

1 **Preventing childhood obesity primary schools: a realist review from UK perspective**

2 **Authors:** Dr Sharea Ijaz<sup>1, 2</sup>; Dr James Nobles<sup>1,2</sup>; Dr Laura Johnson<sup>3</sup>; Miss Theresa Moore<sup>1,2,4</sup>;  
3 Dr Jelena Savović<sup>1,2</sup>; Professor Russell Jago<sup>1,3</sup>

4 1 The National Institute for Health Research Applied Research Collaboration West (NIHR  
5 ARC West) at University Hospitals Bristol and Weston NHS Foundation Trust, UK

6 2 Bristol Medical School, University of Bristol

7 3 Centre for Exercise, Nutrition & health Sciences, School for Policy Studies, University of  
8 Bristol

9 4 Cochrane UK Methods support Unit, Editorial Methods Department

10 Key words: childhood obesity, primary school, United Kingdom, realist synthesis

11 Corresponding author: Sharea Ijaz [s.ijaz@bristol.ac.uk](mailto:s.ijaz@bristol.ac.uk); +44 (0) 117 342 1274

12 PROSPERO Registration: CRD42019142192

13 **Abstract**

14 Objective: to identify contextual and mechanistic factors associated with outcomes of  
15 school-based obesity prevention interventions which may be implementable in UK primary  
16 schools.

17 Design: realist synthesis following REMESSES guidance. We developed an initial programme  
18 theory through expert consensus and stakeholder input and refined it with data from  
19 included studies to produce a final programme theory including all context-mechanism-  
20 outcome configurations.

21 Setting: primary schools

22 Participants: children aged 4-12

23 Interventions: included in the 2019 Cochrane review on prevention of childhood obesity

24 Outcomes: BMIz

25 Results: We included 24 studies comprised of 71 documents in our synthesis. We found that  
26 contextual factors such as baseline BMIz affects intervention mechanisms variably, while  
27 girls, older children and those with higher parental education consistently benefitted more  
28 from school-based interventions. Key mechanisms associated with beneficial effect were

29 sufficient intervention dose, environmental modification, and the intervention components  
30 working together as a whole. Education alone did not produce favourable outcomes.

### 31 Conclusions

32 Interventions should go beyond education and incorporate a sufficient dose to trigger  
33 change in BMIz. Contextual factors deserve consideration when commissioning  
34 interventions to avoid widening health inequalities.

## 35    **1. Background**

36    The world has witnessed a rapid increase in the prevalence of childhood obesity in the last  
37    three decades. UK data indicate that 20% of children aged 4-5 years and one third of  
38    children aged 10-11 years currently have overweight or obesity – as classified via use of  
39    standardised body mass index (BMIz).<sup>1</sup> Strategies to prevent excessive weight gain are  
40    therefore needed.

41    Obesity is now widely accepted as a function of a complex and obesogenic society and  
42    system.<sup>2-4</sup> Population-levels of obesity are known to be the product of many interrelated  
43    and interdependent factors,<sup>5</sup> and in response researchers, practitioners and policy makers  
44    have started to call for the implementation of a systems approach . These approaches  
45    acknowledge that many different sectors, organisations, communities, families and  
46    individuals need to come together to systematically address the root causes of obesity.<sup>2</sup>  
47    Given that children spend approximately 25% of their waking hours in schools, and the  
48    important role that schools play within society, they serve as a key setting for obesity  
49    prevention efforts.<sup>6,7</sup> Although, schools cannot be expected to prevent childhood obesity on  
50    their own, they make up an important part of the system where interventions can go  
51    beyond targeting individual responsibility.

52    The latest Cochrane review<sup>8</sup> found that school-based obesity prevention interventions can  
53    achieve small changes in BMIz over a school year. However, as interventions varied widely in  
54    design and degree of success, the review does not highlight to public health professionals  
55    which intervention features work best, for whom, and in what contexts. Realist reviews can  
56    help answer these questions by identifying contexts and mechanisms associated with  
57    intervention outcomes.<sup>9 10 11</sup>

58 The aim of this realist review was to identify, and understand, the contextual and  
59 mechanistic factors associated with the outcome of school-based obesity prevention studies  
60 included in the Cochrane review of Brown *et al.*<sup>8</sup>, which may be implemented within UK  
61 primary schools.

## 62 **2. Methods**

63 We carried out a realist review underpinned by the RAMESES guidance and the existing  
64 realist reviews in similar fields.<sup>10 11</sup> The study was registered with PROSPERO in July 2019  
65 (CRD42019142192).<sup>12</sup>

### 66 **2.1 Development of a programme theory**

67 We developed an initial programme theory (Figure 1) using our team expertise in obesity  
68 prevention, and intervention development and evaluation.

69 Patient and Public Involvement: We sought external stakeholder consultation<sup>13 14</sup> – via an  
70 online survey - to facilitate our understanding of the UK primary school contexts, and what  
71 stakeholders (school staff, management and organisations that work with primary schools)  
72 consider important.

73 The initial theory outlined the contextual and mechanistic factors that may be associated  
74 with change in BMIz among children aged 4-12 years old exposed to a primary school-based  
75 intervention. This programme theory was further developed and refined with stakeholder  
76 input and data from included studies over the course of the review in an iterative manner.  
77 Supporting information (section 1) illustrates how the programme theory evolved.

78

## **2.2 Inclusion / exclusion criteria**

Our sample frame was the recent Cochrane review “Interventions for Preventing Obesity in Children” which included 153 studies.<sup>8</sup> We included studies which met the following criteria: conducted in primary schools; included children aged 4-12 years; interventions aimed to prevent obesity; and presented mean BMIz as an outcome.

## **2.3 Data extraction (selection and coding)**

Two reviewers (SI, JN) assessed all studies included in the Cochrane review to determine if a study met our inclusion criteria. Data were extracted into a standardised template (see supporting information section 2) which evolved as review progressed. Whenever we identified a new context or mechanism during data extraction, we added these to data extraction forms and then revisited the previously extracted studies to ensure data were not overlooked. Over repeated rounds, and along with input from topic experts on the team (JN, LJ and RJ), we reached consensus over the coding for all extracted texts.

## **2.4 Rigour assessment**

We operationalised rigour assessment into a four-point scale based on the RAMESES definition of rigour<sup>15</sup> which are presented below. We employed risk of bias<sup>16</sup> judgements for the outcome as reported in the Cochrane review.<sup>8</sup> These decisions were made case by case and agreed between two reviewers (SI, JN) (see example in supporting information section 3).

The four categories of rigour for studies were:

- 99       • Highly rigorous data (++): Arguments /data for the CMOs are appropriate  
100       (underpinned with theory and data), and study was at low risk of bias for our  
101       outcome.
- 102       • Rigorous data (+): Arguments/ data presented are appropriate for CMOs, and study  
103       is not at low risk of bias for our outcome.
- 104       • Unclear rigour of data (?): No or weak arguments/ data presented for CMOs,  
105       irrespective of whether study is at low risk of bias for our outcome.
- 106       • Data not rigorous (-): Contrary or unreliable arguments/ data presented, irrespective  
107       of whether study is at low risk of bias for our outcome.

## 108       **2.5 Data synthesis**

109       Synthesis was a two-stage process. We first presented data on the CMO configurations at  
110       study level. Thus, producing a programme theory diagram for each study describing its CMO  
111       configurations. Then, for stage 2, we collated the CMO configurations from each study into a  
112       single, synthesised programme theory diagram (Figure 2).

113       We also summarised data reported on costs and sustainability of the interventions  
114       (supporting information section 4), as stakeholders considered these important.

## 115       **2.6 Analysis of subgroups or subsets**

116       We present programme theories for effective (defined as statistically significant BMIz  
117       change favouring intervention as seen in the Cochrane review) and ineffective interventions  
118       in supporting information section 5. We also synthesised studies with rigorous data alone to  
119       see any differences from main synthesis (see supporting information section 5).

### **3. Results**

All 153 studies included in the Cochrane review were assessed at abstract stage against our inclusion criteria. Of these, 29 studies met the criteria and were assessed in full texts (81 documents). Five studies (10 documents) were excluded at this stage as these were set entirely outside of the school<sup>17-19</sup> or did not involve primary school aged children.<sup>20 21</sup> Thus 24 studies<sup>22-45</sup> (71 documents) were included in this realist review. See supporting information section 6 for study flow and lists of excluded and included study documents.

#### **3.2 Included study characteristics**

See details of studies and extracted data in table 1.

