TITLE: Fathers' daily intake of fruit and vegetables is positively associated

with children's fruit and vegetable consumption patterns in Europe: The

Feel4Diabetes Study.

Maria Michelle Papamichael <sup>1,2</sup>; George Moschonis <sup>1,2</sup>; Christina Mavrogianni <sup>2</sup>; Stavros Liatis <sup>4</sup>;

Konstantinos Makrilakis 4; Greet Cardon 5; Flore De Vylder 5; Jemina Kivelä 6; Paloma Flores-

Barrantes<sup>7</sup>, Rurik Imre<sup>11</sup>, Luis Moreno <sup>7</sup>; Violeta Iotova <sup>8</sup>; Natalya Usheva <sup>9</sup>; Tsvetalina Tankova <sup>10</sup> and

Yannis Manios <sup>2,3</sup> on behalf of the Feel4Diabetes-Study Group

<sup>1</sup> Department of Dietetics, Nutrition and Sport, School of Allied Health, Human Services and Sport,

La Trobe University, Melbourne, VIC 3086, Australia

<sup>2</sup> Department of Nutrition and Dietetics, School of Health Science and Education, Harokopio

University, Athens, Greece

<sup>3</sup> Institute of Agri-food and Life Sciences, Hellenic Mediterranean University Research Centre,

Heraklion, Greece (Agro-Health)

<sup>4</sup> National and Kapodistrian University of Athens Medical School, First Department of Propaedeutic

Medicine, Laiko General Hospital Athens, Greece

<sup>5</sup> Department of Movement and Sports Sciences, Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium

<sup>6</sup> Population Health Unit, Finnish Institute for Health and Welfare, Helsinki, Finland

<sup>7</sup> Growth, Exercise, Nutrition and Development (GENUD) Research Group, University of Zaragoza,

Zaragoza, Spain. Instituto Agroalimentario de Aragón (IA2), Instituto De Investigación Sanitaria

Aragón (IIS Aragón), Zaragoza, Spain

<sup>8</sup> Department of Paediatrics, Medical University – Varna, Bulgaria

<sup>9</sup> Department of Social Medicine and Health Care Organisation, Medical University – Varna, Bulgaria

<sup>10</sup> Department of Endocrinology, Medical University of Sofia, 1431 Sofia, Bulgaria

<sup>11</sup>Department of Family and Occupational Medicine, University of Debrecen, Debrecen, Hungary

Running Title: Fathers, children fruit and vegetable intake

**Keywords:** Fruits, vegetables, children, fathers, education, family income insecurity.

**Acknowledgments:** The authors would like to thank the members of the Feel4Diabetes-study group: Coordinator: Yannis Manios, Steering Committee: Yannis Manios, Greet Cardon, Jaana Lindström, Peter Schwarz, Konstantinos Makrilakis, Lieven Annemans, Winne Ko, Harokopio University (Greece): Yannis Manios, Kalliopi Karatzi, Odysseas Androutsos, George Moschonis, Spyridon Kanellakis, Christina Mavrogianni, Konstantina Tsoutsoulopoulou, Christina Katsarou, Eva Karaglani, Irini Qira, Efstathios Skoufas, Konstantina Maragkopoulou, Antigone Tsiafitsa, Irini Sotiropoulou, Michalis Tsolakos, Effie Argyri, Mary Nikolaou, Eleni-Anna Vampouli, Christina Filippou, Kyriaki Apergi, Amalia Filippou, Gatsiou Katerina, Efstratios Dimitriadis, Finnish Institute for Health and Welfare (Finland): Jaana Lindström, Tiina Laatikainen, Katja Wikström, Jemina Kivelä, Päivi Valve, Esko Levälahti, Eeva Virtanen, Tiina Pennanen, Seija Olli, Karoliina Nelimarkka, Ghent University (Belgium), Department of Movement and Sports Sciences: Greet Cardon, Vicky Van Stappen, Nele Huys, Department of Public Health: Lieven Annemans, Ruben Willems, Department of Endocrinology and Metabolic Diseases: Samyah Shadid, Technische Universität Dresden (Germany): Peter Schwarz, Patrick Timpel, University of Athens (Greece), Konstantinos Makrilakis, Stavros Liatis, George Dafoulas, Christina-Paulina Lambrinou, Angeliki Giannopoulou, International Diabetes Federation European Region (Belgium): Winne Ko, Ernest Karuranga, Universidad De Zaragoza (Spain): Luis Moreno, Fernando Civeira, Gloria Bueno, Pilar De Miguel-Etayo, Esther Ma Gonzalez-Gil, María L. Miguel-Berges, Natalia Giménez-Legarre; Paloma Flores-Barrantes, Aleli M. Ayala-Marín, Miguel Seral-Cortés, Lucia Baila-Rueda, Ana Cenarro, Estíbaliz Jarauta, Rocío Mateo-Gallego, Medical University of Varna (Bulgaria): Violeta Iotova, Tsvetalina Tankova, Natalia Usheva, Kaloyan Tsochev, Nevena Chakarova, Sonya Galcheva, Rumyana Dimova, Yana Bocheva, Zhaneta Radkova, Vanya Marinova, Yuliya Bazdarska, Tanya Stefanova, University of Debrecen (Hungary): Imre Rurik, Timea Ungvari, Zoltán Jancsó, Anna Nánási, László Kolozsvári, Csilla Semánova, Éva Bíró, Emese Antal, Sándorné Radó: Extensive Life Oy (Finland): Remberto Martinez, Marcos Tong.

#### **Declarations:**

**Funding:** The Feel4Diabetes-study has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program [Grant Agreement: n° 643708]. The content of this article reflects only the authors' views and the European Community is not liable for any use that may be made of the information contained therein. The funding body had no role in the

design of this study and collection, analysis, and interpretation of the data and in writing this manuscript.



#### **Author Contributions:**

Conceptualization, MP, YM, GM

Methodology, MP, YM, GM

Formal Analysis: MP conceived the concept for the analysis, conducted the statistical analysis and is the principle author of the first and final draft of the manuscript.

Investigation and data collection, GM, CM

Data curation, MP, GM, CM and YM

Writing-original and final draft preparation, MP, GM, CM

Review and editing, YM, GM, CM, GC, FdV, JK, PFB, SL, KM, VI, RI, LM, TT and NU.

Supervision, YM

Project Administration, YM

All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

**Ethical Standards Disclosure:** This study was conducted according to the guidelines laid down in the Declaration of Helsinki and all procedures involving research study participants were approved by the Ethics committees of the relevant institutions in the six European countries. Written informed consent was obtained from all subjects.

#### **ABSTRACT**

1

- 2 Background Past research has focused on the relation between mothers' and children's eating
- 3 habits, while little is known about fathers as potential agents. This study aimed to investigate
- 4 the relation between fathers' and children's fruit and vegetable (FV) intake in the context of
- 5 fathers' education level and family income insecurity.
- 6 Methods Cross-sectional analysis using baseline data from the multi-centre Feel4Diabetes
- 7 Study collected in 2016. Participants were parent-dyads (fathers n = 10,038) and school
- 8 children (n = 12, 041) from six European countries. Socio-demographic and dietary data were
- 9 collected using questionnaires. Associations were assessed applying the multinomial logistic
- 10 regression model.
- 11 **Results** Overall, European children have low FV intake especially in Southern European
- countries (Greece, Spain, and Hungary). Children with fathers consuming FV daily were more
- 13 likely to consume fresh fruit (OR: 2.75, 95%CI: 1.95-3.88) and vegetables (OR: 2.55, 95%CI:
- 1.80-3.60) 1-2 times per day. After adjusting for paternal educational level and family income
- insecurity significant associations remained for fresh fruit (OR<sub>adi</sub>: 2.59, 95%CI: 1.82-3.69) and
- vegetables OR<sub>adj</sub>: 1.98, 95%CI: 1.38-2.86). Country differences showed that fathers'
- educational level and income insecurity might be important factors worth considering for FV
- intake in Greece.
- 19 Conclusion This study showed that fathers' FV intake was positively associated with
- 20 children's daily intake of these foods. Implementation of future population-based strategies
- 21 promoting FV intake not only in mothers but also in fathers could be an effective public health
- 22 initiative to increase FV intake in children. Policy-makers should give special attention to
- 23 families dwelling in Southern European regions.

