

LONDON  
SCHOOL of  
HYGIENE  
& TROPICAL  
MEDICINE



Mackenbach, JD; Lakerveld, J; van Oostveen, Y; Compernelle, S; De Bourdeaudhuij, I; Brdos, H; Rutter, H; Glonti, K; Oppert, JM; Charreire, H; Brug, J; Nijpels, G (2016) The mediating role of social capital in the association between neighbourhood income inequality and body mass index. *European journal of public health*. ISSN 1101-1262 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/eurpub/ckw157>

Downloaded from: <http://researchonline.lshtm.ac.uk/2965013/>

DOI: [10.1093/eurpub/ckw157](https://doi.org/10.1093/eurpub/ckw157)

#### Usage Guidelines

Please refer to usage guidelines at <http://researchonline.lshtm.ac.uk/policies.html> or alternatively contact [researchonline@lshtm.ac.uk](mailto:researchonline@lshtm.ac.uk).

Available under license: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/2.5/>

1 **The mediating role of social capital in the association between neighbourhood income inequality**  
2 **and body mass index**

3 Joreintje D Mackenbach<sup>a\*</sup>, Jeroen Lakerveld<sup>a</sup>, Yavanna van Oostveen<sup>a</sup>, Sofie Compernelle<sup>b</sup>, Ilse De  
4 Bourdeaudhuij<sup>b</sup>, Helga Bárdos<sup>c</sup>, Harry Rutter<sup>d</sup>, Ketevan Glonti<sup>d</sup>, Jean-Michel Oppert<sup>e,f</sup>, Helene  
5 Charreire<sup>e,g</sup>, Johannes Brug<sup>a</sup>, Giel Nijpels<sup>h</sup>

6

7 <sup>a</sup> Department of Epidemiology & Biostatistics, EMGO Institute for Health and Care Research, VU  
8 University Medical Center, Amsterdam, the Netherlands. Address: De Boelelaan 1089a, 1081 HV  
9 Amsterdam, the Netherlands.

10 <sup>b</sup> Department of Movement and Sport Sciences, Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium. Address:  
11 Watersportlaan 2  
12 9000 Gent, Belgium.

13 <sup>c</sup> Department of Preventive Medicine, Faculty of Public Health, University of Debrecen, Hungary.  
14 Address: Kassai út 26/b, 4028 Debrecen, Hungary.

15 <sup>d</sup> ECOHOST – The Centre for Health and Social Change, London School of Hygiene and Tropical  
16 Medicine, London, UK. Address: 15-17 Tavistock Place, London WC1H 9SH, United Kingdom.

17 <sup>e</sup> Equipe de Recherche en Epidémiologie Nutritionnelle (EREN), Centre de Recherche en  
18 Epidémiologie et Statistiques, Inserm (U1153), Inra (U1125), Cnam, COMUE Sorbonne Paris Cité,  
19 Université Paris 13, Bobigny, France. Address : 74 Rue Marcel Cachin 93017 Bobigny, France.

20 <sup>f</sup> Sorbonne Universités, Université Pierre et Marie Curie, Université Paris 06; Institute of  
21 Cardiometabolism and Nutrition, Department of Nutrition, Pitié-Salpêtrière Hospital, Assistance  
22 Publique-Hôpitaux de Paris, Paris, France. Address : 47-83 Boulevard de l'hôpital, 75013 Paris,  
23 France.

24 <sup>g</sup> Paris Est University, Lab-Urba, UPEC, Urban School of Paris, Créteil, France. Address: 61 Avenue du  
25 Général de Gaulle,  
26 94010 Créteil Cedex, France.

27 <sup>h</sup> Department of General Practice and Elderly Care, EMGO Institute for Health and Care Research, VU  
28 University Medical Center, Amsterdam, the Netherlands. Address: Van der Boechorststraat 7, 1081  
29 BT Amsterdam, the Netherlands.

30

31 \* Corresponding author: Address: De Boelelaan 1089a, 1081 HV Amsterdam, Netherlands. E-mail  
32 address: [j.mackenbach@vumc.nl](mailto:j.mackenbach@vumc.nl). Phone number: 0031 20 4448198.

33

34 **Abstract (236 words)**

35 **Background** Neighbourhood income inequality may contribute to differences in body weight. We  
36 explored whether neighbourhood social capital mediated the association of neighbourhood income  
37 inequality with individual body mass index (BMI).

38 **Methods** A total of 4,126 adult participants from 48 neighbourhoods in France, Hungary,  
39 Netherlands and the UK provided information on their levels of income, perceptions of  
40 neighbourhood social capital and BMI. Factor analysis of the 13-item social capital scale revealed two  
41 social capital constructs: social networks and social cohesion. Neighbourhood income inequality was  
42 defined as the ratio of the amount of income earned by the top 20% and the bottom 20% in a given  
43 neighbourhood. Two single mediation analyses –using multilevel linear regression analyses– with  
44 neighbourhood social networks and neighbourhood social cohesion as possible mediators- were  
45 conducted using MacKinnon’s product-of-coefficients method, adjusted for age, gender, education  
46 and absolute household income.