129 Table 1 Characteristics of included studies

| Study and Location                          | Intervention content and delivery  | Contexts identified   | Mechanisms identified  | CMO configurations   | Rigour |
|---|--|---|--|--|--------|
| Effective studies                           |  |   |  |  |        |
| de Ruyter 2012 <sup>24</sup><br>Netherlands | <b>Description:</b> Double blind RCT, replacing sugary drinks (regularly consumed in school breaks and at home) with identical tasting sugar free drinks.<br><b>Provider:</b> Third party (researchers)<br><b>Timing:</b> N/A – drinks available at home and school; 18 months duration.<br><b>Target group:</b> Children; parents; teachers; school.                          | 1. Age<br>2. Ethnicity<br>3. Health behaviours<br>4. Health status<br>5. Health behaviours of peers/social norms<br>6. Parental academic attainment | 1. Focus on diet only<br>2. Environmental modification<br>3. Reinforcement & incentives<br>4. Mode of delivery<br>5. Time & location of delivery<br>6. Framing of intervention   | 1. Parental academic attainment → change diet<br>2. Ethnicity → change BMiz<br>3. Focus on diet alone → Change child's BMiz  | ++     |
| Khan 2014 <sup>32</sup><br>USA              | <b>Description:</b> Two hours of daily PA, five days/week for nine months; 15 min of education and healthy snack.<br><b>Provider:</b> Third party (undergrads, researchers).<br><b>Timing:</b> After school hours; nine months duration.<br><b>Target group:</b> Children.   | 1. Age<br>2. Pubertal status<br>3. Health status  | 1. Focus on PA only<br>2. Intervention dose<br>3. Education<br>4. Goal setting<br>5. Reinforcements & incentives<br>6. Facilitator skills and attributes<br>7. Changing self-efficacy<br>8. Changing motivation                              | 1. Healthy weight → Change BMiz<br>2. Focus on PA alone → Change BMiz  | ++     |
| Li 2010 <sup>35</sup><br>China              | <b>Description:</b> Two daily 10 min MVPA sessions conducted in the break between classes with variety of safe, moderate, age-, and space-appropriate activities.<br><b>Provider:</b> Teacher.<br><b>Timing:</b> During school hours; 12 months duration.<br><b>Target group:</b> Children.  | 1. Sex<br>2. Age<br>3. Health status<br>4. Location of school   | 1. Focus on PA only<br>2. Intervention dose<br>3. Education<br>4. Role modelling<br>5. Change awareness/ knowledge<br>6. Reinforcements & incentives<br>7. Alignment with curriculum<br>8. Tailoring<br>9. Facilitator skills and attributes | 1. Sex+ baseline BMI → change BMiz<br>2. Staff training → Facilitator skills and attributes → Change awareness/ knowledge<br>3. Intervention dose → Change BMiz<br>4. Facilitator skills+ tailoring+ alignment with curriculum → Change BMiz | +      |
| Marcus 2009 <sup>36</sup><br>Sweden         | <b>Description:</b> 30 min of daily PA was integrated into the curriculum. School lunch and afternoon snack were made healthier by adding fruit and vegetables. Awareness raising intervention provided for staff and parents.<br><b>Provider:</b> Teacher.<br><b>Timing:</b> During school hours; 48 months duration.<br><b>Target group:</b> Children, parents school staff. | 1. Ethnicity<br>2. SES<br>3. Age<br>4. Health status<br>5. Parental education attainment  | 1. Focus on multiple behaviours<br>2. Alignment with curriculum<br>3. Environmental modification<br>4. Change knowledge/ awareness   | 1. Focus on multiple behaviours+ child →<br>2. Environmental modification → change in child's diet → Change child's BMiz<br>3. Focus on multiple behaviours →<br>4. Alignment with curriculum  | +      |



| Study and Location                  | Intervention content and delivery   | Contexts identified  | Mechanisms identified  | CMO configurations   | Rigour |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|--|--|--------|
| Spiegel 2006 <sup>44</sup><br>USA   | <b>Description:</b> Seven modules of educational content for children. Modules on 1) general wellness, 2) reflective self-analysis, 3) principles of PA, 4) principles of diet and nutrition, 5) learning about the body, 6) genetics and family health, and 7) practical application of acquired knowledge. Ten mins of PA each day during class time.<br><b>Provider:</b> Teacher.<br><b>Timing:</b> During school hours; nine months duration<br><b>Target group:</b> Children, family, teacher. | None identified  | 1. Focus on multiple behaviours<br>2. Intervention as a whole<br>3. Education<br>4. Goal setting<br>5. Role play<br>6. Tailoring<br>7. Alignment with curriculum<br>8. Change knowledge & awareness<br>9. Change self-efficacy<br>10. Change motivation                | 1. Focus on multiple behaviours + role play → change self-efficacy<br>2. Focus on multiple behaviours → change knowledge & awareness → change child's diet + PA → change in BMIz<br>3. Change motivation → unintended consequences (academic improvement)<br>4. Intervention as a whole → change in BMIz | ?      |
| <b>Ineffective studies</b>          |   |  |  |  |        |
| Fairclough 2013 <sup>25</sup><br>UK | <b>Description:</b> One hour of content per week over 20 weeks. Intervention provided teachers with lesson plans, worksheets, homework tasks, lesson resources, and a CD-ROM. Topics covered PA and diet, and aligned with the UK Healthy Schools programme. Developed with parents, children, and teachers input.<br><b>Provider:</b> Teacher.<br><b>Timing:</b> During and after school hours; five months duration<br><b>Target group:</b> Children, family, teacher.                            | 1. Sex<br>2. Ethnicity<br>3. SES   | 1. Focus on multiple behaviour<br>2. Education<br>3. Staff upskilling & training<br>4. Intervention dose<br>5. Simplicity of content<br>6. Alignment with curriculum<br>1. Framing of intervention   | 1. Sex → change BMIz<br>2. Simplicity of content → Child's PA<br>3. Intervention dose → change child's diet + PA<br>4. Intervention dose → change BMIz   | ?      |
| Cao 2015 <sup>22</sup><br>China     | <b>Description:</b> Six-hours of health educational content per semester. Also includes regular newspapers, brochures, seminars and morning meetings. Offer one hour of PA per school day. Lower fat content and more fruits and vegetables available at canteens.<br><b>Provider:</b> Teacher, parent.<br><b>Timing:</b> During and after school hours; 34 months duration<br><b>Target group:</b> Children, parent, teacher   | 1. Sex<br>2. Health status<br>3. Parental health status<br>1. Location of school (urban China) | 1. Focus on multiple behaviours<br>2. Education<br>3. Peer support<br>4. Staff upskilling & training<br>5. Environmental modification<br>6. Facilitator skills & attributes<br>7. Alignment with curriculum  | 1. Sex → change BMIz<br>2. Health status → change BMIz<br>3. Parental health status → change BMIz  | ?      |
| Sahota 2001 <sup>41</sup><br>UK     | <b>Description:</b> Teacher training, modifications of school meals, and the development & implementation of school action plans designed to promote healthy eating and PA over one academic year. Developed with parent, teacher and child input.<br><b>Provider:</b> Teacher, school.<br><b>Timing:</b> During school hours; nine months.<br><b>Target group:</b> Children, teacher, school.  | 1. Population health trends (secular trends)   | 1. Focus on multiple behaviours<br>2. Education<br>3. Environmental modification<br>4. Staff upskilling & training<br>5. Intervention dose<br>6. Enjoyable content<br>7. Facilitator skills & attributes<br>8. Alignment with curriculum<br>7. Intervention as a whole | 1. Population health trend → change BMIz<br>2. Focus on multiple behaviours → enjoyable content<br>3. Focus on multiple behaviours + enjoyable content<br>4. Intervention as whole → change child's diet<br>5. Intervention as a whole → change BMIz<br>6. Intervention dose → change BMIz               | ?      |
| Gutin 2008 <sup>28</sup><br>USA     | <b>Description:</b> 40-min session of academic enrichment activities, followed by 80 min MVPA. Offered each day after school. Healthy snacks provided during break.   | 1. Sex<br>2. Ethnicity<br>3. SES   | 1. Focus on multiple behaviours<br>2. Education<br>3. Peer support   | 1. Sex or Ethnicity → BMIz<br>2. Education → change motivation<br>3. Enjoyable content +   | +      |

