

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

2 **Authors:** Dr Sharea Ijaz^{1, 2}; Dr James Nobles^{1,2}; Dr Laura Johnson³; Miss Theresa Moore^{1,2,4};
3 Dr Jelena Savović^{1,2}; Professor Russell Jago^{1,3}

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; +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 BMi. 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).¹ 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.²⁻⁴ Population-levels of obesity are known to be the product of many interrelated
43 and interdependent factors,⁵ 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.²
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.^{6,7} 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 review⁸ 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.^{9 10 11}

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.*⁸, 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.^{10 11} The study was registered with PROSPERO in July 2019
65 (CRD42019142192).¹²

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^{13 14} – 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

79 **2.2 Inclusion / exclusion criteria**

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

84 **2.3 Data extraction (selection and coding)**

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

92 **2.4 Rigour assessment**

93 We operationalised rigour assessment into a four-point scale based on the RAMESES
94 definition of rigour¹⁵ which are presented below. We employed risk of bias¹⁶ judgements for
95 the outcome as reported in the Cochrane review.⁸ These decisions were made case by case
96 and agreed between two reviewers (SI, JN) (see example in supporting information section
97 3).

98 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).

120 **3. Results**

121 All 153 studies included in the Cochrane review were assessed at abstract stage against our
122 inclusion criteria. Of these, 29 studies met the criteria and were assessed in full texts (81
123 documents). Five studies (10 documents) were excluded at this stage as these were set
124 entirely outside of the school¹⁷⁻¹⁹ or did not involve primary school aged children.^{20 21} Thus
125 24 studies²²⁻⁴⁵ (71 documents) were included in this realist review. See supporting
126 information section 6 for study flow and lists of excluded and included study documents.

127 **3.2 Included study characteristics**

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

Study and Location	Intervention content and delivery	Contexts identified	Mechanisms identified	CMO configurations	Rigour
Spiegel 2006 ⁴⁴ USA	<p>Description: 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.</p> <p>Provider: Teacher.</p> <p>Timing: During school hours; nine months duration</p> <p>Target group: Children, family, teacher.</p>	None identified	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Focus on multiple behaviours 2. Intervention as a whole 3. Education 4. Goal setting 5. Role play 6. Tailoring 7. Alignment with curriculum 8. Change knowledge & awareness 9. Change self-efficacy 10. Change motivation 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Focus on multiple behaviours + role play → change self-efficacy 2. Focus on multiple behaviours → change knowledge & awareness → change child's diet + PA → change in BMIz 3. Change motivation → unintended consequences (academic improvement) 4. Intervention as a whole → change in BMIz 	?
Ineffective studies					
Fairclough 2013 ²⁵ UK	<p>Description: 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.</p> <p>Provider: Teacher.</p> <p>Timing: During and after school hours; five months duration</p> <p>Target group: Children, family, teacher.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sex 2. Ethnicity 3. SES 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Focus on multiple behaviour 2. Education 3. Staff upskilling & training 4. Intervention dose 5. Simplicity of content 6. Alignment with curriculum 1. Framing of intervention 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sex → change BMIz 2. Simplicity of content → Child's PA 3. Intervention dose → change child's diet + PA 4. Intervention dose → change BMIz 	?
Cao 2015 ²² China	<p>Description: 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.</p> <p>Provider: Teacher, parent.</p> <p>Timing: During and after school hours; 34 months duration</p> <p>Target group: Children, parent, teacher</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sex 2. Health status 3. Parental health status 1. Location of school (urban China) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Focus on multiple behaviours 2. Education 3. Peer support 4. Staff upskilling & training 5. Environmental modification 6. Facilitator skills & attributes 7. Alignment with curriculum 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sex → change BMIz 2. Health status → change BMIz 3. Parental health status → change BMIz 	?
Sahota 2001 ⁴¹ UK	<p>Description: 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.</p> <p>Provider: Teacher, school.</p> <p>Timing: During school hours; nine months.</p> <p>Target group: Children, teacher, school.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Population health trends (secular trends) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Focus on multiple behaviours 2. Education 3. Environmental modification 4. Staff upskilling & training 5. Intervention dose 6. Enjoyable content 7. Facilitator skills & attributes 8. Alignment with curriculum 7. Intervention as a whole 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Population health trend → change BMIz 2. Focus on multiple behaviours → enjoyable content 3. Focus on multiple behaviours + enjoyable content 4. Intervention as whole → change child's diet 5. Intervention as a whole → change BMIz 6. Intervention dose → change BMIz 	?
Gutin 2008 ²⁸ USA	<p>Description: 40-min session of academic enrichment activities, followed by 80 min MVPA. Offered each day after school. Healthy snacks provided during break.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sex 2. Ethnicity 3. SES 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Focus on multiple behaviours 2. Education 3. Peer support 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sex or Ethnicity → BMIz 2. Education → change motivation 3. Enjoyable content + 	+

