

Statistical method

A. Description

We will use differences-in-differences (DID) estimators of intertemporal treatment effects to assess the effect of SSB tax on the sugar content of newly marketed SSBs in France or the United Kingdom (our outcome).¹ Specifically, these estimators compare the outcome evolution in France or the United Kingdom that has announced/implemented the tax (the treated country) to that of countries that have not (the countries control group), from the last year before the tax has been announced/implemented to the l th year after that announcement/implementation. We will estimate the effect of having announced/implemented the tax for the first time l years ago. SSB tax's instantaneous effect is estimated for $l = 0$ and dynamic effects for ($l \geq 1$).

We will apply de chaisemartin and D'Hautefeuille (2021) estimator to our sharp (treatment does not vary within country c and year t) and staggered treatment adoption design (countries have maintained the tax after they have announced/implemented for the first time in year $t-l$). The estimator proposed is valid even if there are heterogeneity in the effects of the tax over time.¹

We first set the following notations. For any $l \in \{0, \dots, 7\}$ and $t \in \{2012 + l, \dots, 2019\}$, let $N_{c,t,l}^1 = \sum_{i \in c, F_{c,1}=t-l} N_{i,c,t}$ denote the number of taxed newly marketed SSBs i in France or the United Kingdom ($c=FR, UK$) for the first time at year $t-l$, where for any country c , $F_{c,1} = \min\{t: Tax_{c,t} = 1\}$ denotes the first year at which country c has announced/implemented the SSB tax, $Tax_{c,t} = 1$. In our setting, $F_{UK,1}=2016$ and $F_{FR,1} = 2012$ or 2018 for the United Kingdom and France, respectively. It results that $N_{UK,t,l}^1 > 0$ for $(t, l) \in \mathcal{T}^{UK} = \{(2016,0), (2017,1), (2018,2), (2019,3)\}$, and $N_{UK,t,l}^1 = 0$ otherwise. For the 2012 French tax, we have $N_{FR,t,l}^1 > 0$ for $(t, l) \in \mathcal{T}^{FR} = \{(2012,0), (2013,1), (2014,2), (2015,3)\}$, and $N_{FR,t,l}^1 = 0$ otherwise.¹ For the 2018 French tax, $N_{FR,t,l}^1 > 0$ for $(t, l) \in \mathcal{T}^{FR} = \{(2018,0), (2019,1)\}$, and $N_{FR,t,l}^1 = 0$ otherwise. We have the convention that $F_{c,1} = 2020$ if country c has not announced/implemented the tax, $Tax_{c,t} = 0$. Let $N_t^{nt} = \sum_{c: F_{c,1} > t} N_{c,t}$ denote the number of untaxed newly marketed SSBs in countries control group from period 2010 to t , where $N_{c,t}$ is the number of newly marketed SSBs in country c at period t . In our setting, N_t^{nt} is always strictly positive. Finally, let $Y_{c,t} = 1/N_{c,t} \sum_{i \in c,t} Y_{i,c,t}$ denote the observed average of the sugar content in grams per 100 mL of newly marketed SSBs in country c at period t . We define the estimate of the SSB tax effect on the sugar content of newly marketed SSBs in treated country, $treated = UK, FR$, in t of having announced/implemented the tax for the first time l years ago, as:

$$DID_{treated,t,l} = \begin{cases} (Y_{treated,t} - Y_{treated,t-l-1}) - \sum_{c: F_{c,1} > t} \frac{N_{c,t}}{N_t^{nt}} (Y_{c,t} - Y_{c,t-l-1}), & \text{for } (t, l) \in \mathcal{T}^{treated} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

¹ More dynamic effects can be considered, but it turns out that the French excise tax had no effect in the 4 years following its implementation (see below).

$DID_{treated,t,l}$ is the DID estimator comparing the evolution of the sugar content in grams per 100 mL of newly marketed SSBs from period $t - l - 1$ to t in France or the United Kingdom and in countries belonging to the countries control group from 2010 to year t . In our setting for all $(t, l) \in \mathcal{T}^{treated}$, $Y_{UK,t-l-1} = Y_{UK,2015}$ for the United Kingdom; $Y_{FR,t-l-1} = Y_{FR,2011}$ for 2012 French tax; and $Y_{FR,t-l-1} = Y_{FR,2017}$ for 2018 French tax. To illustrate, $DID_{UK,t=2016,l=3}$ is the DID estimator comparing the evolution of the sugar content in grams per 100 mL of newly marketed SSBs from 2015 to 2019 in the United Kingdom, that announced the tax in 2016 and in countries belonging to the countries control group (Germany, Italy, and Spain) from 2010 to 2019. This estimator corresponds to the estimate effect in 2019, so 3 years ago after SDIL announcement, displayed in Exhibit 3 in the main text.

We will not use these notations in the main text for simplicity's sake. The estimators $DID_{UK,t,l}$ will correspond to estimate effects in 2016 ($t = 2016, l = 0$), 2017 ($t = 2017, l = 1$), 2018 ($t = 2018, l = 2$), and 2019 ($t = 2019, l = 3$) for the United Kingdom in the Table that will report the estimation results. The estimators $DID_{FR,t,l}$ will correspond to the effects in 2018 ($t = 2018, l = 0$) and 2019 ($t = 2019, l = 1$) for France in Table that will report the estimation results.

B. Placebo estimators: Plausibility of common trends hypothesis

De chaisemartin and D'Hautefeuille (2021) show that $DID_{treated,t,l}$ is an unbiased estimator of the cumulative effect of having announced/implemented the tax for $l+1$ years if the common trends assumption holds, i.e. the trends of the mean sugar content would have been the same in both the countries control and France or the United Kingdom in the absence of SSB tax. In other words, any selection bias implied by using data from the control countries group to build the counterfactual and not captured by the fixed effects is either constant over time, or, if it does evolve over time, the evolution is linear.