25

24

**Keywords:** Fruits, vegetables, children, fathers, education, family income insecurity.

# Manuscript

28

29

### INTRODUCTION

Fruit and vegetables (FV) are essential components of a healthy diet as they contain important 30 vitamins (such as vitamin C, A, Folic acid), minerals, fibre, and bioactive compounds with 31 antioxidant properties which have overall health benefitting effects, strengthen the immune 32 system, as well as ensure optimal growth and development in children (1). Most importantly, 33 adequate daily intake of FV could prevent major health implications such as cardiovascular 34 disease, cancer, premature mortality (2) and diabetes (3) in later life. Contradicting World Health 35 Organization (WHO) guidelines, European children are not meeting the recommended fruit 36 and vegetable intake of at least 400 g per day (1). From the scant available data, school 37 38 children's intake of fruit and vegetables in Ireland, the Netherlands, and the UK ranged from 221-272g/d, in Italy and Spain ranged from 341-350g/d, and in Denmark averaged 404g/d <sup>(4)</sup>. 39 Given the variability in FV recommendations for school-children along with foods classified 40 as FV and that the evidence is based on few national dietary surveys (4) and not on the European 41 level, then more well-designed European population studies are warranted to address this gap. 42 The development of children's food preferences is multifactorial involving the complex 43 interplay between genetics and environmental factors including the home (5). Pearson et al., 44 45 (2009) in a systematic review showed that parental role modelling and parental intake were positively associated with fruit, fruit juice, and vegetable intake in children and adolescents <sup>(6)</sup>. 46 Contrastingly, Wang et al., (2011) in a systematic review of 24 studies investigating the 47 resemblance between parents and children's diet, only found a weak association (7). Possible 48 limitations of the aforementioned reviews were that there was substantial variability amongst 49 study designs, sample size (range 36-8263), children's age, dietary intake assessment tools 50 (FFQ, food record, or 24-hr food recall) and variables assessed (individual food items, food 51 52 groups, nutrients or overall dietary pattern). Some studies assessed associations between family correlates, parent-dyads and children's dietary outcomes for boys and girls combined, and 53 others separately. Most studies were cross-sectional and at least 50% were conducted in the 54 55 US. Therefore, given the high heterogeneity among studies, establishing the direction and causality of associations remains inconclusive. 56 Regardless of the weak associations reported by the aforementioned systematic reviews, 57 parental influence has been identified as a key determinant of children's food choice and 58 59 consumption patterns via food availability at home, role modelling, family rules, and their own

dietary practices and beliefs <sup>(8)</sup>. Convincing evidence from cross-sectional studies has documented that in families where parents consumed FV regularly, children also had increased intake of healthy foods <sup>(9; 10; 11)</sup>. Traditionally, mothers are viewed as the primary carers and main food providers of children, controlling what food is offered at mealtimes as well as portion size <sup>(12)</sup>. However, today with mothers in the workforce, more fathers are actively involved in the care of their children <sup>(12)</sup>. Past research has focused primarily on mothers' influence on children's eating habits, while little is known about fathers as potential agents of this behaviour <sup>(12; 13)</sup>. Therefore, given the lack of evidence, we endeavoured to investigate the relation between fathers' and children's FV intake as well as to determine whether socio-economic status as measured by fathers' educational level and family income insecurity, modified the association between fathers' daily FV intake and FV consumption patterns in children. We hypothesized that there are positive associations between fathers' FV intake and the frequency of children's intake of these foods. The findings of this study will enhance understanding of the correlates of food intake in children and provide useful insight for the development and implementation of effective intervention programs promoting healthy eating in children.

### **METHODS**

The current study is a sub-analysis of baseline data of the Feel4Diabetes study which was a 2year school- and community-based intervention designed to prevent type 2 diabetes in vulnerable families across Europe. In brief, the Feel4Diabetes intervention promoted healthy eating and physical activity by creating a supportive environment at three levels that included the home/family, school, and municipalities. Recruitment was based on a standardized multisampling procedure and was conducted in selected provinces in six European countries namely Bulgaria, Hungary, Belgium, Finland, Greece and Spain. Primary schools were randomly selected and recruited within each area. Eligibility and inclusion criteria were based on families with children attending the first three grades of primary school in the selected municipalities of each country. The screening procedure and study methodology have been described in greater detail in a previous publication (14) and for the purpose of the current study only baseline data involving all families have been used. Ethical approval was obtained from the Human Ethics committees of all participating institutions in each of the six European countries. The study protocol was conducted according to the standards set by the Declaration of Helsinki for human subjects. Prior to enrolment of participants into the study, all parents signed a written informed consent. In the current study, we posited that parenting is one of the main influential

- 93 components of the home food and social environment that define children's food consumption
- 94 patterns.
- 95 Assessments
- 96 *Anthropometry*
- 97 Children underwent anthropometric measurements that were conducted at school by trained
- 98 researchers (15) using standard procedures and equipment. Body weight was measured in
- 99 children wearing light clothing and without shoes to the nearest 0.1 kg using electronic scales
- 100 (SECA 813); and standing height was measured barefoot with shoulders in a relaxed position,
- arms hanging freely and head in the Frankfurt horizontal plane, to the nearest 0.1 cm using a
- portable stadiometer (SECA 217). Two readings were recorded for each measurement and the
- mean was used for analytical purposes. Body Mass Index (BMI) was calculated using
- Quetelet's equation (kg/m²) and expressed as z-scores estimated by the International Obesity
- 105 Task Force (IOTF) BMI cut-offs (16).
- 106 Socio-demographic details
- 107 Socio-demographic details that included country, fathers' and children's age, fathers'
- 108 educational level and occupation status as well as family income insecurity were collected
- using a self-reported questionnaire. Educational level was measured by the number of years
- attending school or university and comprised of six categories: < 6 years or less, 7-9 years, 10-
- 111 12 years, 13-14 years, 15-16 years and > 16 years. Occupation status was categorized as stay
- at home, employed (full-time or part-time) and unemployed. Family income insecurity was
- assessed by the degree of economic ease or difficulty to meet household expenses as follows:
- very difficult, difficult, fairly difficult, fairly easy, easy and very easy (17). Variables related to
- fathers' socio-demographics were dichotomized as follows: age < 45 years vs  $\ge 45$  years,
- educational level:  $\leq 14$  years vs  $\geq 14$  years and family income insecurity by easy vs difficulty
- to meet household expenses.
- 118 Fathers' daily intake of fruit and vegetables
- 119 Fathers' daily intake of FV was assessed by the question "How often do you eat vegetables,
- fruit or berries?" Possible responses were 'every day' or 'not every day'.
- 121 Children's fruit and vegetable intake

Children's FV intake was evaluated using a Food Frequency Questionnaire that was developed specifically for the Feel4Diabetes Study and was examined for its reliability in a pilot study (18). Parents were used as a proxy for children's dietary habits. Respondents were instructed to report their usual frequency of consumption of 9 food groups in terms of specified serving size. The main food groups included in the questionnaire were fruit and berries (fresh or frozen), fruit and berries (canned or dried), fruit juice (freshly-squeezed or pre-packed without sugar) and vegetables. Conventional household measures were used to represent one standard portion size for each food item (1 cup, ½ cup). Frequency of food intake was recorded as weekly or daily consumption of food items which were categorized as less than one (1) time per week, 1 or 2 times per week, 3 or 4 times per week, 5 or 6 times per week, 1 or 2 times per day, 3 or 4 times per day, 5 or 6 times per day and more than 6 times per day. One serving of fruit was considered to one medium-sized fruit or ½ cup, vegetables ½ cup, canned or dried fruit ½ and ¼ cup respectively and fruit juice by 1 cup.