Study and Location	Intervention content and delivery	Contexts identified	Mechanisms identified	CMO configurations	Rigour
	<p>Provider: Teacher.</p> <p>Timing: After school hours; 36 months duration.</p> <p>Target group: Children, teacher.</p>		<p>4. Staff upskilling & training</p> <p>5. Environmental modification</p> <p>6. Intervention dose</p> <p>7. Time and location of intervention delivery</p> <p>8. Enjoyable content</p> <p>9. Change motivation</p>	<p>4. Peer support → change motivation</p> <p>5. Environmental modification → change motivation</p> <p>6. Change motivation → change child's diet</p> <p>7. Environmental modification → change child's diet</p> <p>8. Intervention dose → change child's PA</p>	
Lazaar 2007 ³⁴ France	<p>Description: Two sessions of school PE per week (one hour per session). The which intensity and duration of sessions increased throughout the study with the aim that the 45 min of exercise in one hour is playful.</p> <p>Provider: Third party (state PE undergrads).</p> <p>Timing: During school hours; six months duration.</p> <p>Target group: Children.</p>	<p>1. Sex</p> <p>2. Health status</p>	<p>1. Focus on PA</p> <p>2. Peer support</p> <p>3. Enjoyable content</p> <p>4. Change knowledge & awareness</p>	<p>1. Sex → change BMIz</p> <p>2. Health status → BMIz change</p> <p>3. Focus on PA alone → change BMIz</p>	?
Damsgaard 2014 ²³ Denmark	<p>Description: 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.</p> <p>Provider: Kitchen staff, school.</p> <p>Timing: During, three months.</p> <p>Target group: Children, school.</p>	<p>1. SES</p> <p>2. Parental academic attainment</p>	<p>1. Focus on diet</p> <p>2. Environmental modification</p> <p>3. Intervention dose</p>	<p>1. Focus on diet → environmental modification</p> <p>2. Focus on diet → change BMIz</p> <p>3. Intervention dose → change child's diet → change BMIz</p>	+
Rush 2012 ⁴⁰ New Zealand	<p>Description: 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).</p> <p>Provider: Third party (project staff), teacher.</p> <p>Timing: During school hours; 24 months duration.</p> <p>Target group: Children, parent, teacher, school, community.</p>	<p>1. Ethnicity</p> <p>2. SES</p> <p>3. Location of school (urban/rural)</p>	<p>1. Focus on multiple behaviours</p> <p>2. Education</p> <p>3. Reinforcements & incentives</p> <p>4. Environmental modification</p> <p>5. Facilitator skills & attributes</p> <p>6. Alignment with curriculum</p> <p>7. Intervention as a whole</p> <p>8. Change awareness & knowledge</p>	<p>1. SES → change general health</p> <p>2. Location of school → change general health</p> <p>3. Intervention as a whole → Environmental modification → change awareness and knowledge</p> <p>4. Intervention as a whole → change BMIz</p>	?
Grydeland 2014 ²⁷ Norway	<p>Description: 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.</p> <p>Provider: Teacher.</p>	<p>1. Sex</p> <p>2. Ethnicity</p> <p>3. SES</p> <p>4. Health status</p> <p>5. Health behaviours</p> <p>6. Health behaviours of</p>	<p>1. Focus on multiple behaviours</p> <p>2. Intervention dose</p> <p>3. Intervention as a whole</p> <p>4. Change awareness and knowledge</p>	<p>1. Sex → change child's PA,</p> <p>2. Health status → change child's PA</p> <p>3. Parental academic attainment → change child's PA</p> <p>4. Health behaviours of peers/ social norms → change child's diet + change BMIz</p>	?