47 **Results** Higher neighbourhood income inequality was associated with elevated levels of BMI and  
48 lower levels of neighbourhood social networks and neighbourhood social cohesion. High levels of  
49 neighbourhood social networks were associated with lower BMI. Results stratified by country  
50 demonstrated that social networks fully explained the association between income inequality and  
51 BMI in France and the Netherlands. Social cohesion was only a significant mediating variable for  
52 Dutch participants.

53 **Conclusion** The results suggest that in some European urban regions, neighbourhood social capital  
54 plays a large role in the association between neighbourhood income inequality and individual BMI.

55

56 **Keywords:** body mass index; Europe; income inequality; social capital; neighbourhood

57 **Introduction (588 words)**

58 Obesity is a major global public health problem.(1–3) Overweight and obesity are unequally  
59 distributed across and within societies.(4–6) Low socio-economic status (SES), as indicated by low  
60 income, educational level and/or occupational status, is recognized as a risk factor for increased body  
61 weight.(5) It has been suggested that income *inequality* rather than low SES per se contributes to this  
62 phenomenon, but it remains unclear why this could be the case.(7, 8)

63 Income inequality is generally defined as the income gap between those with the highest  
64 income and those with the lowest income within a given geographical unit (e.g. country or  
65 neighbourhood). A number of studies have shown higher average body weight as well as prevalence  
66 of overweight/obesity in countries with high income inequality.(7–9)

67 In studies from Europe, more consistent evidence is available for associations of income  
68 inequality with body weight than with other health outcomes.(9–11) It has been suggested that  
69 country-(9) or state-level(12) income inequality influences population health via political  
70 mechanisms, for example through associations with patterns of state spending on education and  
71 welfare.(13) Among more egalitarian countries, such as those in Europe, income inequality at  
72 neighbourhood level may be more important than inequalities at national level.(14) Lower levels of  
73 health in more unequal neighbourhoods may be related to lower levels of community social  
74 capital.(7) Neighbourhoods have emerged as a potentially relevant unit because they provide social  
75 and physical resources that are likely to contribute to better health, and because place of residence is  
76 often patterned by socioeconomic status.(15)

77 Neighbourhood social capital can be conceptualised as a collective characteristic through  
78 which individuals living in a particular area share behaviour patterns and social norms.(16) Although  
79 the study findings are mixed,(17) there is increasing evidence that higher levels of social capital are  
80 associated with lower levels of overweight and obesity.(18) Income inequality could affect health via  
81 perceptions of place in the social hierarchy.(19) In accordance with neighbourhood disadvantage

82 theories,(20, 21) a perceived low position in the social hierarchy leads to social disconnection (lack of  
83 social capital) and social distress(22) which has been associated with risk factors for overweight and  
84 obesity such as over-eating(23) and preferences for energy-dense foods(24).

85           If neighbourhood social capital mediates the association between neighbourhood income  
86 inequality and BMI, higher levels of neighbourhood social capital may help to reduce the negative  
87 effects of income inequality on BMI. Mediation analysis is one approach that can be used to study  
88 such underlying mechanisms. One study has examined if collective efficacy (a measure of social  
89 capital) mediated the association between neighbourhood income inequality and obesity in the US,  
90 but no such evidence was found.(25)

91           A review on associations between country-level income inequality and health outcomes  
92 outlined methodological requirements for future research.(8) First, analyses should be adjusted for  
93 individual income, to ensure that observed associations are due to true income differences and not  
94 to the diminishing marginal gains of income at the individual level.(26) That is, each additional unit of  
95 income is associated with improvements in a person's health, but by ever smaller amounts. Second,  
96 analyses should be adjusted for educational attainment to take into account residual confounding.  
97 Third, studies should focus on the examination of pathways linking income inequality to health;  
98 fourth, appropriate geographical scales should be used for analyses.(8)

99           In a previous study (27), we showed that neighbourhood social capital was associated with  
100 weight status.(18) In the present study we studied the association between neighbourhood income  
101 inequality and BMI of adults from neighbourhoods in urban regions in Europe, and assessed the  
102 mediating role of neighbourhood social capital.

103

104

105 **Methods (857 words)**

106 ***Study design and population***

107 This study was part of the SPOTLIGHT project, conducted in five urban regions in Belgium, France,  
108 Hungary, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom. Neighbourhoods were defined according to small  
109 scale local administrative boundaries as used in each country except for Hungary, where we used 1  
110 square km areas to represent neighbourhoods. Sampling of neighbourhoods, detailed characteristics  
111 of the neighbourhoods and recruitment of participants has been described in detail elsewhere.(27)  
112 Neighbourhood sampling was based on a combination of residential density and SES data at  
113 neighbourhood level. This resulted in four types of neighbourhoods: low SES/ low residential density,  
114 low SES/ high residential density, high SES/ low residential density and high SES/ high residential  
115 density. In each country, three neighbourhoods of each type were randomly sampled (i.e.12  
116 neighbourhoods per country, 60 neighbourhoods in total). Subsequently, a random sample of adults  
117 was invited to participate in an online survey that contained questions on demographics,  
118 neighbourhood perceptions, social environment, health, motivations and barriers for healthy  
119 behaviours, obesity-related behaviours and weight and height. A total of 6,037 (10.8%) individuals  
120 participated between February and September 2014. The study was approved by the local ethics  
121 committees of participating countries and all participants provided informed consent.