Statistical analysis

SPSS version 20 (IBM Incorp, Chicago, IL USA) was used for all statistical analyses. Continuous variables were assessed for normality using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test and graphically by their histograms. In the case of non-normally distributed continuous variables, group differences were determined using the non-parametric Mann-Whitney test, while the Chi-Squared test was used for categorical variables. Socio-demographic and anthropometric characteristics of the sample are presented as medians, 25<sup>th</sup> and 75<sup>th</sup> percentiles, total counts (n), and frequencies (%). Correlation between fathers' and children's frequency of food intake was examined using Spearman's rank coefficient (rho) where values ranging from 0.10-0.29 indicate moderate correlation and  $\geq 0.30$  strong correlation <sup>(19)</sup>. Given that the assumptions for ordinal logistic regression were violated (20), associations between fathers' daily intake of FV and frequency of these foods by children were evaluated by performing a multinomial logistic regression setting each food item from the children's FFQ as the dependent variable and fathers' intake of FV as the dichotomous independent variable. According to previous research, factors such as parental educational level and income status are known to influence family dietary habits, especially FV (21). Dummy variables were created for independent categorical variables (education level and family income insecurity) and then entered into the regression analysis. Model 1 represents the crude analysis (unadjusted), model 2 adjusting for fathers' educational level and family income insecurity. Reference values for frequency of FV intake were based on WHO nutritional guidelines for children and adolescents (1). Multicollinearity amongst predictors was measured using the variance inflation factor (VIF), tolerance statistic, and condition index  $^{(22)}$ . The goodness of fit of the model was checked using Pearson and likelihood ratio chi-square statistics  $^{(22)}$ . Furthermore, the degree of variation of the outcome as explained by the predictors was reflected by the Nagelkerke coefficient  $R^{2}$   $^{(22)}$ . The magnitude of the association is represented by the  $\beta$  coefficient, odds ratio (OR), and 95% confidence intervals (CI). In order to explore country differences in associations, data was stratified by country and the regression analysis was repeated investigating the association between fathers' daily FV intake and children's frequency of consumption patterns of these foods. The level of significance was set at p < 0.05. All reported p-values were two-tailed.

### **RESULTS**

Of the 12,041 European families (parent-dyads) participating in this study, 14.8% (1,787/12,041) dwelled in Belgium, 12.5% (1,504/12,041) in Finland, 19.0% (2,283/12,041) in Greece, 15.2% (1828/12,041) in Hungary, 24.7% (2972/12,041) in Bulgaria and 13.8% (1,667/12,041) in Spain. From data of 10,038 fathers, the majority of fathers (77.7%) were under 45 years old, 46.1 % were well-educated (> 14 years of study), 87.0% worked full-time and 50% of families found it 'difficult' to cover household expenses. The sample comprised of 12, 041 children, median age 8.2 years (interquartile range 1.5 years) of which 49.3% (5942/12,041) were boys. Socio-demographic and anthropometric characteristics of the sample and per children's sex are displayed in Table 1.

Table 1 Socio-demographic, anthropometric and dietary intake characteristics of the sample

Characteristic	Total	Boy	Girl	Pa
Children's details				
Sex % (n) Age (years) Weight (kg) Height (cm) BMI z-score	8.2 (7.4, 8.9) 28.3 (24.7, 33.2) 130.2 (125.0, 136.0) 0.47 (-0.20, 1.3)	49.4% (5942/12041) 8.2 (7.5, 9.0) 28.5 (25.1, 33.5) 130.8 (125.8, 136.4) 0.46 (-0.21, 1.2)	50.6% (6097/12041) 8.1 (7.4, 8.9) 28.0 (24.4, 33.0) 129.6 (124.3,135.4) 0.48 (-0.17, 1.3)	0.05 <sup>b</sup> < <b>0.001<sup>b</sup></b> < <b>0.001<sup>b</sup></b> 0.16 <sup>b</sup>
Children's FV intake (1-2 times/day) Fresh fruit intake (1 fruit or ½ cup) %(n) Canned/dried fruit (½ and ¼ cup) %(n) Fruit juice (1 cup) %(n) Vegetables (½ cup) %(n)	45.6% (5159/11300) 4.6% (503/1081) 13.3% (1472/11083) 37.7% (4220/11194)	44.5% (2477/5566) 4.4% (238/5351) 14.1% (771/5415) 36.3% (2001/5508)	46.8% (2681/5732) 4.8% (265/5465) 12.5% (701/5627) 39.0% (2219/5684)	<b>0.01</b> 0.56 0.25 0.09
Fathers' details				
Age %(n) < 45 years	77.7% (7800/10038)	77.4% (3841/4961)	78.0% (3959/5076)	0.49
Education %(n) > 14years	46.1% (4511/9779)	47.2% (2281/4835)	45.1% (2230/4944)	$0.04^{1}$
Occupation % (n) Stay at home Employed Unemployed	8.1% (798/9787) 87.0% (8520/9787) 4.8% (469/9787)	8.2% (397/4843) 87.3% (4226/4843) 4.5% (220/4843)	8.1% (401/4943) 86.8% (4293/4943) 5.0% (249/4943)	0.52
Fruit/vegetable intake %(n) Everyday	65.9% (6646/10083)	66.2% (3297/4983)	65.6% (3347/5098)	0.62
Family income insecurity Covering household expenses* %(n) Difficult	49.4% (5637/11402)	48.7% (2727/5595)	50.1% (2910/5806)	0.14
*Values are expressed as medians, 25				0.14
For dichotomous variables fathers' ago only one category is presented in Table		evel, family income insec	urity, and fathers' FV int	take,
<sup>a</sup> P-value estimated using Chi-Square		f		
P-values in bold text indicate statistical	•			

- <sup>1</sup> Significant differences in fathers' educational level when comparing educational attainment ≤ 14 years vs > 14 years
- Concerning fathers' FV intake, in the total sample, only 65.9% of fathers (6646/10083)
- consumed FV daily. Investigation of daily FV intake according to country showed that 79.8%
- (1267/1588) of fathers' in Belgium responded that they consumed FV daily, 76.6%
- (1966/2568) in Bulgaria, 71.8% (789/1099) in Finland, 68.6% (968/1411) in Spain, 52.2%
- (994/1855) in Greece and 43.8% (662/1512) in Hungary (p < 0.001).
- Collectively, children had low intake of FV with only 45.6% (5159/11300) consuming fresh
- fruit 1-2 times per day and 37.7% (4220/11194) vegetables at the same frequency. Differences
- were observed amongst countries (fresh fruits: p < 0.001; vegetables: p < 0.001). Children's
- fresh fruit intake of 1-2 times/day ranged from 61.1% (1057/1731) in Belgium, 49.3%

190 (635/1288) in Spain, 49.4% (1434/2902) in Bulgaria, 42.6% (931/2185) in Greece, 35.1% (521/1483) in Finland and 34.0% (581/1711) in Hungary; while 61.6% of children (1065/1729) consumed vegetables 1-2 times/day in Belgium, 47.1% (1362/2890) in Bulgaria, 44.0% (655/1487) in Finland, 24.8% (321/1296) in Spain, 23.5% (383/1633) in Hungary and 20.1% (434/2159) in Greece.

Nevertheless, moderate-strong correlations were observed between fathers' daily FV intake and children's intake of fresh fruit (rho = 0.46, p < 0.001), vegetables (rho = 0.54, p < 0.001), canned/dried fruit (rho = 0.61, p < 0.001) or fruit juice (rho = 0.54, p < 0.001).

