
995 357 (Burrows, et al., 2010). These items describe counterproductive parental behaviors related to  
996  
997 358 offering food in exchange for good behavior (Vaughn, et al., 2016). In Swedish society, using  
998  
999  
1000  
1001  
1002  
1003

1004  
1005  
1006 359 food to reward children is generally considered inappropriate, and in the Swedish validation of  
1007  
1008 360 the CFQ the reward items had to be excluded due to social desirability issues as seen by high  
1009  
1010 361 ceiling effect (Nowicka, Sorjonen, et al., 2014). Hence, although the CFQ has been widely used  
1011  
1012  
1013 362 by researchers to measure parental feeding practices in the past two decades (Shloim, et al.,  
1014  
1015 363 2015; Ventura & Birch, 2008), methodological issues related to the feeding practices the CFQ  
1016  
1017 364 assesses might explain the lack of group differences in our study. In a recent summary of  
1018  
1019 365 measurements of parental feeding, Vaughn, et al. (2016) list a wide range of parental feeding  
1020  
1021 366 strategies involving structure and control. Not all the parental strategies listed are represented  
1022  
1023 367 in the CFQ, and it is possible that changes in parental feeding practices that we did not measure  
1024  
1025 368 could explain our results.

1027  
1028 369 The greater reduction in child weight status in PGB was also not explained by changes in  
1029  
1030 370 reported child food intake. In fact, children within PGNB and ST reportedly reduced their  
1031  
1032 371 consumption frequency of cookies and buns by half compared to baseline. Although assessment  
1033  
1034 372 of child food intake has not been prioritized in trials for obesity treatment (Duncanson, et al.,  
1035  
1036 373 2017), previous research has demonstrated a greater decrease in calorie-dense foods and caloric  
1037  
1038 374 intake, and a greater increase in dietary quality after intensive family-based treatment,  
1039  
1040 375 compared to counseling (Robson, et al., 2019). As the authors note, this change in eating  
1041  
1042 376 patterns also mirrors a greater decrease in child weight status in family-based treatment  
1043  
1044 377 (Robson, et al., 2019; Stark, et al., 2018), such that a lower energy intake may explain the  
1045  
1046 378 treatment effect (Kuhl, et al., 2014). In the present study, we found that child food intake  
1047  
1048 379 relevant to obesity treatment was within recommended levels in all groups already at baseline.  
1049  
1050 380 Thus, other aspects of food intake, such as portion sizes and energy intake, may have changed  
1051  
1052 381 during the intervention, which might explain the greater child weight loss in PGB. However,  
1053  
1054 382 more time-consuming methods, such as 24 h-recalls or food recall diaries, would have been  
1055  
1056 383 required to extract this information. We chose not to use them, as it would have resulted in  
1057  
1058  
1059  
1060  
1061  
1062

1063  
1064  
1065  
1066  
1067  
1068  
1069  
1070  
1071  
1072  
1073  
1074  
1075  
1076  
1077  
1078  
1079  
1080  
1081  
1082  
1083  
1084  
1085  
1086  
1087  
1088  
1089  
1090  
1091  
1092  
1093  
1094  
1095  
1096  
1097  
1098  
1099  
1100  
1101  
1102  
1103  
1104  
1105  
1106  
1107  
1108  
1109  
1110  
1111  
1112  
1113  
1114  
1115  
1116  
1117  
1118  
1119  
1120  
1121

384 greater participant burden. Likewise, we did not measure physical activity using objective  
385 measurements such as accelerometers, and therefore could not assess if children’s physical  
386 activity affected their energy balance.

387 We found that certain feeding practices were associated with child food intake. Increased  
388 parental monitoring and restriction were associated with decreased consumption of energy-  
389 dense foods in the total sample and ST. Although a reduction in energy-dense foods can be  
390 expected with increased monitoring (Haszard, Skidmore, Williams, & Taylor, 2015; Rollins, et  
391 al., 2016), it is a surprising finding considering the coercive nature of restriction, which previous  
392 research has suggested might be counterproductive in relation to child eating behaviors (Fisher  
393 & Birch, 1999; Rollins, et al., 2016). The similar associations for increased monitoring and  
394 restriction may indicate that parents who reported restriction and parents who reported  
395 monitoring were referring to similar kinds of control. Recent studies on feeding practices have  
396 focused on disentangling the effects of overt control (child can detect parental control, e.g.  
397 “How often are you firm about what your child should eat”) and covert control (child cannot  
398 detect parental control, e.g. “Avoid buying sweets and crisps and bringing them into the  
399 house?”) (Boots, Tiggemann, & Corsini, 2018; Nowicka, Flodmark, Hales, & Faith, 2014;  
400 Ogden, Reynolds, & Smith, 2006). Whereas overt control may lead to unfavorable outcomes  
401 over time, covert control is associated with more favorable weight and food intake outcomes  
402 (Ogden, et al., 2006; Rodenburg, Kremers, Oenema, & van de Mheen, 2014), such that a more  
403 nuanced understanding of parental restriction is needed (Vaughn, et al., 2016). The CFQ items  
404 assessing restriction, however, may not make the distinction clear. Of note, a Swedish study of  
405 nearly 900 mothers of preschoolers (Nowicka, Sorjonen, et al., 2014) showed that covert control  
406 was moderately correlated with restriction (as measured through the CFQ). This shows that, in  
407 Sweden, parents may interpret the CFQ restriction items as capturing covert controlling  
408 behaviors related to structure and limit setting (Rollins, et al., 2016). Taken together, these

1122  
1123  
1124  
1125  
1126  
1127  
1128  
1129  
1130  
1131  
1132  
1133  
1134  
1135  
1136  
1137  
1138  
1139  
1140  
1141  
1142  
1143  
1144  
1145  
1146  
1147  
1148  
1149  
1150  
1151  
1152  
1153  
1154  
1155  
1156  
1157  
1158  
1159  
1160  
1161  
1162  
1163  
1164  
1165  
1166  
1167  
1168  
1169  
1170  
1171  
1172  
1173  
1174  
1175  
1176  
1177  
1178  
1179  
1180

409 findings highlight the challenges for operationalizing relevant constructs in parental feeding  
410 research. The field has accumulated a theory-based pool of items that are developmentally  
411 appropriate and easy to administer; however, novel ways to analyze existing data that account  
412 for certain limitations may be needed. Item Response Theory (IRT) might be one alternative  
413 which can facilitate analyses of empirical data while refining our existing conceptualization of  
414 feeding practices so that they can be better operationalized (Gordon, 2015).

