Economic Impact of a Precision Nutrition Digital Therapeutic on Employer Health Costs: A Multi-Employer and Multi-Year Claims Analysis

Inti Pedroso[1], Shreyas V. Kumbhare[1], Santosh K. Saravanan[1], Garima Sharma[1], Daniel E. Almonacid[1], Ranjan Sinha[1]*

[1]Digbi Health, CA, USA

*Author to whom correspondence should be addressed: ranjan@digbihealth.com

Keywords: personalised nutrition, obesity, digestive health, depression, anxiety, digital health, precision medicine, employer-sponsored insurance, health economics, difference-in-differences

Corresponding Author:
Ranjan Sinha[1]
[1]Digbi Health, CA, USA
Email address: ranjan@digbihealth.com

Abstract

Background: Obesity, gastrointestinal disorders, and mental health conditions are leading contributors to employer healthcare expenditures, yet effective nutrition-based strategies are rarely integrated into coverage. Precision nutrition, which tailors dietary and lifestyle guidance using genetics, gut microbiome profiles, lifestyle and blood biomarkers, and behavioral data, may provide a scalable approach to reduce healthcare costs in diet-responsive health conditions.

Methods: We conducted a retrospective cohort study of medical claims from seven U.S. self-insured employers. Employees who enrolled in a precision nutrition digital therapeutic (n = 258) were compared with matched non-enrolled controls (n = 8,268). Outcomes were changes in per-member-per-year (PMPY) medical expenditures over 12 months before and after enrollment, estimated using a two-stage difference-in-differences framework. Analyses focused on total medical costs, diet-responsive "diet-responsive" categories (obesity, digestive, and mental health), and condition-specific subgroups. Exploratory analyses of Current Procedural Terminology (CPT) and Healthcare Common Procedure Coding System (HCPCS) codes were conducted to examine utilization patterns.

Results: Enrollment was associated with a -$251 PMPM (-$3,012 PMPY; N treated and never treated = 233/7,611) reduction in diet-responsive medical spending. The largest effects were observed in digestive disorders (-$770 PMPM; -$9,240 PMPY, N=18/502), though with wide confidence intervals and small sample size, followed by obesity (-$407 PMPM; -$4,884 PMPY, N = 23/1,125) and anxiety-related mental health conditions (-$113 PMPM; -$1,356 PMPY, N= 38/1,061). Depression showed a negative but non-significant trend (-$248 PMPM; -$2,976 PMPY; N = 28/842). Total medical spending, inclusive of non-diet-responsive categories, was reduced by -$337 PMPM (-$4,044 PMPY; N = 258/8,365) but did not reach statistical significance. CPT/HCPCS analyses indicated that savings were driven by reduced utilization of medical nutrition therapy codes in digestive disorders, psychotherapy codes in anxiety, and outpatient visits and procedures related to obesity. These exploratory findings are consistent with prior reports of diet-based interventions reducing reliance on recurrent outpatient services.

Conclusions: Precision nutrition delivered through a digital therapeutic was associated with meaningful reductions in medical expenditures for diet-responsive conditions, averaging approximately $3,000 PMPY in gross medical savings. These effects were directionally consistent with prior food-as-medicine interventions; however, subgroup results—particularly for digestive disorders—should be interpreted cautiously due to the small sample sizes. As pharmacy and program costs were not included, findings reflect changes in medical benefit expenditures only. Within these limitations, the study adds evidence that precision nutrition may offer a scalable, data-driven strategy to help employers address the growing healthcare burden of obesity, gastrointestinal, and mental health conditions.

Introduction

The escalating burden of obesity, gastrointestinal disorders, and mental health conditions poses a major challenge for U.S. employers and payers. For self-insured employers, these conditions are among the fastest-growing cost categories, contributing disproportionately to year-over-year increases in medical claims (Everhart & Ruhl, 2009; Buono et al., 2017; Burhans et al., 2019; Deana Bell et al., 2024). Traditional approaches, including generic wellness programs, dietary guidelines, and pharmacological therapy, have delivered limited and often unsustainable results (Lowe, Miller-Kovach & Phelan, 2001; Tuomilehto et al., 2001; Ryan & Yockey, 2017).