The association between fathers' daily FV intake and children's daily FV intake

Associations between fathers' daily FV intake and children's frequency of intake are presented in Table 2. Applying the multinomial logistic regression model to explore associations of fathers' daily FV intake and children's frequency of food intake revealed significant positive associations in the crude analysis for children's fresh fruit intake (p < 0.001) and vegetables (p < 0.001). When fathers consumed daily FV, children were 2.75 times and 2.55 times more likely to consume fresh fruit or vegetables, respectively, 1-2 times per day. Addition of fathers' educational level and family income insecurity did not modify the associations for children's fresh fruit and vegetable intake. The same trend was observed for children's fruit juice intake, although marginally significant in the crude and adjusted analyses (crude OR: 1.46, 95%CI: 0.94-2.28, p = 0.09); (adjusted OR: 1.52, 95%CI: 0.96-2.42,  $p_{adj} = 0.08$ ). In contrast, no associations were found for canned/or dried fruits.

Table 2 Association between fathers' daily FV intake and frequency of children's FV intake derived from the crude multinomial logistic regression analysis (Model 1) and after adjusting for fathers' educational level and family income insecurity (Model 2).

			Model 1				Model 2	
Food item /Frequency of children's food intake	β	$\mathbb{R}^2$	OR (95%CI)	P <sup>a</sup>	β	$\mathbb{R}^2$	OR (95%CI)	P <sup>b</sup>
Fruits/berries (Fresh/frozen) 3-4 times/week 1-2 times/day	Ref 1.01	8.1%	2.75(1.95, 3.88)	<0.001	0.95	14.6%	6 2.59(1.82, 3.69)	<0.001

Fruits/berries (canned/dried) 3-4 times/week 1-2 times/day	Ref -0.54	0.70%	0.58 (0.28, 1.20)	0.140	-0.40	12.0%	0.67 (0.31, 1.44)	0.300
Fruit juice 3-4 times/week 1-2 times /day	Ref 0.38	0.80%	1.46 (0.94, 2.28)	0.090	0.42	5.0%	1.52 (0.96, 2.42)	0.080
Vegetables 3-4 times/week 1-2 times/day	Ref 0.93	8.50%	2.55 (1.80, 3.60)	<0.001	0.68	0.0%	1.98 (1.38, 2.86)	<0.001

- Ref- Reference
- 217 Independent dichotomous variable- father consumes fruit and vegetables (every day/ not every day)
- 218 Dependent variable: Children's frequency of fruit and vegetable intake from FFQs
- 219 β Unstandardized beta coefficient; OR: Odds ratio; 95%CI: 95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)
- 220 R<sup>2</sup> Model fit as represented by the Nagelkerke coefficient
- <sup>a</sup> Model 1 P-value estimated from the unadjusted multinomial logistic regression
- b Model 2 P-value adjusted for fathers' educational level and family income insecurity.
- 223 Statistically significant P-values are indicated in bold.
- Regarding the impact of fathers' daily FV intake and children's consumption patterns, 224 disparities were found across countries (Table 3). In the crude and adjusted regression analyses 225 there were positive associations between fathers' daily FV intake and children's intake of fresh 226 fruit 1-2 times per day in Belgium, Greece and Bulgaria only [(Adjusted) children's fresh fruit 227 intake: Belgium OR: 3.95, 95%CI: 1.35-11.51, p  $_{adj} = 0.012$ ; Greece OR: 3.31, 95%CI: 1.59-228 6.86, p  $_{adj} = 0.001$ ; Bulgaria OR: 4.24, 95%CI: 1.39-12.95, p  $_{adj} = 0.011$ )]. The same trend was 229 observed for children's vegetable intake 1-2 times per day in Belgium and Hungary [(Adjusted) 230 children's vegetable intake: Belgium OR: 3.44, 95%CI: 1.28-9.28, p = 0.015; Hungary OR: 231 3.20, 95%CI: 1.16-8.83, p = 0.024)]. Interestingly, for Greece, a positive association was 232 observed in the crude analysis between fathers' daily FV intake and children's vegetable intake 233 (OR: 2.31, 95%CI: 1.09-4.87, p = 0.029) which became non-significant after adjustment (p =234 0.270). Hence, it appears that fathers' educational level and income insecurity might be 235 important factors worth considering for FV intake in Greece. No significant associations were 236 noted for canned/dried fruit or fruit juice in any country, which coincides with the original 237 analyses. 238

Table 3 Associations between fathers' daily FV intake and children's frequency of FV intake by country, derived from the crude multinomial logistic regression analysis (Model 1) and after adjusting for fathers' educational level and family income insecurity (Model 2).

