

1 **Do dietary and physical activity interventions in**
2 **adolescents provide a cost-effective use of healthcare**
3 **resources? Model development and illustration based on**
4 **the Engaging Adolescents in Changing Behaviour (EACH-**
5 **B) programme**

6
7 Authors: Neelam Kalita¹, Keith Cooper¹, Janis Baird^{2;3}, Kathryn Woods-Townsend^{3;4}, Keith
8 M Godfrey^{2;3}, Cyrus Cooper^{2;6;7}, Hazel Inskip^{2;3}, Mary Barker^{2;3;5}, Joanne Lord¹ and the
9 EACH-B study group

10
11 Affiliations:

12 ¹ Southampton Health Technology Assessments Centre, University of Southampton, UK

13 ² MRC Lifecourse Epidemiology Unit, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK

14 ³ NIHR Southampton Biomedical Research Centre, University of Southampton and University
15 Hospital Southampton NHS Foundation Trust, Southampton, UK

16 ⁴ Southampton Education School, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Southampton,
17 Southampton, UK

18 ⁵ School of Health Sciences, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK

19 ⁶ Faculty of Medicine, University of Southampton

20 ⁷ Nuffield Department of Orthopaedics, Rheumatology and Musculoskeletal Sciences, University of
21 Oxford

22
23
24 Corresponding author: Neelam Kalita

25 Email: N.Kalita@soton.ac.uk

26
27
28

29 **ABSTRACT**

30 **Objective** To assess costs, health outcomes and cost-effectiveness of interventions that aim
31 to improve quality of diet and level of physical activity in adolescents.

32 **Design** A Markov model was developed to assess four potential benefits of healthy behaviour
33 for adolescents: better mental health, Type 2 diabetes, higher earnings and reduced incidences
34 of adverse pregnancy outcomes. The model parameters were informed by published
35 literature. The analysis took a societal perspective over a 20-year period. One-way and
36 probabilistic sensitivity analyses were conducted.

37 **Setting** Secondary schools.

38 **Participants** A hypothetical cohort of adolescents aged 12-13 years.

39 **Interventions** An exemplar school-based, multi-component intervention that was developed
40 by the Engaging Adolescents for Changing Behaviour programme, compared with usual
41 schooling.

42 **Primary and secondary outcome measures** Incremental cost-effectiveness ratio as
43 measured by cost per quality-adjusted life year (QALY) gained.

44 **Results** The model suggested that an intervention for improving diet and physical activity has
45 the potential to offer a cost-effective use of healthcare resources for adolescents in the UK at
46 a willingness-to-pay threshold of £20,000 per QALY. The key model drivers are the
47 intervention effect on levels of physical activity, quality of life gain for high levels of
48 physical activity, the duration of the intervention effects and the period over which effects
49 wane.

50 **Conclusions** The model focused on short to medium-term benefits of healthy eating and
51 physical activity exploiting the strong evidence base that exists for this age group. Other
52 benefits in later life, such as reduced cardiovascular risk, are more sensitive to assumptions
53 about the persistence of behavioural change and discounting.

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62 **ARTICLE SUMMARY**

63 **Strengths and limitations of this study**

- 64 • The study addresses an important public health question by examining if
65 interventions targeting healthy eating and doing more physical activities provide
66 value for money from a societal perspective.
- 67 • A Markov cohort model was developed to assess the costs and benefits, expressed
68 in terms of quality-adjusted life years, of an exemplar school-based, multi-
69 component intervention to improve adolescents' diet and increase their levels of
70 physical activity.
- 71 • The study incorporates existing evidence on the effect of improvement in
72 adolescent health behaviours on four high prevalence short-to-medium term
73 benefits relevant to young people: improved mental health, higher earnings,
74 improved pregnancy outcomes and prevention of Type 2 diabetes.
- 75 • Extensive sensitivity analyses were conducted to investigate the impact of
76 uncertainty over the model assumptions and parameter inputs, thereby highlighting
77 areas where further research would be most useful.
- 78 • A limitation of the study is that it does not estimate the long-term impacts of such
79 interventions due to the lack of longitudinal data on lifetime trajectories of healthy
80 diet and increased levels of physical activity.

81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94

Mesh terms: Adolescent, Cost-effectiveness, School-based, Exercise, Diet

95 **INTRODUCTION**

96 Poor diet and lack of physical activity increase the risk of non-communicable diseases
97 (NCDs), including cardiovascular diseases, Type 2 diabetes and some cancers such as breast,
98 colon and endometrial, in part by contributing to overweight and obesity.^{1 2} Adolescence, the
99 life stage between childhood and adulthood, is a critical period for the development of health
100 and disease in later life.^{3 4} Compared with other age-groups, adolescents have the unhealthiest
101 diets and most (over 80%) fail to meet national guidelines for physical activity.⁵⁻⁷
102 Furthermore, the proportion meeting recommended levels of physical activity has been
103 declining, particularly among girls (from 14% to 8%, 2008-2012).⁸

104
105 The disease burden of poor diet and physical inactivity on healthcare services is significant.
106 In the UK, poor diet and physical inactivity cost £7 billion to the National Health Service
107 (NHS) annually.⁹ Meeting current dietary recommendations would reduce years-of-life lost to
108 coronary heart disease by 2 million, stroke by 400,000 and Type 2 diabetes by 19,000 over 20
109 years.¹⁰

110
111 Health behaviours in adolescence track into adulthood.^{5 9 11 12} Therefore, sub-optimal diet and
112 body composition in adolescence not only affect immediate physical and mental health but
113 also increase the risk of NCDs in later life. Developmental plasticity in adolescence means
114 that interventions to improve diet and levels of physical activity have the potential to reduce
115 the trajectory of NCD risk over the life course.¹³ While many adolescents find it difficult to
116 engage with the long-term consequences of health behaviour, motivated and engaged
117 adolescents can improve their health behaviours.^{14 15} Evidence suggests that school-based
118 interventions that offer combinations of peer-modelling, social support and choice, may be
119 effective in improving diet and physical activity amongst adolescents.^{16 17 18} Furthermore
120 there is an increasing use of digital platforms by adolescents. According to 2018 estimates,
121 83% of 12-15 years olds own smartphones with 99% spending an average of 20 hours per
122 week online.^{19 20} With an explosion in the use of such platforms to influence health
123 behaviours in young people, there are suggestions that they have potential as a
124 complementary feature in complex interventions that aim to influence health behaviour in
125 adolescents.²⁰