Food-as-medicine interventions have gained attention for their ability to improve outcomes and reduce costs. In high-risk populations, medically tailored meal (MTM) programs have been associated with substantially lower utilization, producing gross savings of ~$570 per member per month (PMPM) and net savings of ~$220 PMPM after accounting for meal delivery costs (Berkowitz et al., 2018, 2019). Large Medicaid food-as-medicine intervention demonstrations report net savings of approximately $210 per participant over 3–12 months (equivalent to ~$18 PMPM) (Berkowitz et al., 2022; Berkowitz et al., 2019, Seligman et al., 2025). Digital nutrition platforms have produced more modest but consistent savings of $30-45 PMPM in employer and health plan settings (Horstman et al., 2021). Importantly, unlike anti-obesity pharmacotherapies, which often carry high costs and variable adherence, nutrition-based strategies offer a lower-cost, sustainable alternative (Ryan & Yockey, 2017). Together, these studies establish a payer-relevant benchmark for diet-based interventions ranging from small but scalable digital savings to larger net reductions from intensive MTM services.

Economic evidence also supports dietary interventions for mental health. The SMILES randomized trial in adults with depression found that a Mediterranean-style diet not only improved clinical outcomes but also reduced costs by A$856 (~US $640) per patient over 12 weeks, or ~$218 PMPM in health-sector savings, with societal savings exceeding A$2,500 (~US $1,865 PMPY; ~$155 PMPM) (Chatterton et al., 2018). Similarly, the HELFIMED trial demonstrated that Mediterranean diet-based group programs achieved cost-effectiveness at ~A$2,775 per quality-adjusted life year (QALY ~US $ 2,070) (Segal et al., 2020). These results provide economic plausibility for nutritional psychiatry interventions. However, there is a need to evaluate the economic impact of nutrition-based interventions for mental health in U.S. populations, particularly within employer-sponsored insurance.

For digestive disorders, diet-based therapies are both clinically effective and economically attractive. Low-FODMAP diets reduce irritable bowel syndrome (IBS) symptom severity and, when guided by dietitians, are highly cost-effective, with incremental values of $75-150 PMPM relative to drug-based management (Halmos et al., 2014; Shah et al., 2021, 2022). Mediterranean-style diets have also demonstrated clinical effectiveness for gastroesophageal reflux disease (GERD), offering opportunities to reduce long-term reliance on proton-pump inhibitors and associated utilization costs (Zalvan et al., 2017). Given that IBS and GERD affect 15-20% of working-age adults and contribute several thousand dollars in incremental costs per patient annually (Buono et al., 2017; Peery et al., 2019), nutrition-first strategies represent a high-value approach for employers.

Despite this growing body of evidence, most dietary interventions are delivered as one-size-fits-all programs. Yet responsiveness to dietary change varies significantly due to genetic predisposition, metabolic flexibility, gut microbiome composition, and behavioral context (Corella et al., 2012; Wen & Duffy, 2017). Meta-analyses confirm that tailoring interventions to individual biological and behavioral profiles improves both clinical outcomes and cost-effectiveness (Galekop, Uyl-de Groot & Ken Redekop, 2021). Precision nutrition, which integrates genetics, microbiome data, biomarkers, and digital engagement, has therefore emerged as a paradigm to overcome the limitations of generic guidelines (Severin et al., 2019).

Digbi Health has developed a precision digital care platform that combines genetic and gut microbiome profiling, blood biomarker tracking, continuous coaching, and mobile engagement. Previous studies have documented clinically meaningful weight loss, improved glycemic control, reduced gastrointestinal symptoms, reduced mental health symptoms and improved microbiome profiles in real-world employer populations (Ricchetti et al., 2020; Sinha et al., 2021; Kumbhare et al., 2022; Pedroso et al., 2022, Kumbhare et al., 2024,). However, the impact of such precision nutrition programs on employer-paid healthcare costs has not been systematically evaluated.

This study addresses this gap by analyzing medical claims data from seven U.S. self-insured employers. Using a retrospective cohort and a two-stage difference-in-differences framework, we evaluated changes in per-member-per-month (PMPM) medical expenditures in the 12 months before and after enrollment. To our knowledge, this is the first multi-employer claims-based economic evaluation of a microbiome- and genetics-informed digital nutrition program, with specific focus on obesity, digestive health, and mental health costs.

Materials & Methods

Study design and setting

This was a retrospective cohort study across seven self-insured US employers (2022-2025) to evaluate the economic impact of the digital health intervention as measured by deidentified medical claims.

The Digital Health Intervention

The Digbi Health intervention program (Digbi Control™) is a digital therapeutics platform designed to support weight loss, digestive health, and cardiometabolic health, addressing weight-related inflammatory disorders and associated comorbidities. The program integrates genetic and gut microbiome profiling, CGM data, baseline participant information, and continuous health monitoring through an AI-powered mobile application. The Digbi Health intervention is a 12-month program commercially available to employers and payers in the USA, who offer it to their employees and eligible dependents without an out-of-pocket copay as part of the employer's benefit programs. Employees and eligible dependents, or more generally members, can join the program voluntarily if they are over 18 years of age, and meet any of the following criteria: BMI >= 30 or > 27 and have one or more obesity related comorbidities, or diabetes. Upon enrollment, participants received online access to the Digbi Health app and were required to complete a comprehensive health questionnaire. They were also provided with a Bluetooth-compatible digital weighing scale, buccal swab, and stool sampling kits, which were shipped directly to them for the self-collection of biological samples.