$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	
Frequency of intake           Fruits/berries (Fresh/frozen)           3-4 times/week         Ref           1-2 times/day         Belgium         1.21         12.3%         3.36(1.27, 8.89)         0.015         1.37         40.0%         3.95(1.35, 1 inches)         1.2 times/day         0.02         0.015         1.37         40.0%         3.95(1.35, 1 inches)         1.2 times/day         0.04         1.47(0.56, 3.84)         0.429         0.51         33.3%         1.67(0.55, 5 inches)         0.02         0.01         1.20         18.6%         3.31(1.59, 6 inches)         0.02         0.001         1.20         18.6%         3.31(1.59, 6 inches)         0.001         1.20         18.6%         1.73(0.68, 4 inches)         0.001	
Fruits/berries (Fresh/frozen   Ref   1-2 times/day   Belgium   1.21   12.3%   3.36(1.27, 8.89)   0.015   1.37   40.0%   3.95(1.35, 1   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20   1.20	) P <sub>adj</sub>
3-4 times/week 1-2 times/day Belgium 1.21 12.3% 3.36(1.27, 8.89) 0.015 1.37 40.0% 3.95(1.35, 1 Finland 0.39 4.6% 1.47(0.56, 3.84) 0.429 0.51 33.3% 1.67(0.55, 5 Greece 1.18 10.8% 3.26(1.69, 6.29) 0.001 1.20 18.6% 3.31(1.59, 6 Hungary 0.60 10.4% 1.82(0.78, 4.26) 0.165 0.55 43.6% 1.73(0.68, 4 Bulgaria 1.28 10.5% 3.61(1.30, 9.99) 0.014 1.44 39.6% 4.24(1.39, 1 Spain 0.60 15.5% 1.81(0.59, 5.57) 0.297 0.61 43.7% 1.83(0.56, 5  Fruits/berries (canned/dried) 3-4 times/week 1-2 times/day Belgium 0.13 1.8% 0.87(0.14, 5.58) 0.888 0.02 35.5% 1.02(0.12, 8.89) 0.40(0.06, 2 Greece 19.46 5.3% Not computable 1.73 2.5% 0.18(0.00, 1) Hungary 0.98 7.9% 0.37(0.08, 1.80) 0.220 0.35 46.4% 0.70(0.13, 3) Bulgaria 0.85 3.2% 0.43(0.05, 3.52) 0.430 0.80 7.8% 2.22(0.25, 1)	
1-2 times/day	
Finland 0.39 4.6% 1.47(0.56, 3.84) 0.429 0.51 33.3% 1.67(0.55, 5)  Greece 1.18 10.8% 3.26(1.69, 6.29) < 0.001 1.20 18.6% 3.31(1.59, 6)  Hungary 0.60 10.4% 1.82(0.78, 4.26) 0.165 0.55 43.6% 1.73(0.68, 4)  Bulgaria 1.28 10.5% 3.61(1.30, 9.99) 0.014 1.44 39.6% 4.24(1.39, 1)  Spain 0.60 15.5% 1.81(0.59, 5.57) 0.297 0.61 43.7% 1.83(0.56, 5)  Fruits/berries (canned/dried)  3-4 times/week Ref 1-2 times/day Belgium -0.13 1.8% 0.87(0.14, 5.58) 0.888 0.02 35.5% 1.02(0.12, 8)  Finland -0.56 1.3% 0.57(0.11, 3.07) 0.511 -0.92 30.0% 0.40 (0.06, 2)  Greece -19.46 5.3% Not computable -1.73 2.5% 0.18(0.00, 1)  Hungary -0.98 7.9% 0.37(0.08, 1.80) 0.220 -0.35 46.4% 0.70(0.13, 3)  Bulgaria -0.85 3.2% 0.43(0.05, 3.52) 0.430 -0.51 0.0% 0.60(0.04, 8)  Spain 0.47 3.7% 1.60(0.24, 10.81) 0.630 0.80 7.8% 2.22(0.25, 19)	
Greece 1.18 10.8% 3.26(1.69, 6.29) < 0.001 1.20 18.6% 3.31(1.59, 6) Hungary 0.60 10.4% 1.82(0.78, 4.26) 0.165 0.55 43.6% 1.73(0.68, 4) Bulgaria 1.28 10.5% 3.61(1.30, 9.99) 0.014 1.44 39.6% 4.24(1.39, 1) Spain 0.60 15.5% 1.81(0.59, 5.57) 0.297 0.61 43.7% 1.83(0.56, 5)  Fruits/berries (canned/dried) 3-4 times/week Ref 1-2 times/day Belgium -0.13 1.8% 0.87(0.14, 5.58) 0.888 0.02 35.5% 1.02(0.12, 8) Finland -0.56 1.3% 0.57(0.11, 3.07) 0.511 -0.92 30.0% 0.40 (0.06, 2) Greece -19.46 5.3% Not computable -1.73 2.5% 0.18(0.00, 1) Hungary -0.98 7.9% 0.37(0.08, 1.80) 0.220 -0.35 46.4% 0.70(0.13, 3) Bulgaria -0.85 3.2% 0.43(0.05, 3.52) 0.430 -0.51 0.0% 0.60(0.04, 8) Spain 0.47 3.7% 1.60(0.24, 10.81) 0.630 0.80 7.8% 2.22(0.25, 19)	.51) <b>0.012</b>
Hungary 0.60 10.4% 1.82(0.78, 4.26) 0.165 0.55 43.6% 1.73(0.68, 4 Bulgaria 1.28 10.5% 3.61(1.30, 9.99) 0.014 1.44 39.6% 4.24(1.39, 1 Spain 0.60 15.5% 1.81(0.59, 5.57) 0.297 0.61 43.7% 1.83(0.56, 5 Fruits/berries (canned/dried)  3-4 times/week Ref 1-2 times/day Belgium -0.13 1.8% 0.87(0.14, 5.58) 0.888 0.02 35.5% 1.02(0.12, 8 Finland -0.56 1.3% 0.57(0.11, 3.07) 0.511 -0.92 30.0% 0.40 (0.06, 2 Greece -19.46 5.3% Not computable -1.73 2.5% 0.18(0.00, 1 Hungary -0.98 7.9% 0.37(0.08, 1.80) 0.220 -0.35 46.4% 0.70(0.13, 3.90) 0.40 (0.04, 8 Spain 0.47 3.7% 1.60(0.24, 10.81) 0.630 0.80 7.8% 2.22(0.25, 19.46) 1.60(0.24, 10.81) 0.630 0.80 7.8% 2.22(0.25, 19.46) 1.60(0.24, 10.81) 0.630 0.80 7.8% 2.22(0.25, 19.46) 1.60(0.24, 10.81) 0.630 0.80 7.8% 2.22(0.25, 19.46) 1.60(0.24, 10.81) 0.630 0.80 7.8% 2.22(0.25, 19.46) 1.60(0.24, 10.81) 0.630 0.80 7.8% 2.22(0.25, 19.46) 1.60(0.24, 10.81) 0.630 0.80 7.8% 2.22(0.25, 19.46) 1.60(0.24, 10.81) 0.630 0.80 7.8% 2.22(0.25, 19.46) 1.60(0.24, 10.81) 0.630 0.80 7.8% 2.22(0.25, 19.46) 1.60(0.24, 10.81) 0.630 0.80 7.8% 2.22(0.25, 19.46) 1.60(0.24, 10.81) 0.630 0.80 7.8% 2.22(0.25, 19.46) 1.60(0.24, 10.81) 0.630 0.80 7.8% 2.22(0.25, 19.46) 1.60(0.24, 10.81) 0.630 0.80 7.8% 2.22(0.25, 19.46) 1.60(0.24, 10.81) 0.630 0.80 7.8% 2.22(0.25, 19.46) 1.60(0.24, 10.81) 0.630 0.80 7.8% 2.22(0.25, 19.46) 1.60(0.24, 10.81) 0.630 0.80 7.8% 2.22(0.25, 19.46) 1.60(0.24, 10.81) 0.630 0.80 7.8% 2.22(0.25, 19.46) 1.60(0.24, 10.81) 0.630 0.80 7.8% 2.22(0.25, 19.46) 1.60(0.24, 10.81) 0.630 0.80 7.8% 2.22(0.25, 19.46) 1.60(0.24, 10.81) 0.630 0.80 7.8% 2.22(0.25, 19.46) 1.60(0.24, 10.81) 0.630 0.80 7.8% 2.22(0.25, 19.46) 1.60(0.24, 10.81) 0.630 0.80 7.8% 2.22(0.25, 19.46) 1.60(0.24, 10.81) 0.630 0.80 7.8% 2.22(0.25, 19.46) 1.60(0.24, 10.81) 0.630 0.80 7.8% 2.22(0.25, 19.46) 1.60(0.24, 10.81) 0.630 0.80 7.8% 2.22(0.25, 19.46) 1.60(0.24, 10.81) 0.630 0.80 7.8% 2.22(0.25, 19.46) 1.60(0.24, 10.81) 0.630 0.80 7.8% 2.22(0.25, 19.46) 1.60(0.24, 10.81) 0.630 0.80 7.8% 2.22(0.25, 19.46) 1.60(0.24, 10.81) 0.630 0.80 7.8% 2.	0.364
Bulgaria 1.28 10.5% 3.61(1.30, 9.99) <b>0.014</b> 1.44 39.6% 4.24(1.39, 1 Spain 0.60 15.5% 1.81(0.59, 5.57) 0.297 0.61 43.7% 1.83(0.56, 5 Fruits/berries (canned/dried)  3-4 times/week Ref 1-2 times/day Belgium -0.13 1.8% 0.87(0.14, 5.58) 0.888 0.02 35.5% 1.02(0.12, 8 Finland -0.56 1.3% 0.57(0.11, 3.07) 0.511 -0.92 30.0% 0.40 (0.06, 2 Greece -19.46 5.3% Not computable -1.73 2.5% 0.18(0.00, 1 Hungary -0.98 7.9% 0.37(0.08, 1.80) 0.220 -0.35 46.4% 0.70(0.13, 3 Bulgaria -0.85 3.2% 0.43(0.05, 3.52) 0.430 -0.51 0.0% 0.60(0.04, 8 Spain 0.47 3.7% 1.60(0.24, 10.81) 0.630 0.80 7.8% 2.22(0.25, 19)	<b>0.001</b>
Spain   0.60   15.5%   1.81(0.59, 5.57)   0.297   0.61   43.7%   1.83(0.56, 5)	44) 0.253
Spain   0.60   15.5%   1.81(0.59, 5.57)   0.297   0.61   43.7%   1.83(0.56, 5)	2.95) <b>0.011</b>
Fruits/berries (canned/dried) 3-4 times/week 1-2 times/day  Belgium -0.13 1.8% 0.87(0.14, 5.58) 0.888 0.02 35.5% 1.02(0.12, 8.66) Finland -0.56 1.3% 0.57(0.11, 3.07) 0.511 -0.92 30.0% 0.40 (0.06, 2.66) Greece -19.46 5.3% Not computable -1.73 2.5% 0.18(0.00, 1.66) Hungary -0.98 7.9% 0.37(0.08, 1.80) 0.220 -0.35 46.4% 0.70(0.13, 3.66) Bulgaria -0.85 3.2% 0.43(0.05, 3.52) 0.430 -0.51 0.0% 0.60(0.04, 8.66) Spain 0.47 3.7% 1.60(0.24, 10.81) 0.630 0.80 7.8% 2.22(0.25, 19)	,
3-4 times/week 1-2 times/day  Belgium -0.13 1.8% 0.87(0.14, 5.58) 0.888 0.02 35.5% 1.02(0.12, 8.6) Finland -0.56 1.3% 0.57(0.11, 3.07) 0.511 -0.92 30.0% 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.40 (0.06, 2) 0.4	ŕ
Finland -0.56 1.3% 0.57(0.11, 3.07) 0.511 -0.92 30.0% 0.40 (0.06, 2) Greece -19.46 5.3% Not computable -1.73 2.5% 0.18(0.00, 1) Hungary -0.98 7.9% 0.37(0.08, 1.80) 0.220 -0.35 46.4% 0.70(0.13, 3) Bulgaria -0.85 3.2% 0.43(0.05, 3.52) 0.430 -0.51 0.0% 0.60(0.04, 8) Spain 0.47 3.7% 1.60(0.24, 10.81) 0.630 0.80 7.8% 2.22(0.25, 1)	
Finland -0.56 1.3% 0.57(0.11, 3.07) 0.511 -0.92 30.0% 0.40 (0.06, 2) Greece -19.46 5.3% Not computable -1.73 2.5% 0.18(0.00, 1) Hungary -0.98 7.9% 0.37(0.08, 1.80) 0.220 -0.35 46.4% 0.70(0.13, 3.13) Bulgaria -0.85 3.2% 0.43(0.05, 3.52) 0.430 -0.51 0.0% 0.60(0.04, 8.13) Spain 0.47 3.7% 1.60(0.24, 10.81) 0.630 0.80 7.8% 2.22(0.25, 1.50)	92) 0.990
Greece       -19.46       5.3%       Not computable       -1.73       2.5%       0.18(0.00, 12)         Hungary       -0.98       7.9%       0.37(0.08, 1.80)       0.220       -0.35       46.4%       0.70(0.13, 3)         Bulgaria       -0.85       3.2%       0.43(0.05, 3.52)       0.430       -0.51       0.0%       0.60(0.04, 8)         Spain       0.47       3.7%       1.60(0.24, 10.81)       0.630       0.80       7.8%       2.22(0.25, 19)	
Bulgaria -0.85 3.2% 0.43(0.05, 3.52) 0.430 -0.51 0.0% 0.60(0.04, 8.55)	,
Bulgaria -0.85 3.2% 0.43(0.05, 3.52) 0.430 -0.51 0.0% 0.60(0.04, 8.55)	0.680
Spain 0.47 3.7% 1.60(0.24, 10.81) 0.630 0.80 7.8% 2.22(0.25, 19	55) 0.710
	.77) 0.470
Fruit juice	,
3-4 times/week Ref	
1-2 times /day Belgium -0.19 5.4% 0.83(0.23, 2.98) 0.771 0.36 35.2% 1.43(0.33, 6	10) 0.630
Finland -0.37 5.4% 0.69(0.08, 5.64) 0.727 -1.05 29.5% 0.35(0.03, 3.3)	34) 0.390
Greece 0.44 5.3% 1.55(0.79, 3.03) 0.205 0.45 17.6% 1.57(0.76, 3.03)	,
Hungary 0.78 3.9% 2.18(0.53, 9.02) 0.283 0.99 11.3% 2.70(0.54, 13)	
Bulgaria 0.77 2.3% 2.17(0.39, 12.06) 0.377 0.47 25.2% 1.60(0.25, 10)	,
Spain 0.74 5.7% 2.10(0.59, 7.45) 0.251 0.54 39.1% 1.71(0.45, 6.	,
Vegetables	,
3-4 times/week Ref	
1-2 times/day Belgium 1.17 8.0% 3.24(1.28, 8.19) <b>0.013</b> 1.24 39.7% 3.44 (1.28, 9.10)	28) <b>0.015</b>