415 Despite such challenges, the different patterns of associations across treatment groups provide  
416 insights into how parent-reported measures may change through different treatment approaches.  
417 This is highlighted by the contrasting patterns of associations of increased restriction in PGNB  
418 (increased consumption of pizza and hamburgers) and ST (decreased consumption of pizza and  
419 hamburgers). The findings for ST align with a proposed model by which parental restriction  
420 and monitoring of obesogenic foods relate to children’s decreased consumption of these foods.  
421 Because ST was less effective in improving child weight status, such associations may only  
422 reflect increased knowledge on matters of nutrition and socially desirable responses,  
423 considering the focus of ST on lifestyle modification and the provision of information about  
424 *what* would be healthy/unhealthy to consume/not consume.

425 The associations for PGNB may reflect *how* parent-child dynamics shift after a parenting  
426 program not solely focused on food and nutrition. In PGNB, increased restriction and pressure  
427 to eat were associated with both increased consumption of healthy foods (fruits and vegetables)  
428 and increased consumption of energy-dense foods (pizza and hamburgers and cookies and  
429 buns). Parents who attended the program (without receiving booster sessions) may have become  
430 more attuned to what their children ate (child food intake), adjusting their feeding practices  
431 accordingly. As children grow older they tend to become more food responsive, and thereby  
432 increase their obesogenic food intake. At the same time, children appear to become pickier with  
433 food, possibly following a normal developmental trajectory. It is possible that in PGNB, parents

1181  
1182  
1183  
1184  
1185  
1186  
1187  
1188  
1189  
1190  
1191  
1192  
1193  
1194  
1195  
1196  
1197  
1198  
1199  
1200  
1201  
1202  
1203  
1204  
1205  
1206  
1207  
1208  
1209  
1210  
1211  
1212  
1213  
1214  
1215  
1216  
1217  
1218  
1219  
1220  
1221  
1222  
1223  
1224  
1225  
1226  
1227  
1228  
1229  
1230  
1231  
1232  
1233  
1234  
1235  
1236  
1237  
1238  
1239

434 reporting increasing restriction (or monitoring) along with increasing pressure to eat (which  
435 may focus on ‘healthier’ food items, like vegetables) were responding to developmental  
436 changes in children’s appetites (Ashcroft, Semmler, Carnell, van Jaarsveld, & Wardle, 2008;  
437 Ek, et al., 2016). Data from the ML study indicated that, following the parenting program,  
438 children with high levels of picky eating at baseline reduced their weight status over 12 months  
439 to a lower degree than non-picky eaters (Sandvik, et al., 2019). Thus, introducing an assessment  
440 of child characteristics, such as appetite traits, at baseline, might help to tailor treatment to  
441 families’ needs. Taken together, the findings suggest that tailored treatment approaches may be  
442 more suitable to address high consumption of certain energy-dense foods and/or the low  
443 consumption of healthier foods. These findings are unexpected in light of the null associations  
444 found in PGB, which is contrary to our hypotheses. Greater child weight loss in this group  
445 cannot be explained by the associations between changes in parental feeding practices and  
446 changes in child food intake presented in this paper. Such null findings in PGB reflect that  
447 parental feeding practices, child weight status, and child food intake were not correlated at the  
448 different time points (data not shown). It is possible that general parenting strategies, which  
449 reflect the sustained focus on general parenting in PGB, and/or aspects of dietary intake not  
450 measured in the study, e.g. portion sizes, may explain the effectiveness of the PGB.  
451 Alternatively, parents in PGB who were actively involved for the entire follow-up period  
452 became increasingly aware of their parenting practices and their child’s behavior, which may  
453 have resulted in null associations between those over time.

454 Regarding the third study objective, our hypothesis was not confirmed and parental feeding  
455 practices at baseline did not influence the effect of treatment on child weight status in either  
456 mother-child or father-child dyads. In contrast, a study by Epstein, et al. (2008) found that  
457 higher restriction at baseline predicted more favorable child weight outcomes for the treatment  
458 group that focused on replacing energy-dense foods with healthier alternatives, compared to



1240  
1241  
1242  
1243  
1244  
1245  
1246  
1247  
1248  
1249  
1250  
1251  
1252  
1253  
1254  
1255  
1256  
1257  
1258  
1259  
1260  
1261  
1262  
1263  
1264  
1265  
1266  
1267  
1268  
1269  
1270  
1271  
1272  
1273  
1274  
1275  
1276  
1277  
1278  
1279  
1280  
1281  
1282  
1283  
1284  
1285  
1286  
1287  
1288  
1289  
1290  
1291  
1292  
1293  
1294  
1295  
1296  
1297  
1298

459 treatment that only focused on reducing energy-dense foods. This may be because parents who  
460 exerted more control over child feeding at baseline continued to apply the same practices during  
461 treatment. As a result, they were able to implement positive changes in child food intake, as  
462 directed by the intervention, to influence child weight status. While the intervention described  
463 by Epstein et al. (2008) exclusively focused on dietary changes without addressing parenting,  
464 in the ML study, we have focused on evidence-based parenting practices, such as how to use  
465 effective limit setting strategies and how to handle a power struggle with one’s child. Since  
466 parental feeding practices did not differentially change over time across treatment groups, we  
467 could not provide evidence that they mediated treatment effects. However, the children’s weight  
468 status in the ML study may have been influenced by how general parenting strategies, including  
469 parental feeding practices, changed over time (mediating effect) rather than by baseline levels  
470 of parental feeding practices (moderating effect).