126
127 Within this framework, a research programme Engaging Adolescents in CHanging Behaviour

128 (EACH-B) was designed to develop and test an intervention to encourage UK-based school
129 students, aged 12-13 years, to adopt healthy behaviours such as eating better and exercising
130 more (Trial registration: ISRCTN 74109264). EACH-B involves a cluster randomised
131 controlled trial as a test of intervention effectiveness. Further details of the trial design are
132 given elsewhere.²⁰ The research programme is funded by the National Institute for Health
133 Research (RP-PG-0216-20004). The “LifeLab Plus” intervention developed as part of this
134 programme is a complex three-part programme that comprises: i) an education module that
135 teaches school students the science behind health messages through a 2-week module with a
136 “hands-on” practical one-day visit to a teaching laboratory at University Hospital
137 Southampton or in school while COVID-19 restrictions apply; ii) training for teachers in
138 skills to support behaviour change; and iii) access to a specially-designed, interactive
139 smartphone app with game features.

140

141 Despite an emerging interest in identifying and developing interventions for improving diet
142 and physical activity levels in adolescents, there is sparse economic evidence assessing health
143 effects and costs of such interventions. To address this gap, we developed an illustrative
144 decision-analytic model to assess the health benefits, costs and cost-effectiveness of a multi-
145 component intervention such as LifeLab Plus. This prototype model is designed to investigate
146 how changes in diet quality and levels in physical activity could affect future health outcomes
147 and costs. We used costs data from the EACH-B programme and effectiveness from
148 published literature. The model will be updated when results from the EACH-B trial are
149 available.

150

151 Although there is good epidemiological evidence of long-term tracking of health behaviour,^{5,9}
152 ^{11 12} school-based trials rarely follow up for more than a year.^{1 21 22} The persistence of
153 intervention effects is therefore uncertain. We take a conservative approach and focus on
154 potential impacts of improved diet and physical activity likely to manifest in the short to
155 medium term: up to a maximum time horizon of 20 years. We also explore alternative
156 assumptions about the persistence of effects on behaviour after trial follow-up.

157

158 **METHODS**

159 We developed a prototype *de novo* Markov model to estimate the costs, benefits and cost-
160 effectiveness of school-based interventions that aim to improve diet quality and levels of

161 physical activity compared with usual schooling for a cohort of adolescents. The model
162 focussed on four potential short to medium-term benefits of healthy eating and physical
163 activity in this age group: better mental health outcomes, higher earnings and reduced
164 incidences of adverse pregnancy outcomes and Type 2 diabetes.

165

166 The model assumed that improved diet quality and increased physical activity would impact
167 these four health outcomes via reduction in BMI. Discussion with key project stakeholders
168 reiterated these four benefits as the most relevant obesity-related effects in this population.
169 The model did not include later life cardiovascular disease or other chronic diseases as
170 outcomes since the likely impact on these of an intervention undertaken as an adolescent was
171 uncertain. The model also investigated independent effects of physical activity on diabetes
172 and depression (i.e. direct impacts not mediated by BMI). Information relating to
173 epidemiology, mortality, effectiveness, health-related quality of life and costs was obtained
174 from a variety of sources and used to inform the model parameters and assumptions. See
175 Figure 1 for model illustration.

176 ***Structuring the model***

177 **Population**

178 A cohort of adolescents with an equal proportion of boys and girls and a mean age of 13
179 years was entered into the model. The intervention is based on that developed by the EACH-
180 B programme, i.e. LifeLab Plus.²⁰ The impact of this is compared with that of usual
181 schooling.

182

183 **Model states**

184 The Markov model consisted of three health states: *No Type 2 Diabetes*, *Type 2 Diabetes* and
185 *Death*. Outcomes associated with mental health, loss of earnings and adverse pregnancy
186 outcome were incorporated as model events. Mental health encompasses a wide spectrum of
187 conditions. Therefore, a pragmatic approach was adopted to include the two most relevant
188 mental health events for adolescents: clinical depression (henceforth, referred as depression)
189 and General Anxiety Disorder (GAD). These events were categorised as: chronic (history of
190 persistent mental illness), intermittent (experiencing intermittent episodes), and new onset (a
191 one-time episode). Adverse pregnancy outcome was defined by pre-term delivery categorised
192 as: extremely pre-term (delivery <28 weeks); very pre-term (delivery <33 weeks); and

193 moderately pre-term (delivery between 34-36 weeks). The pregnancy outcome was
194 applicable for girls only.

195

196 Adolescents enter the model in the *No Type 2 diabetes* health state. In each model cycle, a
197 proportion of individuals develop Type 2 diabetes and move to the *Type 2 diabetes* health
198 state. They may also experience mental health events or pre-term births (girls only), which
199 are treated as transient states. Each health state and event are associated with a health-related
200 quality of life (HRQoL) and excess cost estimate. The model included intervention cost
201 associated with LifeLab Plus and healthcare costs associated with- Type 2 diabetes, mental
202 health events, pre-term delivery and loss of earnings due to obesity. In each model cycle, the
203 total costs and QALYs are calculated by multiplying the individual costs and HRQoL by the
204 number of people in the cohort still alive for each of the intervention and control arms. The
205 total lifetime costs and QALYs are calculated by aggregating the costs and QALYs for all
206 cycles.

207

208 **Persistence of effects and time horizon**

209 For the base case, the duration of the intervention effect was assumed to be sustained for 4
210 years with the effect waning over a period of 10 years. The model time horizon was 20 years,
211 with yearly cycle length. This was considered appropriate as the mean age of adolescents
212 entering the model was 13 years as it is in the EACH-B trial. The persistence of behaviour
213 change effects from such interventions remains unclear. Therefore, the treatment effect on
214 behaviour was not assumed to last for 20 years. Costs and outcomes were half-cycle
215 corrected.

216 ***Populating the model***

217 Targeted literature searches were conducted to identify sources to inform model parameters.
218 These are discussed below. For further details, see Appendix A and Appendix B.