The Digbi Health app facilitated continuous tracking of participants' weight, dietary intake (via uploaded food photographs), and other lifestyle metrics. Meals are scored using a Nutrient Density Score based on their pro-inflammatory potential, fiber diversity, and expected insulin response. The details of the personalized intervention are described elsewhere (Ricchetti et al., 2020; Sinha et al., 2021; Kumbhare et al., 2022).
Members enrolled in the intervention program provided electronic informed consent as part of their written consent process. The Institutional Review Board of E&I Review Services reviewed and approved the study protocol (protocol code #18053, approved 05/22/2018). All medical and pharmacy claims used for the control cohort (members who never enrolled) were de-identified in-house before analysis by applying the HIPAA 45 CFR 164.514(b)(2) safe-harbor method. Eighteen direct and indirect identifiers were removed or generalized, and no re-identification key was retained.

Data sources and processing

The current study focuses on the analysis of medical claims only. We acknowledge the importance of pharma claims for the evaluation of the economic impact of health interventions, however, the availability of pharma claims for the same employers was much more limited and did not allow a systematic comparison.
Claims files were obtained from seven self-insured employers on a monthly basis during the time of active enrollment for each employer, encompassing the total from January 2022 to August 2025. The files were parsed using custom-developed Python scripts following the corresponding claims layout files that specify the file's content format. We cross-referenced the members' claims records to those self-reported by enrolled members using their first and last names and date of birth. After matching and identifying which claims records correspond to enrolled members, the claims data were de-identified in-house before analysis by applying the HIPAA 45 CFR 164.514(b)(2) safe-harbor method. From each claim we extracted unique employer identifier, unique member identifier, member's gender, member's age, claim type (medical or pharma), service date, payment date, International Classification of Disease v10 (ICD10) codes (DiSantostefano, 2009), Current Procedural Terminology (CPT)/Healthcare Common Procedure Coding System (HCPCS) codes (Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, 2025), and $USD amount paid by the employer or payer.
Data processing and analyses were performed using Python (version 3.13.5) libraries including Pandas v2.3.1 (The pandas development team, 2025), numpy v2.2.0 (Harris et al., 2020), Ibis v 10.5.0 (Ibis dev team, 2025), pyfixest v0.30.2 (The PyFixest Authors, 2025), plotnine v0.15.0 (Kibirige, 2025), and duckdb v1.2.0 (Raasveldt & Mühleisen, 2019).

Inclusion and exclusion criteria

The member's inclusion criteria for the current study were age >= 18 (at the time of the claim's service date) and being an employee or dependant eligible for enrollment in the intervention. We included claims with non-zero cost to the employer ($USD > 0) reported until July 2025 with service date between 1st of Jan 2022 and 31st of Dec 2024. We restricted the analyses to claims associated with "diet-responsive conditions," comprising a set of 142 3-character ICD10 codes covering diagnoses that are directly relevant and for which evidence of modifiable health outcomes exists using food-as-medicine intervention. Supp Note S1 provides a list of the codes used and a detailed rationale for their selection. Briefly, the codes were selected because they represent a) material economic burden in working-age, privately-insured populations, b) strong

evidence that outcomes for these conditions are nutrition-responsive, and c) align with the external policy landscape for Food-is-Medicine interventions.
We included the claims of members enrolled in the program for the 12 months before and 12 months after the enrollment date. For non-enrolled members, we included claims from the same months during which enrolled individuals had eligible claims. We excluded claims with ICD10 or CPT/HCPCS codes indicating costs associated with causes outside the scope of the intervention's health outcomes, like organ transplants, dialysis, or trauma (see Supp Note S1).
We restricted our analyses to three health areas: obesity, digestive health and mental health which are the primary focus of the digital health intervention being evaluated. To capture expenditure associated to each disease area we employed the standardized Clinical Classifications Software Refined (CCSR) developed by the U.S. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ), 2025) which maps ICD-10 codes into clinically meaningful groups, facilitating reproducibility and comparability across studies. The CCSR category used for obesity was END009 “Obesity”, for digestive health was DIG025 “Other specified and unspecified gastrointestinal disorders” covering IBS and GERD, for mental health was MBD002 “Depressive disorders”, MBD005 “Anxiety and fear-related disorders”, and also a combined depression + anxiety. Supp Note S2 provides detail of the rationale to focus on this health areas and CCSR categories.