Study and Location	Intervention content and delivery	Contexts identified	Mechanisms identified	CMO configurations	Rigour
	Timing: During and after school hours; 20 months duration. Target group: Children, teacher, parent.	peers/ social norms		5. Intervention dose → change BMIz 6. Intervention as a whole → change (parental) awareness & knowledge	
James 2004 ³⁰ UK	Description: 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. Provider: Third party (project staff), teacher. Timing: During school hours; 12 months duration. Target group: Children.	None identified	1. Focus on diet 2. Education 3. Simplicity of content 4. Facilitator skills & attributes	1. Focus on diet → change BMIz 2. Focus on diet → change child's diet 3. Simplicity of content → change BMIz	+
Meng 2013 ³⁷ China	Description: 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. Provider: Teacher Timing: During school hours; six months duration. Target group: Children, parent teacher.	1. Location of schools (urban China)	1. Focus on multiple behaviours 2. Focus on diet 3. Focus on PA 4. Education 5. Enjoyable content 6. Intervention dose 7. Intervention as a whole	1. Intervention dose → change in BMIz 2. Intervention as a whole → change in BMIz 3. Focus on PA → enjoyable content	?
Rosario 2012 ³⁹ Portugal	Description: 12 nutritional education sessions of three hours each duration for children plus six month of teacher training. Provider: Teacher. Timing: During school hours; six months duration. Target group: Children, teacher.	1. Parental academic attainment 2. Location of school (urban)	1. Focus on diet 2. Education 3. Staff upskilling & training 4. Facilitator skills & attributes 5. Tailoring 6. Enjoyable content 7. Intervention dose 8. Intervention as a whole 9. Change motivation	1. Teacher upskilling → tailoring → change motivation 2. Intervention as a whole → change in child's diet 3. Intervention dose of teacher training → tailoring → motivation	-
Foster 2008 ²⁶ USA	Description: 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. Provider: Teacher, third party (nutrition educators). Timing: During and after school hours; 24 months duration. Target group: Children, parent, teacher, school.	1. Ethnicity 2. SES 3. Location of school 4. Population health trend	1. Focus on multiple behaviours 2. Education 3. Reinforcement & incentives 4. Staff upskilling & training 5. Facilitator skills & attributes 6. Tailoring 7. Social marketing 8. Environmental modification 9. Policy/legislation 10. Alignment with curriculum 11. Intervention as a whole	1. Ethnicity → change BMIz 2. Tailoring → change BMIz 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 ³⁸ Germany	<p>Description: Combined environmental and educational intervention promoting water consumption: water fountains installed in schools, provision of reusable water bottles, and lessons importance of water consumption</p> <p>Provider: Teacher, school.</p> <p>Timing: During school hours; 12 months duration.</p> <p>Target group: Children, teacher, school.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ethnicity 2. Health status 3. Health behaviours of family 4. Health behaviours of peers/ social norms 5. Health offering of school 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Focus on diet 2. Education 3. Goal setting 4. Reinforcement and incentives 5. Environmental modification 6. Alignment with curriculum 7. Change motivation 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Education +goal setting→ change motivation → change child's diet 2. Reinforcement & incentive → change child's diet 3. Environmental modification → change child's diet 4. Change child's diet⇒ change in BMlz 	-
Santos 2014 ⁴² Canada	<p>Description: 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.</p> <p>Provider: Teacher, child.</p> <p>Timing: During school hours; 10 months duration.</p> <p>Target group: Children.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Age 2. Health status 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Focus on multiple behaviours 2. Education 3. Role modelling 4. Peer support 5. Staff upskilling/ training 6. Alignment with curriculum 7. Intervention as a whole 8. Change awareness/ knowledge 9. Change self-efficacy 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Intervention as a whole → change in awareness/knowledge 2. Intervention as a whole → change self-efficacy 3. Intervention as a whole ⇒ change BMlz 	++
Siegrist 2013 ⁴³ Germany	<p>Description: 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..</p> <p>Provider: Teacher.</p> <p>Timing: During and after school hours; 12 months duration.</p> <p>Target group: Children, parents, teachers.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Health status 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Focus on multiple behaviours 2. Education 3. Staff upskilling/training 4. Environmental modification 5. Alignment with curriculum 6. Intervention dose 7. Change motivation 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Health status → change child's PA 2. Education → change motivation→ change child's PA 3. Intervention dose ⇒ change child's PA 	-
Williamson 2012 ⁴⁵ USA	<p>Description: 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.</p> <p>Provider: Teacher.</p> <p>Timing: During school hours; 28 months duration</p> <p>Target group: Children</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sex 2. Ethnicity 3. Health status 4. SES 5. Location or schools (rural) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Focus on multiple behaviours 2. Education 3. Environmental modification 4. Alignment with curriculum 5. Tailoring 6. Intervention dose 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Health status → tailoring 2. Tailoring ⇒ change BMlz 3. Education → change child's PA 4. Intervention dose ⇒ change BMlz 	?
Herscovici 2013 ²⁹ Argentina	<p>Description: 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.</p> <p>Provider: Third party (interdisciplinary team).</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sex 2. SES 3. Health behaviours of peers/ social norms 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Focus on multiple behaviours 2. Education 3. Environmental modification 4. Facilitator skills & attributes 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sex →change child's diet 2. Intervention dose ⇒change BMlz 	?

Study and Location	Intervention content and delivery	Contexts identified	Mechanisms identified	CMO configurations	Rigour
	Timing: During school hours; six months duration. Target group: Children, parents.		5. Change awareness & knowledge 6. Change motivation		
Johnston 2013 ³¹ USA	Description: 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. Provider: Third party (trained health professionals), teacher. Timing: During school hours; 24 months duration. Target group: Children, parents, teachers, school.	1. Health status	1. Focus on multiple behaviours 2. Reinforcements & incentives 3. Staff upskilling/training 4. Facilitator skills and attributes 5. Mode of intervention delivery 6. Alignment with curriculum 7. Change motivation	1. Health status → change BMlZ 2. Staff upskilling/training+ facilitator skills & attributes→ teacher motivation 3. Mode of intervention delivery→ change BMlZ 4. Change motivation→ change BMlZ	+
Kipping 2014 ³³ UK	Description: 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. Provider: Teacher, third party (multidisciplinary). Timing: During and after school hours; eight months duration. Target group: Children, parent, teacher, school.	1. Staff interest in health/ obesity 2. School ethos & inspirations 3. Government policy	1. Focus on multiple behaviours 2. Role modelling, staff upskilling/ training 3. Intervention dose 4. Simplicity of content 5. Change awareness& knowledge 6. Change self-efficacy	1. Role modelling → change awareness & knowledge 2. Intervention dose → change child's PA 3. Intervention dose → Change self-efficacy → change child's diet/PA 4. Simplicity of content → change BMlZ	++

- 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

140 The majority of interventions addressed multiple health behaviours (16 studies), followed by
141 diet alone (six studies) and PA alone (three studies). Interventions were most often tested in
142 the USA (six studies), followed by UK and China (three studies in each). Most (n=16)
143 interventions were delivered entirely during school hours and majority interventions (n=13
144 studies) targeted children, their parents (or family) and teachers together. Teachers were
145 the providers (deliverers) of interventions most often (18 studies) either exclusively (10
146 studies) or with a third party such as researchers, children, health or PA experts (eight
147 studies). Interventions durations ranged from three months to four years with a median of
148 12 months (IQR 7.5 to 24).