219

220 **Epidemiological data**

221 Data on the relationship between mean BMI, age and sex was taken from Health Survey for
222 England.²³ For adolescents aged ≤ 19 years, BMI z-scores are normally used. Therefore, we
223 rescaled the values to relate relative risks to BMI z-scores, where:

224

225 *BMI z-score = (observed value – median value of the reference population) / standard*
226 *deviation value of reference population.*

227

228 Physical activity levels for children aged 13-15 years were taken from Health Survey
229 England, 2015.²⁴ The incidence of Type 2 diabetes in UK was based on an analysis of
230 longitudinal electronic health records in the Health Improvement Network (THIN) primary
231 care database.²⁵ The prevalence of depressive episodes and GAD was taken from the Adult
232 Psychiatric Morbidity Survey 2014²⁶ and from Mental Health of Children and Young people
233 in England 2017.²⁷ The proportion in each category was assumed as follows: 17% had a
234 chronic and 40% had a fluctuating (intermittent) course, while 43% remitted (new one-time
235 episode).²⁸ Those individuals with depression or anxiety are at higher risk of suicide than the
236 general population.²⁹ The excess death rate for those with depression and anxiety was
237 calculated by using the suicide rate in the UK from Office of National Statistics (ONS) 2017
238 and applying a relative risk of 10.9 for depression and anxiety.²⁹ The proportions of pre-term
239 deliveries, obtained from ONS 2017 data, were assumed as follows: 0.5% of total births as
240 extremely pre-term (<28 weeks), 1.2% very pre-term birth (28 to <33 weeks) and 6.3%
241 moderately pre-term birth (33-36 weeks) respectively.³⁰

242

243 **Relationship between BMI and risks of health events**

244 The economic model assumed a positive correlation between increased BMI and the risks of -
245 Type 2 diabetes, depression and GAD, pre-term delivery and loss of earnings. We fitted
246 equations to the BMI relative risks. Hazard ratios, obtained from the Medicare Current
247 Beneficiary Survey 1991-2010, were used to estimate the increased risk of individuals with
248 higher BMI developing Type 2 diabetes.³¹ The odds of depression and GAD in obese and
249 overweight adolescents compared with normal-weight adolescents were obtained from
250 Sutaria et al.³² This systematic review included 22 observational studies published between
251 2000 and 2017, representing 143,603 children. The relative risk of pre-term birth for mothers
252 with overweight and obesity was obtained from McDonald et al.³³ The risk was assumed to be
253 the same for all three type of pre-term births.

254

255 **Relationship between physical activity and risk of health event**

256 The direct effect of physical activity on developing depression is modelled independent of the
257 effect of physical activity via BMI. The odds ratio of developing depression was assumed to
258 be 0.83 (95% CI 0.79-0.88) in those with high levels of physical activity compared to those

259 with lower levels.³⁴ Furthermore, an increase from being inactive to achieving the
260 recommended physical activity level (150 minutes of moderate-intensity aerobic activity per
261 week) was assumed to lower the risk of Type 2 diabetes incidence by 26%, after adjustment
262 for body weight.³⁵ The pooled odds ratio between Type 2 diabetes and risk of depression was
263 1.33 (95% CI, 1.18-1.51).³⁶

264

265 **Intervention effect**

266 The intervention effect was based on three systematic reviews and meta-analyses that
267 estimated the overall effects of school-based obesity prevention interventions.^{37 38 39} The
268 results of the meta-analyses were found to be significantly different between groups based on
269 BMI (-0.17 (95% CI $-0.29, -0.06$) kg/m^2)³⁸ and BMI z-score (-0.06 (95% CI $-0.10, -$
270 0.03))³⁹ for multi-component interventions including physical activity, health education and
271 dietary improvement. The effect of school-based intervention was assumed to increase the
272 level of moderate or vigorous physical activity in children and adolescents by 4.84 min/day
273 (95% CI -0.94 to 10.61).⁴⁰

274

275 **Mortality**

276 General population mortality, adjusted for age and gender, was based on ONS 2020.⁴¹ A
277 hazard ratio of mortality of 2.98 was applied for individuals with Type 2 diabetes and aged
278 <65 years.⁴²

279

280 **Quality of life**

281 EQ-5D estimates adjusted for age, gender and BMI were used to estimate quality of life. See
282 Table 1. These estimates were obtained from 14,117 participants aged ≥ 16 years from the
283 Health Survey for England 2008.⁴³ Adults with diabetes was assumed to have a disutility of
284 -0.161 where the pooled mean EQ-5D score for individuals with Type 2 diabetes was 0.67 at
285 a mean age of 60 years.⁴⁴ We estimated the disutility by comparing the mean general
286 population EQ-5D score with that for diabetes. A disutility of -0.087 is used for adolescents
287 with Type 2 diabetes based on a Swedish cohort of adolescents aged 13-18 years.⁴⁵ A utility
288 decrement of 0.188 was assumed for those with intermittent episodes of mental health
289 conditions;⁴⁶ a decrement of 0.488 for those with persistent/chronic depression;⁴⁷ a decrement
290 of 0.094 (half of the decrement for intermittent depression) was assumed for those with a new
291 episode of depression. For pre-term delivery, a mean utility decrement of 0.066 was applied
292 throughout the model time horizon. This was based on a systematic review and meta-analysis

293 for health utility values associated with pre-term birth where all but one study used Health
294 Utilities Index (HUI) Mark 2 (HUI2) or Mark 3 (HUI3) measures as their primary health
295 utility assessment method.⁴⁸ We found no evidence for quality of life loss in parents of pre-
296 term babies. Therefore, we assumed that the quality of life decrement would be similar to
297 intermittent mental health condition and lasts for the first two years.

298

299 **Costs**

300 *Intervention costs*

301 The intervention cost for our illustrative analysis was based on LifeLab Plus. Further
302 information on resources used for delivering LifeLab are in Appendix B. The cost of the
303 application used delivered as part of the intervention, was incorporated as a capital cost and
304 was assumed to last 10 years and be used in 10 centres. Similarly, the cost of setting up
305 LifeLab Plus in a different centre was assumed to consist of one year's staff costs and
306 assumed to last for 10 years. Maintenance costs were estimated at 25% of the development
307 cost per year. Overheads were included according to the rates used in Curtis et al. 2019⁴⁹, i.e.
308 direct overheads based on 29% of direct care salary costs and indirect overheads based on
309 16% direct care salary costs.