| Study and Location                      | Intervention content and delivery   | Contexts identified   | Mechanisms identified   | CMO configurations  | Rigour |
|---|---|---|---|---|--------|
|   | <b>Provider:</b> Teacher.<br><b>Timing:</b> After school hours; 36 months duration.<br><b>Target group:</b> Children, teacher.  |   | 4. Staff upskilling & training<br>5. Environmental modification<br>6. Intervention dose<br>7. Time and location of intervention delivery<br>8. Enjoyable content<br>9. Change motivation  | 4. Peer support → change motivation<br>5. Environmental modification → change motivation<br>6. Change motivation → change child's diet<br>7. Environmental modification → change child's diet<br>8. Intervention dose → change child's PA |        |
| Lazaar 2007 <sup>34</sup><br>France     | <b>Description:</b> Two sessions of school PE per week (one hour per session). The which intensity and duration off sessions increased throughout the study with the aim that the 45 min of exercise in one hour is playful.<br><b>Provider:</b> Third party (state PE undergrads).<br><b>Timing:</b> During school hours; six months duration.<br><b>Target group:</b> Children.   | 1. Sex<br>2. Health status  | 1. Focus on PA<br>2. Peer support<br>3. Enjoyable content<br>4. Change knowledge & awareness  | 1. Sex → change BMIz<br>2. Health status → BMIz change<br>3. Focus on PA alone → change BMIz  | ?      |
| Damsgaard 2014 <sup>23</sup><br>Denmark | <b>Description:</b> School lunch and snacks based on the New Nordic Diet, designed to cover 40–45% of the children's daily energy intake (mid-morning snack, ad-libitum hot lunch, afternoon snack, fresh fruit or fruit-based dessert). Seasonal menus developed. Children participated in the cooking.<br><b>Provider:</b> Kitchen staff, school.<br><b>Timing:</b> During, three months.<br><b>Target group:</b> Children, school.   | 1. SES<br>2. Parental academic attainment   | 1. Focus on diet<br>2. Environmental modification<br>3. Intervention dose   | 1. Focus on diet → environmental modification<br>2. Focus on diet → change BMIz<br>3. Intervention dose → change child's diet → change BMIz   | +      |
| Rush 2012 <sup>40</sup><br>New Zealand  | <b>Description:</b> Project staff allocated to schools to model classes around various physical activities. Study also promoted active transport, lunchtime games, bike days and training for students to be leaders of PA. Project staff assisted school with healthy-eating initiatives (e.g. canteen makeovers). Nutritional information included in weekly school newsletter. Parents asked to attend three information sessions and a 45-min practical nutrition class. Project staff helped teachers, parents and the local community via a range of activities (open days, edible gardens).<br><b>Provider:</b> Third party (project staff), teacher.<br><b>Timing:</b> During school hours; 24 months duration.<br><b>Target group:</b> Children, parent, teacher, school, community. | 1. Ethnicity<br>2. SES<br>3. Location of school (urban/rural)   | 1. Focus on multiple behaviours<br>2. Education<br>3. Reinforcements & incentives<br>4. Environmental modification<br>5. Facilitator skills & attributes<br>6. Alignment with curriculum<br>7. Intervention as a whole<br>8. Change awareness & knowledge | 1. SES → change general health<br>2. Location of school → change general health<br>3. Intervention as a whole → Environmental modification → change awareness and knowledge<br>4. Intervention as a whole → change BMIz                   | ?      |
| Grydeland 2014 <sup>27</sup><br>Norway  | <b>Description:</b> Classroom-based dietary education using personally tailored computer software. Also offered fruit/vegetable and PA breaks during day. Inspirational PA courses for teachers, and fact sheets to parents. Environmental component included active transport campaigns, PA equipment, and suggestions for playground improvements.<br><b>Provider:</b> Teacher.   | 1. Sex<br>2. Ethnicity<br>3. SES<br>4. Health status<br>5. Health behaviours<br>6. Health behaviours of | 1. Focus on multiple behaviours<br>2. Intervention dose<br>3. Intervention as a whole<br>4. Change awareness and knowledge  | 1. Sex → change child's PA,<br>2. Health status → change child's PA<br>3. Parental academic attainment → change child's PA<br>4. Health behaviours of peers/ social norms → change child's diet + change BMIz                             | ?      |

| Study and Location                     | Intervention content and delivery   | Contexts identified   | Mechanisms identified   | CMO configurations  | Rigour |
|--|---|---|---|---|--------|
|  | <b>Timing:</b> During and after school hours; 20 months duration.<br><b>Target group:</b> Children, teacher, parent.  | peers/ social norms   |   | 5. Intervention dose → change BMIz<br>6. Intervention as a whole → change (parental) awareness & knowledge  |        |
| James 2004 <sup>30</sup><br>UK         | <b>Description:</b> Four educational components delivered to children by project staff: 1) a one hour session delivered once per term on the balance of good health and promotion of drinking water; 2&3) one off sessions to create a rap / song about healthy diet, and 4) a presentation and quiz.<br><b>Provider:</b> Third party (project staff), teacher.<br><b>Timing:</b> During school hours; 12 months duration.<br><b>Target group:</b> Children.          | None identified   | 1. Focus on diet<br>2. Education<br>3. Simplicity of content<br>4. Facilitator skills & attributes  | 1. Focus on diet → change BMIz<br>2. Focus on diet → change child's diet<br>3. Simplicity of content → change BMIz  | +      |
| Meng 2013 <sup>37</sup><br>China       | <b>Description:</b> Classroom-based 10-min MVPA led by teachers. Sessions on nutrition and health six times for students (monthly), twice for parents and four times for teachers and health workers.<br><b>Provider:</b> Teacher<br><b>Timing:</b> During school hours; six months duration.<br><b>Target group:</b> Children, parent teacher.   | 1. Location of schools (urban China)  | 1. Focus on multiple behaviours<br>2. Focus on diet<br>3. Focus on PA<br>4. Education<br>5. Enjoyable content<br>6. Intervention dose<br>7. Intervention as a whole   | 1. Intervention dose → change in BMIz<br>2. Intervention as a whole → change in BMIz<br>3. Focus on PA → enjoyable content  | ?      |
| Rosario 2012 <sup>39</sup><br>Portugal | <b>Description:</b> 12 nutritional education sessions of three hours each duration for children plus six month of teacher training.<br><b>Provider:</b> Teacher.<br><b>Timing:</b> During school hours; six months duration.<br><b>Target group:</b> Children, teacher.   | 1. Parental academic attainment<br>2. Location of school (urban)              | 1. Focus on diet<br>2. Education<br>3. Staff upskilling & training<br>4. Facilitator skills & attributes<br>5. Tailoring<br>6. Enjoyable content<br>7. Intervention dose<br>8. Intervention as a whole<br>9. Change motivation  | 1. Teacher upskilling → tailoring → change motivation<br>2. Intervention as a whole → change in child's diet<br>3. Intervention dose of teacher training → tailoring → motivation | -      |
| Foster 2008 <sup>26</sup><br>USA       | <b>Description:</b> The School Nutrition Policy Initiative included: school self-assessment; nutritional education for parent, child and teacher; nutrition policy; social marketing campaign targeted at children; and parent outreach work via nutrition educators.<br><b>Provider:</b> Teacher, third party (nutrition educators).<br><b>Timing:</b> During and after school hours; 24 months duration.<br><b>Target group:</b> Children, parent, teacher, school. | 1. Ethnicity<br>2. SES<br>3. Location of school<br>4. Population health trend | 1. Focus on multiple behaviours<br>2. Education<br>3. Reinforcement & incentives<br>4. Staff upskilling & training<br>5. Facilitator skills & attributes<br>6. Tailoring<br>7. Social marketing<br>8. Environmental modification<br>9. Policy/legislation<br>10. Alignment with curriculum<br>11. Intervention as a whole | 1. Ethnicity → change BMIz<br>2. Tailoring → change BMIz<br>3. Intervention as a whole → change child's sedentary behaviour change BMIz → change BMIz                             | -      |

| Study and Location                         | Intervention content and delivery  | Contexts identified   | Mechanisms identified   | CMO configurations   | Rigour |
|--|--|---|---|--|--------|
| Muckelbauer 2010 <sup>38</sup><br>Germany  | <b>Description:</b> Combined environmental and educational intervention promoting water consumption: water fountains installed in schools, provision of reusable water bottles, and lessons importance of water consumption<br><b>Provider:</b> Teacher, school.<br><b>Timing:</b> During school hours; 12 months duration.<br><b>Target group:</b> Children, teacher, school.   | 1. Ethnicity<br>2. Health status<br>3. Health behaviours of family<br>4. Health behaviours of peers/ social norms<br>5. Health offering of school | 1. Focus on diet<br>2. Education<br>3. Goal setting<br>4. Reinforcement and incentives<br>5. Environmental modification<br>6. Alignment with curriculum<br>7. Change motivation   | 1. Education +goal setting→ change motivation → change child's diet<br>2. Reinforcement & incentive → change child's diet<br>3. Environmental modification → change child's diet<br>4. Change child's diet→ change in BMIz | -      |
| Santos 2014 <sup>42</sup><br>Canada        | <b>Description:</b> Older students received a weekly 45-min healthy living lesson from teachers (given training for two days). Older students acted as peer mentors, teaching a 30-minute lesson to younger “buddies.” Two 30-minute structured aerobic fitness sessions per week with student pairs.<br><b>Provider:</b> Teacher, child.<br><b>Timing:</b> During school hours; 10 months duration.<br><b>Target group:</b> Children.   | 1. Age<br>2. Health status  | 1. Focus on multiple behaviours<br>2. Education<br>3. Role modelling<br>4. Peer support<br>5. Staff upskilling/ training<br>6. Alignment with curriculum<br>7. Intervention as a whole<br>8. Change awareness/ knowledge<br>9. Change self-efficacy | 1. Intervention as a whole → change in awareness/knowledge<br>2. Intervention as a whole → change self-efficacy<br>3. Intervention as a whole → change BMIz  | ++     |
| Siegrist 2013 <sup>43</sup><br>Germany     | <b>Description:</b> 45 min per month of additional PE during school hours. Re-arrangement of the classrooms, halls, and playgrounds to promote more PA. Worksheets, assignments, and newsletters sent home to support PA. Measures to improve the quality of food sold at school snack bars. Parents provided with three hours of training, and teachers given nine hours..<br><b>Provider:</b> Teacher.<br><b>Timing:</b> During and after school hours; 12 months duration.<br><b>Target group:</b> Children, parents, teachers.               | 1. Health status  | 1. Focus on multiple behaviours<br>2. Education<br>3. Staff upskilling/training<br>4. Environmental modification<br>5. Alignment with curriculum<br>6. Intervention dose<br>7. Change motivation  | 1. Health status → change child's PA<br>2. Education → change motivation→ change child's PA<br>3. Intervention dose → change child's PA  | -      |
| Williamson 2012 <sup>45</sup><br>USA       | <b>Description:</b> Environmental modification of school setting: 1) cues related to healthy eating and activity, 2) cafeteria food service, and 4) PE programs. Behavioural modification: 1) educational program delivered as a part of class work, with synchronous on-line counselling and asynchronous email communications for children and parents. Teachers trained prior to, and throughout, the trial duration.<br><b>Provider:</b> Teacher.<br><b>Timing:</b> During school hours; 28 months duration<br><b>Target group:</b> Children | 1. Sex<br>2. Ethnicity<br>3. Health status<br>4. SES<br>5. Location or schools (rural)  | 1. Focus on multiple behaviours<br>2. Education<br>3. Environmental modification<br>4. Alignment with curriculum<br>5. Tailoring<br>6. Intervention dose  | 1. Health status → tailoring<br>2. Tailoring → change BMIz<br>3. Education → change child's PA<br>4. Intervention dose → change BMIz   | ?      |
| Herscovici 2013 <sup>29</sup><br>Argentina | <b>Description:</b> Four workshops (40 min each, once a month) on diet and PA (three for children and one for parents). Modifications made to school cafeteria menu.<br><b>Provider:</b> Third party (interdisciplinary team).   | 1. Sex<br>2. SES<br>3. Health behaviours of peers/ social norms   | 1. Focus on multiple behaviours<br>2. Education<br>3. Environmental modification<br>4. Facilitator skills & attributes  | 1. Sex →change child's diet<br>2. Intervention dose →change BMIz   | ?      |