I	Finland	0.74	5.0%	2.09(0.78, 5.61)	0.141	0.83	34.0%	2.29(0.76, 6.91)	0.140
	Greece	0.83	10.1%	2.31(1.09, 4.87)	0.029	0.42	7.1%	1.52(0.72, 3.19)	0.270
I	Hungary	0.93	10.6%	2.53(1.03, 6.20)	0.043	1.16	49.9%	3.20(1.16, 8.83)	0.024
I	Bulgaria	0.97	9.2%	2.64(0.96, 7.20)	0.059	1.01	0.0%	2.74(0.87, 8.64)	0.090
S	Spain	-0.13	5.2%	0.88(0.32, 2.41)	0.796	-0.03	42.5%	0.97 (0.34, 2.76)	0.950

242 Ref- Reference

- Independent dichotomous variable- father consumes fruit and vegetables (every day/ not every day)
- 244 Dependent variable: Children's frequency of fruit and vegetables intake from FFQs
- β Unstandardized beta coefficient; OR: Odds ratio; 95%CI: 95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)
- 246 R<sup>2</sup> Model fit as represented by the Nagelkerke coefficient
- 247 Model 1 Crude regression analysis
- \*Model 2 Regression analysis adjusted for fathers' educational level and family income insecurity
- 249 Statistically significant P-values are indicated in bold

## **DISCUSSION**

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

The promotion of healthy eating in children is crucial, since food habits established in childhood may track into adolescence and adulthood (23). There is substantial evidence that children's dietary intake and behaviours are influenced by parents, especially mothers, who are key components in the environmental and social context. However, the extent to which fathers' dietary intake influences children's food consumption patterns is unclear. This is of considerable importance given the changes in family structure with more mothers employed and fathers responsible for daily care and rearing of their children (12). The findings of this study support the primary hypothesis that there are positive associations between fathers' FV intake and frequency of children's intake of these foods. This suggests that, apart from mothers, fathers should be considered as potential agents for the implementation of positive feeding practices in children. Even though convincing evidence indicates that fathers exert a positive influence on children's eating habits, direct comparisons are difficult due to the lack of studies examining specific father-child FV intakes (24, 25). According to a recent systemic review of 23 studies, fathers' dietary intake was predictive of children's intake, while fathers' food parenting style as represented by their own intake of FV, availability of healthy foods at home, and encouragement to consume healthy foods, influenced children's eating behaviours (26). Coparenting by mothers and fathers and when household rules concerning food were reinforced by both parents produced healthier child food choices. Unfortunately, we did not assess coparenting and this would be worth future investigation. It has been advocated that parenthood could instigate health awareness and motivate the adoption of healthier eating habits such as increased intake of FV by fathers (27).

Intriguingly, country differences were observed in associations between fathers' FV intake and children's daily intake of fresh fruit and vegetables which may be an important factor to consider when devising health promotion strategies. Strong associations were observed for Belgium, Greece, Bulgaria, and Hungary. One might speculate that fathers' educational level and income insecurity might be important factors worth considering for FV intake in Greece. A feasible explanation for associations observed between fathers' FV intake and children's consumption patterns of FV might be that with more women in the workforce, fathers expend more time interacting with children especially during mealtimes and in the preparation, cooking of meals including grocery shopping (12). In this context, paternal dietary behaviour is likely to play an important role in shaping children's diets through positive role modelling of eating

habits and by controlling the type and amount of food made accessible and available within the home <sup>(8)</sup>. From another point of view, fathers' health-related nutrition knowledge is another determinant of children's FV intake. Wolincka et al., documented positive correlations between parent's knowledge of the recommended intakes of FV and children's frequency of consumption of FV <sup>(28)</sup>.

These observations bring to our attention that fathers should be aware of the multiple correlates that can influence their children's food intake including the impact of their own food choices and eating behaviour. Ultimately, foods preferred and consumed by parents (both mothers and fathers) are those foods that children are habitually exposed to and define children's choices and intake <sup>(26; 29)</sup>. School children are likely to be consuming 2/3 of meals at home with parents mostly controlling children's diets rather than peers and the school environment. So, explicit displays of good paternal eating behaviours, home availability and accessibility of FV, combined with encouragement that promotes consumption of healthy foods in children might be a useful parenting strategy for the adoption of desirable eating habits in children <sup>(30)</sup>. On the other hand, non-adherence to healthy eating guidelines in parents could undermine attempts to ensure healthy eating in children. Therefore, interventions focusing to improve the quality of both parents' diet could be effective in improving their children's eating habits.