122

123 ***Measures***

124 ***Dependent variables***

125 BMI, calculated from self-reported weight and height was normally distributed and treated as a  
126 continuous variable. In a sensitivity analysis, we present results with weight status (BMI  $\geq$  25 kg/m<sup>2</sup>)  
127 as outcome variable.

128 ***Independent variables***

129 Participants from France, Hungary, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom provided information  
130 on their annual or monthly net household income, according to five categories that represented  
131 national quintiles of net household income. Participants from Belgium did not provide information on  
132 household income due to country-specific ethical considerations and were excluded.

133 To calculate the neighbourhood income inequality ratio the sum of the total earnings of the richest  
134 20% of included households was divided by the sum of the total earnings of the poorest 20% of  
135 included households resulting in a 20:20 ratio.(28)

136

### 137 *Potential mediating variables*

138 Aspects of perceived neighbourhood social capital were measured as described by Beenackers et  
139 al.(29) using a reliable 13-item scale (Cronbach's alpha = 0.86). Responses ranged from 1 (totally  
140 disagree) to 5 (totally agree). Factor analysis was performed and identified two reliable constructs,  
141 namely 'social network' (Cronbach's alpha =0.83) and 'social cohesion' (Cronbach's alpha =0.79).(18)  
142 Supplementary Table 1 describes the item description and rotated factor loadings for the 13 items.  
143 The mean of all individual social capital scores were calculated to generates scores for  
144 'neighbourhood social cohesion' and a 'neighbourhood social network'.

### 145 *Covariates*

146 Covariates included were country of residence, age, gender, education level (higher [i.e. college or  
147 university] and lower), household composition (number of children and adults) and absolute monthly  
148 net household income.

149

### 150 *Statistical analysis*

151 We excluded individuals who could not be allocated to a sampled neighbourhood (n=137), and  
152 respondents from Belgium, who did not provide information on household income (n=1,774), leaving  
153 a sample of 4,126 participants available for analyses.

154 Item-nonresponse ranged from 1% (age) to 19% (household income). Missing values for all variables  
155 were imputed using Predictive Mean Matching in SPSS version 22.0. All variables described under  
156 'measures' were used as predictors in the imputation model to create 20 imputed datasets, and  
157 'neighbourhood type' and 'urban region' were used as auxiliary variables. A sensitivity analysis was  
158 carried out using a non-imputed dataset.

159 To explore the hypothesised mediating roles of the neighbourhood social networks score and the  
160 neighbourhood social cohesion score, two single mediation analyses were performed using  
161 MacKinnon's product-of-coefficients method(30). A series of linear regression analyses were  
162 conducted using a four-step process (Figure 1).

163 -- Figure 1 about here --

164 First, we performed multivariable multilevel linear regression analyses to explore the association  
165 between neighbourhood income inequality and BMI (path c), taking into account clustering at the  
166 neighbourhood level. All covariates were tested as potential effect modifiers, but only country of  
167 residence turned out to be a significant effect modifier in the a- and b-paths ( $p < 0.05$ ). Covariates that  
168 were not effect modifiers were included in the model as confounding variables. Model 1 represents  
169 unadjusted analyses and model 2 represents analyses adjusted for age, gender and education. As  
170 suggested by Wagstaff and van Doorslaer (2000), we also present a third model in which we adjusted  
171 for household composition and household income. This allows for the conclusion that income  
172 inequality is associated with BMI regardless of absolute levels of income.(26)

173 Second, we explored the association between neighbourhood income inequality and neighbourhood  
174 social networks (path  $a_1$ ) and neighbourhood social cohesion (path  $a_2$ ) using linear regression  
175 analyses. Third, the association between neighbourhood social networks (path  $b_1$ ) and



176 neighbourhood social cohesion (path  $b_2$ ) and BMI were analysed, adjusted for the independent  
177 variable neighbourhood income inequality. The regression coefficients of these multilevel analyses  
178 were multiplied to compute the mediating effects (i.e.  $a_1b_1$  and  $a_2b_2$ ) and the statistical significance  
179 (Sobel test; z-score). Finally, the proportion of the association between neighbourhood income  
180 inequality and BMI that was mediated by neighbourhood social networks and neighbourhood social  
181 cohesion (path  $c'$ ) was calculated by dividing  $ab$  by  $c$ . The statistical analyses were performed using  
182 SPSS version 22.0. A p-value  $<0.05$  was considered to be statistically significant.