149 **3.3 The final programme theory**

150 Amendments to the programme theory throughout the review period can be seen from
151 figures 1 and 2 and in supporting information section 1. Six new contexts (age, health
152 behaviours of child, pubertal status, parental health status, parental academic attainment,
153 and population health trend) and six new mechanisms (social marketing, timing of
154 intervention delivery, enjoyability of content, simplicity of content, role play, and alignment
155 with curriculum) in total were added to the programme theory over five iterations (available
156 in online supporting information section 1). We found evidence on 16 contexts and 20
157 mechanisms from the 24 included studies. We present our findings below starting from
158 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.

168 **3.3.1 Contextual factors**

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

175 **Sex** appeared to be the next noteworthy context. Girls were reported on several occasions
176 to benefit more from interventions in terms of favourable BMIz, PA or diet change.^{22 25 27 29}
177 ^{34 35} Study authors argued that girls may be more concerned about their body image and
178 weight, therefore more likely to adhere to the educational content of the interventions.
179 Compared to boys, girls also maintained changes in BMIz after the interventions stopped.²⁵
180 ³⁵

181 For **ethnicity**, one study²⁶ found evidence that black children benefited more from their
182 intervention than white children. Conversely, another³⁸ argued that, since the educational
183 component of the intervention was not tailored to account for cultural differences, their
184 intervention may have been less effective for migrant (non-German) children, although no
185 effect difference by this variable was seen. Two studies^{28,40} tailored their intervention
186 content for cultural differences and found no difference in the outcomes between children
187 of different ethnicities.

188 Older **age** children achieved lower BMIz³⁶ and higher PA levels³⁵; Li *et al.*³⁵ argued this may
189 be because older children are better able to understand and follow the directions associated
190 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.^{24 36} These children were also less likely to complete the intervention.^{23 24}

194 **Peer behaviour and social norms** were noted contexts in two studies.^{24 27} DeRuyter *et al.*²⁴
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.*,²⁷ 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.⁴¹ Other contexts potentially influencing an
206 interventions' effect on child's health were **good parental health status**,²² **rural location of**
207 **school**⁴⁰ and **high socioeconomic status (SES)**.⁴⁰

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^{28 38 43} and to change in *self efficacy* in one,³² but not BMIz.
211 Spiegel *et al.*⁴⁴ 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 *BMlz*. Williamson *et al.*⁴⁵ 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 *BMlz change*.^{32 35 36} Ten³⁵ and
218 30³⁶ minutes of integrated daily PA over 12 and 48 months respectively was effective in
219 changing *BMlz* 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 *BMlz* in
221 children with healthy weight at baseline.³²

222 Several other studies argued that the intervention dose was too low to achieve a *BMlz*
223 reduction.^{25 27 29 33 37 41 43 45} However, most of these involved educational health promotions
224 and little enabling of PA. For example, 20 months²⁷ and 28 months of PA promotion in
225 school⁴⁵ was insufficient to alter *BMlz* compared with the control group. While *BMlz* stayed
226 unaffected, children's *PA levels* improved after three years of 80 min MVPA at least twice a
227 week²⁸ but not after 6 months of 10 min daily MVPA³⁷. 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*
230²³ 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.*³³ 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.^{22 23 26 29 40 41 43 45} Only in two
238 studies^{36 38} was environmental modification associated with a change in child’s diet, and
239 with a BMIz change in one.³⁶ 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.³⁶ and b) the installation of water fountains in school premises.³⁸ 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.^{28 43} Gutin *et al.*²⁸ created what they termed a “fitogenic environment”
246 through the provision of additional PA afterschool, whilst Siegrist *et al.*⁴³ 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*.⁴⁴ Spiegel *et al.*⁴⁴ 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.*⁴¹ and Rosario *et al.*³⁹, reported that the intervention as a whole only changed
257 *dietary intake*. Similarly, Foster *et al.*²⁶ found that their intervention, as a whole, only led to
258 a change in *sedentary behaviour*, with Grydland *et al.*²⁷ Rush *et al.*⁴⁰, and Santos *et al.*⁴²

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^{22 25}
262^{26 31 35 41-43} aiming to **educate** the children in order to change the behaviour and yet led to
263 behaviour change in only one study.³⁵ 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^{35 39 44 45} and, as mentioned above, only in one³⁵ 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,³⁵ options to increase intensity of aerobic exercises in class in
269 another,⁴⁴ and a software programme recognizing children with overweight and offering
270 them different content in one.⁴⁵ The fourth study³⁹ 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**.^{28 34 37 39 41} However,
273 only one of these studies²⁸ 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,^{25 30 33}
276 all from the UK. One argued that their simple message led to change in child's PA levels.²⁵
277 The other two studies,^{30 33} 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.*³³ employed child education, role modelling, teacher training, and parent counselling.
281 They argue in their conclusions that such "simple school-based interventions that are

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

286 3.4 Gaps in evidence

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

295 3.5 Reporting of Costs

296 Eight studies reported cost or resource use (see supporting information section 4). Costs for
297 these varied interventions in current GBP values could range from £12³⁷ to over £1300³²
298 per child per year.