Unexpectedly, we found that educational level and family income insecurity did not alter our observations. In contrast, Petrauskienė et al. in a national survey of school children participating in the COSI study found that the odds ratio of daily fresh fruit consumption was 1.4 times higher in children with fathers of high educational level than those of low educated parents <sup>(21)</sup>. The odds ratio of children's fresh fruit consumption was 1.5 times higher in families with high income compared to low income. A plausible explanation for differences between our study and previous research might be attributed to population differences, variability in definition of SES status, categorization of educational levels and measurement of family income (quantitative versus qualitative).

Despite the overwhelming evidence of the positive health benefits of consuming a varied diet abundant in FV, in our study, overall 60% of fathers and less than 50% of children consumed FV 1-2 times/day which does not comply with the current WHO recommendations to consume an abundance of FV as part of a healthy diet <sup>(1)</sup>. Interestingly, families in Southern European countries (i.e. Greece and Spain), as well as in Hungary continue to have poor dietary habits as evident by the low intake of FV. This is consistent with the findings of dietary surveys in Europe reporting considerable variability in FV intake across and within countries reflecting the prevailing economic, cultural, geographical and agricultural diversity <sup>(31)</sup>. Nevertheless, there is a propensity for people with high educational attainment to eat more fruit and vegetables compared to those with low educational levels (14% vs 10% respectively) <sup>(32)</sup>. Our observation is highly significant because childhood is a critical period during which eating behaviours and food preferences evolve providing an opportunity to develop and foster healthy eating habits that carries into adulthood.

# Strengths/limitations

The present study endeavoured to unravel the complex environment-dietary behaviour interaction in the research area of food parenting. Traditionally, past research has focused on the influence of maternal eating habits on children's food intake and our study is unique in that it explored the impact of fathers, thereby extending to the literature (12). Although FV intake was not assessed quantitatively (g/day), the European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition (EPIC) study demonstrated that, in adults, the frequency of FV consumption was more important than serving size in distinguishing between increased and decreased intake of these foods <sup>(33)</sup>. Another forte of the present study was the large sample size comprising of data from six European countries, homogeneity amongst participants with respect to age, and selection (all school children) along with the use of standardized assessment tools which guarantees higher internal validity. From a statistical point of view, in the regression analysis, assessment of the model fit as described by low values of the R<sup>2</sup> coefficient suggest that variation in the dependent variable cannot be exclusively explained by the predictors and that there might be other factors affecting children's intake of FV warranting further investigation. Nevertheless, assessment of multicollinearity amongst predictor variables yielded no collinearity as represented by values of VIF < 4, tolerance statistic > 0.2, and condition index  $< 15^{(22)}$ .

In light of limitations in the current study, the direction of the relationship between fathers' and children's FV intake cannot be established due to the cross-sectional nature of the data. There is a possibility that the association between fathers' FV consumption and children's might be bi-directional modified through social interaction. Another drawback, we did not evaluate concepts such as household norms regarding the serving of FV daily as part of family meals as well as home support (encouragement) for the consumption of healthy foods (34). Then again, parental feeding practices were beyond the scope of our study but deserve consideration in future studies to determine parental traits that favour the fostering of healthy eating patterns in children. In addition, we did not have data concerning country differences in availability and variety of FV consumed in the family setting. Furthermore, we used family income insecurity in lieu of family income as a socio-economic status index, and therefore it is unknown how much of the family income was spent on food. It has been reported that food expenditure was strongly related to children's FV consumption (10). Alternatively, we did not have details on the cost of FV and average family income per country which could be a source of bias. One more factor, details on family structure were not collected. Previous studies have shown that consumption of FV amongst children from single-parent families was lower than in those with two parents (35; 36) due to low income and the higher cost of healthy foods such as FV (37). Concerning dietary assessment methods using self-administered FFQs, the scale used to categorize frequency of food intake, reporting, and social desirability bias are common disadvantages that may lead to overestimation of healthy food intake and underestimation of unhealthy foods in parents and children (38; 39). Furthermore, children's FFQ could resemble that of the parent completing the questionnaire (40). Nonetheless, uniform to all dietary guidelines of the participating countries is the recommendation for increased intake of FV for health benefits and in the prevention of future chronic disease <sup>(4)</sup>.

## **Conclusions**

344

345

346

347

348

349

350

351

352

353

354

355

356

357

358

359

360

361

362

363

364

365

366

367

368

370

371

372

373

374

375

Family is an important social environment where children learn and adopt their eating habits.

Parents play a crucial role as health promoters, role models, and educators influencing the food

choices of their children. Baseline data from the large-scale Feel4Diabetes study highlighted

that families in Southern European countries (i.e. Greece and Spain), as well as in Hungary

continue to have poor dietary habits as evident by the low FV intake. This study showed that

fathers' daily FV intake was positively associated with children's intake of these foods.

Implementation of future population-based strategies promoting FV intake not only in mothers

376	but also in fathers could be an effective public health initiative to increase FV intake in children.
377	Policy-makers should give special attention to families dwelling in Southern European regions.
378	
379	Transparency Declaration: The lead author affirms that this manuscript is an honest,
380	accurate, and transparent account of the study being reported. The reporting of this work is
381	compliant with the STROBE guidelines. The lead author affirms that no important aspects of
382	the study have been omitted and that any discrepancies from the study as planned have been
383	explained.

Conflict of Interest: The authors have no conflict of interests to declare

#### REFERENCES

- 1. WHO (2004) WHO/FAO. Fruit and vegetables for health, report of a joint FAO/WHO
- workshop. <a href="https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/43143">https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/43143</a> (accessed October 2020)
- 2. Aune D, Giovannucci E, Boffetta P et al. (2017) Fruit and vegetable intake and the risk of
- 389 cardiovascular disease, total cancer and all-cause mortality-a systematic review and dose-
- response meta-analysis of prospective studies. Int J Epidemiol 46, 1029-1056. doi:
- 391 10.1093/ije/dyw319.
- 392 3. Li M, Fan Y, Zhang X et al. (2014) Fruit and vegetable intake and risk of type 2 diabetes
- mellitus: meta-analysis of prospective cohort studies. BMJ Open 4, e005497. doi:
- 394 10.1136/bmjopen-2014-005497.
- 4. McCarthy R, Kehoe L, Flynn A et al. (2020) The role of fruit and vegetables in the diets of
- 396 children in Europe: current state of knowledge on dietary recommendations, intakes and
- 397 contribution to energy and nutrient intakes. Proc Nutr Soc, 1-8. doi:
- 398 10.1017/S0029665120007090.
- 5. Scaglioni S, De Cosmi V, Ciappolino V et al. (2018) Factors Influencing Children's Eating
- 400 Behaviours. *Nutrients* **10**, 706. doi: 10.3390/nu10060706.
- 401 6. Pearson N, Biddle SJ, Gorely T (2009) Family correlates of fruit and vegetable consumption
- 402 in children and adolescents: a systematic review. Public Health Nutr 12, 267-283. doi:
- 403 10.1017/S1368980008002589.
- 404 7. Wang Y, Beydoun MA, Li J et al. (2011) Do children and their parents eat a similar diet?
- 405 Resemblance in child and parental dietary intake: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal*
- 406 of Epidemiol. Community Health 65, 177. doi: 10.1136/jech.2009.095901.
- 8. Scaglioni S, Arrizza C, Vecchi F et al. (2011) Determinants of children's eating behavior.
- 408 Am J Clin Nutr. 94, 2006s-2011s. doi: 10.3945/ajcn.110.001685.
- 9. Draxten M, Fulkerson JA, Friend S et al. (2014) Parental role modeling of fruits and
- vegetables at meals and snacks is associated with children's adequate consumption. *Appetite*
- **78**, 1-7. doi: 10.1016/j.appet.2014.02.017.
- 412 10. Jones LR, Steer CD, Rogers IS et al. (2010) Influences on child fruit and vegetable intake:
- sociodemographic, parental and child factors in a longitudinal cohort study. Public Health
- 414 *Nutr.* **13**, 1122-1130. doi: 10.1017/S1368980010000133