471 **4.1 Future studies**

472 Although PGB was more successful in decreasing child weight status (Ek, et al., 2019), in the  
473 present study we found that changes in feeding practices did not differentially predict changes  
474 in child food intake in PGB. Examining potential changes in more general parenting skills may  
475 shed light on the greater decreases in child weight in this group. Because feeding practices have  
476 considerable stability over time, general parenting might not influence parental feeding  
477 practices in a measurable way (Duncanson, Burrows, & Collins, 2016; Powell, Farrow, Meyer,  
478 & Haycraft, 2018), and might instead moderate the effects of feeding practices on child eating  
479 patterns (Rodenburg, Kremers, Oenema, & van de Mheen, 2012; Sleddens, et al., 2014). Thus,  
480 we believe that factors related to co-parenting and the combined effects of maternal and paternal  
481 feeding practices (Pratt, et al., 2017; Tan, Domoff, Pesch, Lumeng, & Miller, 2019), as the child  
482 perceives them, warrant further investigation. In the ML study, we developed and validated an  
483 instrument to assess parenting practices and skills (unpublished data), which has the potential

1299  
1300  
1301  
1302  
1303  
1304  
1305  
1306  
1307  
1308  
1309  
1310  
1311  
1312  
1313  
1314  
1315  
1316  
1317  
1318  
1319  
1320  
1321  
1322  
1323  
1324  
1325  
1326  
1327  
1328  
1329  
1330  
1331  
1332  
1333  
1334  
1335  
1336  
1337  
1338  
1339  
1340  
1341  
1342  
1343  
1344  
1345  
1346  
1347  
1348  
1349  
1350  
1351  
1352  
1353  
1354  
1355  
1356  
1357

484 to provide clearer answers on how the intervention worked. Our group will address this in a  
485 future analysis.

486 ***4.2 Strengths and limitations***

487 The main strength in our study is its diverse sample (Foster, Farragher, Parker, & Sosa, 2015).  
488 Sixty percent of mothers and fathers were of non-Swedish background; this allows for higher  
489 generalizability of the study across migrant groups, and better reflects demographic changes in  
490 Sweden and in Europe more widely. Another strength of the study is the prior validation of the  
491 CFQ in Sweden (Nowicka, Sorjonen, et al., 2014). In addition, we included a FFQ to assess  
492 child food habits, which are rarely evaluated in obesity interventions (Duncanson, et al., 2017).  
493 Placing equal focus on both mothers and fathers is also a strength. Previous research has focused  
494 on maternal feeding practices and not much is known about the effect of paternal feeding  
495 practices (Khandpur, Blaine, Fisher, & Davison, 2014; Morgan, et al., 2017). In the changing  
496 family environment, both parents/caregivers and members of the extended family need to be  
497 addressed (Eli, Howell, Fisher, & Nowicka, 2016; Niermann, et al., 2018). Our analysis, which  
498 includes mother-child and father-child dyads, is an important step in acknowledging  
499 subsystems within the family. Fathers along with mothers were involved in the parenting  
500 program, although attendance varied. This may explain why mothers responded to the  
501 questionnaires to a greater degree. No data on which caregivers attended ST are available.

502 The main limitation of the analysis is that power was calculated for the primary outcome of the  
503 RCT, change in child BMI SDS, and not for parental feeding practices (Ek, et al., 2015).  
504 Another limitation is missing data, which was more pronounced in fathers, for whom 61 and  
505 89 questionnaires (35% and 51% of total sample) were missing at baseline and at 12 months  
506 post-baseline, respectively. Consequently, analyses for mother-child dyads are based on a larger  
507 sample, which may explain why some associations were found for mothers but not fathers. An  
508 alternative explanation is that mothers predominantly filled out the child background

questionnaire, which included the FFQ. Mothers also assumed greater responsibility for child eating/drinking. Hence, the observed associations may reflect maternal perceptions of parent-child dynamics in feeding. Moreover, mothers and fathers with a foreign background and no university degree were twice more likely not to respond to the questionnaires. However, the rate of missing data did not differ across treatment groups. We used a listwise approach, which has further reduced statistical power. Moreover, questionnaire data were self-reported and thus social desirability bias cannot be ruled out (Farrow, Blissett, & Haycraft, 2011). Low reliability for maternal/paternal pressure to eat presents additional methodological limitations, which may relate to the non-specificity of food items in the questions about pressure to eat in the CFQ.

### **4.3 Conclusion**

This is among the few studies to examine the effect of parental feeding practices on child food intake and weight status after obesity treatment among preschoolers. Neither changes in feeding practices nor changes in child eating patterns could explain why the parent group with boosters was more effective in reducing children's weight status in the ML study. Because intermediary processes involving parenting practices and parent-child interactions may be important, future studies should examine whether general parenting practices moderate the effect of feeding practices on child weight status. Moreover, from a methodological point of view, our results suggest that instruments that include more nuanced categories for feeding practices should be considered in future research.