299 3.6 Reporting on sustainability of intervention

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

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

305 3.7 Findings of sensitivity analysis

306 Restricting our analysis to only rigorously conducted studies (n=11; judged either ++ or +),²³
307 ^{24 28 30-36 42} we found the key contexts of influence were still baseline BMI,^{31 32 34-36} parental
308 educational attainment^{24 36} and sex^{34 35} (see supporting information section 5). Among
309 mechanisms, intervention dose^{23 28 32 33 35} stood out again along with environmental
310 modification^{23 24 28 36} as the most often cited.

311 4. Discussion

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

322 Despite socio-economic status (SES) being a well-known moderator of intervention effect
323 for health promotion interventions,⁴⁷ it was formally explored in only one included study.⁴⁰
324 This limited evidence on SES was also reported in a recent overview of obesity prevention in
325 adolescents.⁴⁸ 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,^{49 50}
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.⁵¹ 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.⁵² 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.

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

353 **4.1 Comparison with existing literature**

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

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

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

374 **4.2 Strengths and limitations of our realist synthesis**

375 The key strength of this review is that we approached the existing evidence on obesity
376 prevention to understand *why* and *how* an intervention works rather than *whether* it works.
377 The realist synthesis – a relatively new method – allowed us to address these questions
378 which are important to decision-makers. We present new insights into the evidence beyond
379 traditional meta-analysis on the intervention outcome and avenues for future exploration.
380 The findings should help implement an effective obesity prevention intervention in practice.
381 The review included a large, robust dataset from the most recent Cochrane review.⁸ We
382 included all qualitative and process evaluations from the 24 studies, amounting to 71
383 documents in total. This led to rich data for analysing CMO configurations. We restricted our
384 sampling frame to the Cochrane review, which is up to date until 2015 so we may have
385 missed new interventions, contexts, or mechanisms, which is a limitation. The planned
386 Cochrane update effort has identified (but not extracted) a further 162 relevant trials
387 published between 2015 and 2018 and search for trials after 2018 is ongoing. However, the
388 included interventions in the Cochrane review did not change substantially since its first
389 publication in 2002 (*i.e.*, with a downstream focus on individual behaviour change)⁸ and this
390 was confirmed in a recent secondary analysis of the Cochrane review⁵⁸ using a Wider
391 Determinants of Health lens. The findings indicate that a) the majority of studies target
392 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.⁷⁴⁸ Policy
398 interventions can be evaluated using randomised designs,⁵⁹ 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.⁶⁰ That said, two recent systematic reviews⁷⁶¹ 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 suggestion⁶² 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.

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

425 **5. Conclusions**

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

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

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

444 **Contribution of Authors**

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

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

451 **References**

- 452 1. Conolly A, Davies B. Health Survey for England 2017: Adult and child overweight and obesity:
453 NatCen Social Research, 2018.
- 454 2. Bagnall AM, Radley D, Jones R, et al. Whole systems approaches to obesity and other complex
455 public health challenges: a systematic review. *BMC Public Health* 2019;19(1):8. doi:
456 10.1186/s12889-018-6274-z [published Online First: 2019/01/05]
- 457 3. Finegood DT. The Complex Systems Science of Obesity. In: Cawley J, ed. *The Oxford Handbook of*
458 *the Social Science of Obesity*. New York, USA. : Oxford University Press, Inc 2011.
- 459 4. Swinburn BA, Kraak VI, Allender S, et al. The Global Syndemic of Obesity, Undernutrition, and
460 Climate Change: The Lancet Commission report. *Lancet (London, England)*
461 2019;393(10173):791-846. doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(18)32822-8 [published Online First:
462 2019/02/01]
- 463 5. Butland B, Jebb S, Kopelman P, et al. *Tackling Obesities: Future Choices – Project report (2nd ed)*.
464 Foresight. London, UK: Government Office for Science:164.
- 465 6. Wang Y, Cai L, Wu Y, et al. What childhood obesity prevention programmes work? A systematic
466 review and meta-analysis. *Obes Rev* 2015;16(7):547-65. doi: 10.1111/obr.12277 [published
467 Online First: 2015/04/22]
- 468 7. Bramante CT, Thornton RLJ, Bennett WL, et al. Systematic Review of Natural Experiments for
469 Childhood Obesity Prevention and Control. *Am J Prev Med* 2019;56(1):147-58. doi:
470 10.1016/j.amepre.2018.08.023 [published Online First: 2018/12/24]
- 471 8. Brown T MT, Hooper L, Gao Y, Zayegh A, Ijaz S, Foxen SC, Magee L, O'Malley C, Waters (deceased)
472 E, Summerbell CD. . Interventions for preventing obesity in children. . *Cochrane Database of*
473 *Systematic Reviews* 2019:Art. No.: CD001871. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD001871.pub3.
- 474 9. Rycroft-Malone J, McCormack B, Hutchinson AM, et al. Realist synthesis: illustrating the method
475 for implementation research. *Implementation Science* 2012;7(1):33. doi: 10.1186/1748-
476 5908-7-33
- 477 10. Hnatiuk JA, Brown HE, Downing KL, et al. Interventions to increase physical activity in children 0-
478 5 years old: a systematic review, meta-analysis and realist synthesis. *Obes Rev*
479 2019;20(1):75-87. doi: 10.1111/obr.12763 [published Online First: 2018/09/27]