Data preparation and Statistical analyses

The study’s primary outcome was monthly per-member per-month (PMPM) spending, aggregated across claims at the member-month level. We derived both total costs and “diet-responsive” costs, the latter restricted to conditions plausibly modifiable through nutrition and behavior (cardiometabolic, gastrointestinal, and mental-health domains). Diagnoses were mapped to curated ICD-10 groups and CCSR categories. Only months with positive spending for the payer were included.
We defined the treated group as the members who enrolled in Digbi and the treatment period as the 12 calendar months since the month of enrollment, regardless of the calendar day on which the member enrolled. The control group comprises never-enrolled members with reported claims on the same months as the treated group. Before performing the statistical analysis, we summarized the data at the level of the employer and calendar month by calculating the average per member per month (PMPM) $USD spent for treated and control members for each cost category being studied.
We constructed a panel with a monthly event-time structure indexed by employer, member identifier, and calendar month. For enrollees, observations were restricted to the window -12 to +12 months around enrollment month. Controls were retained across the full window without trimming. To ensure common support each employer × cost category × month stratum had to contain ≥1 treated and ≥1 control member. Treated members were required to contribute ≥1 pre- and ≥1 post-enrollment month; never-treated required ≥1 pre-index month. Employer strata were included only if ≥2 treated and ≥2 control members remained.
We estimated treatment effects using Gardner’s two-stage difference-in-differences (DiD2S) as implemented in pyfixest software package version 0.30.2 (The PyFixest Authors, 2025) with the following formulation: dependent variable: log-transformed monthly spending (log_spent), first stage: unit fixed effects (member identifier) and calendar month fixed effects, and second stage: regression on the calendar month treatment indicator (0 if member is untreated and 1 if treated). Standard errors were calculated clustered at the member level. To aggregate employer-level

results without allowing larger employers to dominate the pooled estimates, we used geometric mean weights across employer strata. This approach has precedent in multi-site evaluations (Goodman-Bacon, 2021) and meta-analytic methods (Hedges & Olkin, 2014; Cooper, Hedges & Valentine, 2019), where geometric weighting provides a balanced synthesis across heterogeneous units. Coefficient estimates, 95% confidence intervals, and p-values were retained alongside descriptive PMPM breakdowns by cohort, partner, and month. Since the outcome is modeled as log spent, we interpret the % change in spent as "exp(coefficient)-1" and the same for the confidence intervals.

Procedural code classification

To complement ICD-10-based categorizations and gain insight on potential drivers of cost and savings, we classified medical claims using Current Procedural Terminology (CPT) and Healthcare Common Procedure Coding System (HCPCS) codes to capture utilization and spending patterns directly tied to provider-delivered services. The goal was to identify whether program enrollment was associated with differential patterns of high-cost or disease-specific services plausibly modifiable by nutrition and behavioral interventions. We pre-specified the following CPT/HCPCS code families for each disease category:

- Obesity: Bariatric surgeries, medical nutrition therapy, metabolic labs, obesity behavioral counseling, and diabetes self-management training.
- Digestive Health: Endoscopy and colonoscopy, GERD diagnostics, and anti-reflux procedures.
- Mental Health: Psychiatric evaluation, psychotherapy, behavioral screening and intervention, collaborative care, and somatic treatments.
- Cross-domain: Emergency Department visits, inpatient/outpatient evaluation and management.

For each disease category, we first identified the medical claims having at least one associated ICD10 code, and for those claims we quantified the monthly expenditure and utilization (number of different days in the month) for each of the corresponding CPT/HCPCS code families.
Supp Note S3 provides a detailed description of each CPT/HCPCS code family. The association between enrollment and the expenditure and utilization was evaluated using the DiD2S.

Results

A total of 46,812 members across seven self-insured employers were initially identified in the medical claims of seven self-insured employers. After exclusion of claims associated with catastrophic events and ensuring appropriate data panel structure for DiD2S analysis (e.g., having at least one pre-enrollment month and one post-enrollment month of claims data) the final dataset for analyses included 258 enrolled members and 8,365 never-enrolled members, and a total of 167,326 member-months from Jan-2022 to Dec-2024.
Among the members selected for analyses, the mean age of enrolled members was 46.9 years (SD 10.6), compared with 48.5years (SD 13.8) in the never-enrolled group. Females comprised 64% of the enrolled cohort and 54% of the never-enrolled cohort.
Across the seven employers, the total payer spent and total diet-responsive spent for medical claims expenditures demonstrated an increasing trend over the study period, consistent with a