310

311 *Health state costs*

312 Literature for costing studies and national datasets relating to individuals with Type 2
313 diabetes, depression, pre-term birth, and loss of earnings related to obesity were reviewed to
314 inform the cost parameters. Both direct and indirect costs were included. Indirect costs
315 included the effect of depression on income and productivity. Costs were updated to 2019
316 prices using the hospital and community health services index.⁴⁹ See Table 1.

317

318 The current and future costs for Type 2 diabetes were sourced from Hex et al.⁵⁰ Direct health
319 costs and indirect societal and productivity costs were estimated using a top-down approach.
320 We assumed that individuals with diabetes would not incur costs for complications as these
321 are likely to affect individuals who have diabetes for a longer period. Direct and indirect
322 costs for depression were taken from a trial of patients with a history of recurrent depression
323 by Kuyken et al.;⁵¹ and the costs associated with pre-term birth were based on the study by
324 Khan et al.⁵²

325

326 Total societal costs for children born at 32-33 weeks and 34-36 weeks gestation from birth to
327 24 months were taken from a study that compared these costs to those for children born at
328 full-term. Costs for children born <28 weeks and 28-33 weeks were estimated, assuming that
329 they varied in the same way.⁵³ The cost used in the model was the mean societal cost
330 difference between these two groups.

331

332 The lifetime indirect costs for overweight and obesity in childhood and adolescence is based
333 on the study by Hamilton et al.⁵⁴ Mean total lifetime healthcare and productivity costs were
334 estimated in Irish Euros, which were converted to GBP (£) and adjusted according to the
335 average wage in the UK.

336

337 **Validation**

338 The structure of the prototype model was validated by the study team comprising
339 epidemiologists, statisticians, trialists, public health experts and health economists. Internal
340 validity of the model was established through running several tests and ensuring that the
341 model predictions were consistent with the model specification.

342

343 **Cost-effectiveness analysis**

344 We followed the modelling guidelines advocated by NICE Reference case,⁵⁵ with an
345 exception for the perspective adopted for the analysis. The economic evaluation was
346 conducted from a societal perspective that included both direct and indirect costs. Costs and
347 benefits were discounted at 3.5% per year and expressed in terms of QALYs. These were
348 estimated and averaged across the simulated cohort. The incremental cost-effectiveness ratio
349 (ICER) was estimated as a ratio of the incremental costs of the intervention, i.e. LifeLab Plus
350 relative to the comparator (usual schooling) to the incremental QALYs of the intervention
351 relative to the comparator. The intervention was considered cost-effective if the ICER was
352 below the lower (more conservative) threshold of £20,000 per QALY gained, as
353 recommended for the English NHS by NICE.⁵⁵

354

355 **Sensitivity analyses**

356 To assess the uncertainty around the model predictions, we conducted deterministic
357 sensitivity analysis (DSA), probabilistic sensitivity analyses (PSA) and scenario analyses. For
358 the DSA, input parameters were varied by 95% confidence intervals where available. Monte
359 Carlo simulations of 1000 iterations were run for the PSA to assess the combined effects of

360 input parameter uncertainties where parameters were simultaneously sampled within a
361 specified distribution. See Table 1. Further details in Appendix A. Scenario analyses were
362 conducted to assess structural uncertainties related to model assumptions. Uncertainty about
363 the sustainability of the intervention effect was assessed by varying the duration of
364 intervention effect and its waning period.

365

366 Effectiveness parameters were assigned beta and lognormal distributions, utilities were
367 assumed to follow a beta distribution, and costs were assigned a gamma distribution. The
368 model was developed and implemented in Microsoft Excel.

369

370 **Patient and public involvement**

371 The research questions addressed in the overarching research programme EACH-B were
372 informed by public involvement. Furthermore, representatives from public involved in the
373 EACH-B research programme were presented the conceptual framework, modelling
374 approaches and invited to comment.

375

376 **RESULTS**

377 **Base case analysis**

378 In the base case analysis, the exemplar intervention based on the multi-component LifeLab
379 Plus was associated with higher costs and better health outcomes (more QALYs) compared
380 with usual schooling. LifeLab Plus was associated with a mean QALY gain of 0.0085 at an
381 incremental cost of £123 per person compared with usual schooling, resulting in an ICER of
382 £14,367 per QALY. See Table 2.

383

384 **Sensitivity analyses**

385 As outlined in the methods section, sensitivity analyses were implemented by varying the
386 base case assumptions and parameter inputs. The result of the one-way sensitivity analyses is
387 presented as a Tornado plot. See Figure 2. Parameters such as the intervention effect on
388 levels of physical activity (expressed in terms of minutes of moderate or vigorous physical
389 activity), quality of life gain for high levels of physical activity, duration of intervention
390 effect and duration of treatment waning period had the highest impact on the cost-
391 effectiveness results. Other parameters such as effect of physical activity on BMI, time
392 horizon and intervention costs also influenced the base case results, but to a lesser extent. The

393 results of the PSA presented as the cost-effectiveness scatter plot showed that the simulations
394 lie in the North-East quadrant of the cost-effectiveness plane. See Figure 3. This implies that
395 the intervention- LifeLab Plus is likely to produce health benefits at an additional cost. At a
396 willingness-to-pay threshold of £20,000 per QALY gained, the probability of LifeLab Plus
397 being cost-effective was 69% compared with usual schooling at 31% respectively.

398

399 **DISCUSSION**

400 **Main findings**

401 Based on economic modelling, we estimate that a multi-component intervention to improve
402 dietary quality and physical activity, such as LifeLab Plus, would be considered cost-
403 effective under conventional willingness-to-pay thresholds of £20,000–£30,000 per QALY
404 gained in the UK. For our base case, the duration of the treatment effect was assumed to be
405 sustained for 4 years with the effect waning over a further period of 10 years. Our sensitivity
406 analyses showed that if the duration of the treatment effect was not sustained to this extent,
407 the intervention would be less cost-effective. See Table 2.

408

409 **Comparison with previous models**

410 Previous cost-effectiveness studies evaluating dietary and physical activity interventions for
411 adolescents have largely consisted of within trial analyses that have not considered the
412 benefits beyond the trial period.⁵⁶⁻⁶⁰ The cost-effectiveness of these intervention vary between
413 cost saving of NZ\$835 per child for the low intensity program⁵⁶ to £120,630 per QALY for
414 the HELP intervention.⁵⁹ However, comparison between studies is difficult because of the
415 differences in the study designs, the interventions considered and the outcomes reported.