- 480 11. Brown HE, Atkin AJ, Panter J, et al. Family-based interventions to increase physical activity in
481 children: a systematic review, meta-analysis and realist synthesis. *Obes Rev* 2016;17(4):345-
482 60. doi: 10.1111/obr.12362 [published Online First: 2016/01/13]
- 483 12. Ijaz S, Nobles J, Johnson L, et al. Preventing childhood obesity in the UK primary schools: a realist
484 review. *PROSPERO 2019* 2019. Available from:
485 https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/display_record.php?ID=CRD42019142192.
- 486 13. Wong G, Greenhalgh T, Westhorp G, et al. RAMESES publication standards: realist syntheses.
487 *BMC Med* 2013;11:21.
- 488 14. Wong G, Greenhalgh T, Westhorp G, et al. Development of methodological guidance, publication
489 standards and training materials for realist and meta-narrative reviews: the RAMESES
490 (Realist And Meta-narrative evidence Syntheses - Evolving Standards) project. Health
491 Services and Delivery Research. Southampton (UK): NIHR Journals Library 2014.
- 492 15. Wong G, Westhorp G, Pawson R, et al. Realist Synthesis: RAMESES training materials. RAMESES
493 Project, 2013.
- 494 16. Higgins JPT, Altman DG, JAC S. Chapter 8: Assessing risk of bias in included studies. In: Higgins JPT
495 GSe, ed. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions Version 510* (updated
496 March 2011) The Cochrane Collaboration, 2011 2011.
- 497 17. Haire-Joshu D, Nanney MS, Elliott M, et al. The Use of Mentoring Programs to Improve Energy
498 Balance Behaviors in High-risk Children. *Obesity* 2010;18:S75-S83. doi:
499 10.1038/oby.2009.435
- 500 18. Paineau DL, Beaufils F, Boulier A, et al. Family dietary coaching to improve nutritional intakes and
501 body weight control: a randomized controlled trial. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med*
502 2008;162(1):34-43. doi: 10.1001/archpediatrics.2007.2 [published Online First: 2008/01/09]
- 503 19. Robinson TN, Matheson DM, Kraemer HC, et al. A randomized controlled trial of culturally
504 tailored dance and reducing screen time to prevent weight gain in low-income African
505 American girls: Stanford GEMS. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med* 2010;164(11):995-1004. doi:
506 10.1001/archpediatrics.2010.197 [published Online First: 2010/11/03]
- 507 20. Amaro S, Viggiano A, Di Costanzo A, et al. Kaledo, a new educational board-game, gives
508 nutritional rudiments and encourages healthy eating in children: a pilot cluster randomized
509 trial. *Eur J Pediatr* 2006;165(9):630-5. doi: 10.1007/s00431-006-0153-9 [published Online
510 First: 2006/05/31]
- 511 21. HEALTHY Study Grp, Baranowski T, Adams L, et al. A School-Based Intervention for Diabetes Risk
512 Reduction. *New Engl J Med* 2010;363(5):443-53. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1001933
- 513 22. Cao ZJ, Wang SM, Chen Y. A randomized trial of multiple interventions for childhood obesity in
514 China. *Am J Prev Med* 2015;48(5):552-60. doi: 10.1016/j.amepre.2014.12.014 [published
515 Online First: 2015/04/22]
- 516 23. Damsgaard CT, Dalskov SM, Laursen RP, et al. Provision of healthy school meals does not affect
517 the metabolic syndrome score in 8-11-year-old children, but reduces cardiometabolic risk
518 markers despite increasing waist circumference. *Br J Nutr* 2014;112(11):1826-36. doi:
519 10.1017/S0007114514003043 [published Online First: 2014/10/18]
- 520 24. de Ruyter JC, Olthof MR, Kuijper LD, et al. Effect of sugar-sweetened beverages on body weight
521 in children: design and baseline characteristics of the Double-blind, Randomized
522 INtervention study in Kids. *Contemp Clin Trials* 2012;33(1):247-57. doi:
523 10.1016/j.cct.2011.10.007 [published Online First: 2011/11/08]
- 524 25. Fairclough SJ, Hackett AF, Davies IG, et al. Promoting healthy weight in primary school children
525 through physical activity and nutrition education: a pragmatic evaluation of the CHANGE!
526 randomised intervention study. *BMC Public Health* 2013;13:626. doi: 10.1186/1471-2458-
527 13-626 [published Online First: 2013/07/04]
- 528 26. Foster GD, Sherman S, Borradaile KE, et al. A policy-based school intervention to prevent
529 overweight and obesity. *Pediatrics* 2008;121(4):e794-802. doi: 10.1542/peds.2007-1365
530 [published Online First: 2008/04/03]