### **Abbreviations**

CFQ: Child Feeding Questionnaire; FFQ: Food Frequency Questionnaire; BMI SDS: Body Mass Index; SD: standard deviation; RCT: Randomized Controlled Trial; ML: the More and Less study

1417  
1418  
1419  
1420  
1421  
1422  
1423  
1424  
1425  
1426  
1427  
1428  
1429  
1430  
1431  
1432  
1433  
1434  
1435  
1436  
1437  
1438  
1439  
1440  
1441  
1442  
1443  
1444  
1445  
1446  
1447  
1448  
1449  
1450  
1451  
1452  
1453  
1454  
1455  
1456  
1457  
1458  
1459  
1460  
1461  
1462  
1463  
1464  
1465  
1466  
1467  
1468  
1469  
1470  
1471  
1472  
1473  
1474  
1475

533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539

**Acknowledgements**

We want to thank all participating families, child health care and school nurses and all personnel involved in the standard treatment offered in the pediatric outpatient clinics. We also thank Sofia Ljung, Jonna Nyman, Mahnoush Etminan Malek, Karin Nordin, Kathryn Lewis Chamberlain, Jan Ejderhamn, Philip A. Fisher, Patricia Chamberlain and Claude Marcus who were involved in the ML study's design or data collection.

540

**Authors' contributions**

PN conceived the study, designed the statistical approach together with MS and supervised the coordination of the study and manuscript process. MS performed the statistical analyses with guidance from KS and drafted the initial manuscript. KS and KE interpreted data and edited the manuscript. AE and PS made a substantial contribution to conception and design, data collection and to interpretation of data. All authors contributed to reviewing and approving the final manuscript.

548

**Declarations of interest**

549

None

550

**Funding**

551

This study was supported by the Swedish Research Council (2014-02404), Karolinska

552

Institutet Doctoral Funds, the Swedish Society of Medicine, VINNOVA (2011-3443), Jerring

553

Foundation, Samariten Foundation, Magnus Bergvall Foundation, Ingrid and Fredrik Thuring

554

Foundation, Helge Ax:son Foundation, Crown Princess Lovisa Foundation, Foundation

1476  
1477  
1478 555 Frimurare Barnhuset in Stockholm, Foundation Pediatric Care, Foundation Martin Rind, Jane  
1479  
1480  
1481 556 and Dan Olsson Foundation, Groschinsky Foundation, Sigurd, Elsa Golje Memory  
1482  
1483  
1484 557 Foundation and iShizu Matsumurais Donation and Foundation Tornspiran. The funding  
1485  
1486 558 sources had no role in the study design, collection, analysis or interpretation of the data,  
1487  
1488 559 writing the manuscript, or the decision to submit the paper for publication.

1490 560

1493 561

1495 562

1498 563

1501 564

1504 565

1507 566

## 1510 567 **References**

1513 568

- 1515 569 Altman, M., & Wilfley, D. E. (2015). Evidence update on the treatment of overweight and obesity in  
1516 570 children and adolescents. *J Clin Child Adolesc Psychol*, *44*, 521-537.
- 1517 571 Ashcroft, J., Semmler, C., Carnell, S., van Jaarsveld, C. H., & Wardle, J. (2008). Continuity and stability  
1518 572 of eating behaviour traits in children. *Eur J Clin Nutr*, *62*, 985-990.
- 1519 573 Best, J. R., Goldschmidt, A. B., Mockus-Valenzuela, D. S., Stein, R. I., Epstein, L. H., & Wilfley, D. E.  
1520 574 (2016). Shared weight and dietary changes in parent-child dyads following family-based  
1521 575 obesity treatment. *Health Psychol*, *35*, 92-95.
- 1522 576 Birch, L. L., Fisher, J. O., & Davison, K. K. (2003). Learning to overeat: maternal use of restrictive  
1523 577 feeding practices promotes girls' eating in the absence of hunger. *Am J Clin Nutr*, *78*, 215-  
1524 578 220.
- 1525 579 Birch, L. L., Fisher, J. O., Grimm-Thomas, K., Markey, C. N., Sawyer, R., & Johnson, S. L. (2001).  
1526 580 Confirmatory factor analysis of the Child Feeding Questionnaire: a measure of parental  
1527 581 attitudes, beliefs and practices about child feeding and obesity proneness. *Appetite*, *36*, 201-  
1528 582 210.
- 1529 583 Blissett, J. (2011). Relationships between parenting style, feeding style and feeding practices and fruit  
1530 584 and vegetable consumption in early childhood. *Appetite*, *57*, 826-831.