| Study and Location                 | Intervention content and delivery   | Contexts identified  | Mechanisms identified   | CMO configurations   | Rigour |
|------------------------------------|---|--|---|--|--------|
|                                    | <b>Timing:</b> During school hours; six months duration.<br><b>Target group:</b> Children, parents.   |  | 5. Change awareness & knowledge<br>6. Change motivation   |  |        |
| Johnston 2013 <sup>31</sup><br>USA | <b>Description:</b> Trained health professionals visited school three times per week to meet staff and provide suggestions for how to improve health messages across school. They trained and assisted teachers (60 hours training and 40 hours of supervised practice) to implement healthy messages in curriculum. They also helped to improve availability of nutrient rich food at school cafeteria.<br><b>Provider:</b> Third party (trained health professionals), teacher.<br><b>Timing:</b> During school hours; 24 months duration.<br><b>Target group:</b> Children, parents, teachers, school.                                     | 1. Health status   | 1. Focus on multiple behaviours<br>2. Reinforcements & incentives<br>3. Staff upskilling/training<br>4. Facilitator skills and attributes<br>5. Mode of intervention delivery<br>6. Alignment with curriculum<br>7. Change motivation | 1. Health status → change BMIz<br>2. Staff upskilling/training+ facilitator skills & attributes→ teacher motivation<br>3. Mode of intervention delivery→ change BMIz<br>4. Change motivation→ change BMIz      | +      |
| Kipping 2014 <sup>33</sup><br>UK   | <b>Description:</b> Training for teachers and teaching assistants provided by the study team. Teachers provided with 16 lesson-plans and teaching materials. Schools also provided with information that they could use in newsletters about the importance of PA, sedentary behaviour and diet. Parents provided with 10 parent-child interaction homework activities, and information on how to encourage their child's health behaviours.<br><b>Provider:</b> Teacher, third party (multidisciplinary).<br><b>Timing:</b> During and after school hours; eight months duration.<br><b>Target group:</b> Children, parent, teacher, school. | 1. Staff interest in health/ obesity<br>2. School ethos & inspirations<br>3. Government policy | 1. Focus on multiple behaviours<br>2. Role modelling, staff upskilling/ training<br>3. Intervention dose<br>4. Simplicity of content<br>5. Change awareness& knowledge<br>6. Change self-efficacy                                     | 1. Role modelling → change awareness & knowledge<br>2. Intervention dose → change child's PA<br>3. Intervention dose → Change self-efficacy → change child's diet/PA<br>4. Simplicity of content → change BMIz | ++     |

130 BMIz: standardized body mass index; CMO: context-mechanism-outcome; min: minutes; MVPA: moderate to vigorous physical activity; PA: physical activity; PE: physical education; RCT:

131 randomised controlled trial; SES: socioeconomic status

132 ++: Highly rigorous data

133 +: Rigorous data

134 ?: Unclear rigour of data

135 -: Data not rigorous

136 →: context or mechanism produced a favourable effect

137 ↗: context or mechanism did not produce favourable effect

138

139

The majority of interventions addressed multiple health behaviours (16 studies), followed by diet alone (six studies) and PA alone (three studies). Interventions were most often tested in the USA (six studies), followed by UK and China (three studies in each). Most (n=16) interventions were delivered entirely during school hours and majority interventions (n=13 studies) targeted children, their parents (or family) and teachers together. Teachers were the providers (deliverers) of interventions most often (18 studies) either exclusively (10 studies) or with a third party such as researchers, children, health or PA experts (eight studies). Interventions durations ranged from three months to four years with a median of 12 months (IQR 7.5 to 24).

### **3.3 The final programme theory**

Amendments to the programme theory throughout the review period can be seen from figures 1 and 2 and in supporting information section 1. Six new contexts (age, health behaviours of child, pubertal status, parental health status, parental academic attainment, and population health trend) and six new mechanisms (social marketing, timing of intervention delivery, enjoyability of content, simplicity of content, role play, and alignment with curriculum) in total were added to the programme theory over five iterations (available in online supporting information section 1). We found evidence on 16 contexts and 20 mechanisms from the 24 included studies. We present our findings below starting from most cited to least cited contexts and mechanisms across studies.

159 **Figure 1 The initial programme theory**

160

161 **Figure 2 Final programme theory showing CMOs from all included studies**

162 Dotted black lines indicate which contexts affected which outcomes. Continuous black lines from mechanism to outcomes indicate a favourable change (e.g. improved PA levels) while continuous red lines indicate  
163 lack of a favourable change (e.g. no difference in PA levels or an unfavourable change (e.g. lower PA levels).

164 [] bracketed numbers underneath the lines indicate respective studies for that CMO line. Green brackets refer to studies that found a favourable BMI z change (effective studies) and red refer to those that did not  
165 (ineffective studies): 1=deRuyter 2012; 2=Khan 2014; 3=Li 2010; 4=Marcus 2009; 5=Spiegel 2006; 6=Fairclough 2013; 7=Cao 2015; 8=Sahota 2001; 9=Gutin 2008; 10=Lazaar 2007; 11=Damsgaard 2014; 12=Rush  
166 2012; 13=Grydeland 2014; 14=James 2004; 15=Meng 2013; 16=Rosario 2012; 17=Foster 2008; 18=Muckelbauer 2010; 19=Santos 2014; 20=Siegrist 2013; 21=Williamson 2012; 22=Herscovici 2013; 23=Johnston  
167 2013; 24=Kipping 2014.

### 3.3.1 Contextual factors

**Baseline BMI classification** was a major contextual factor for intervention effect. Four studies found their interventions worked better for children with overweight or obesity in contrast to children of a healthy weight.<sup>22 31 34-36</sup> Two studies found their intervention worked only for children who were of a healthy weight at baseline.<sup>27 32</sup> Only one study discretely tailored the intervention differently for the two groups so as to minimize “potential for stigmatizing overweight kids”<sup>45</sup>, albeit with no effect difference in BMIz.

**Sex** appeared to be the next noteworthy context. Girls were reported on several occasions to benefit more from interventions in terms of favourable BMIz, PA or diet change.<sup>22 25 27 29 34 35</sup> Study authors argued that girls may be more concerned about their body image and weight, therefore more likely to adhere to the educational content of the interventions. Compared to boys, girls also maintained changes in BMIz after the interventions stopped.<sup>25 35</sup>

For **ethnicity**, one study<sup>26</sup> found evidence that black children benefited more from their intervention than white children. Conversely, another<sup>38</sup> argued that, since the educational component of the intervention was not tailored to account for cultural differences, their intervention may have been less effective for migrant (non-German) children, although no effect difference by this variable was seen. Two studies<sup>28,40</sup> tailored their intervention content for cultural differences and found no difference in the outcomes between children of different ethnicities.

Older **age** children achieved lower BMIz<sup>36</sup> and higher PA levels<sup>35</sup>; Li *et al.*<sup>35</sup> argued this may be because older children are better able to understand and follow the directions associated with the intervention.



191 **Parental academic attainment** also impacted an intervention's effects. In two studies,  
 192 children of parents with lower academic attainment were less likely to make dietary  
 193 changes.<sup>24 36</sup> These children were also less likely to complete the intervention.<sup>23 24</sup>

194 **Peer behaviour and social norms** were noted contexts in two studies.<sup>24 27</sup> DeRuyter *et al.*<sup>24</sup>  
 195 who replaced children's sugary drinks with artificially sweetened ones noted that the social  
 196 norm among Dutch children to bring a sugar sweetened drink with them to school allowed  
 197 for easy switch to an artificially sweetened drink. So, the intervention is unlikely to work in  
 198 countries where sugar-sweetened drinks are not routinely consumed at school. Grydland *et*  
 199 *al.*,<sup>27</sup> who offered fruit and vegetable snacks at break time noted that fruit, but not  
 200 vegetable, intake increased amongst the children. They argued that this was because in  
 201 Norway, vegetables are often eaten during evening meal, which is why only fruit  
 202 consumption increased.