- 531 27. Grydeland M, Bergh IH, Bjelland M, et al. Intervention effects on physical activity: the HEIA study
532 - a cluster randomized controlled trial. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act* 2013;10:17. doi:
533 10.1186/1479-5868-10-17 [published Online First: 2013/02/06]
- 534 28. Gutin B, Yin Z, Johnson M, et al. Preliminary findings of the effect of a 3-year after-school
535 physical activity intervention on fitness and body fat: the Medical College of Georgia Fitkid
536 Project. *Int J Pediatr Obes* 2008;3 Suppl 1:3-9. doi: 10.1080/17477160801896457 [published
537 Online First: 2008/02/20]
- 538 29. Herscovici CR, Kovalskys I, De Gregorio MJ. Gender differences and a school-based obesity
539 prevention program in Argentina: a randomized trial. *Rev Panam Salud Publica*
540 2013;34(2):75-82. [published Online First: 2013/10/08]
- 541 30. James J, Thomas P, Cavan D, et al. Preventing childhood obesity by reducing consumption of
542 carbonated drinks: cluster randomised controlled trial. 2004 doi:
543 10.1136/bmj.38077.458438.EE %J BMJ
- 544 31. Johnston CA, Moreno JP, El-Mubasher A, et al. Impact of a school-based pediatric obesity
545 prevention program facilitated by health professionals. *J Sch Health* 2013;83(3):171-81. doi:
546 10.1111/josh.12013 [published Online First: 2013/01/25]
- 547 32. Khan NA, Raine LB, Drollette ES, et al. Impact of the FITKids physical activity intervention on
548 adiposity in prepubertal children. *Pediatrics* 2014;133(4):e875-83. doi: 10.1542/peds.2013-
549 2246 [published Online First: 2014/04/02]
- 550 33. Kipping RR, Howe LD, Jago R, et al. Effect of intervention aimed at increasing physical activity,
551 reducing sedentary behaviour, and increasing fruit and vegetable consumption in children:
552 active for Life Year 5 (AFLY5) school based cluster randomised controlled trial. *BMJ*
553 2014;348:g3256. doi: 10.1136/bmj.g3256 [published Online First: 2014/05/29]
- 554 34. Lazaar N, Aucouturier J, Ratel S, et al. Effect of physical activity intervention on body composition
555 in young children: influence of body mass index status and gender. *Acta Paediatr*
556 2007;96(9):1315-20. doi: 10.1111/j.1651-2227.2007.00426.x [published Online First:
557 2007/08/28]
- 558 35. Li YP, Hu XQ, Schouten EG, et al. Report on childhood obesity in China (8): effects and
559 sustainability of physical activity intervention on body composition of Chinese youth. *Biomed*
560 *Environ Sci* 2010;23(3):180-7. doi: 10.1016/S0895-3988(10)60050-5 [published Online First:
561 2010/08/17]
- 562 36. Marcus C, Nyberg G, Nordenfelt A, et al. A 4-year, cluster-randomized, controlled childhood
563 obesity prevention study: STOPP. *Int J Obesity* 2009;33(4):408-17. doi: 10.1038/ijo.2009.38
- 564 37. Meng L, Xu H, Liu A, et al. The costs and cost-effectiveness of a school-based comprehensive
565 intervention study on childhood obesity in China. *PLoS One* 2013;8(10):e77971. doi:
566 10.1371/journal.pone.0077971 [published Online First: 2013/11/10]
- 567 38. Muckelbauer R, Libuda L, Clausen K, et al. Immigrational background affects the effectiveness of
568 a school-based overweight prevention program promoting water consumption. *Obesity*
569 *(Silver Spring)* 2010;18(3):528-34. doi: 10.1038/oby.2009.270 [published Online First:
570 2009/08/29]
- 571 39. Rosario R, Oliveira B, Araujo A, et al. The impact of an intervention taught by trained teachers on
572 childhood overweight. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2012;9(4):1355-67. doi:
573 10.3390/ijerph9041355 [published Online First: 2012/06/13]
- 574 40. Rush E, Reed P, McLennan S, et al. A school-based obesity control programme: Project Energize.
575 Two-year outcomes. *Br J Nutr* 2012;107(4):581-7. doi: 10.1017/S0007114511003151
576 [published Online First: 2011/07/08]
- 577 41. Sahota P, Rudolf MC, Dixey R, et al. Randomised controlled trial of primary school based
578 intervention to reduce risk factors for obesity. *BMJ* 2001;323(7320):1029-32. doi:
579 10.1136/bmj.323.7320.1029 [published Online First: 2001/11/03]
- 580 42. Santos RG, Durksen A, Rabbanni R, et al. Effectiveness of peer-based healthy living lesson plans
581 on anthropometric measures and physical activity in elementary school students: a cluster

