**Evidence Table 6a. Weight related outcomes for combined diet and physical activity intervention studies taking place in a school only setting**

| **Author, Year** | **Arm** | **Base-line N** | **Bas-line measure, mean (SD)** | **First follow-up timepoint in weeks** | **N at first follow-up** | **First follow-up measure, mean (SD)** | **Mean change from baseline (SD)** | **Second follow-up time-point in weeks** | **N Second follow-up** | **Second follow-up measure, mean (SD)** | **Mean change from baseline (SD)** | **Final measure timepoint** | **N at final measure** | **Final follow-up measure, mean (SD)** | **Mean Change from baseline (SD)** | **Measure of Association** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **BMI (Kg/m2)** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gutin, 200817, 63 | 1 | 164 | 18.4 | 52 | 164 | 19.75 |  | 104 | 164 | 21.1 |  | 138 | 164 | 21.75 | 3.35 |  |
| 2 | 42 | 18.8 | 42 | 42 | 20 |  | 104 | 42 | 20.8 |  | 138 | 42 | 22.1 | 3.3 |  |
| Barbeau, 20072 | 1 | 83 | 20.9 (5.6) | 43 | 83 | 22.2 (6.1) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.3 |  |
| 2 | 118 | 20.9 (5.0) | 43 | 118 | 21.6 (5.2) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.7 | Adjusted mean change= -0.45  (95% CI;  -0.79 to -0.12)  P= 0.008 |
| Manios, 200634, 61 | 1 | 222 | 16.3 (0.15) | 312 |  | 20.3 (SE=0.17)  CI: 0.26 to 4.03 |  |  |  |  |  | 520 weeks |  | 23.0 (SE=0.21)  CI; 0.29 to 6.67 | 6.7 | P=0.043  Adjusted Mean change =6.67 (SE 0.21) |
| 2 | 261 | 16.2 (0.13) | 312 |  | 20.3 (SE=0.16)  CI; 0.26 to 3.53 |  |  |  |  |  | 520 weeks |  | 22.2 (SE=0.18)  CI; 0.25 to 6.05 | 4 | Adjusted Mean change =6.05 (SE 0.18) |
| Manios, 199932 | 1 | 177 | 16.3 (0.2) |  |  |  |  | 156 | 177 | 18.1 (SE:0.1)  CI;0.2 to 1.8 |  |  |  |  | 1.8 | Adjusted Mean change= 1.8 (0.1) |
| 2 | 248 | 16.2 (0.1) |  |  |  |  | 156 | 248 | 17.0 (SE=0.1)  CI;0.2 to 0.7 |  |  |  |  | 0.8 | Adjusted Mean change= 0.7 (0.1)  P-value 0.001 |
| Manios, 200233 | 1 | 285 | 16.3 (2.2) | 312 | 285 | 20.5 (4.1) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4.2 | Adjusted Mean change =3·68 (0·16) |
| 2 | 356 | 16.3 (2.3) | 312 | 356 | 19.9 (3.9) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.6 | Adjusted Mean change = 4·28 (0·16) P value<0.05 |
| Sollerhed, 200846 | 1 | 74 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 156 | 74 | 0.25 (1.576) | 0.25 (1.576) | P=0.033 |
| 2 | 58 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 156 | 58 | -0.32 (1.442) | -0.32  (1.442) |  |
| Graf, 200816 | 1 | 172 | 16.4(2.4) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 208 weeks | 170 | 17.9(3.4) | 1.5 (1.8) | Difference from ANCOVA: 0.7 (95%CI: 0.3-1.1)  p<0.001 |
| 2 | 414 | 16.2(2.2) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 208 weeks | 410 | 18.3 (3.4) | 2.1 (2.1) |  |
| Neumark-Sztainer, 201036 | 1 | 174 | 25.5 (6.49) | 39 | 159 | 26.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.6 | Intervention effect:  -0.10  p =0.446 |
| 2 | 182 | 25.9 (7.11) | 39 | 177 | 26.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.1 |  |
| Madsen, 199368 |  | 162 | 19.2(3.9) | 52 | 84 | r= -0.03 |  |  |  |  |  | 104 | 82 |  | r= -0.03 | r=0.09 |
|  | 162 | 19.2(3.9) | 52 | 84 | r=0.04 |  |  |  |  |  | 104 | 82 |  | r=0.04 | R=0.07 |
|  | 162 | 19.2(3.9) | 52 | 84 | r= -0.03 |  |  |  |  |  | 104 | 82 |  | r= -0.03 | r=0.09 |
| Magnusson, 201231 | 1 | 76 | 16.7(2.1) |  |  |  |  | 104 |  | 17.5 (2.7) |  |  |  |  | 0.8 | NS |
| 2 | 90 | Median (SD) =16.0, (1.8) |  |  |  |  |  |  | 17.4 (2.2) |  | 104 |  |  | 1.4 |  |
| Lubans, 201228 | 1 | 179 | 22.59  4.49) | 52 | 153 | 23.37  (4.68) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.8 | P<0.001 |