203 **Population health trends** appeared to affect how an intervention worked in one study  
 204 where the population prevalence of childhood overweight and is high, it is unlikely that a  
 205 simple educational intervention will suffice.<sup>41</sup> Other contexts potentially influencing an  
 206 interventions' effect on child's health were **good parental health status**,<sup>22</sup> **rural location of**  
 207 **school**<sup>40</sup> and **high socioeconomic status (SES)**.<sup>40</sup>

### 208 **3.3.2 Mechanisms**

209 **Education** was the most used mechanism (18 studies). Education alone led to a change in  
 210 *motivation* in three studies<sup>28 38 43</sup> and to change in *self efficacy* in one,<sup>32</sup> but not BMIz.  
 211 Spiegel *et al.*<sup>44</sup> demonstrated that education, when delivered through mechanisms of **goal**  
 212 **setting, role play** and **tailoring**, would change *knowledge, self-efficacy, and motivation*. The  
 213 knowledge change was argued to have brought about change in child's *diet, PA levels and*

214 *BMiZ*. Williamson *et al.*<sup>45</sup> provided evidence that education combined with **alignment with**  
215 **curriculum** as a mechanism could change child's PA.

216 The second most cited mechanism was sufficient **intervention dose**. Three studies argued  
217 that sufficient intervention dose brought about a significant *BMiZ change*.<sup>32 35 36</sup> Ten<sup>35</sup> and  
218 30<sup>36</sup> minutes of integrated daily PA over 12 and 48 months respectively was effective in  
219 changing *BMiZ* for children with overweight or obesity. While 70 minutes of intermittent  
220 MVPA, five times a week, for nine months was argued as sufficient to change *BMiZ* in  
221 children with healthy weight at baseline.<sup>32</sup>

222 Several other studies argued that the intervention dose was too low to achieve a *BMiZ*  
223 reduction.<sup>25 27 29 33 37 41 43 45</sup> However, most of these involved educational health promotions  
224 and little enabling of PA. For example, 20 months<sup>27</sup> and 28 months of PA promotion in  
225 school<sup>45</sup> was insufficient to alter *BMiZ* compared with the control group. While *BMiZ* stayed  
226 unaffected, children's *PA levels* improved after three years of 80 min MVPA at least twice a  
227 week<sup>28</sup> but not after 6 months of 10 min daily MVPA<sup>37</sup>. Both interventions claimed to be  
228 enjoyable (i.e. an additional mechanism).

229 Insufficient intervention dose was also proposed as a reason for unchanged *diet behaviour*  
230<sup>23</sup> because the intervention could only influence food consumed within school hours and  
231 therefore had limited potential to change total daily intake. Kipping *et al.*<sup>33</sup> hypothesised  
232 **self-efficacy** as a mechanism for change in diet and activity behaviours, however suggested  
233 that intervention dose was not enough to change self-efficacy. They also suggested that  
234 change in PA requires more intense PA interventions, however also noted that given how  
235 busy schools and staff already are it may not be feasible.

236 **Environmental modification** often altered food options available for children but this was  
 237 not always associated with change in dietary behaviour.<sup>22 23 26 29 40 41 43 45</sup> Only in two  
 238 studies<sup>36 38</sup> was environmental modification associated with a change in child's diet, and  
 239 with a BMIz change in one.<sup>36</sup> These modifications consisted of: a) modifying the  
 240 arrangement of school lunches in self-service areas: fruit and vegetables were placed  
 241 before other options.<sup>36</sup> and b) the installation of water fountains in school premises.<sup>38</sup> The  
 242 authors argued that these environmental modifications – once implemented – led to  
 243 sustainable changes in dietary behaviours.

244 Two studies used environmental modification as a mechanism to bring about change in the  
 245 children's PA levels.<sup>28 43</sup> Gutin *et al.*<sup>28</sup> created what they termed a "fitogenic environment"  
 246 through the provision of additional PA afterschool, whilst Siegrist *et al.*<sup>43</sup> made  
 247 modifications to the classrooms, halls and playgrounds to encourage PA. Both studies  
 248 demonstrated positive impacts on PA levels, but not on BMIz.

249 **Intervention as a whole** was cited as a mechanism in six studies. We assume that most  
 250 interventions are designed to work as a whole, however in the context of this realist review,  
 251 only a small number of studies were explicit in stating that it was the entirety of the  
 252 intervention that brought about a change in an outcome, with one of these achieving *BMIz*  
 253 *change*.<sup>44</sup> Spiegel *et al.*<sup>44</sup> attributed the BMIz change to the various intervention  
 254 components (via **role play, goal setting, tailoring, and alignment with curriculum**) working  
 255 "in concert ... creating something greater than the sum of the parts." Two other studies,  
 256 Sahota *et al.*<sup>41</sup> and Rosario *et al.*<sup>39</sup>, reported that the intervention as a whole only changed  
 257 *dietary intake*. Similarly, Foster *et al.*<sup>26</sup> found that their intervention, as a whole, only led to  
 258 a change in *sedentary behaviour*, with Grydland *et al.*<sup>27</sup> Rush *et al.*<sup>40</sup>, and Santos *et al.*<sup>42</sup>

259 citing their interventions as a whole changed *knowledge and awareness* of health  
 260 behaviours.

261 **Alignment with curriculum** and **staff upskilling/ training** were often employed together<sup>22 25</sup>  
 262 <sup>26 31 35 41-43</sup> aiming to **educate** the children in order to change the behaviour and yet led to  
 263 behaviour change in only one study.<sup>35</sup> This was achieved via additional contributions from  
 264 **tailoring** of this intervention to the age group and an optimal intervention dose.

265 **Tailoring** was employed in four studies<sup>35 39 44 45</sup> and, as mentioned above, only in one<sup>35</sup> it led  
 266 to the desired behaviour change in children. Tailoring was demonstrated via age-, and  
 267 space-appropriate exercises where students and teachers were allowed to develop new  
 268 activities in one study,<sup>35</sup> options to increase intensity of aerobic exercises in class in  
 269 another,<sup>44</sup> and a software programme recognizing children with overweight and offering  
 270 them different content in one.<sup>45</sup> The fourth study<sup>39</sup> ensured that intervention content could  
 271 be tailored by the teachers themselves in order to best serve the needs of their pupils.

272 Five studies reported their interventions to have **enjoyable content**.<sup>28 34 37 39 41</sup> However,  
 273 only one of these studies<sup>28</sup> highlighted that their enjoyable PA content (by offering different  
 274 activities and enabling children to see their progression) changed motivation.

275 **Simplicity** of the intervention and / or intervention content was cited in three studies,<sup>25 30 33</sup>  
 276 all from the UK. One argued that their simple message led to change in child's PA levels.<sup>25</sup>  
 277 The other two studies,<sup>30 33</sup> found their simple interventions not successful as a mechanism in  
 278 changing BMIz. It must be reiterated here that we took authors' labelling of their  
 279 intervention as "simple" and there is limited interpretation possible from them. Kipping *et*  
 280 *al.*<sup>33</sup> employed child education, role modelling, teacher training, and parent counselling.  
 281 They argue in their conclusions that such "simple school-based interventions that are

designed to minimise costs” cannot bring about major change in diet and PA. Fairclough *et al.*<sup>25</sup> on the other hand although employed education and training for child, teacher, and parent- focused on changing the curriculum to include the simple message ‘move more sit less’ which they believe was a simple non-prescriptive approach.

### 3.4 Gaps in evidence

We found no evidence for some individual contextual factors (such as child’s academic attainment, health literacy, perceived health status and perceived importance of own health), and some family factors (family constraints, family structures and relationships, and household income). Also missing was evidence on type of school (public or private), slack (resource) available in school, staff health status, healthiness of the school environment and curriculum flexibility. The mechanisms not addressed in any studies were monitoring/screening, change marketing/promotion of health offering, and changing social norms.

### 3.5 Reporting of Costs

Eight studies reported cost or resource use (see supporting information section 4). Costs for these varied interventions in current GBP values could range from £12<sup>37</sup> to over £1300<sup>32</sup> per child per year.

### 3.6 Reporting on sustainability of intervention

Eleven studies highlighted intervention features which they believe increased the sustainability of the intervention – see supporting information section 4. These were: stakeholder involvement in intervention design and development, delivering it within the

existing resources of the school; collaborating with the relevant authorities and sectors; and adaptable (flexible) intervention content.

### 3.7 Findings of sensitivity analysis

Restricting our analysis to only rigorously conducted studies (n=11; judged either ++ or +),<sup>23</sup> we found the key contexts of influence were still baseline BMI,<sup>31 32 34-36</sup> parental educational attainment<sup>24 36</sup> and sex<sup>34 35</sup> (see supporting information section 5). Among mechanisms, intervention dose<sup>23 28 32 33 35</sup> stood out again along with environmental modification<sup>23 24 28 36</sup> as the most often cited.