1532  
1533  
1534

1535  
1536  
1537 585 Blissett, J., & Bennett, C. (2013). Cultural differences in parental feeding practices and children's  
1538 586 eating behaviours and their relationships with child BMI: a comparison of Black Afro-  
1539 587 Caribbean, White British and White German samples. *Eur J Clin Nutr*, 67, 180-184.  
1540 588 Boots, S. B., Tiggemann, M., & Corsini, N. (2018). Eating in the absence of hunger in young children:  
1541 589 The role of maternal feeding strategies. *Appetite*, 130, 45-49.  
1542 590 Burrows, T., Warren, J. M., & Collins, C. E. (2010). The impact of a child obesity treatment  
1543 591 intervention on parent child-feeding practices. *Int J Pediatr Obes*, 5, 43-50.  
1544 592 Byrne, R., Bell, L., Taylor, R. W., Mauch, C., Mihrshahi, S., Zarnowiecki, D., Hesketh, K. D., Wen, L. M.,  
1545 593 Trost, S. G., & Golley, R. (2019). Brief tools to measure obesity-related behaviours in children  
1546 594 under 5 years of age: A systematic review. *Obes Rev*, 20, 432-447.  
1547 595 Cardel, M., Willig, A. L., Dulin-Keita, A., Casazza, K., Mark Beasley, T., & Fernández, J. R. (2012).  
1548 596 Parental feeding practices and socioeconomic status are associated with child adiposity in a  
1549 597 multi-ethnic sample of children. *Appetite*, 58, 347-353.  
1550 598 Carnell, S., & Wardle, J. (2008). Appetite and adiposity in children: evidence for a behavioral  
1551 599 susceptibility theory of obesity. *Am J Clin Nutr*, 88, 22-29.  
1552 600 Cole, T. J., Bellizzi, M. C., Flegal, K. M., & Dietz, W. H. (2000). Establishing a standard definition for  
1553 601 child overweight and obesity worldwide: international survey. *Bmj*, 320, 1240-1243.  
1554 602 Cole, T. J., & Lobstein, T. (2012). Extended international (IOTF) body mass index cut-offs for thinness,  
1555 603 overweight and obesity. *Pediatr Obes*, 7, 284-294.  
1556 604 Collins, C., Duncanson, K., & Burrows, T. (2014). A systematic review investigating associations  
1557 605 between parenting style and child feeding behaviours. *J Hum Nutr Diet*, 27, 557-568.  
1558 606 Colquitt, J. L., Loveman, E., O'Malley, C., Azevedo, L. B., Mead, E., Al-Khudairy, L., Ells, L. J.,  
1559 607 Metzendorf, M. I., & Rees, K. (2016). Diet, physical activity, and behavioural interventions for  
1560 608 the treatment of overweight or obesity in preschool children up to the age of 6 years.  
1561 609 *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*, 3, Cd012105.  
1562 610 Derks, I. P., Tiemeier, H., Sijbrands, E. J., Nicholson, J. M., Voortman, T., Verhulst, F. C., Jaddoe, V. W.,  
1563 611 & Jansen, P. W. (2017). Testing the direction of effects between child body composition and  
1564 612 restrictive feeding practices: results from a population-based cohort. *Am J Clin Nutr*, 106,  
1565 613 783-790.  
1566 614 DiSantis, K. I., Hodges, E. A., Johnson, S. L., & Fisher, J. O. (2011). The role of responsive feeding in  
1567 615 overweight during infancy and toddlerhood: a systematic review. *International Journal of*  
1568 616 *Obesity*, 35, 480.  
1569 617 Doring, N., Hansson, L. M., Andersson, E. S., Bohman, B., Westin, M., Magnusson, M., Larsson, C.,  
1570 618 Sundblom, E., Willmer, M., Blennow, M., Heitmann, B. L., Forsberg, L., Wallin, S., Tynelius, P.,  
1571 619 Ghaderi, A., & Rasmussen, F. (2014). Primary prevention of childhood obesity through  
1572 620 counselling sessions at Swedish child health centres: design, methods and baseline sample  
1573 621 characteristics of the PRIMROSE cluster-randomised trial. *BMC Public Health*, 14, 335.  
1574 622 Duncanson, K., Burrows, T. L., & Collins, C. E. (2016). Child Feeding and Parenting Style Outcomes and  
1575 623 Composite Score Measurement in the 'Feeding Healthy Food to Kids Randomised Controlled  
1576 624 Trial'. *Children (Basel)*, 3.  
1577 625 Duncanson, K., Shrewsbury, V. A., Collins, C. E., & Consortium, D.-C. (2017). Interim Report on the  
1578 626 Effectiveness of Dietary Interventions for Children and Adolescents with Overweight and  
1579 627 Obesity for the World Health Organization. In.  
1580 628 Ek, A., Chamberlain, K. L., Ejderhamn, J., Fisher, P. A., Marcus, C., Chamberlain, P., & Nowicka, P.  
1581 629 (2015). The More and Less Study: a randomized controlled trial testing different approaches  
1582 630 to treat obesity in preschoolers. *BMC Public Health*, 15, 735.  
1583 631 Ek, A., Lewis Chamberlain, K., Sorjonen, K., Hammar, U., Etminan Malek, M., Sandvik, P., Somaraki,  
1584 632 M., Nyman, J., Lindberg, L., Nordin, K., Ejderhamn, J., Fisher, P. A., Chamberlain, P., Marcus,  
1585 633 C., & Nowicka, P. (2019). A Parent Treatment Program for Preschoolers With Obesity: A  
1586 634 Randomized Controlled Trial. *Pediatrics*, 144.  
1587 635 Ek, A., Sorjonen, K., Eli, K., Lindberg, L., Nyman, J., Marcus, C., & Nowicka, P. (2016). Associations  
1588 636 between Parental Concerns about Preschoolers' Weight and Eating and Parental Feeding