| 2 | 178 | Median (SD) =22.70, (4.70) |  | 141 | 23.30  (4.71) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.6 |  |
| Llargues, 201227 | 1 |  | 237 | 16.4(2.8) | 104 | NR | 18.12  (3.4) |  |  |  |  | 208 | 201 | 19.1(3.8) | 2.7 |  |
| 2 |  | 272 | Median (SD) =16.94, (2.38) |  |  | 17.7  (2.9) |  |  |  |  | 208 | 225 | 18.9(3.5) | 2.04 |  |
| Burguera, 20115 | 2  High PA | 27 | 22.4(4.5) | 26 |  | 22.6(4.9) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | –0.6 (95% CI –1.4; 0.2) | NR |
| 3  Low PA | 29 | 22.5(4.3) | 26 |  | 22.1(4.3) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | –0.4 (95% CI–0.9; 0.1) |  |
| Howe, 201120 | 1 | 44 | 20.0(4.4) | 40 | 44 | 20.5(4.6) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.5 | NR |
| 2 | 31 (ATT) | Median (SD) =20.4, (5.4) | 40 | 31 | 20.3(5.5) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.1 |  |
| 3 | 31 (NTT) | 20.3(4.9) | 40 | 31 | 20.7(5.2) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.4 |  |
| Taylor, 200749 | 1 | 219 | 18.2(3.3) | 52 | 217 |  | 18.9  (3.8) |  |  |  |  | 104 | 136 | 19.7 (3.8) | 0.8 | NR |
|  | 2 | 250 | 17.4(2.4) | 52 | 246 |  | 17.9  (2.7) |  |  |  |  | 104 | 151 | 18.3 (3.1) | 0.4 | NR |
| **BMI z-score** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Muckelbauer, 200935 | 1 | 1309 | 0.30(1.13) | 43 |  |  | 0.007  (0.295) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | 1641 | 0.23(1.06) | 43 |  |  | 0.005  (0.289) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Estimated group difference in BMI SDS change; -0.004 95%CI -0.045-0.036, p=0.829 |
| Sahota, 200141 | 1 | 312 | NR | 43 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 303 |  |  | Effect of intervention, weighted mean diff and 95%CI of intervention schools and control schools = 0 (-0.1, 0.1) |
| 2 | 301 | NR | 43 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 292 |  |  |  |
| Amaro, 20061 | 1 | 88 | 0.15 (0.88) | 24 | 74 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Not significant at follow up Adjusted means were 0.405 (95% CI 0.345 to 0.465) |
| 2 | 153 | 0.47 (0.93) | 24 | 123 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Adjusted means were 0.345 (95% CI 0.299 to 0.390) |
| Newton, 201037 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | 77 | 0.8 (0.1) | 26 | 77 | 0.8(0.1) |  | |  | | --- | | 52 | |  | | 59 | 0.9 (0.2) |  | 78 | 55 | 0.8 (0.2) | 0 | NS |
| Rosario, 201239 | 1 | 233 | 0.66(1.12) | 24 | 143 | 0.92(1.0) | 0.34 (0.05) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | 231 | Median (SD) =0.84, (1.07) | 24 | 151 | 0.90(0.97) | 0.13 (0.04) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | After intervention, the BMI z-score variation (post intervention—baseline) was higher in the control than in the intervention subjects [respectively, mean (se) 0.34 (0.05) versus 0.13 (0.04)]. After adjusting for gender, age, baseline total energy intake, baseline BMI z-score and parents’ education, the BMI z-score increased 0.176 units more in the control group than in the intervention group [95% CI = (0.044;0.308),  p = 0.009]. |
| Lubans, 201228 | 1 | 179 | 0.78(1.16) | 52 | 153 | 0.81(1.17) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.03 | NR |
| 2 | 178 | Median (SD) =0.82, (1.12) |  | 141 | 0.76(1.16) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.06 |  |
| Taylor, 200749 | 1 | 219 | 0.80(0.87) | 52 | 217 |  | 0.79  (0.86) |  |  |  |  | 104 | 135 | 0.89 (0.81) | 0.09 |  |
|  | 2 | 250 | 0.61(0.82) | 52 | 246 |  | 0.53  (0.84) |  |  |  |  | 104 | 151 | 0.45 (1.00) | -0.16 | Adjusted difference year 1; -0.09  95% CI: -0.18, -0.01  Year 2; -0.26  95% CI: -0.32, -0.21 |
| **Percent (%) Overweight/Obese** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Muckelbauer, 200935 | 1 | 1309 | 25.90 | 47 |  | 27.80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | OR=1.00 |