416

417 Gc et al¹ developed a model to assess the long-term costs and health outcomes of two
418 physical activity interventions targeting adolescents in UK. The cost-effectiveness of these
419 interventions varied between £11,426 per QALY for an after-school intervention and £68,056
420 per QALY for a multicomponent intervention. The costs of these interventions varied
421 between £51 per participant for the after-school intervention to AUS\$394 for the
422 multicomponent intervention. Their model included different health states to our model for
423 diseases which typically affect people in later life such as chronic heart disease, stroke, heart
424 failure, breast failure and colorectal cancer. They ran the model for a lifetime horizon of 65
425 years. We have not included these health states as our cost-effectiveness results are based on

426 a conservative assumption that treatment benefits for adolescents from such multicomponent
427 intervention as LifeLab Plus do not persist beyond 20 years.

428

429 **Strengths and limitations**

430 The study addresses an important public health question by examining if interventions
431 targeting healthy eating and doing more physical activities provide value for money from a
432 societal perspective. The study incorporates existing evidence on the effect of improvement
433 in adolescent health behaviours on four high prevalence short-to-medium term benefits
434 relevant to young people: improved mental health, higher earnings, improved pregnancy
435 outcomes and prevention of Type 2 diabetes. Sources for data used within our model were
436 identified from a targeted literature review. Where data were not available for adolescents,
437 we have used data from the adult population. Model structure and assumptions were informed
438 by this review and discussions with public health experts. UK-specific incidence rates were
439 used to ensure that patients entering the model matched the likely distribution of events in the
440 UK.

441

442 The model does not estimate the long-term impacts of such interventions due to the lack of
443 longitudinal data on lifetime trajectories of healthy diet and increased levels of physical
444 activity. If the effects are more lasting, then additional benefits such as prevention of
445 cardiovascular disease would enhance the cost-effectiveness of the intervention. Per se our
446 cost-effectiveness results are conservative.

447

448 Our model has several shortcomings. Firstly, there is uncertainty around key assumptions
449 related to the duration of benefits from the intervention. In our analysis, we have assumed
450 that the benefit observed in the clinical trials will last for 4 years and then will gradually
451 reduce over the next 10 years. We only include costs and effects over a 20-year time horizon
452 and have assumed that there would be no further benefits of the intervention for chronic
453 diseases such as cardiovascular diseases and diabetes. Secondly, there are limitations in our
454 approach to estimating income lost due to obesity. We have adopted a simple approach;
455 however, this is a complex interacting bi-directional system. We have not fully explored
456 whether income loss is due to obesity or whether obesity is caused by income loss through,
457 for example, unemployment. Finally, where data from adolescent age groups were
458 unavailable, those from adult populations were used to inform model parameters.

459 **CONCLUSION**

460 Complex behavioural interventions that aim to improve diet and increase levels of physical
461 activity amongst school-aged children have the potential to provide cost-effective use of UK
462 healthcare resources. Such interventions have the potential to reduce burden of NCDs,
463 although benefits in later life are more sensitive to assumptions about the persistence of
464 behavioural change and discounting. Lastly, there is a need to establish long-term (preferably,
465 lifetime) effectiveness of such interventions.

466

467 **Word count:** 3987

468

469 **Author Contributions** NK designed the model, performed the analysis, interpreted the analysis, and
470 wrote the first draft of the manuscript. KC designed the model and performed the analysis. JL
471 supervised the process, provided comments on model structure and data analysis. KWT provided
472 inputs for model parameters. JB, KMG, HI, MB and CC provided critical comments on the model
473 structure. All authors contributed to the critical revision of the manuscript and approved the final
474 version of the manuscript.

475

476 **Funding** The research is funded by the National Institute for Health Research (RP-PG-0216-20004).
477 HMI and KMG are funded by the UK Medical Research Council (MC_UU_12011/4). KMG is
478 supported by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR Senior Investigator (NF-SI-0515-
479 10042), NIHR Southampton 1000DaysPlus Global Nutrition Research Group (17/63/154) and NIHR
480 Southampton Biomedical Research Centre (IS-BRC-1215-20004)), the European Union (Erasmus+
481 Programme ImpENSA 598488-EPP-1-2018-1-DE-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP) and the British Heart
482 Foundation (RG/15/17/3174).

483

484 **Competing Interests** KMG has received reimbursement for speaking at conferences sponsored by
485 companies selling nutritional products, and is part of an academic consortium that has received
486 research funding from Abbott Nutrition, Nestec, BenevolentAI Bio Ltd. and Danone. The other
487 authors have no potentially competing interests to declare.

488

489 **Patient consent for publication** Not required

490

491 **Data availability statement** Data from publicly available sources were used for the model. All model
492 inputs are described in the paper.

Table 1 Input parameters used in the model

Parameter	Value	SD/SE	95% CI-Low	95% CI-High	Distribution
Utility inputs					
Disutility for Diabetes for 13-18 years old	0.087	0.036	0.016	0.158	Beta
Disutility for Diabetes	0.161	0.040	0.240	0.080	Beta
Disutility for pre-term babies < 33 weeks	-0.066	0.016	0.098	0.035	Beta
Disutility for parents of pre-term babies < 33 weeks	-0.094	0.019	0.057	0.131	Beta
Disutility for depression	-0.188	0.038	0.114	0.262	Beta
Disutility for Chronic mental health condition	-0.448	0.036	0.377	0.519	Beta
Disutility for Intermittent mental health condition	-0.188	0.038	0.114	0.262	Beta
Disutility for New cases mental health condition	-0.094	0.019	0.057	0.131	Beta
Quality of life gain for high activity	0.020	0.002	0.016	0.024	Beta
Direct costs					
Type 2 Diabetes	£622	£62	£500	£744	Gamma
Mental health condition	£1,334	£383	£585	£2,307	Gamma
Mental health condition- chronic	£4,233	£629	£3,001	£7,238	Gamma
Mental health condition- intermittent	£1,334	£383	£585	£2,307	Gamma
Mental health condition-new onset	£667	£191	£292	£1,042	Gamma
Pre-term birth <28 weeks	£25,452	£2,169	£21,201	£29,704	Gamma
Pre-term birth 28-33 weeks	£13,073	£1,114	£10,889	£15,256	Gamma
Pre-term birth, 34-36 weeks	£4,157	£1,020	£2,157	£6,157	Gamma
Indirect costs					
Diabetes	£4,116	£412	£3,309	£4,923	Gamma
Mental health condition	£223	£64	£98	£348	Gamma
Mental health condition- chronic	£707	£203	£310	£1,105	Gamma
Mental health condition- intermittent	£223	£64	£98	£348	Gamma
Mental health condition-new onset	£112	£32	£49	£174	Gamma