183 **Results (541 words)**

184 Mean BMI was highest in Hungary, while the highest income inequality ratio was observed in the UK.

185 Neighbourhood level scores of social networks and social cohesion were highest in the Netherlands

186 (Table 1).

187 ---- Table 1 about here ---

188 The association between neighbourhood income inequality and BMI is shown in Table 2. In the

189 empty model, variances of BMI at the individual and neighbourhood level were 19.58 and 0.99,

190 respectively. After adjustment for age, gender and education (model 2), a 1-point increase in the

191 neighbourhood income inequality ratio was associated with a 0.37 kg/m<sup>2</sup> higher body mass index

192 (95%CI=0.03; 0.70). Further adjustment for absolute household income slightly attenuated the

193 association. In the fully adjusted model, BMI variances at the individual and neighbourhood level

194 were 17.81 and 0.74, respectively. Table S2 displays the results when analyses were additionally

195 adjusted for country of residence, which slightly strengthened the associations.

196 ---- Table 2 about here ---

197 The results of the two single mediation models are presented in Table 3 (coefficients for covariates

198 are presented in Table S2). Country of residence was an effect modifier in the a- and b-paths, so

199 results are presented for the total sample and stratified by country. In the total sample,

200 neighbourhood income inequality was statistically significantly associated with the neighbourhood

201 social networks score (path  $a_1$ ) and the neighbourhood social cohesion score (path  $a_2$ ). A 1-point

202 increase in neighbourhood income inequality was associated with a 0.56 point lower neighbourhood

203 social networks score, and a 0.79 point lower neighbourhood social cohesion score. A 1-point higher

204 neighbourhood social networks score was associated with a 0.35kg/m<sup>2</sup> lower BMI (path  $b_1$ ). In the

205 total sample, neighbourhood social cohesion was not significantly associated with BMI (path  $b_2$ ).

206 Stratified results show that income inequality was associated with lower levels of social networks and

207 social cohesion in all four countries, but these associations were strongest in France and the

208 Netherlands (a-path). In France and the Netherlands, a negative association of social networks with  
209 BMI was observed, while a positive association was observed in the UK. Only in the Netherlands, the  
210 neighbourhood social cohesion score was significantly associated with a lower BMI.

211 In the total sample, the Sobel test showed that the association between neighbourhood income  
212 inequality and BMI was significantly ( $p=0.006$ ) mediated by neighbourhood social networks, but not  
213 by neighbourhood social cohesion ( $p=0.24$ ). The proportion of the association between  
214 neighbourhood income inequality and BMI that was mediated by neighbourhood social networks  
215 was 46%. For participants from France ( $p=0.04$ ) and the Netherlands ( $p=0.03$ ), the association  
216 between neighbourhood income inequality and BMI was fully mediated by neighbourhood social  
217 networks, while this was not the case for participants from Hungary and the UK. Neighbourhood  
218 social cohesion was only a significant mediator in the association between income inequality and BMI  
219 in the Netherlands ( $p=0.04$ ).

220 ---- Table 3 about here ----

221 Tables S3 and S4 show the un-stratified results using non-imputed data. Results were comparable,  
222 with a significant (Z-score = 2.73,  $p=0.006$ ) mediating effect of social network, and a non-significant  
223 (Z-score=1.05,  $p=0.29$ ) mediating effect of social cohesion. Table S3 and S5 show the results using  
224 overweight as dependent variable; a 1-point increase in the neighbourhood income inequality ratio  
225 was associated with a 1.24 times higher odds of being overweight/obese (95%CI: 1.07. 1.43).

226

227 **Discussion (1008 words)**

228 Using data from a cross-European survey, we found a mediating role of neighbourhood social capital  
229 in the association between neighbourhood income inequality and individual BMI. This suggests that  
230 income inequality affects the provision of neighbourhood social resources that are relevant for a  
231 healthy body weight.(15)

232 To our knowledge, this is the first study to provide evidence for an association between  
233 neighbourhood income inequality and body weight in Europe. This association was modest in size,  
234 with a one point increase in the neighbourhood income inequality ratio (which differed by three  
235 points between the least and most unequal neighbourhoods in this sample) associated with 1.24  
236 times higher odds of being overweight/obese. However, the consequences of, and ways of  
237 responding to, income inequality may become increasingly important given the rising levels of  
238 income inequality in Europe associated with ageing populations, smaller family structures (single-  
239 parent families/fewer children in the household), globalised markets, and governmental policies.(31–  
240 33)

241 Higher neighbourhood income inequality was consistently associated with lower levels of  
242 neighbourhood social networks and social cohesion. This supports the idea that a certain degree of  
243 homogeneity within neighbourhoods is required for neighbourhoods to serve as resources for social  
244 connections.(34) These associations were modest overall, but strongest in participants from France.  
245 In concordance with findings from previous studies(18, 21, 35), a higher neighbourhood social  
246 networks score was associated with lower BMI in French and Dutch participants. The higher social  
247 networks and social cohesion scores in the Dutch neighbourhoods are in concordance with previous  
248 reports describing relatively high levels of membership belonging, sense of trust and doing voluntary  
249 work in the Netherlands compared to other European countries such as Hungary.(36, 37) In French  
250 participants, mean BMI was about 2.2 kg/m<sup>2</sup> lower in neighbourhoods with the highest compared to  
251 the lowest social network scores. In contrast, mean BMI of UK participants was about 1.5 kg/m<sup>2</sup>  
252 higher in neighbourhoods with the highest compared to the lowest social network scores. This may

253 suggest that there are socio-cultural differences in the role of social networks for behaviours that  
254 influence weight status.