| 2 | 1641 | 23.40 | 47 |  | 23.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | OR= 0.69 95%CI; 0.48-0.98, p=0.04 |
| Llargues, 201227 | 1 |  | 201 | 8.0% | NR |  |  |  | 104 | 201 | 11.2% |  | 208 | 201 | 8.5% |  |
| 2 |  | 225 | Median (SD) =10.3% | NR |  |  |  |  | 225 | 8.6% |  |  | 225 | 6.7% |  |
| Coleman, 20118 | 1 |  |  | 22% | 52 | 22% | 104 | 25% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3% | NS |
| 2 |  |  | 28% | 52 | 27% | 104 | 32% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4% |  |
| Taylor, 200749 | 1 | 219 | 42.5 | 52 | 217 | 40.6 |  |  |  |  |  | 104 | 136 | 47.8 | 5.3 |  |
|  | 2 | 250 | 32.4 | 52 | 246 | 28.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 104 | 151 | 28.5 | -3.9 | Adjusted difference Year 1; 0.92 (0.71, 1.18),  Year 2; 0.88 (0.69, 1.14) |
| Damon, 20059 | 1 | 231 |  | 14 |  |  |  | 43 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2 | 260 |  | 14 |  |  |  | 43 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Obesity prevalence (%)** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Klish, 201225 | 1 | 510 | 154 (30.2) | 36 | 510 | 29.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | 779 | 237 (30.4) | 36 | 510 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Mean change=-0.4;mean=242;SD=31.1 | OR = 0.98 (95% CI 0.76 to 1.25); p=0.86 |
| Rosario, 201239 | 1 | 233 | 5.0% | 24 | 143 | 9.1% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | 231 | Median (SD) =4.5% |  | 151 | 6.6% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Change in obesity -.058 (95% CI 0.04-4.94); p-value = 0.493 |
| Fung, 201214 | 1 | 3421 | 6.9% |  |  |  |  | 104 | 3398 | 8.8% |  |  |  |  | 1.9 | Change in obesity 8.8%; OR = 1.37 (95% CI 1.11-1.70) |
| 2 | 293 | Median (SD) =12.5% |  |  |  |  |  | 394 | 10.7% |  |  |  |  | -1.8 |  |
| **Incidence of overweight** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rosario, 201239 | 1 | 98 | mean (SD) = Not applicable since looking at incidence of over-weight | 24 | 98 | 18.4% | Un-adjusted percent change = 18.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | 89 | Median (SD) =Not applicable since looking at incidence of over-weight |  |  | 5.6% | Un-adjusted percent change = 5.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.25 (95% CI 0.07-0.92); p-value = 0.037 |
| Coleman, 20118 | 1 |  | 22% | 52 |  | 27 |  | 104 |  | mean=25%mean=30% |  |  |  |  | 5% | NR |
| Warren, 200359 | 1 | 4 | 52 | 2% | 42 | 2% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| **BMI-percentile** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lubans, 201228 | 1 | 50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | NR |
| 2 | 50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Percent body fat** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gutin, 200817 | 1 | 164 | 26.1% | 52 | 164 | 26.7% |  | 104 | 164 | 30% |  | 138 | 164 | 29% | 2.9 | p<0.05 for time x group |
| 2 | 42 | 26.5% | 52 | 42 | 27.2% |  | 104 | 42 | 29.9% |  | 138 | 42 | 27.5% | 1 |  |
| Barbeau, 20072 | 1 | 83 | 30.7 (12.7) | 43 | 83 | 31 (12.2) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.3 |  |
| 2 | 118 | 30.2 (11.9) | 43 | 118 | 29.1 (11.8) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -1.1 | Adjusted change-2.01 (CI -2.98 to -1.04)  P value <0.0001 |
| Skybo, 200244\* | 1 | 25 | 26 (8) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 34 | 24 | 27(9) | 1 |  |
| 2 | 33 | 25 (10) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 34 | 32 | 26(11) | 1 |  |