## 4. Discussion

This realist synthesis found that female sex, and older age, alongside higher parental academic attainment, are key contexts for intervention effectiveness. While some interventions benefited children with a higher baseline BMIz status others benefited already healthy weight children. Girls appeared to benefit from the interventions due to the influence of social norms surrounding body image, which is in line with findings of a recent large scale study in the UK.<sup>46</sup> Future studies should therefore consider how interventions may better meet the needs of boys while also addressing the negative social norms surrounding female body image. Similarly, interventions should ensure that they are not just effective for children of highly educated parents, or those without overweight and obesity, because this may inadvertently widen health inequalities.

Despite socio-economic status (SES) being a well-known moderator of intervention effect for health promotion interventions,<sup>47</sup> it was formally explored in only one included study.<sup>40</sup> This limited evidence on SES was also reported in a recent overview of obesity prevention in adolescents.<sup>48</sup> Thus, it is important to consider here how interventions may widen health

326 inequalities if they offer more favourable outcomes for people who are socio-economically  
327 better off. As aforementioned, parental education, which is a proxy indicator for SES,<sup>49 50</sup>  
328 was associated with intervention uptake and effect. Educational attainment is only one  
329 domain associated with SES, and so future studies should separate the effects of SES from  
330 parental education levels. This will allow us to target the context that is preventing the  
331 intended mechanisms from working.

332 The perceived sufficiency of the intervention dose appeared to affect BMIz in various  
333 contexts. However, what constituted sufficient or optimal dose (or dose range) was not  
334 specified. Dose can include frequency of and duration of an intervention session (per week  
335 or per month) as well as the duration of the entire intervention (in months or years). Which,  
336 if any, or what combination of these components may be more beneficial is unknown. A  
337 recent systematic review found no link between dose and weight outcomes, which they  
338 argued could be either because behaviour change is non-linear or because of varied  
339 reporting of dose.<sup>51</sup> Given the emphasis placed on intervention dose by many studies in this  
340 review, this is a key area for future clarification.

341 Interventions adopting environmental modification require little individual agency to alter  
342 health behaviours, and therefore may be simpler and more sustainable than educational  
343 interventions.<sup>52</sup> However, the limited evidence on changing BMIz is important as it may  
344 suggest further intervention is required to impact health beyond behaviour change.

345 Simplicity and enjoyability of intervention were argued to have the potential to change  
346 activity and diet related health behaviours. However, we need clarity on what children  
347 deem simple or enjoyable.

Interventions using education as the sole mechanism appeared to have limited impact on behaviour or BMIz. This aligns with the broader evidence base, which suggests educational interventions are unlikely to elicit effective changes for children,<sup>53 54</sup> and for general population.<sup>55</sup> Relying on individual agency is unlikely to translate into substantial or sustained behaviour change, and consequently obesity prevention.<sup>56</sup>

#### **4.1 Comparison with existing literature**

There is no shortage of evidence syntheses of childhood obesity preventive interventions: a recent overview included 66 meta-analyses and systematic reviews on the topic.<sup>57</sup> Syntheses usually find that interventions addressing diet and PA are more promising than targeting either behaviour alone. However, the high heterogeneity across studies provided the rationale for our realist synthesis, which aimed to understand the underlying contextual and mechanistic factors that help interventions generate outcomes.

Our findings broadly align with recent realist reviews in the area of childhood PA.<sup>10 11</sup> These reviews found that sex (contextual factor) and goal setting, tailoring and intervention dose (mechanistic factors) were linked to the intervention outcomes. Tailoring seldom arose within our review, perhaps due to different operational definitions for what tailoring constitutes or due to the contextual differences between study settings and populations; the review of Hnatiuk *et al.*<sup>10</sup> focused on children aged 0-5 in pre-school settings, whilst the review of Brown *et al.*<sup>11</sup> looked at family-based interventions for children of primary school age (5-12 years). There may be more scope to tailor interventions within these settings in contrast to a primary school setting. While many interventions aimed to align or embed content within the school curriculum, they rarely hypothesised this mechanism to affect BMIz. It may also be that processes were not in place to measure these mechanisms in



studies and is not a sign *per se* that these are ineffective. It would be good in future to consider *a-priori* how mechanisms would act together to bring about a change and evaluate if the process happened as anticipated.

#### **4.2 Strengths and limitations of our realist synthesis**

The key strength of this review is that we approached the existing evidence on obesity prevention to understand *why* and *how* an intervention works rather than *whether* it works.

The realist synthesis – a relatively new method – allowed us to address these questions which are important to decision-makers. We present new insights into the evidence beyond traditional meta-analysis on the intervention outcome and avenues for future exploration.

The findings should help implement an effective obesity prevention intervention in practice.

The review included a large, robust dataset from the most recent Cochrane review.<sup>8</sup> We included all qualitative and process evaluations from the 24 studies, amounting to 71 documents in total. This led to rich data for analysing CMO configurations. We restricted our sampling frame to the Cochrane review, which is up to date until 2015 so we may have missed new interventions, contexts, or mechanisms, which is a limitation. The planned Cochrane update effort has identified (but not extracted) a further 162 relevant trials published between 2015 and 2018 and search for trials after 2018 is ongoing. However, the included interventions in the Cochrane review did not change substantially since its first publication in 2002 (*i.e.*, with a downstream focus on individual behaviour change)<sup>8</sup> and this was confirmed in a recent secondary analysis of the Cochrane review<sup>58</sup> using a Wider Determinants of Health lens. The findings indicate that a) the majority of studies target individual dietary and PA behaviours, and b) the focus of childhood obesity prevention

393 interventions has not changed over time since 1993- publication date of the oldest study  
394 included in the Cochrane review.

395 This is a limitation of the evidence-base, whereby the focus is traditionally on behaviour  
396 change at individual levels, and environmental or policy interventions targeting wider  
397 determinants of health (upstream) are rarely evaluated in randomised trials.<sup>748</sup> Policy  
398 interventions can be evaluated using randomised designs,<sup>59</sup> where one geographical or  
399 political region may implement the policy sooner than others (waitlist control or stepped  
400 wedge design). Where randomisation is not feasible, interrupted time series or controlled  
401 before after designs could be employed to evaluate wider determinants of health and policy  
402 interventions.<sup>60</sup> That said, two recent systematic reviews<sup>761</sup> of natural experiment studies  
403 also found that the included studies predominantly focused on downstream determinants  
404 of childhood overweight and obesity. Thus, we anticipate it is unlikely that the focus of  
405 interventions has changed dramatically between 2015 and 2020.

#### 406 **4.3 Implications for UK-based primary schools**

407 The stakeholder consultation indicated that UK primary schools have limited resources to  
408 take on obesity prevention tasks. With no evidence in the review to support usefulness of  
409 additional health education for changing BMIz, it may be difficult to justify teachers doing  
410 this. Education may be important but is insufficient on its own to change BMIz.

411 Implementing environmental modification (such as the installation of water fountains,  
412 changed canteen offerings) may be perceived more favourably by school staff. This may also  
413 bypass the reliance on individual agency for behaviour change. One suggestion<sup>62</sup> to optimise  
414 implementation of a school intervention is to involve delivery staff (school staff,

415 management or third party) in the design and development of the intervention. We  
416 recommend including children in this planning.

Given the limitation of school finances in the UK, cost is a major consideration for any intervention. Whilst obesity prevention interventions are likely to be cost effective in the long- term,<sup>63</sup> these returns may not be seen by the education sector (or individual schools), and thus the immediate investment required to establish a new initiative may be negatively perceived by stakeholders. Unfortunately, there was insufficient information in the studies to analyse the costs of different intervention types. We need full cost reporting for future interventions, including a breakdown of the costs per intervention component, to facilitate decision making.

## **5. Conclusions**

Our findings indicate that being female and older, and having parents with a high academic attainment can help children benefit from obesity preventive interventions, while baseline BMI can affect intervention outcomes variably. The potential ramifications for health inequalities with these contexts must be kept in mind by both commissioners and researchers. Sufficient intervention dose and environmental modifications in schools are mechanisms that may help achieve desired outcomes. In addition, an intervention that worked as a whole rather than a collection of separate components can better achieve desired outcome, illustrating the interdependent nature of the intervention mechanics - the effect being greater than the sum of its parts. That said, few mechanisms favourably influenced BMIz, and were more likely to only change knowledge, motivation, and dietary and physical activity behaviours.

**Potential conflicts of interest for authors:** Dr. Jago reports grants from National Institute of Health Research during the conduct of the study. Other authors have no conflicts of interests to report.

**Funding statement:** This research was funded by the National Institute for Health Research Applied Research Collaboration West (NIHR ARC West). The views expressed in this article are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NIHR or the Department of Health and Social Care.

#### **Contribution of Authors**

SI contributed to all stages of the review and wrote the manuscript; JN contributed to all stages of the review and edited the manuscript; LJ and RJ advised as subject experts at all stages and edited the manuscript; TM contributed to data collection and edited the manuscript; JS advised as method expert on rigour assessment and edited the manuscript.