1594  
1595  
1596 637 Practices: Results from Analyses of the Child Eating Behavior Questionnaire, the Child  
1597 638 Feeding Questionnaire, and the Lifestyle Behavior Checklist. *PLoS One*, 11, e0147257.  
1598 639 Eli, K., Howell, K., Fisher, P. A., & Nowicka, P. (2016). A question of balance: Explaining differences  
1599 640 between parental and grandparental perspectives on preschoolers' feeding and physical  
1600 641 activity. *Soc Sci Med*, 154, 28-35.  
1601 642 Enghardt Barbieri, H., Pearson, M., & Becker, W. (2006). Riksmatern-barn 2003: Livsmedels-och  
1602 643 näringsintag bland barn i Sverige. In.  
1603 644 Epstein, L. H., Paluch, R. A., Beecher, M. D., & Roemmich, J. N. (2008). Increasing healthy eating vs.  
1604 645 reducing high energy-dense foods to treat pediatric obesity. *Obesity (Silver Spring)*, 16, 318-  
1605 646 326.  
1606 647 Farrow, C., Blissett, J., & Haycraft, E. (2011). Does child weight influence how mothers report their  
1607 648 feeding practices? *Int J Pediatr Obes*, 6, 306-313.  
1608 649 Fisher, J. O., & Birch, L. L. (1999). Restricting access to palatable foods affects children's behavioral  
1609 650 response, food selection, and intake. *Am J Clin Nutr*, 69, 1264-1272.  
1610 651 Foster, B. A., Farragher, J., Parker, P., & Sosa, E. T. (2015). Treatment Interventions for Early  
1611 652 Childhood Obesity: A Systematic Review. *Acad Pediatr*, 15, 353-361.  
1612 653 Galloway, A. T., Fiorito, L., Lee, Y., & Birch, L. L. (2005). Parental pressure, dietary patterns, and  
1613 654 weight status among girls who are "picky eaters". *J Am Diet Assoc*, 105, 541-548.  
1614 655 Galloway, A. T., Fiorito, L. M., Francis, L. A., & Birch, L. L. (2006). 'Finish your soup': counterproductive  
1615 656 effects of pressuring children to eat on intake and affect. *Appetite*, 46, 318-323.  
1616 657 Golan, M., Kaufman, V., & Shahar, D. R. (2006). Childhood obesity treatment: targeting parents  
1617 658 exclusively v. parents and children. *Br J Nutr*, 95, 1008-1015.  
1618 659 Golley, R. K., Bell, L. K., Hendrie, G. A., Rangan, A. M., Spence, A., McNaughton, S. A., Carpenter, L.,  
1619 660 Allman-Farinelli, M., de Silva, A., Gill, T., Collins, C. E., Truby, H., Flood, V. M., & Burrows, T.  
1620 661 (2017). Validity of short food questionnaire items to measure intake in children and  
1621 662 adolescents: a systematic review. *J Hum Nutr Diet*, 30, 36-50.  
1622 663 Gordon, R. A. (2015). Measuring Constructs in Family Science: How Can Item Response Theory  
1623 664 Improve Precision and Validity? *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 77, 147-176.  
1624 665 Gubbels, J. S., Kremers, S. P., Stafleu, A., de Vries, S. I., Goldbohm, R. A., Dagnelie, P. C., de Vries, N.  
1625 666 K., van Buuren, S., & Thijs, C. (2011). Association between parenting practices and children's  
1626 667 dietary intake, activity behavior and development of body mass index: the KOALA Birth  
1627 668 Cohort Study. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act*, 8, 18.  
1628 669 Haszard, J. J., Skidmore, P. M., Williams, S. M., & Taylor, R. W. (2015). Associations between parental  
1629 670 feeding practices, problem food behaviours and dietary intake in New Zealand overweight  
1630 671 children aged 4-8 years. *Public Health Nutr*, 18, 1036-1043.  
1631 672 Hayes, J. F., Altman, M., Kolko, R. P., Balantekin, K. N., Holland, J. C., Stein, R. I., Saelens, B. E., Welch,  
1632 673 R. R., Perri, M. G., Schechtman, K. B., Epstein, L. H., & Wilfley, D. E. (2016). Decreasing food  
1633 674 fussiness in children with obesity leads to greater weight loss in family-based treatment.  
1634 675 *Obesity (Silver Spring)*, 24, 2158-2163.  
1635 676 Holland, J. C., Kolko, R. P., Stein, R. I., Welch, R. R., Perri, M. G., Schechtman, K. B., Saelens, B. E.,  
1636 677 Epstein, L. H., & Wilfley, D. E. (2014). Modifications in parent feeding practices and child diet  
1637 678 during family-based behavioral treatment improve child zBMI. *Obesity (Silver Spring)*, 22,  
1638 679 E119-126.  
1639 680 Hubbs-Tait, L., Kennedy, T. S., Page, M. C., Topham, G. L., & Harrist, A. W. (2008). Parental feeding  
1640 681 practices predict authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive parenting styles. *J Am Diet*  
1641 682 *Assoc*, 108, 1154-1161; discussion 1161-1152.  
1642 683 Jansen, E., Williams, K. E., Mallan, K. M., Nicholson, J. M., & Daniels, L. A. (2018). Bidirectional  
1643 684 associations between mothers' feeding practices and child eating behaviours. *Int J Behav*  
1644 685 *Nutr Phys Act*, 15, 3-3.  
1645 686 Jansen, P. W., de Barse, L. M., Jaddoe, V. W. V., Verhulst, F. C., Franco, O. H., & Tiemeier, H. (2017).  
1646 687 Bi-directional associations between child fussy eating and parents' pressure to eat: Who  
1647 688 influences whom? *Physiol Behav*, 176, 101-106.