255 A number of studies have found social capital to be a mediator in the association between income  
256 inequality and mortality or self-rated health (i.e.(20)), but the only study to date (conducted in the  
257 US) that examined potential mediation of social capital in the association between income inequality  
258 and BMI did not find evidence for such mediation.(38) Following the observed country differences, it  
259 may be speculated that in countries like France and the Netherlands social connections generally  
260 stimulate healthier behaviours. Alternatively, it may be that social networks are mostly stronger  
261 among healthier individuals in the Netherlands and France, while social networks are stronger among  
262 unhealthier individuals in the UK.

263 While reforming tax and benefit policies are considered to be the most direct and powerful  
264 instrument for increasing redistributive effects at the national level,(32) it remains unknown how to  
265 decrease neighbourhood income inequality without promoting segregation by socio-economic  
266 status. The findings from this study also suggest that the potential adverse effects of neighbourhood  
267 income inequality may be at least partially addressed via the enhancement of social interactions. On  
268 a regional level this could include (re)designing neighbourhoods to promote *active* social  
269 interactions, e.g. via the social use of neighbourhood public spaces, community centres or outdoor  
270 recreational facilities and more walkable streets. On a national level, policies to prevent  
271 discrimination and social exclusion and the promotion of civic participation may contribute to  
272 stronger social networks.

273

#### 274 **Strengths and limitations**

275 Several studies have shown that self-reported height and weight data are valid for identifying  
276 relationships in epidemiological studies, but these data may be prone to a degree of reporting bias,  
277 such as higher levels of underestimation among heavier men and women.(39, 40) Lack of continuous  
278 data on household income prevented us from calculating the Gini coefficient, the most used method

279 for measuring household income inequality. Instead, 20:20 ratios were calculated but this does not  
280 provide an absolute measure of income inequality, and it does not include the middle part of the  
281 income distribution.(41) On the other hand, the 20:20 ratio is a useful method to measure  
282 neighbourhood income inequality since it quantifies the range between the richest and the poorest  
283 in an area. It should be noted though, that this measure only measured income inequality among the  
284 survey participants, and thus may not be accurately representative of the actual neighbourhood  
285 income inequality. Additionally, the neighbourhood income inequality ratios, ranging from 1.7-4.9,  
286 were quite small compared to national income inequality statistics, which may imply that the  
287 consequences of neighbourhood income inequality in areas with higher neighbourhood income  
288 inequalities will be larger in terms of BMI and weight status differences. Further, the cross-sectional  
289 data limit the interpretation of mediation effects. The results give an indication of relations between  
290 the studied variables, but we were not able to determine the direction of the pathways. Lastly, the  
291 response rate in the SPOTLIGHT survey, at about 10%, may have resulted in a selection bias with  
292 potentially more highly motivated people participating in the survey, so there is a need for caution  
293 when generalising these findings.

294

295 This study also benefits from a number of strengths. First, we were able to include a relatively large  
296 sample of adults from high and low SES neighbourhood in four European countries. This provided  
297 power to conduct multilevel mediation analysis, which resulted in comparable relationships across  
298 several countries with different political and social systems. Second, the multilevel approach allowed  
299 us to differentiate the possible sources of variability (individual and neighbourhood) and it enabled  
300 us to control for clustering effects. Third, we were able to adjust our analysis for a number of  
301 relevant covariates such as individual income and educational level, which decreases the likelihood  
302 of the observed associations being confounded.

303

304 **Conclusions**

305 The results from this study suggest that social capital plays a large role in the association between  
306 neighbourhood income inequality and individual BMI, especially in France and the Netherlands.  
307 Further investigation of the activities done within social networks will help identify potential  
308 intervention tools to attenuate the adverse effects of income inequality on BMI in European adults.

309 **Acknowledgements:** This work was supported by the Seventh Framework Programme (CORDIS FP7)  
310 of the European Commission, HEALTH (FP7-HEALTH-2011-two-stage) [278186]. The content of this  
311 article reflects only the authors' views and the European Commission is not liable for any use that  
312 may be made of the information contained therein. We would like to thank the participants to the  
313 SPOTLIGHT survey for their responses, and our VU Medical Centre colleagues from the bi-weekly  
314 DIABOLO meeting for their thoughts on this topic.