| Newton, 201037† | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | 77 | 25.0 (1.3) | 26 | 77 | 25.5 (1.3) |  | 52 | 59 | 25.1 (1.5) |  | 78 | 55 | 25.3 (1.5) | 0.3 | NS for trend in main effect over time; however, three way interaction for %BF (p=0.027) with gender. (gender x time x %BF). |
| Magnusson, 201231 | 1 |  | 76 | 24.9(5.2) |  |  |  |  | 104 |  | 26.4  (6.6) |  |  |  | 1.5 | NR |
| 2 |  | 90 | Median (SD) =23.8, (6.5) |  |  |  |  |  |  | 24.7 (7.6) |  |  |  | 0.9 |  |
| Lubans, 201227 | 1 |  | 179 | 28.31  (6.76) | 52 | 153 | 32.55  (5.87) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4.24 | NS |
| 2 |  | 178 | Median (SD) =29.58, (6.54); |  | 141 | 32.72  (5.85) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.14 |  |
| **Body fat, % lean mass** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Magnusson, 201231 | 1 |  | 76 | mean (SD) = 20.2(2.8) ; |  |  |  |  | 104 |  | 24.8 (3.6) |  |  |  | 4.6 | NR |
| 2 |  | 90 | Median (SD) =19.9, (2.2); |  |  |  |  | 104 |  | 24.6 (2.8) |  |  |  | 4.7 |  |
| Bronikowski, 20113 |  |  |  | 28.1(2.3) | 65(15 months) | 34 | 30.0 (2.4) |  | 130 wks (30 months) | 34 | 31.8  (2.2 |  |  |  | 3.7 |  |
|  |  |  | Median (SD) =26.3, (1.9) |  | 38 | 32.0 (2.0) |  | 130 wks (30 months) | 38 | 33.1  (1.8) |  |  |  | 6.3 | ANOVA (F test),Differences between groups in terms of changes in muscle mass, F(2, 140) = 3.81; p=0.02 |
|  |  |  | 25.0(1.4) | 32 | 26.4(1.8) |  | 130 wks (30 months) | 32 | 26.8(1.4) |  |  |  |  | 1.8 |  |
|  |  |  | 26.0  (1.2) | 33 | 29.0(1.3) |  | 130 wks (30 months) | 33 | 28.1(1.2) |  |  |  |  | 2.1 |  |
| **Percent body fat meas. with DXA** | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Neumark-Sztainer201036 | 1 | 174 | 36.6 (8.84) | 39 | 159 |  | 37.7% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.1 | Intervention effect: 0.46  P=0.216 |
| 2 | 182 | 37.3 (9.55) | 39 | 177 |  | 37.2% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.1 |  |
| **Triceps skin fold thickness.** | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walter, 198557 | 1 | 446 | 12.6 (5.7) | 52 | 310 | 13.7 (5.8) | +1.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | 1117 | 13.1 (6.1) | 52 | 805 | 14.4 (6.4) | +1.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | P value 0.302 |
| Bush, 19896 | 1 | 148 | 14.8 (7.2) |  |  |  |  | 104 | 148 | 14.5 (7.1) | -0.32 SE=0.43 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | 283 | 15 (7.3) |  |  |  |  | 104 | 283 | 15.3 (7.5) | 0.33 SE=0.32 |  |  |  |  | Difference in change in skinfold = 0.24; se=0.51; p=0.636 |
| **Waist Circum-ference(cm)** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Barbeau, 20072 | 1 | 83 | 67.0 (12.2) | 43 | 83 | 69.9 (12.5) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | +2.9 |  |
| 2 | 118 | 66.5 (11.5) | 43 | 118 | 67.9 (11.3) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -1.34 | CI: -2.78 to 0.09  P=0.068 |
| Sollerhed, 200846 | 1 | 74 |  | 156 | 74 |  | 0.041 (5.0865) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | P=0.917 |
| 2 | 58 |  | 156 | 58 |  | 0.052 (5.0198) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Magnusson, 201231 | 1 | 76 | 57.6 (5.0) |  |  |  |  | 104 |  | 60.8 (6.2) |  |  |  |  | +3.2 | NR |
| Magnusson, 201231 | 2 | 90 | Median (SD) =57.0, (4.7) |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.1 (6.0) |  |  |  |  | +4.1 |  |
| Howe, 201120 | 1 | 44 | 65.7(9.9) | 40 | 44 | 67.1(10.3) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.4 | NR |
| 2 | 31 | Median (SD) =66.4, (11.6) |  | 31 | 66.9(12.1) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.5 | NR |
| 3 | 31 | 66.1(10.8) |  | 31 | 67.5(12.2) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.4 |  |
| Taylor, 200749 | 1 | 219 | 61.4 (9.6) |  |  |  |  | 52 | 217 | 64.2(10.8) |  | 104 | 136 | 65.8 (10.3) | 2.8 |  |