1653  
1654  
1655 689 Khandpur, N., Blaine, R. E., Fisher, J. O., & Davison, K. K. (2014). Fathers' child feeding practices: a  
1656 690 review of the evidence. *Appetite*, 78, 110-121.  
1657 691 Kleber, M., Schaefer, A., Winkel, K., Hoffmann, D., Wunsch, R., Kersting, M., & Reinehr, T. (2009).  
1658 692 Lifestyle intervention "Obeldicks Mini" for obese children aged 4 to 7 years. *Klin Padiatr*, 221,  
1659 693 290-294.  
1660 694 Kuhl, E. S., Clifford, L. M., Bandstra, N. F., Filigno, S. S., Yeomans-Maldonado, G., Rausch, J. R., &  
1661 695 Stark, L. J. (2014). Examination of the association between lifestyle behavior changes and  
1662 696 weight outcomes in preschoolers receiving treatment for obesity. *Health Psychol*, 33, 95-98.  
1663 697 Loveman, E., Al-Khudairy, L., Johnson, R. E., Robertson, W., Colquitt, J. L., Mead, E. L., Ells, L. J.,  
1664 698 Metzendorf, M. I., & Rees, K. (2015). Parent-only interventions for childhood overweight or  
1665 699 obesity in children aged 5 to 11 years. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*, Cd012008.  
1666 700 Mazzeo, S. E., Kelly, N. R., Stern, M., Gow, R. W., Cotter, E. W., Thornton, L. M., Evans, R. K., & Bulik,  
1667 701 C. M. (2014). Parent skills training to enhance weight loss in overweight children: evaluation  
1668 702 of NOURISH. *Eat Behav*, 15, 225-229.  
1669 703 Morgan, P. J., Young, M. D., Lloyd, A. B., Wang, M. L., Eather, N., Miller, A., Murtagh, E. M., Barnes, A.  
1670 704 T., & Pagoto, S. L. (2017). Involvement of Fathers in Pediatric Obesity Treatment and  
1671 705 Prevention Trials: A Systematic Review. *Pediatrics*, 139.  
1672 706 Neuman, N., Eli, K., & Nowicka, P. (2019). Feeding the extended family: gender, generation, and  
1673 707 socioeconomic disadvantage in food provision to children. *Food, Culture & Society*, 22, 45-62.  
1674 708 Niermann, C. Y. N., Gerards, S., & Kremers, S. P. J. (2018). Conceptualizing Family Influences on  
1675 709 Children's Energy Balance-Related Behaviors: Levels of Interacting Family Environmental  
1676 710 Subsystems (The LIFES Framework). *Int J Environ Res Public Health*, 15.  
1677 711 Nowicka, P., Flodmark, C. E., Hales, D., & Faith, M. S. (2014). Assessment of parental overt and covert  
1678 712 control of child's food intake: a population-based validation study with mothers of  
1679 713 preschoolers. *Eat Behav*, 15, 673-678.  
1680 714 Nowicka, P., Sorjonen, K., Pietrobelli, A., Flodmark, C. E., & Faith, M. S. (2014). Parental feeding  
1681 715 practices and associations with child weight status. Swedish validation of the Child Feeding  
1682 716 Questionnaire finds parents of 4-year-olds less restrictive. *Appetite*, 81, 232-241.  
1683 717 Ogden, J., Reynolds, R., & Smith, A. (2006). Expanding the concept of parental control: a role for  
1684 718 overt and covert control in children's snacking behaviour? *Appetite*, 47, 100-106.  
1685 719 Okely, A. D., Collins, C. E., Morgan, P. J., Jones, R. A., Warren, J. M., Cliff, D. P., Burrows, T. L., Colyvas,  
1686 720 K., Steele, J. R., & Baur, L. A. (2010). Multi-Site Randomized Controlled Trial of a Child-  
1687 721 Centered Physical Activity Program, a Parent-Centered Dietary-Modification Program, or  
1688 722 Both in Overweight Children: The HIKCUPS Study. *J Pediatr*, 157, 388-394.e381.  
1689 723 Pfister, R., Schwarz, K., Carson, R., & Janczyk, M. (2013). Easy methods for extracting individual  
1690 724 regression slopes: Comparing SPSS, R, and Excel. *Tutorials in Quantitative Methods for*  
1691 725 *Psychology*, 9, 72-78.  
1692 726 Powell, F., Farrow, C., Meyer, C., & Haycraft, E. (2018). The Stability and Continuity of Maternally  
1693 727 Reported and Observed Child Eating Behaviours and Feeding Practices across Early  
1694 728 Childhood. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*, 15, 1017.  
1695 729 Pratt, M., Hoffmann, D., Taylor, M., & Musher-Eizenman, D. (2017). Structure, coercive control, and  
1696 730 autonomy promotion: A comparison of fathers' and mothers' food parenting strategies. *J*  
1697 731 *Health Psychol*, 1359105317707257.  
1698 732 Robson, S. M., Ziegler, M. L., McCullough, M. B., Stough, C. O., Zion, C., Simon, S. L., Ittenbach, R. F., &  
1699 733 Stark, L. J. (2019). Changes in diet quality and home food environment in preschool children  
1700 734 following weight management. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical*  
1701 735 *Activity*, 16, 16.  
1702 736 Rodenburg, G., Kremers, S. P., Oenema, A., & van de Mheen, D. (2012). Associations of children's  
1703 737 appetitive traits with weight and dietary behaviours in the context of general parenting. *PLoS*  
1704 738 *One*, 7, e50642.  
1705  
1706  
1707  
1708  
1709  
1710  
1711