315

316 **Conflicts of interest:** none declared.

317

318 **Key-points:**

- 319 • Income inequality is consistently associated with lower levels of social networks and social  
320 cohesion across urban European regions
- 321 • In France and the Netherlands, neighbourhood social networks fully explained the  
322 association between neighbourhood income inequality and body mass index
- 323 • Actions to reduce socio-economic inequalities in health may benefit from approaches that  
324 stimulate healthy behaviours in social networks

325

326



327 **References**

- 328 1. Finucane MM, Stevens G a, Cowan MJ, *et al.* National, regional, and global trends in body-  
329 mass index since 1980: systematic analysis of health examination surveys and epidemiological  
330 studies with 960 country-years and 9·1 million participants. *Lancet* 2011;377:557–67.
- 331 2. Guh DP, Zhang W, Bansback N, Amarsi Z, Birmingham CL, Anis AH. The incidence of co-  
332 morbidities related to obesity and overweight: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC*  
333 *Public Health* 2009;9:88.
- 334 3. Must A, Spadano J, Coakley EH, Field AE, Colditz G, Dietz WH. The disease burden associated  
335 with overweight and obesity. *Jama* 1999;282:1523–29.
- 336 4. Sobal J, Stunkard AJ. Socioeconomic status and obesity: a review of the literature. *Psychol Bull*  
337 1989;105:260–75.
- 338 5. Stunkard AJ. Socioeconomic status and obesity. *Ciba Found Symp* 1996;201:174–193.
- 339 6. Roskam AJR, Kunst AE, van Oyen H, *et al.* Comparative appraisal of educational inequalities in  
340 overweight and obesity among adults in 19 European countries. *Int J Epidemiol* 2010;39:392–  
341 404.
- 342 7. Wilkinson RG. *The impact of inequality-how to make sick societies healthier*. New York:  
343 Penguin New York; 2005.
- 344 8. Subramanian SV, Kawachi I. Income Inequality and Health: What Have We Learned So Far?  
345 *Epidemiol Rev* 2004;26:78–91.
- 346 9. Pickett KE, Kelly S, Brunner E, Lobstein T, Wilkinson RG. Wider income gaps, wider  
347 waistbands? An ecological study of obesity and income inequality. *J Epidemiol Community*  
348 *Health* 2005;59:670–674.
- 349 10. Hu Y, van Lenthe FJ, Mackenbach JP. Income inequality, life expectancy and cause-specific

- 350 mortality in 43 European countries, 1987-2008: a fixed effects study. *Eur J Epidemiol*  
351 2015;30:615–625.
- 352 11. Nikolaou A, Nikolaou D. Income-related inequality in the distribution of obesity among  
353 Europeans. *J Public Heal* 2008;16:403–411.
- 354 12. Diez-Roux a V, Link BG, Northridge ME. A multilevel analysis of income inequality and  
355 cardiovascular disease risk factors. *Soc Sci Med* 2000;50:673–87.
- 356 13. Kawachi I, Kennedy BP. *The health of nations*. New York, NY: The New Press; 2003.
- 357 14. Islam MK, Merlo J, Kawachi I, Lindström M, Gerdtham U-G. Social capital and health: does  
358 egalitarianism matter? A literature review. *Int J Equity Health* 2006;5:3.
- 359 15. Diez-Roux AV. Neighborhoods and health: where are we and where do we go from here? *Rev*  
360 *Epidemiol Sante Publique* 2007;55:13–21.
- 361 16. Kawachi I, Kim D, Coutts A, Subramanian S V. Commentary: Reconciling the three accounts of  
362 social capital. *Int J Epidemiol* 2004;33:682–90; discussion 700–4.
- 363 17. Glonti K, Mackenbach JD, Ng J, *et al*. Psychosocial environment: definitions, measures and  
364 associations with weight status - a systematic review. *Obes Rev* 2016;17:81–95.
- 365 18. Mackenbach JD, Lakerveld J, van Lenthe FJ, *et al*. Neighbourhood social capital: measurement  
366 issues and associations with health outcomes. *Obes Rev* 2016;17:96–107.
- 367 19. Pearce N, Davey Smith G. Is social capital key to inequalities in health? *Am J Public Heal*  
368 2003;93:122–129.
- 369 20. Kawachi I, Kennedy BP, Lochner K, Prothrow-Stith D. Social capital, income inequality, and  
370 mortality. *Am J Public Health* 1997;87:1491–1498.
- 371 21. Wilkinson RG, Marmot MG. *Social determinants of health: the solid facts*. Copenhagen: World  
372 Health Organization; 2003.