|  | 2 | 250 | 58.9 (7.5) |  |  |  |  | 52 | 246 | 62.0 (8.5) |  | 104 | 151 | 62.2 (8.1) | 3.3 | Adjusted difference  Year 1; 0.1  95% CI: -1.0, 1.0  Year 2; -1.0  95% CI: -2.0, 0.0  No intervention effect was observed on waist circumference. |
| **Body fat, sum of 4 SF measures** | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Magnusson, 201231 | 1 |  | 76 | 33.6 (12.4) |  |  |  |  | 104 |  | 40.4 (17.6) |  |  |  | +3.8 | NR |
| 2 |  | 90 | Median (SD) =31.7, (12.2) |  |  |  |  |  |  | 38.3 (16.4) |  |  |  | +6.6 |  |
| **Weight, Kg** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Manios, 199932 | 1 | 177 | 24.4 (0.3) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 156 | 177 | 32.8 (0.5) | 9.1 (0.3) |  |
| 2 | 248 | 22.8 (0.3) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 156 | 248 | 30.9 (0.4) | 7.4 (0.2) | NS |
| 1 | 285 | 24.3 (4.6) | 312 | 285 | 46.2 (11.5) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 22•9 (SE 0.38) | There was significantly higher weight gain in control group compared to intervention group. |
| 2 | 356 | 23.1 (4.5) | 312 | 356 | 45.2 (11.2) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 21.6 (SE 0.37) | P value <0·05 |
| Bronikowski, 20113  Boys | 1 |  | 49.7 (9.76 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 59.9 (9.76 | 10.2 | P = 0.95 |
| 2 |  | 48.7 (8.82 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 60.9 (8.33) | 12.2 |  |
| Bronikowski, 20113  Girls | 1 |  | 50.2 (7.79) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 56.0 (9.21) | 5.8 |  |
| 2 |  | 48.2 (5.79) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 56.9 (6.78) | 8.7 | P = 0.26 |
| Taylor, 200749 | 1 | 219 | 29.8 (8.7) | 52 | 217 | 33.9 (11.6) |  |  |  |  |  | 104 | 136 | 37.3 (11.0) | 4.1 | NR |
|  | 2 | 250 | 28.1 (8.3) | 52 | 246 | 31.9 (9.4) |  |  |  |  |  | 104 | 151 | 35.3 (11.1) | 3.8 | NR |
| **Weight, z-score** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Taylor, 200749 | 1 | 219 | 0.65 (0.97) | 52 | 217 | 0.64 (0.99) |  |  |  |  |  | 104 | 135 | 0.72 (0.92) | 0.7 |  |
|  | 2 | 250 | 0.44 (0.91) | 52 | 246 | 0.42 (0.89) |  |  |  |  |  | 104 | 151 | 0.37 (0.96) | -0.2 | Adjusted difference year 1; -0.03  95% CI: -0.10, 0.05  year 2; -0.17  95% CI: -0.21, -0.13 |
| **Pounds (lbs)** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Skybo, 200244 | 1 | 25 | 72(18) | 22 | 24 | 74 (18) |  |  |  |  |  | 34 | 24 | 78 (19) | +6 |  |
| 2 | 33 | 73(18) | 22 | 32 | 75 (20) |  |  |  |  |  | 34 | 32 | 78 (21) | +2weight | P<0.05 |

ANCOVA = Analysis of Covariance Test; BMI = Body Mass Index; CI = Confidence Interval; DXA = Dual-Energy X-Ray Absorptiometry; Kg/m2 = Kilograms per meter squared; Lbs = Pounds; NR = Not Reported; NS = Not significant; OR = Odds Ratio; P = P-value; r = Pearson’s r; SD = Standard deviation; SE = Standard Error; SF = Skin Fold OR = Odds Ratio; Wks = Weeks

\* MALES: In this study, 52% of the males in the experimental group and 67% of the males in the control group had body fat percentages higher

than 20%. In the experimental group, one male converted from abnormal levels to normal levels,

whereas none of the males in the control

group changed to normal levels. In fact, 22% of the control group males moved into the high-risk category by the end of the study.

FEMALES: Seventy-two percent of the experimental

group girls and 47% of the control group girls maintained body fat percentages higher than the 24% recommendation. During the course of the program, 7% of the females in each group moved into the elevated body fat percentages category.

However, 13% of the females in the control group moved from the high level to the normal level category by the end of the program.

† Covariates used: height, age, and baseline percent body fat