1712  
1713  
1714 739 Rodenburg, G., Kremers, S. P., Oenema, A., & van de Mheen, D. (2014). Associations of parental  
1715 740 feeding styles with child snacking behaviour and weight in the context of general parenting.  
1716 741 *Public Health Nutr*, *17*, 960-969.  
1717 742 Rodgers, R. F., Paxton, S. J., Massey, R., Campbell, K. J., Wertheim, E. H., Skouteris, H., & Gibbons, K.  
1718 743 (2013). Maternal feeding practices predict weight gain and obesogenic eating behaviors in  
1719 744 young children: a prospective study. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act*, *10*, 24.  
1720 745 Rollins, B. Y., Loken, E., Savage, J. S., & Birch, L. L. (2014). Effects of restriction on children's intake  
1721 746 differ by child temperament, food reinforcement, and parent's chronic use of restriction.  
1722 747 *Appetite*, *73*, 31-39.  
1723 748 Rollins, B. Y., Loken, E., Savage, J. S., & Birch, L. L. (2014). Maternal controlling feeding practices and  
1724 749 girls' inhibitory control interact to predict changes in BMI and eating in the absence of  
1725 750 hunger from 5 to 7 y. *Am J Clin Nutr*, *99*, 249-257.  
1726 751 Rollins, B. Y., Savage, J. S., Fisher, J. O., & Birch, L. L. (2016). Alternatives to restrictive feeding  
1727 752 practices to promote self-regulation in childhood: a developmental perspective. *Pediatr*  
1728 753 *Obes*, *11*, 326-332.  
1730 754 Russell, C. G., Haszard, J. J., Taylor, R. W., Heath, A. M., Taylor, B., & Campbell, K. J. (2018). Parental  
1731 755 feeding practices associated with children's eating and weight: What are parents of toddlers  
1732 756 and preschool children doing? *Appetite*.  
1733 757 Russell, C. G., Taki, S., Laws, R., Azadi, L., Campbell, K. J., Elliott, R., Lynch, J., Ball, K., Taylor, R., &  
1734 758 Denney-Wilson, E. (2016). Effects of parent and child behaviours on overweight and obesity  
1735 759 in infants and young children from disadvantaged backgrounds: systematic review with  
1736 760 narrative synthesis. *BMC Public Health*, *16*, 151.  
1737 761 Sandvik, P., Ek, A., Eli, K., Somaraki, M., Bottai, M., & Nowicka, P. (2019). Picky eating in an obesity  
1738 762 intervention for preschool-aged children – what role does it play, and does the measurement  
1739 763 instrument matter? *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, *16*, 76.  
1740 764 Shloim, N., Edelson, L. R., Martin, N., & Hetherington, M. M. (2015). Parenting Styles, Feeding Styles,  
1741 765 Feeding Practices, and Weight Status in 4-12 Year-Old Children: A Systematic Review of the  
1742 766 Literature. *Front Psychol*, *6*, 1849.  
1743 767 Sleddens, E. F., Kremers, S. P., Stafleu, A., Dagnelie, P. C., De Vries, N. K., & Thijs, C. (2014). Food  
1744 768 parenting practices and child dietary behavior. Prospective relations and the moderating role  
1745 769 of general parenting. *Appetite*, *79*, 42-50.  
1746 770 SLL. (2016). Primary Child Health Care Report 2016. In. Mottala: Stockholm County Sweden.  
1747 771 Somaraki, M., Eli, K., Ek, A., Lindberg, L., Nyman, J., Marcus, C., Flodmark, C. E., Pietrobelli, A., Faith,  
1748 772 M. S., Sorjonen, K., & Nowicka, P. (2016). Controlling feeding practices and maternal migrant  
1749 773 background: an analysis of a multicultural sample. *Public Health Nutr*, 1-11.  
1750 774 Stark, L. J., Clifford, L. M., Towner, E. K., Filigno, S. S., Zion, C., Bolling, C., & Rausch, J. (2014). A pilot  
1751 775 randomized controlled trial of a behavioral family-based intervention with and without home  
1752 776 visits to decrease obesity in preschoolers. *J Pediatr Psychol*, *39*, 1001-1012.  
1753 777 Stark, L. J., Spear Filigno, S., Bolling, C., Ratcliff, M. B., Kichler, J. C., Robson, S. M., Simon, S. L.,  
1754 778 McCullough, M. B., Clifford, L. M., Odar Stough, C., Zion, C., & Ittenbach, R. F. (2018). Clinic  
1755 779 and Home-Based Behavioral Intervention for Obesity in Preschoolers: A Randomized Trial. *J*  
1756 780 *Pediatr*, *192*, 115-121.e111.  
1757 781 Steele, R. G., Jensen, C. D., Gayes, L. A., & Leibold, H. C. (2014). Medium is the message: moderate  
1758 782 parental control of feeding correlates with improved weight outcome in a pediatric obesity  
1759 783 intervention. *J Pediatr Psychol*, *39*, 708-717.  
1760 784 Tan, C. C., Domoff, S. E., Pesch, M. H., Lumeng, J. C., & Miller, A. L. (2019). Coparenting in the feeding  
1761 785 context: perspectives of fathers and mothers of preschoolers. *Eat Weight Disord*.  
1762 786 Vaughn, A. E., Ward, D. S., Fisher, J. O., Faith, M. S., Hughes, S. O., Kremers, S. P., Musher-Eizenman,  
1763 787 D. R., O'Connor, T. M., Patrick, H., & Power, T. G. (2016). Fundamental constructs in food  
1764 788 parenting practices: a content map to guide future research. *Nutr Rev*, *74*, 98-117.  
1765  
1766  
1767  
1768  
1769  
1770

1771

1772

1773 789 Wehrly, S. E., Bonilla, C., Perez, M., & Liew, J. (2014). Controlling parental feeding practices and child  
1774 790 body composition in ethnically and economically diverse preschool children. *Appetite*, 73,  
1775 791 163-171.

1776 792 Ventura, A. K., & Birch, L. L. (2008). Does parenting affect children's eating and weight status? *Int J*  
1777 793 *Behav Nutr Phys Act*, 5, 15.

1778 794 West, F., Sanders, M. R., Cleghorn, G. J., & Davies, P. S. (2010). Randomised clinical trial of a family-  
1779 795 based lifestyle intervention for childhood obesity involving parents as the exclusive agents of  
1780 796 change. *Behav Res Ther*, 48, 1170-1179.

1781

1782 797

1783

1784

1785

1786

1787

1788

1789

1790

1791

1792

1793

1794

1795

1796

1797

1798

1799

1800

1801

1802

1803

1804

1805

1806

1807

1808

1809

1810

1811

1812

1813

1814

1815

1816

1817

1818

1819

1820

1821

1822

1823

1824



1825

1826

1827

1828

1829



## **Ethical statement**

The More and Less study (ML study) described in the attached manuscript was approved by the ethics committee in Stockholm, Sweden on November 16th 2011 (dnr: 2011/1329-31/4).

All participating caregivers provided written informed consent on behalf of their children.