Table 1 Input parameters used in the model

Parameter	Value	SD/SE	95% CI-Low	95% CI-High	Distribution
Pre-term birth <28 weeks	£397	£114	£174	£619	Gamma
Pre-term birth 28-33 weeks	£119	£34	£52	£185	Gamma
Pre-term birth, 34-36 weeks	£103	£29	£45	£161	Gamma
Cost of the intervention	£155	£15	£124	£185	Gamma

SD: Standard Deviation; SE: Standard Error; CI: Confidence Interval

Table 2 Incremental cost-effectiveness ratios in the base case and scenario analyses

	Total cost (£)	Total QALYs	Incremental cost (£)	Incremental QALY	ICER
Base case analysis					
Usual schooling	£4,416	13.07			
LifeLab Plus	£4,539	13.08	£123	0.0085	£14,367
Perspective: NHS					
Usual schooling	£2,001	13.07			
LifeLab Plus	£2,141	13.08	£140	0.0085	£16,339
Costs discounted at 3.5%; QALYs at 1.5% per annum					
Usual schooling	£4,416	15.76			
LifeLab Plus	£4,539	15.77	£123	0.0097	£12,640
Costs and QALYs discounted at 1.5%					
Usual schooling	£5,813	15.76			
LifeLab Plus	£5,930	15.77	£117	0.0097	£12,044
Time Horizon: 5 years					
Usual schooling	£488	4.25			
LifeLab Plus	£633	4.25	£145	0.0043	£33,423
Time Horizon: 10 years					
Usual schooling	£1,132	7.76			
LifeLab Plus	£1,265	7.77	£134	0.0071	£18,851
Time Horizon: 30 years					
Usual schooling	£11,137	16.67			
LifeLab Plus	£11,258	16.67	£121	0.0088	£13,719
Time Horizon: 40 years					
Usual schooling	£18,417	19.05			
LifeLab Plus	£18,537	19.06	£120	0.0089	£13,455
Duration of treatment effect: 1 year & Treatment waning: 2 years					
Usual schooling	£4,416	13.07			
LifeLab Plus	£4,566	13.08	£150	0.0030	£49,758
Duration of treatment effect: 1 years & Treatment waning: 5 years					
Usual schooling	£4,416	13.07			
LifeLab Plus	£4,563	13.08	£147	0.0043	£34,089
Duration of treatment effect: 2 years & Treatment waning: 5 years					
Usual schooling	£4,416	13.07			
LifeLab Plus	£4,560	13.08	£144	0.0051	£28,034
Duration of treatment effect: 5 years & Treatment waning: 5 years					
Usual schooling	£4,416	13.07			
LifeLab Plus	£4,553	13.08	£137	0.0075	£18,218
Duration of treatment effect: 5 years & Treatment waning: 10 years					
Usual schooling	£4,416	13.07			
LifeLab Plus	£4,529	13.08	£113	0.0092	£12,184
Duration of treatment effect: 10 years & Treatment waning: 10 years					
Usual schooling	£4,416	13.07			
LifeLab Plus	£4,432	13.09	£16	0.0125	£1,257
Duration of treatment effect: 15 years & Treatment waning: 5 years					
Usual schooling	£4,416	13.07			

Table 2 Incremental cost-effectiveness ratios in the base case and scenario analyses

	Total cost (£)	Total QALYs	Incremental cost (£)	Incremental QALY	ICER
LifeLab Plus	£4,308	13.09	-£108	0.0147	Dominates

ICER, incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (incremental cost/incremental QALY); QALY, quality-adjusted life year.

REFERENCES

1. Gc VS, Suhrcke M, Atkin AJ, et al. Cost-effectiveness of physical activity interventions in adolescents: model development and illustration using two exemplar interventions. *BMJ Open* 2019;9(8):e027566. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2018-027566 [published Online First: 2019/08/21]
2. Organisation WH. Unhealthy Diets & Physical Inactivity 2009 [Available from: https://www.who.int/nmh/publications/fact_sheet_diet_en.pdf accessed 19/11/2020.
3. Organisation WH. Adolescent Health 2020 [Available from: https://www.who.int/health-topics/adolescent-health/#tab=tab_1 accessed 13/11/20.
4. Viner RM, Ross D, Hardy R, et al. Life course epidemiology: recognising the importance of adolescence. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health* 2015;69(8):719-20. doi: 10.1136/jech-2014-205300
5. Rose T, Barker M, Maria Jacob C, et al. A Systematic Review of Digital Interventions for Improving the Diet and Physical Activity Behaviors of Adolescents. *J Adolesc Health* 2017;61(6):669-77. doi: 10.1016/j.jadohealth.2017.05.024 [published Online First: 2017/08/16]
6. Bates B, Lennox A, Prentice A, et al. National Diet and Nutrition Survey: Results from Years 1, 2, 3 and 4 (combined) of the Rolling Programme (2008/2009-2011/2012): a Survey Carried Out on Behalf of Public Health England and the Food Standards Agency: Public Health England, 2014.
7. Woods-Townsend K, Bagust L, Barker M, et al. Engaging teenagers in improving their health behaviours and increasing their interest in science (Evaluation of LifeLab Southampton): study protocol for a cluster randomized controlled trial. *Trials* 2015;16:372-72. doi: 10.1186/s13063-015-0890-z
8. NHS. Health Survey for England 2015 Physical activity in children 2016 [Available from: <http://healthsurvey.hscic.gov.uk/media/37752/hse2015-child-phy-act.pdf> accessed 17/11/20.
9. term TNL. 2019 [Available from: <https://www.longtermplan.nhs.uk/publication/nhs-long-term-plan> accessed 15/09/20.
10. Milner J, Green R, Dangour AD, et al. Health effects of adopting low greenhouse gas emission diets in the UK. *BMJ Open* 2015;5(4):e007364. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2014-007364
11. Kelder SH, Perry CL, Klepp KI, et al. Longitudinal tracking of adolescent smoking, physical activity, and food choice behaviors. *Am J Public Health* 1994;84(7):1121-26. doi: 10.2105/ajph.84.7.1121
12. Craigie AM, Lake AA, Kelly SA, et al. Tracking of obesity-related behaviours from childhood to adulthood: A systematic review. *Maturitas* 2011;70(3):266-84. doi: 10.1016/j.maturitas.2011.08.005 [published Online First: 2011/09/17]
13. Hanson M, Gluckman P. Developmental origins of noncommunicable disease: population and public health implications. *Am J Clin Nutr* 2011;94(6 Suppl):1754s-58s. doi: 10.3945/ajcn.110.001206 [published Online First: 2011/04/29]
14. Gates M. Advancing the adolescent health agenda. *The Lancet* 2016;387(10036):2358-59. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(16)30298-7
15. Organisation WH. Global Accelerated Action for the Health of Adolescents (AAHA!): guidance to support country implementation. Geneva, 2017.
16. Kelishadi R, Azizi-Soleiman F. Controlling childhood obesity: A systematic review on strategies and challenges. *J Res Med Sci* 2014;19(10):993-1008.
17. Calvert S, Dempsey RC, Povey R. Delivering in-school interventions to improve dietary behaviours amongst 11- to 16-year-olds: A systematic review. *Obesity Reviews* 2019;20(4):543-53. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/obr.12797>