It is also possible that France or the United-Kingdom and countries control group have experienced different evolution of SSBs sugar content over time, but the DID approach can still produce unbiased estimators provided that those differential evolutions are accounted for by the change in country's covariates. Thus, we will also integrate in regressions time- and country-varying covariates that may affect companies' strategy regarding SSB sugar content, such as the country's variable indicators of health (childhood obesity rate,² share of out-of-pocket medical expenses over total health spending,³ death rate due to NCDs among populations aged 30--70 years⁴ and dietary and high body mass index risks⁵); the consumer price index of mineral waters, soft drinks and fruit and vegetable juices; and the proportion of SSBs with artificial sweeteners in each country over time. In our estimations, the share of out-of-pocket medical expenses will control for sugar content variations caused by changes in a country's health context. For example, if out-of-pocket medical expenses increase (i.e., the health care system becomes less protective), an individual may be more motivated to adopt healthier food habits such as purchasing healthier food products, which in turn may encourage SSBs companies to remove sugar. The proportion of SSBs with artificial sweeteners will control for time-varying reformulation strategies regarding the use of artificial sweeteners in SSBs recipes.

The common trends assumption is not directly testable, but to assess its plausibility de

Chaisemartin and D’Hautefeuille (2021) propose “long-difference” placebo estimators computed using pre-policy observations.¹ Contrary to standard tests used in event-study model, the test deployed in the analysis is robust even if tax effects are heterogeneous over time.¹ Following their analysis and notions defined above, we define

$$DID_{treated,t,l}^{pl} = (Y_{treated,t-2l-2} - Y_{treated,t-l-1}) - \sum_{c:F_{c,1}>t} \frac{N_{c,t}}{N_t^{nt}} (Y_{c,t-2l-2} - Y_{c,t-l-1})$$

for $treated = UK, FR$ and if $(t, l) \in \mathcal{T}^{treated}$, and we let $DID_{treated,t,l}^{pl} = 0$ otherwise. The l th placebo estimator, $DID_{treated,t,l}^{pl}$, compares the evolution of the sugar content in grams per 100 mL of newly marketed SSBs in a country c that has announced/implemented the tax (either France or the United Kingdom) for the first time in year $t-l$, and in countries that have not from 2010 to year t , as $DID_{treated,t,l}$, but between periods $t-2l-2$ and $t-l-1$ instead of $t-l-1$ and t .

We will not use these notations in the main text for simplicity's sake. These estimators $DID_{UK,t,l}^{pl}$ will correspond to the estimated difference in the evolution of the sugar content from 2014 to 2015 ($t = 2016, l = 0$), 2013 to 2015 ($t = 2017, l = 1$), 2012 to 2015 ($t = 2018, l = 2$), and 2011 to 2015 ($t = 2019, l = 3$) that we will report in Table of results for the United Kingdom. And the estimators $DID_{FR,t,l}^{pl}$ will correspond to the estimated difference in the evolution of the sugar content from 2016 to 2017 ($t = 2018, l = 0$), and 2015 to 2017 ($t = 2019, l = 1$) that we will report in Table of results for France. To further illustrate if necessary, $DID_{UK,t=2019,l=3}^{pl}$ is the DID estimator comparing the evolution of the sugar content in grams per 100 mL of newly marketed SSBs from 2011 to 2015 in the United Kingdom, that announced the tax in 2016 and in countries belonging to the countries control group (Germany, Italy, and Spain). It corresponds to the Estimated differences in the evolution of the sugar content from 2011 to 2015 in Exhibit 3 in the main text.

If common trend assumption holds, then de chaisemartin and D’Hautefeuille (2021) show that $E[DID_{treated,t,l}^{pl}] = 0$. So finding an estimation of $DID_{treated,t,l}^{pl}$, or say differently an estimated difference in the evolution of the sugar content in the United Kingdom or France and in Germany, Italy, and Spain between periods $t-2l-2$ and $t-l-1$, for $(t, l) \in \mathcal{T}^{treated}$, significantly different from 0 would imply that the common trends assumption is violated: France or the United Kingdom experienced different trend before announcement/implementation of the tax than the countries belonging to the countries control group used to reconstruct France or the United Kingdom counterfactual trend. Thus, the l th placebo estimator assesses whether common trends assumption holds over $l+1$ years, the number of years over which the assumption has to hold for the l th estimated dynamic effect, $DID_{treated,t,l}$, to be unbiased.

References

1. de Chaisemartin C, D’Haultfoeuille X. Difference-in-Differences Estimators of Intertemporal Treatment Effects. Available at SSRN 3731856. 2020;
2. Abarca-Gómez L, Abdeen ZA, Hamid ZA, Abu-Rmeileh NM, Acosta-Cazares B, Acuin C, et al. Worldwide trends in body-mass index, underweight, overweight, and obesity from 1975 to 2016: a pooled analysis of 2416 population-based measurement studies in 128·9 million children, adolescents, and adults. The Lancet. 2017;390(10113):2627–42.

3. Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation. Financing Global Health Visualization, WA: IHME, University of Washington [Internet]. 2017. Available from: <http://vizhub.healthdata.org/fgh/>
4. Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation. GBD Compare Data Visualization. Seattle, WA: IHME, University of Washington [Internet]. 2017. Available from: <http://vizhub.healthdata.org/gbd-compare>
5. Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation. Health-related SDGs. Seattle, WA: IHME, University of Washington [Internet]. 2017. Available from: <http://vizhub.healthdata.org/sdg> accessed