- 373 22. Wilkinson RG. *Unhealthy Societies: The Afflictions of Inequality*. London: Routledge; 1996.
- 374 23. Greeno CG, Wing RR. Stress-induced eating. *Psychol Bull* 1994;115:444–64.
- 375 24. Oliver G, Wardle J, Gibson EL. Stress and food choice: a laboratory study. *Psychosom Med*  
376 2000;62:853–65.
- 377 25. Bjornstrom EE. An examination of the relationship between neighborhood income inequality,  
378 social resources, and obesity in Los Angeles county. *Am J Heal Promot* 2011;26:109–115.
- 379 26. Wagstaff a, van Doorslaer E. Income inequality and health: what does the literature tell us?  
380 *Annu Rev Public Health* 2000;21:543–67.
- 381 27. Lakerveld J, Ben-Rebah M, Mackenbach JD, *et al*. Obesity-related behaviours and BMI in five  
382 urban regions across Europe: sampling design and results from the SPOTLIGHT cross-sectional  
383 survey. *BMJ Open* 2015;5:e008505.
- 384 28. Charles-Coll JA. Understanding Income Inequality: Concept, Causes and Measurement. *Int J*  
385 *Econ Manag Scii* 2011;1:17–28.
- 386 29. Beenackers MA, Kamphuis CBM, Mackenbach JP, Burdorf A, van Lenthe FJ. Why some walk  
387 and others don't: exploring interactions of perceived safety and social neighborhood factors  
388 with psychosocial cognitions. *Health Educ Res* 2013;28:220–33.
- 389 30. Mackinnon DP, Fairchild AJ, Fritz MS. Mediation Analysis. *Annu Rev Psychol* 2010;58.
- 390 31. RAND Europe. *Demography and inequality. How Europe's changing population will impact on*  
391 *income inequality*. 2013.
- 392 32. OECD. *An Overview of Growing Income Inequalities in OECD Countries: Main Findings*. 2011.
- 393 33. Jaumotte F, Lall S, Papageorgiou C. *Rising Income Inequality: Technology, or Trade and*  
394 *Financial Globalization?* Washington, DC; 2013.
- 395 34. Alesina A, La Ferrara E. Who trusts others? *J Public Econ* 2002;85:207–234.

- 396 35. Lynch J, Smith GD, Harper S, *et al.* Is income inequality a determinant of population health?  
397 Part 1. A systematic review. *Milbank Q* 2004;82:5–99.
- 398 36. Adam F. Mapping social capital across Europe: findings, trends and methodological  
399 shortcomings of cross-national surveys. *Soc Sci Inf* 2008;47:159–186.
- 400 37. European Observatory on the Social Situation. *Social Cohesion , Trust and Participation: Social*  
401 *Capital , Social Policy and Social Cohesion in the European Union and Candidate Countries.*  
402 2007.
- 403 38. Kim D, Subramanian S V, Gortmaker SL, Kawachi I. US state- and county-level social capital in  
404 relation to obesity and physical inactivity: A multilevel, multivariable analysis. *Soc Sci Med*  
405 2006;63:1045–1059.
- 406 39. Yoong SL, Carey ML, D’Este C, Sanson-Fisher RW. Agreement between self-reported and  
407 measured weight and height collected in general practice patients: a prospective study. *BMC*  
408 *Med Res Methodol* 2013;13:38.
- 409 40. Dekkers JC, van Wier MF, Hendriksen IJ, Twisk JW, van Mechelen W. Accuracy of self-reported  
410 body weight, height and waist circumference in a Dutch overweight working population. *BMC*  
411 *Med Res Methodol* 2008;8:69.
- 412 41. De Maio FG. Income inequality measures. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2007;61:849–852.  
413

## 414 TABLES

415 **Table 1.** Characteristics of the study population

<b>Variable</b>	<b>N total sample<sup>‡</sup></b>	<b>Characteristics total sample</b>	<b>France (N=835)</b>	<b>Hungary (N=875)</b>	<b>Netherlands (N=1609)</b>	<b>UK (N=824)</b>
Age (mean (SD))	4107	51.4 (16.3)	46.7 (15.8)	48.5 (15.4)	54.9 (15.9)	49.4 (17.4)
Gender (% male)	4116	42.6%	41.5%	36.9%	46.0%	43.2%
BMI (mean (SD))	3616	25.1 (4.5)	24.5 (4.4)	26.0 (5.12)	25.0 (3.9)	25.1 (4.8)
% overweight	1610	44.5%	37.9%	52.8%	42.7%	45.6%
Income	3371					
<i>First quintile (%)</i>	297	8.8%	7.6%	7.4%	8.4%	11.9%
<i>Second quintile (%)</i>	589	17.5%	20.9%	10.6%	21.6%	12.7%
<i>Third quintile (%)</i>	625	18.5%	21.5%	13.8%	21.8%	13.9%
<i>Fourth quintile (%)</i>	727	21.6%	20.6%	20.4%	25.3%	16.4%
<i>Fifth quintile (%)</i>	1133	33.6%	29.3%	47.7%	22.9%	45.1%
Neighbourhood income inequality ratio (median, range)	4126	3.0 (1.5-4.9)	2.8 (1.7-3.4)	2.9 (1.5-3.6)	3.0 (1.9-4.8)	3.7 (1.9-4.9)
Educational level (% higher)	3746	43.1%	64.7%	49.6%	56.4%	58.1%
Household composition (median, range)	3732	2 (1-10)	2.0 (1.0-8.0)	2.0 (1.0-8.0)	2.0 (1.0-8.0)	2.0 (1.0-10.0)
Social networks sum score (median, range)	3818	10.3 (4-20)	10.6 (8.7-11.7)	9.3 (7.9-10.8)	11.4 (8.9-12.6)	10.1 (8.3-11.0)
Social cohesion sum score (median, range)	3799	17.3 (5-25)	16.7 (14.8-18.4)	17.4 (14.9-18.0)	18.8 (14.8-19.6)	16.5 (14.8-18.8)