- 582 randomized trial. *JAMA Pediatr* 2014;168(4):330-7. doi: 10.1001/jamapediatrics.2013.3688
583 [published Online First: 2014/02/12]
- 584 43. Siegrist M, Lammel C, Haller B, et al. Effects of a physical education program on physical activity,
585 fitness, and health in children: the JuvenTUM project. *Scand J Med Sci Sports*
586 2013;23(3):323-30. doi: 10.1111/j.1600-0838.2011.01387.x [published Online First:
587 2011/11/19]
- 588 44. Spiegel SA, Foulk D. Reducing overweight through a multidisciplinary school-based intervention.
589 *Obesity* 2006;14(1):88-96. doi: DOI 10.1038/oby.2006.11
- 590 45. Williamson DA, Champagne CM, Harsha DW, et al. Effect of an environmental school-based
591 obesity prevention program on changes in body fat and body weight: a randomized trial.
592 *Obesity (Silver Spring)* 2012;20(8):1653-61. doi: 10.1038/oby.2012.60 [published Online First:
593 2012/03/10]
- 594 46. Breheny K, Passmore S, Adab P, et al. Effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of The Daily Mile on
595 childhood weight outcomes and wellbeing: a cluster randomised controlled trial. *Int J*
596 *Obesity* 2020 doi: 10.1038/s41366-019-0511-0
- 597 47. McGill R, Anwar E, Orton L, et al. Are interventions to promote healthy eating equally effective
598 for all? Systematic review of socioeconomic inequalities in impact. *BMC Public Health*
599 2015;15(1):457. doi: 10.1186/s12889-015-1781-7
- 600 48. Flodgren GM, Helleve A, Lobstein T, et al. Primary prevention of overweight and obesity in
601 adolescents: An overview of systematic reviews.n/a(n/a) doi: 10.1111/obr.13102
- 602 49. Carozza SE, Puumala SE, Chow EJ, et al. Parental educational attainment as an indicator of
603 socioeconomic status and risk of childhood cancers. *British Journal of Cancer*
604 2010;103(1):136-42. doi: 10.1038/sj.bjc.6605732
- 605 50. Fernández-Alvira JM, Mouratidou T, Bammann K, et al. Parental education and frequency of food
606 consumption in European children: the IDEFICS study. *Public Health Nutrition*
607 2013;16(3):487-98. doi: 10.1017/S136898001200290X [published Online First: 2012/06/12]
- 608 51. Heerman WJ, JaKa MM, Berge JM, et al. The dose of behavioral interventions to prevent and
609 treat childhood obesity: a systematic review and meta-regression. *International Journal of*
610 *Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity* 2017;14(1):157. doi: 10.1186/s12966-017-0615-7
- 611 52. Driessen CE, Cameron AJ, Thornton LE, et al. Effect of changes to the school food environment
612 on eating behaviours and/or body weight in children: a systematic review. *Obes Rev*
613 2014;15(12):968-82. doi: 10.1111/obr.12224 [published Online First: 2014/10/01]
- 614 53. Cooper AM, O'Malley LA, Elison SN, et al. Primary school - based behavioural interventions for
615 preventing caries. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2013(5) doi:
616 10.1002/14651858.CD009378.pub2
- 617 54. Mason - Jones AJ, Sinclair D, Mathews C, et al. School - based interventions for preventing HIV,
618 sexually transmitted infections, and pregnancy in adolescents. *Cochrane Database of*
619 *Systematic Reviews* 2016(11) doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD006417.pub3
- 620 55. Ebrahim S, Taylor F, Ward K, et al. Multiple risk factor interventions for primary prevention of
621 coronary heart disease. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2011(1) doi:
622 10.1002/14651858.CD001561.pub3
- 623 56. Adams J, Mytton O, White M, et al. Why Are Some Population Interventions for Diet and Obesity
624 More Equitable and Effective Than Others? The Role of Individual Agency. *PLOS Medicine*
625 2016;13(4):e1001990. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1001990
- 626 57. Psaltopoulou T, Tzanninis S, Ntanasis-Stathopoulos I, et al. Prevention and treatment of
627 childhood and adolescent obesity: a systematic review of meta-analyses. *World journal of*
628 *pediatrics : WJP* 2019;15(4):350-81. doi: 10.1007/s12519-019-00266-y [published Online
629 First: 2019/07/18]
- 630 58. Nobles J, Summerbell C, Brown T, et al. A Secondary Analysis of the Childhood Obesity
631 Prevention Literature through a Wider Determinants of Health Lens. 2020 (submitted)

- 632 59. Oliver S, Bagnall AM, Thomas J, et al. Randomised controlled trials for policy interventions: a
633 review of reviews and meta-regression. *Health technology assessment (Winchester, England)*
634 2010;14(16):1-165, iii. doi: 10.3310/hta14160 [published Online First: 2010/03/27]
635 60. Crane M, Bohn-Goldbaum E, Grunseit A, et al. Using natural experiments to improve public
636 health evidence: a review of context and utility for obesity prevention. *Health Research*
637 *Policy and Systems* 2020;18(1):48. doi: 10.1186/s12961-020-00564-2
638 61. Karacabeyli D, Allender S, Pinkney S, et al. Evaluation of complex community-based childhood
639 obesity prevention interventions. 2018;19(8):1080-92. doi: 10.1111/obr.12689
640 62. Flynn MA, McNeil DA, Maloff B, et al. Reducing obesity and related chronic disease risk in
641 children and youth: a synthesis of evidence with 'best practice' recommendations. *Obes Rev*
642 2006;7 Suppl 1:7-66. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-789X.2006.00242.x [published Online First:
643 2005/12/24]
644 63. Brown V, Ananthapavan J, Sonntag D, et al. The potential for long-term cost-effectiveness of
645 obesity prevention interventions in the early years of life. *Pediatr Obes* 2019;14(8):e12517.
646 doi: 10.1111/ijpo.12517 [published Online First: 2019/03/01]

647



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