**Acknowledgements:** We are grateful to Dr Jill Hnatiuk who provided expert methodological advice.

#### **References**

1. Conolly A, Davies B. Health Survey for England 2017: Adult and child overweight and obesity: NatCen Social Research, 2018.
2. Bagnall AM, Radley D, Jones R, et al. Whole systems approaches to obesity and other complex public health challenges: a systematic review. *BMC Public Health* 2019;19(1):8. doi: 10.1186/s12889-018-6274-z [published Online First: 2019/01/05]
3. Finegood DT. The Complex Systems Science of Obesity. In: Cawley J, ed. *The Oxford Handbook of the Social Science of Obesity*. New York, USA. : Oxford University Press, Inc 2011.
4. Swinburn BA, Kraak VI, Allender S, et al. The Global Syndemic of Obesity, Undernutrition, and Climate Change: The Lancet Commission report. *Lancet (London, England)* 2019;393(10173):791-846. doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(18)32822-8 [published Online First: 2019/02/01]
5. Butland B, Jebb S, Kopelman P, et al. *Tackling Obesities: Future Choices – Project report* (2nd ed). Foresight. London, UK: Government Office for Science:164.
6. Wang Y, Cai L, Wu Y, et al. What childhood obesity prevention programmes work? A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Obes Rev* 2015;16(7):547-65. doi: 10.1111/obr.12277 [published Online First: 2015/04/22]
7. Bramante CT, Thornton RLJ, Bennett WL, et al. Systematic Review of Natural Experiments for Childhood Obesity Prevention and Control. *Am J Prev Med* 2019;56(1):147-58. doi: 10.1016/j.amepre.2018.08.023 [published Online First: 2018/12/24]
8. Brown T MT, Hooper L, Gao Y, Zayegh A, Ijaz S, Foxen SC, Magee L, O'Malley C, Waters (deceased) E, Summerbell CD. . Interventions for preventing obesity in children. . *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2019:Art. No.: CD001871. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD001871.pub3.
9. Rycroft-Malone J, McCormack B, Hutchinson AM, et al. Realist synthesis: illustrating the method for implementation research. *Implementation Science* 2012;7(1):33. doi: 10.1186/1748-5908-7-33
10. Hnatiuk JA, Brown HE, Downing KL, et al. Interventions to increase physical activity in children 0-5 years old: a systematic review, meta-analysis and realist synthesis. *Obes Rev* 2019;20(1):75-87. doi: 10.1111/obr.12763 [published Online First: 2018/09/27]


11. Brown HE, Atkin AJ, Panter J, et al. Family-based interventions to increase physical activity in children: a systematic review, meta-analysis and realist synthesis. *Obes Rev* 2016;17(4):345-60. doi: 10.1111/obr.12362 [published Online First: 2016/01/13]
12. Ijaz S, Nobles J, Johnson L, et al. Preventing childhood obesity in the UK primary schools: a realist review. *PROSPERO* 2019. Available from: [https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospERO/display\\_record.php?ID=CRD42019142192](https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospERO/display_record.php?ID=CRD42019142192).
13. Wong G, Greenhalgh T, Westhorp G, et al. RAMESES publication standards: realist syntheses. *BMC Med* 2013;11:21.
14. Wong G, Greenhalgh T, Westhorp G, et al. Development of methodological guidance, publication standards and training materials for realist and meta-narrative reviews: the RAMESES (Realist And Meta-narrative evidence Syntheses - Evolving Standards) project. Health Services and Delivery Research. Southampton (UK): NIHR Journals Library 2014.
15. Wong G, Westhorp G, Pawson R, et al. Realist Synthesis: RAMESES training materials. RAMESES Project, 2013.
16. Higgins JPT, Altman DG, JAC S. Chapter 8: Assessing risk of bias in included studies. In: Higgins JPT GSe, ed. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* Version 5.10 (updated March 2011) The Cochrane Collaboration, 2011 2011.
17. Haire-Joshu D, Nanney MS, Elliott M, et al. The Use of Mentoring Programs to Improve Energy Balance Behaviors in High-risk Children. *Obesity* 2010;18:S75-S83. doi: 10.1038/oby.2009.435
18. Paineau DL, Beaufils F, Boulier A, et al. Family dietary coaching to improve nutritional intakes and body weight control: a randomized controlled trial. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med* 2008;162(1):34-43. doi: 10.1001/archpediatrics.2007.2 [published Online First: 2008/01/09]
19. Robinson TN, Matheson DM, Kraemer HC, et al. A randomized controlled trial of culturally tailored dance and reducing screen time to prevent weight gain in low-income African American girls: Stanford GEMS. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med* 2010;164(11):995-1004. doi: 10.1001/archpediatrics.2010.197 [published Online First: 2010/11/03]
20. Amaro S, Viggiano A, Di Costanzo A, et al. Kaledo, a new educational board-game, gives nutritional rudiments and encourages healthy eating in children: a pilot cluster randomized trial. *Eur J Pediatr* 2006;165(9):630-5. doi: 10.1007/s00431-006-0153-9 [published Online First: 2006/05/31]
21. HEALTHY Study Grp, Baranowski T, Adams L, et al. A School-Based Intervention for Diabetes Risk Reduction. *New Engl J Med* 2010;363(5):443-53. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1001933
22. Cao ZJ, Wang SM, Chen Y. A randomized trial of multiple interventions for childhood obesity in China. *Am J Prev Med* 2015;48(5):552-60. doi: 10.1016/j.amepre.2014.12.014 [published Online First: 2015/04/22]
23. Damsgaard CT, Dalskov SM, Laursen RP, et al. Provision of healthy school meals does not affect the metabolic syndrome score in 8-11-year-old children, but reduces cardiometabolic risk markers despite increasing waist circumference. *Br J Nutr* 2014;112(11):1826-36. doi: 10.1017/S0007114514003043 [published Online First: 2014/10/18]
24. de Ruyter JC, Olthof MR, Kuisper LD, et al. Effect of sugar-sweetened beverages on body weight in children: design and baseline characteristics of the Double-blind, Randomized INtervention study in Kids. *Contemp Clin Trials* 2012;33(1):247-57. doi: 10.1016/j.cct.2011.10.007 [published Online First: 2011/11/08]
25. Fairclough SJ, Hackett AF, Davies IG, et al. Promoting healthy weight in primary school children through physical activity and nutrition education: a pragmatic evaluation of the CHANGE! randomised intervention study. *BMC Public Health* 2013;13:626. doi: 10.1186/1471-2458-13-626 [published Online First: 2013/07/04]
26. Foster GD, Sherman S, Borradaile KE, et al. A policy-based school intervention to prevent overweight and obesity. *Pediatrics* 2008;121(4):e794-802. doi: 10.1542/peds.2007-1365 [published Online First: 2008/04/03]

27. Grydeland M, Bergh IH, Bjelland M, et al. Intervention effects on physical activity: the HEIA study - a cluster randomized controlled trial. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act* 2013;10:17. doi: 10.1186/1479-5868-10-17 [published Online First: 2013/02/06]
28. Gutin B, Yin Z, Johnson M, et al. Preliminary findings of the effect of a 3-year after-school physical activity intervention on fitness and body fat: the Medical College of Georgia Fitkid Project. *Int J Pediatr Obes* 2008;3 Suppl 1:3-9. doi: 10.1080/17477160801896457 [published Online First: 2008/02/20]
29. Herscovici CR, Kovalskys I, De Gregorio MJ. Gender differences and a school-based obesity prevention program in Argentina: a randomized trial. *Rev Panam Salud Publica* 2013;34(2):75-82. [published Online First: 2013/10/08]
30. James J, Thomas P, Cavan D, et al. Preventing childhood obesity by reducing consumption of carbonated drinks: cluster randomised controlled trial. 2004 doi: 10.1136/bmj.38077.458438.EE %J BMJ
31. Johnston CA, Moreno JP, El-Mubasher A, et al. Impact of a school-based pediatric obesity prevention program facilitated by health professionals. *J Sch Health* 2013;83(3):171-81. doi: 10.1111/josh.12013 [published Online First: 2013/01/25]
32. Khan NA, Raine LB, Drollette ES, et al. Impact of the FITKids physical activity intervention on adiposity in prepubertal children. *Pediatrics* 2014;133(4):e875-83. doi: 10.1542/peds.2013-2246 [published Online First: 2014/04/02]
33. Kipping RR, Howe LD, Jago R, et al. Effect of intervention aimed at increasing physical activity, reducing sedentary behaviour, and increasing fruit and vegetable consumption in children: active for Life Year 5 (AFLY5) school based cluster randomised controlled trial. *BMJ* 2014;348:g3256. doi: 10.1136/bmj.g3256 [published Online First: 2014/05/29]
34. Lazaar N, Aucouturier J, Ratel S, et al. Effect of physical activity intervention on body composition in young children: influence of body mass index status and gender. *Acta Paediatr* 2007;96(9):1315-20. doi: 10.1111/j.1651-2227.2007.00426.x [published Online First: 2007/08/28]
35. Li YP, Hu XQ, Schouten EG, et al. Report on childhood obesity in China (8): effects and sustainability of physical activity intervention on body composition of Chinese youth. *Biomed Environ Sci* 2010;23(3):180-7. doi: 10.1016/S0895-3988(10)60050-5 [published Online First: 2010/08/17]
36. Marcus C, Nyberg G, Nordenfelt A, et al. A 4-year, cluster-randomized, controlled childhood obesity prevention study: STOPP. *Int J Obesity* 2009;33(4):408-17. doi: 10.1038/ijo.2009.38
37. Meng L, Xu H, Liu A, et al. The costs and cost-effectiveness of a school-based comprehensive intervention study on childhood obesity in China. *PLoS One* 2013;8(10):e77971. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0077971 [published Online First: 2013/11/10]
38. Muckelbauer R, Libuda L, Clausen K, et al. Immigrational background affects the effectiveness of a school-based overweight prevention program promoting water consumption. *Obesity (Silver Spring)* 2010;18(3):528-34. doi: 10.1038/oby.2009.270 [published Online First: 2009/08/29]
39. Rosario R, Oliveira B, Araujo A, et al. The impact of an intervention taught by trained teachers on childhood overweight. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2012;9(4):1355-67. doi: 10.3390/ijerph9041355 [published Online First: 2012/06/13]
40. Rush E, Reed P, McLennan S, et al. A school-based obesity control programme: Project Energize. Two-year outcomes. *Br J Nutr* 2012;107(4):581-7. doi: 10.1017/S0007114511003151 [published Online First: 2011/07/08]
41. Sahota P, Rudolf MC, Dixey R, et al. Randomised controlled trial of primary school based intervention to reduce risk factors for obesity. *BMJ* 2001;323(7320):1029-32. doi: 10.1136/bmj.323.7320.1029 [published Online First: 2001/11/03]
42. Santos RG, Durksen A, Rabbanni R, et al. Effectiveness of peer-based healthy living lesson plans on anthropometric measures and physical activity in elementary school students: a cluster