18. Woods-Townsend K, Hardy-Johnson P, Bagust L, et al. A cluster-randomised controlled trial of the LifeLab education intervention to improve health literacy in adolescents. *PLoS One* in press
19. Ofcom. Children and parents: Media use and attitudes report 2019 [Available from: https://www.ofcom.org.uk/data/assets/pdf_file/0023/190616/children-media-use-attitudes-2019-report.pdf accessed 10/09/20.
20. Strömmer S, Barrett M, Woods-Townsend K, et al. Engaging adolescents in changing behaviour (EACH-B): a study protocol for a cluster randomised controlled trial to improve dietary quality and physical activity. *Trials* 2020;21(1):859. doi: 10.1186/s13063-020-04761-w
21. Borde R, Smith JJ, Sutherland R, et al. Methodological considerations and impact of school-based interventions on objectively measured physical activity in adolescents: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Obesity Reviews* 2017;18(4):476-90. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/obr.12517>
22. Buxton MJ, Drummond MF, Van Hout BA, et al. Modelling in Economic Evaluation: An Unavoidable Fact of Life. *Health Economics* 1997;6(3):217-27. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-1050\(199705\)6:3<217::AID-HEC267>3.0.CO;2-W](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-1050(199705)6:3<217::AID-HEC267>3.0.CO;2-W)
23. NHS Digital. Health Survey for England 2016. 2017.
24. Digital N. Health Survey for England 2015 [Available from: <https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/publications/statistical/health-survey-for-england/health-survey-for-england-20152020>.
25. Sharma M, Nazareth I, Petersen I. Trends in incidence, prevalence and prescribing in type 2 diabetes mellitus between 2000 and 2013 in primary care: a retrospective cohort study. *BMJ Open* 2016;6(1):e010210. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2015-010210 [published Online First: 2016/01/16]
26. McManus S BP, Jenkins R, Brugha T. Mental health and wellbeing in England: Adult Psychiatric Morbidity Survey 2014. 2016.
27. NHS Digital. Mental health of children and young people in England, 2017. 2017.
28. Stegenga BT, Kamphuis MH, King M, et al. The natural course and outcome of major depressive disorder in primary care: the PREDICT-NL study. *Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol* 2012;47(1):87-95. doi: 10.1007/s00127-010-0317-9 [published Online First: 2010/11/09]
29. Singhal A, Ross J, Seminog O, et al. Risk of self-harm and suicide in people with specific psychiatric and physical disorders: comparisons between disorders using English national record linkage. *J R Soc Med* 2014;107(5):194-204. doi: 10.1177/0141076814522033 [published Online First: 2014/02/15]
30. Office of National Statistics. Births in England and Wales: 2017. 2018.
31. Gray N, Picone G, Sloan F, et al. Relation between BMI and diabetes mellitus and its complications among US older adults. *South Med J* 2015;108(1):29-36. doi: 10.14423/SMJ.0000000000000214 [published Online First: 2015/01/13]
32. Sutaria S, Devakumar D, Yasuda SS, et al. Is obesity associated with depression in children? Systematic review and meta-analysis. *Arch Dis Child* 2019;104(1):64-74. doi: 10.1136/archdischild-2017-314608 [published Online First: 2018/07/01]
33. McDonald SD, Han Z, Mulla S, et al. Overweight and obesity in mothers and risk of preterm birth and low birth weight infants: systematic review and meta-analyses. *BMJ* 2010;341:c3428. doi: 10.1136/bmj.c3428 [published Online First: 2010/07/22]
34. Schuch FB, Vancampfort D, Firth J, et al. Physical Activity and Incident Depression: A Meta-Analysis of Prospective Cohort Studies. *Am J Psychiatry* 2018;175(7):631-48. doi: 10.1176/appi.ajp.2018.17111194 [published Online First: 2018/04/25]