416 †The Randstad comprises a conurbation including Amsterdam, Rotterdam, the Hague and Utrecht

417 ‡ N varies due to missing data

418

419 **Table 2.** Multilevel linear regression coefficients of the association between neighbourhood income inequality and individual body mass index (N=4126).

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
	B (95%CI)	B (95%CI)	B (95%CI)
Neighbourhood income inequality <sup>†</sup>	0.33 (-0.05; 0.71)	0.37 (0.03; 0.70)*	0.35 (0.01; 0.69)*

420 <sup>†</sup> This ratio reflects the neighbourhood income inequality between the poorest and the richest quintiles

421 Model 1 crude model.

422 Model 2 adjusted for age, gender, education.

423 Model 3 adjusted for age, gender, education, household composition and income.

424 \*P value <0.05

425 B = coefficient, 95%CI = 95% confidence interval

426

427

428 **Table 3.** Linear regression coefficients (path *a*) and multilevel linear regression coefficients (path *b* and *c*) of the mediation analysis with neighbourhood  
 429 social networks and neighbourhood social cohesion

	Path <i>a</i> (B, 95%CI)	Path <i>b</i> (B, 95%CI)	Path <i>c</i> (B, 95%CI)	Path <i>c'</i> (B, 95%CI)	Sobel test (z-score)	Proportion mediated
Neighbourhood social networks score – total sample	-0.56 (-0.61; -0.51)*	-0.35 (-0.61; -0.09)*	0.35 (0.01; 0.69)*	0.19 (-0.16; 0.53)	2.75*	46%
<i>France</i>	-0.81 (-0.89; -0.74)*	-0.73 (-0.81; -0.66)*	0.25 (-0.29; 0.80)	-0.20 (-0.89; 0.49)	2.10*	100%
<i>Hungary</i>	-0.31 (-0.46; -0.17)*	0.38 (-0.22; 0.97)	1.09 (-0.15; 2.34)	1.21 (0.00; 2.41)	-1.19	-
<i>Netherlands</i>	-0.61 (-0.66; -0.55)*	-0.32 (-0.60; -0.03)*	0.19 (-0.21; 0.59)	-0.02 (-0.39; 0.36)	2.21*	100%
<i>United Kingdom</i>	-0.33 (-0.40; -0.27)*	0.56 (0.00; 1.12)*	0.36 (-0.19; 0.92)	0.49 (-0.04; 1.01)	-1.93	-
Neighbourhood social cohesion score – total sample	-0.79 (-0.85; -0.73)*	-0.13 (-0.38; 0.12)	0.35 (0.01; 0.69)*	0.26 (-0.18; 0.70)	1.18	-
<i>France</i>	-1.61 (-1.66; -1.55)*	-0.04 (-0.78; 0.69)	0.25 (-0.29; 0.80)	0.19 (-1.14; 1.51)	0.11	-
<i>Hungary</i>	-0.82 (-0.99; -0.64)*	0.09 (-0.44; 0.61)	1.09 (-0.15; 2.34)	1.16 (-0.16; 2.49)	-0.34	-
<i>Netherlands</i>	-0.84 (-0.91; -0.77)*	-0.24 (-0.47; -0.01)*	0.19 (-0.21; 0.59)	-0.03 (-0.42; 0.36)	2.03*	100%



<i>United Kingdom</i>	<i>-0.73 (-0.81; -0.66)*</i>	<i>0.15 (-0.36; 0.67)</i>	<i>0.36 (-0.19; 0.92)</i>	<i>0.46 (-0.19; 1.12)</i>	<i>-0.56</i>	<i>-</i>
-----------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------	---------------------------	---------------------------	--------------	----------

430 Path a represents the association between the neighbourhood income inequality ratio and neighbourhood social networks/cohesion. Path b represents the  
431 association between neighbourhood social networks/cohesion and body mass index. Path c represents the direct association between the neighbourhood  
432 income inequality ratio and body mass index. Path c' represents the indirect association between the neighbourhood income inequality ratio and body mass  
433 index.

434 Associations are adjusted for age, gender, education, household composition and income.

435 \*P value <0.05

436 B = coefficient, 95%CI = 95% confidence interval

437

438

439

440 **Figure 1.** Overview of the analyses that were conducted