- randomized trial. *JAMA Pediatr* 2014;168(4):330-7. doi: 10.1001/jamapediatrics.2013.3688 [published Online First: 2014/02/12]
43. Siegrist M, Lammel C, Haller B, et al. Effects of a physical education program on physical activity, fitness, and health in children: the JuvenTUM project. *Scand J Med Sci Sports* 2013;23(3):323-30. doi: 10.1111/j.1600-0838.2011.01387.x [published Online First: 2011/11/19]
44. Spiegel SA, Foulk D. Reducing overweight through a multidisciplinary school-based intervention. *Obesity* 2006;14(1):88-96. doi: DOI 10.1038/oby.2006.11
45. Williamson DA, Champagne CM, Harsha DW, et al. Effect of an environmental school-based obesity prevention program on changes in body fat and body weight: a randomized trial. *Obesity (Silver Spring)* 2012;20(8):1653-61. doi: 10.1038/oby.2012.60 [published Online First: 2012/03/10]
46. Breheny K, Passmore S, Adab P, et al. Effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of The Daily Mile on childhood weight outcomes and wellbeing: a cluster randomised controlled trial. *Int J Obesity* 2020 doi: 10.1038/s41366-019-0511-0
47. McGill R, Anwar E, Orton L, et al. Are interventions to promote healthy eating equally effective for all? Systematic review of socioeconomic inequalities in impact. *BMC Public Health* 2015;15(1):457. doi: 10.1186/s12889-015-1781-7
48. Flodgren GM, Helleve A, Lobstein T, et al. Primary prevention of overweight and obesity in adolescents: An overview of systematic reviews. *n/a(n/a)* doi: 10.1111/obr.13102
49. Carozza SE, Puumala SE, Chow EJ, et al. Parental educational attainment as an indicator of socioeconomic status and risk of childhood cancers. *British Journal of Cancer* 2010;103(1):136-42. doi: 10.1038/sj.bjc.6605732
50. Fernández-Alvira JM, Mouratidou T, Bammann K, et al. Parental education and frequency of food consumption in European children: the IDEFICS study. *Public Health Nutrition* 2013;16(3):487-98. doi: 10.1017/S136898001200290X [published Online First: 2012/06/12]
51. Heerman WJ, JaKa MM, Berge JM, et al. The dose of behavioral interventions to prevent and treat childhood obesity: a systematic review and meta-regression. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity* 2017;14(1):157. doi: 10.1186/s12966-017-0615-7
52. Driessen CE, Cameron AJ, Thornton LE, et al. Effect of changes to the school food environment on eating behaviours and/or body weight in children: a systematic review. *Obes Rev* 2014;15(12):968-82. doi: 10.1111/obr.12224 [published Online First: 2014/10/01]
53. Cooper AM, O'Malley LA, Elison SN, et al. Primary school - based behavioural interventions for preventing caries. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2013(5) doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD009378.pub2
54. Mason - Jones AJ, Sinclair D, Mathews C, et al. School - based interventions for preventing HIV, sexually transmitted infections, and pregnancy in adolescents. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2016(11) doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD006417.pub3
55. Ebrahim S, Taylor F, Ward K, et al. Multiple risk factor interventions for primary prevention of coronary heart disease. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2011(1) doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD001561.pub3
56. Adams J, Mytton O, White M, et al. Why Are Some Population Interventions for Diet and Obesity More Equitable and Effective Than Others? The Role of Individual Agency. *PLOS Medicine* 2016;13(4):e1001990. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1001990
57. Psaltopoulou T, Tzanninis S, Ntanasios-Stathopoulos I, et al. Prevention and treatment of childhood and adolescent obesity: a systematic review of meta-analyses. *World journal of pediatrics : WJP* 2019;15(4):350-81. doi: 10.1007/s12519-019-00266-y [published Online First: 2019/07/18]
58. Nobles J, Summerbell C, Brown T, et al. A Secondary Analysis of the Childhood Obesity Prevention Literature through a Wider Determinants of Health Lens. 2020 (submitted)



59. Oliver S, Bagnall AM, Thomas J, et al. Randomised controlled trials for policy interventions: a review of reviews and meta-regression. *Health technology assessment (Winchester, England)* 2010;14(16):1-165, iii. doi: 10.3310/hta14160 [published Online First: 2010/03/27]
60. Crane M, Bohn-Goldbaum E, Grunseit A, et al. Using natural experiments to improve public health evidence: a review of context and utility for obesity prevention. *Health Research Policy and Systems* 2020;18(1):48. doi: 10.1186/s12961-020-00564-2
61. Karacabeyli D, Allender S, Pinkney S, et al. Evaluation of complex community-based childhood obesity prevention interventions. 2018;19(8):1080-92. doi: 10.1111/obr.12689
62. Flynn MA, McNeil DA, Maloff B, et al. Reducing obesity and related chronic disease risk in children and youth: a synthesis of evidence with 'best practice' recommendations. *Obes Rev* 2006;7 Suppl 1:7-66. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-789X.2006.00242.x [published Online First: 2005/12/24]
63. Brown V, Ananthapavan J, Sonntag D, et al. The potential for long-term cost-effectiveness of obesity prevention interventions in the early years of life. *Pediatr Obes* 2019;14(8):e12517. doi: 10.1111/ijpo.12517 [published Online First: 2019/03/01]



| CONTEXT                                |                                    |               | MECHANISMS     |                               |  | OUTCOME  |   |   |
|--|------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|-------------------------------|--|--|---|---|
| Individual Factors                     | Sex                                | Who targeted? | Education      | Extra-curricular education    | Intervention dose                                  | Change awareness / knowledge of health behaviour | Change child's diet quality                     |   |
|  | Ethnicity                          |               |                |                               |  |  |   |   |
|  | Health status                      |               |                |                               |  |  |   |   |
|  | Perceived health status            |               |                |                               |  |  |   |   |
|  | SES                                |               |                |                               |  |  |   |   |
| Health literacy                        |                                    |               | Apps / eHealth | Mode of intervention delivery | Change self-efficacy to undertake health behaviour |  |   |   |
| Academic attainment                    |                                    |               |                |                               |  |  |   |   |
| Perceived importance of own health     |                                    |               |                |                               |  |  |   |   |
| Social, Familial and Community Factors | Health behaviours of family        |               | Child          |                               | Curricular education                               | Location of intervention delivery                | Change motivation to undertake health behaviour | Change child's level of physical activity     |
|  | Family constraints                 |               | Parent         |                               | Goal setting                                       | Facilitator skills and attributes                |   | Stabilisation or reduction in child's BMI SDS |
|  | Family structure and relationships |               |                |                               |  |  |   |   |
|  | Household income                   |               | Teacher        |                               | Role modelling                                     |  | Change child's level of sedentary behaviour     |   |
|  | Health behaviours of peers         |               |                |                               | Tailoring  | Intervention focus not on health                 |   |   |
| Living and Working Conditions          | Type of school                     |               | Home           |                               | Peer support                                       |  |   | Unintended consequences                       |
|  | (Slack) resource available         |               |                |                               | Reinforcement                                      |  |   |   |
|  | Staff interest in health / obesity |               | School         |                               | Staff training / upskilling                        | Multiple behaviours targeted concurrently        | Change child's mental health status             |   |
|  | Staff health status                |               |                |                               |  |  |   |   |
|  | Health offering of school          |               |                |                               |  |  |   |   |
| Wider Conditions                       | Location of school                 |               | Community      | Environmental modification    | Stealth intervention                               |  | Change child's general health status            |   |
|  | Curriculum flexibility             |               |                |                               |  |  |   |   |
|  | School ethos & aspirations         |               |                |                               |  |  |   |   |
|  | Governmental policy                |               |                |                               | Policy/legislation                                 |  |   |   |