- 415 11. Rodenburg G, Oenema A, Kremers SP et al. (2012) Parental and child fruit consumption
- 416 in the context of general parenting, parental education and ethnic background. Appetite 58,
- 417 364-372. doi: 10.1016/j.appet.2011.11.001.
- 12. Khandpur N, Blaine RE, Fisher JO et al. (2014) Fathers' child feeding practices: a review
- of the evidence. *Appetite* **78**, 110-121. doi: 10.1016/j.appet.2014.03.015
- 420 13. Latomme J, Huys N, Cardon G et al. (2019) Do physical activity and screen time mediate
- 421 the association between European fathers' and their children's weight status? Cross-sectional
- data from the Feel4Diabetes-study. Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act 16, 100-100.
- doi.org/10.1186/s12966-019-0864-8
- 14. Manios Y, Androutsos O, Lambrinou CP et al. (2018) A school- and community-based
- intervention to promote healthy lifestyle and prevent type 2 diabetes in vulnerable families
- across Europe: design and implementation of the Feel4Diabetes-study. *Public Health Nutr.* 21,
- 427 3281-3290. doi: 10.1017/S1368980018002136.
- 428 15. Androutsos O, Anastasiou C, Lambrinou C-P et al. (2020) Intra- and inter- observer
- 429 reliability of anthropometric measurements and blood pressure in primary schoolchildren and
- 430 adults: the Feel4Diabetes-study. *BMC Endocr Disord.* **20**, 27. doi: 10.1186/s12902-020-0501-
- 431 1.
- 432 16. Cole TJ, Lobstein T (2012) Extended international (IOTF) body mass index cut-offs for
- 433 thinness, overweight and obesity. Pediatr Obes. 7, 284-294. doi: 10.1111/j.2047-
- 434 6310.2012.00064.x.
- 17. Festy P, Gaymu J, Thévenin M (2014) Évaluer la situation budgétaire de son ménage, en
- 436 tête-à-tête avec l'enquêteur ou en présence du partenaire. Population 69, 85-107.
- 437 doi.org/10.3917/popu.1401.0085
- 438 18. Anastasiou CA, Fappa E, Zachari K et al. (2020) Development and reliability of
- 439 questionnaires for the assessment of diet and physical activity behaviors in a multi-country
- sample in Europe the Feel4Diabetes Study. BMC Endocr Disord 20, 135. doi: 10.1186/s12902-
- 441 019-0469-x.
- 442 19. Britton D (2020) SPSS e tutor Measures of Association and Correlation
- https://subjectguides.esc.edu/c.php?g=659059&p=4626955 (accessed February 2021).

- 20. Norusis M (2019) Ch 4 Ordinal Logistic Regression In *IBM SPSS Statistics 19 Advanced*
- 445 Statistical Procedures Companion: Prentice-Hall.
- https://www.norusis.com/pdf/ASPC\_v13.pdf. (accessed February 2021)
- 21. Petrauskienė A, Žaltauskė V, Albavičiūtė E (2015) Family socioeconomic status and
- nutrition habits of 7-8 year old children: cross-sectional Lithuanian COSI study. *Ital J Pediatr*.
- **449 41**, 34.
- 450 22. Laerd Statistics (2015) Ordinal logistic regression using SPSS statistics. Statistical tutorials
- and software guides. statistics. http://www.statistics.laerd.com (accessed December 2020)
- 452 23. Birch LL, Fisher JO (1998) Development of eating behaviors among children and
- 453 adolescents. *Pediatrics* **101**, 539-549.
- 24. Hall L, Collins CE, Morgan PJ et al. (2011) Children's intake of fruit and selected energy-
- dense nutrient-poor foods is associated with fathers' intake. J Am Diet Assoc 111, 1039-1044.
- 456 doi: 10.1016/j.jada.2011.04.008.
- 25. Robinson LN, Rollo ME, Watson J et al. (2015) Relationships between dietary intakes of
- children and their parents: a cross-sectional, secondary analysis of families participating in the
- 459 Family Diet Quality Study. *J Hum Nutr Diet* **28**, 443-451. doi: 10.1111/jhn.12261
- 26. Litchford A, Savoie Roskos MR, Wengreen H (2020) Influence of fathers on the feeding
- practices and behaviors of children: A systematic review. Appetite 147, 104558. doi:
- 462 10.1016/j.appet.2019.104558.
- 27. Ek S (2015) Gender differences in health information behaviour: a Finnish population-
- based survey. *Health Promot Int.* **30**, 736-745. doi: 10.1093/heapro/dat063
- 28. Wolnicka K, Taraszewska AM, Jaczewska-Schuetz J et al. (2015) Factors within the family
- 466 environment such as parents' dietary habits and fruit and vegetable availability have the
- greatest influence on fruit and vegetable consumption by Polish children. *Public Health Nutr*
- 468 **18**, 2705-2711. doi:10.1017/S1368980015000695
- 29. Birch LL (1992) Children's preferences for high-fat foods. *Nutr Revs.* **50**, 249-255. doi:
- 470 10.1111/j.1753-4887.1992.tb01341.x.
- 30. Walsh AD, Hesketh KD, van der Pligt P et al. (2017) Fathers' perspectives on the diets and
- 472 physical activity behaviours of their young children. PloS One 12, e0179210.
- 473 https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0179210.

- 474 31. Hall JN, Moore S, Harper SB et al. (2009) Global variability in fruit and vegetable
- 475 consumption. *Am J Prev Med.* **36**, 402-409.e405. doi: 10.1016/j.amepre.2009.01.029.
- 32. OECD (2016) Health at a Glance: Europe 2016 State of Health in the EU Cycle. Paris:
- 477 Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD).
- 478 http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264265592-en. (accessed February 2021)
- 33. Ashfield-Watt PAL, Welch AA, Day NE et al. (2004) Is 'five-a-day' an effective way of
- 480 increasing fruit and vegetable intakes? Public Health Nutr 7, 257-261. doi:
- 481 10.1079/PHN2003524.
- 34. Sleddens EFC, Kremers SPJ, Stafleu A et al. (2014) Food parenting practices and child
- 483 dietary behavior. Prospective relations and the moderating role of general parenting. *Appetite*
- **79**, 42-50. doi: 10.1016/j.appet.2014.04.004.
- 485 35. Zugravu C (2012) Eating habits and influential factors for mothers and children in
- 486 Romania. Internat J Collab Res Internal Med Public Health 4, 362-374.
- 487 https://internalmedicine.imedpub.com/eating-habits-and-influential-factors-for-mothers-
- 488 andchildren-in-romania.php?aid=6099
- 489 36. Baek YJ, Paik HY, Shim JE (2014) Association between family structure and food group
- 490 intake in children. *Nutr Res Pract* **8**, 463-468. doi: 10.4162/nrp.2014.8.4.463
- 491 37. Drewnowski A, Darmon N (2005) The economics of obesity: dietary energy density and
- 492 energy cost. Am J Clin Nutr **82**, 265s-273s. doi: 10.1093/ajcn/82.1.265S.
- 493 38. Moghames P, Hammami N, Hwalla N et al. (2016) Validity and reliability of a food
- frequency questionnaire to estimate dietary intake among Lebanese children. *Nutr J* **15**, 4. doi:
- 495 10.1186/s12937-015-0121-1.
- 496 39. Subar AF, Freedman LS, Tooze JA et al. (2015) Addressing Current Criticism Regarding
- 497 the Value of Self-Report Dietary Data. *J Nutr.* **145**, 2639-2645. doi: 10.3945/jn.115.219634.
- 498 40. Vepsäläinen H, Nevalainen J, Fogelholm M et al. (2018) Like parent, like child? Dietary
- 499 resemblance in families. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act.* **15**, 62. doi: 10.1186/s12966-018-0693-1.