35. Wahid A, Manek N, Nichols M, et al. Quantifying the Association Between Physical Activity and Cardiovascular Disease and Diabetes: A Systematic Review and Meta - Analysis. *Journal of the American Heart Association* 2016;5(9) doi: 10.1161/jaha.115.002495
36. Chireh B, Li M, D'Arcy C. Diabetes increases the risk of depression: A systematic review, meta-analysis and estimates of population attributable fractions based on prospective studies. *Prev Med Rep* 2019;14:100822. doi: 10.1016/j.pmedr.2019.100822 [published Online First: 2019/03/01]
37. Liu Z, Xu HM, Wen LM, et al. A systematic review and meta-analysis of the overall effects of school-based obesity prevention interventions and effect differences by intervention components. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act* 2019;16(1):95. doi: 10.1186/s12966-019-0848-8 [published Online First: 2019/10/31]
38. Lavelle HV, Mackay DF, Pell JP. Systematic review and meta-analysis of school-based interventions to reduce body mass index. *J Public Health (Oxf)* 2012;34(3):360-9. doi: 10.1093/pubmed/fdr116 [published Online First: 2012/01/24]
39. Jacob CM, Hardy-Johnson PL, Inskip HM, et al. A systematic review and meta-analysis of school-based interventions with health education to reduce body mass index in adolescents aged 10 to 19 years. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act* 2021;18(1):1. doi: 10.1186/s12966-020-01065-9 [published Online First: 2021/01/06]
40. Mears R, Jago R. Effectiveness of after-school interventions at increasing moderate-to-vigorous physical activity levels in 5- to 18-year olds: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Br J Sports Med* 2016;50(21):1315-24. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2015-094976 [published Online First: 2016/05/26]
41. Statistics OfN. National life tables: England. 2020. <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/birthsdeathsandmarriages/lifeexpectancies/datasets/nationallifetablesenglandreferencetables> (accessed 22/03/2021).
42. Mulnier HES, H.E.;Raleigh,V.S.;Soedamah-Muthu,S.S.;Colhoun,H.M.;Lawrenson,R.A.;. Mortality in people with Type 2 diabetes in the UK. *Diabetic Medicine* 2006(23):516-21.
43. Maheswaran H, Petrou S, Rees K, et al. Estimating EQ-5D utility values for major health behavioural risk factors in England. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2013;67(2):172-80. doi: 10.1136/jech-2012-201019 [published Online First: 2012/07/31]
44. Janssen MF, Lubetkin EI, Sekhobo JP, et al. The use of the EQ-5D preference-based health status measure in adults with Type 2 diabetes mellitus. *Diabet Med* 2011;28(4):395-413. doi: 10.1111/j.1464-5491.2010.03136.x [published Online First: 2011/03/12]
45. Astrom M, Persson C, Linden-Bostrom M, et al. Population health status based on the EQ-5D-Y-3L among adolescents in Sweden: Results by sociodemographic factors and self-reported comorbidity. *Qual Life Res* 2018;27(11):2859-71. doi: 10.1007/s11136-018-1985-2 [published Online First: 2018/09/10]
46. Lynch FD, JF.; Feeny, DH.; Clarke, GN.; MacMillan, AL.;. Measuring Health-related Quality of Life in Teens With and Without Depression. *Medical Care* 2016;54(12):8.
47. Morriss R, Garland A, Nixon N, et al. Efficacy and cost-effectiveness of a specialist depression service versus usual specialist mental health care to manage persistent depression: a randomised controlled trial. *The Lancet Psychiatry* 2016;3(9):821-31. doi: 10.1016/s2215-0366(16)30143-2
48. Petrou S, Krabuanrat N, Khan K. Preference-Based Health-Related Quality of Life Outcomes Associated with Preterm Birth: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis.

Pharmacoeconomics 2019 doi: 10.1007/s40273-019-00865-7 [published Online First: 2019/12/10]

49. Curtis LB, A.; Unit costs of Health and Social Care 2018. 2018.
50. Hex N, Bartlett C, Wright D, et al. Estimating the current and future costs of Type 1 and Type 2 diabetes in the UK, including direct health costs and indirect societal and productivity costs. *Diabet Med* 2012;29(7):855-62. doi: 10.1111/j.1464-5491.2012.03698.x [published Online First: 2012/04/28]
51. Kuyken W, Hayes R, Barrett B, et al. Effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of mindfulness-based cognitive therapy compared with maintenance antidepressant treatment in the prevention of depressive relapse or recurrence (PREVENT): a randomised controlled trial. *The Lancet* 2015;386(9988):63-73. doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(14)62222-4
52. Khan KA, Petrou S, Dritsaki M, et al. Economic costs associated with moderate and late preterm birth: a prospective population-based study. *BJOG* 2015;122(11):1495-505. doi: 10.1111/1471-0528.13515 [published Online First: 2015/07/30]
53. Mangham LJ, Petrou S, Doyle LW, et al. The cost of preterm birth throughout childhood in England and Wales. *Pediatrics* 2009;123(2):e312-27. doi: 10.1542/peds.2008-1827 [published Online First: 2009/01/28]
54. Hamilton D, Dee A, Perry IJ. The lifetime costs of overweight and obesity in childhood and adolescence: a systematic review. *Obes Rev* 2018;19(4):452-63. doi: 10.1111/obr.12649 [published Online First: 2017/12/23]
55. Excellence NIHaC. Guide to the methods of technology appraisal, 2013.
56. Anderson YC, Leung W, Grant CC, et al. Economic evaluation of a multi-disciplinary community-based intervention programme for New Zealand children and adolescents with obesity. *Obesity Research & Clinical Practice* 2018;12(3):293-98. doi: <https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.orcp.2018.04.001>
57. Ladapo JA, Bogart LM, Klein DJ, et al. Cost and Cost-Effectiveness of Students for Nutrition and eXercise (SNaX). *Academic pediatrics* 2016;16(3):247-53. doi: <https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.acap.2015.07.009>
58. Lee BY, Adam A, Zenkov E, et al. Modeling The Economic And Health Impact Of Increasing Children's Physical Activity In The United States. *Health Affairs* 2017;36(5):902-08. doi: <https://dx.doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.2016.1315>
59. Panca M, Christie D, Cole TJ, et al. Cost-effectiveness of a community-delivered multicomponent intervention compared with enhanced standard care of obese adolescents: cost-utility analysis alongside a randomised controlled trial (the HELP trial). *BMJ Open* 2018;8(2):e018640. doi: <https://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2017-018640>
60. Sutherland R, Reeves P, Campbell E, et al. Cost-effectiveness of a multi-component school-based physical activity intervention targeting adolescents: the 'Physical Activity 4 Everyone' cluster randomized trial. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition & Physical Activity* 2016;13:94. doi: <https://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12966-016-0418-2>

Figure 1: Illustration of the conceptual framework and model structure





Figure 2: Tornado diagram to show the impact of varying parameter input values on ICERs



MVPA: Moderate or Vigorous Physical Activity; BMI: Body Mass Index; CI: Confidence Interval; ICER: Incremental Cost Effectiveness Ratio

Figure 3: Scatter plot of PSA cost-effectiveness results