general rise in employer healthcare costs, with year on year increases ranging between 2.5% to 52% across employer sizes and years.
Across enrolled members, program participation was associated with meaningful reductions in diet-responsive medical expenditures. Using the two-stage difference-in-differences model, enrollment in the intervention was linked to a 23% decrease in diet-responsive spend, corresponding to an average reduction of -$251 per member per month (PMPM) (95% CI: -$420 to -$41; $p = 0.021$). By contrast, changes in total medical spend (which includes non-diet-responsive conditions such infectious or respiratory disease) were not statistically significant, with an estimated reduction of -$337 PMPM (95% CI: -$654 to +$59; $p = 0.09$). These findings suggest that cost impacts are concentrated in diet- and lifestyle-sensitive conditions rather than across all categories of healthcare use.

Subgroup analyses revealed substantial variation across condition categories. Enrollment was associated with a -$770 PMPM reduction in diet-responsive spending in Digestive Disorders (95% CI: -$1,021 to -$123; p-value = 0.029). This represents the largest absolute savings observed, although the subgroup sample was relatively small (N=18). A -$407 PMPM reduction was observed for spending in obesity (95% CI: -$606 to -$131; p-value = 0.007). While smaller in absolute terms than digestive disorders, this effect reflects consistent reductions across outpatient and procedural claims. In the case of mental health, we identified a significant effect for the anxiety and depression combined category (PMPM$ -164 (-248, -50), p-value = 0.008), which was consistent with the effect in anxiety only (PMPM$ -113 (-190, -4), p-value = 0.043) but not in depression only (PMPM$ -248 (-451, 153), p-value = 0.174) (Table 1). These findings suggest greater economic responsiveness in anxiety-predominant conditions compared with depression.

We carried out exploratory analyses aiming to evaluate if we could gain insight into the drivers of these cost reductions. To this end we defined groups/families of CPT/HCPCS codes representing known drivers of cost of each of these disease conditions (see Material and Methods and Supp Note S3). Of the sixteen families of CPT/HCPCS codes four met the minimum sample size criteria to perform the DiD2S analyses. We identified statistically significant reduction in expenditure for Medical Nutrition Therapy CPT/HCPCS codes within digestive health claims (PMPM$ -283 (-297, -238), p-value = 5.4×10^{-6}), Psychotherapy add-on with E/M within anxiety and depression combined (PMPM$ -21 (-34, -6), p-value = 0.008), anxiety (PMPM$ -18 (-27, -8), p-value = 5.2×10^{-4}), and depression (PMPM$ -23 (-39, -3), p-value = 0.025) (see Supp Table S1). We also evaluated changes in utilization (number of days in a calendar month) and identified a reduction in utilization within obesity claims (%-change = -21% (-35, -6), p-value = 0.01) (see Supp Table S2).

Discussion

This multi-employer claims analysis provides new evidence that a precision nutrition digital therapeutic integrating genetics, microbiome profiles, blood biomarkers, and health coaching can reduce medical expenditures for diet-responsive conditions. Participation in the program was associated with a reduction of -$251 per member per month (PMPM), or -$3,012 per member per year (PMPY), in diet-responsive medical spending. Effects were concentrated in digestive

disorders (-$770 PMPM; -$9,240 PMPY), obesity (-$407 PMPM; -$4,884 PMPY), and anxiety-related mental health conditions (-$113 PMPM; -$1,356 PMPY). While total medical spending, inclusive of all categories, showed a negative but non-significant trend, the concentration of significant effects in diet-responsive conditions supports the plausibility of nutrition-first interventions as a cost-saving strategy. These results complement prior studies demonstrating clinically meaningful improvements in weight, glycemic control, gastrointestinal symptoms, mental health symptoms and microbiome composition changes among participants in Digbi Health programs (Ricchetti et al., 2020; Sinha et al., 2021; Kumbhare et al., 2022; Pedroso et al., 2022, Kumbhare et al., 2024, 2025), indicating that nutritional and behavioral changes translate into measurable economic impact.

The magnitude of observed savings exceeds those typically reported for most food-as-medicine interventions. Medically tailored meals (MTMs) consistently reduce spending by approximately $220-$400 PMPM after program costs, largely by lowering acute care use (Berkowitz et al., 2018, 2019). Medicaid nutrition pilots have shown smaller net savings of approximately $210 per participant, or $18 PMPM (Seligman et al., 2025). Digital lifestyle and nutrition programs deployed by health plans and employers generally report savings of $30-$45 PMPM (Horstman et al., 2021). Considering this context, the reductions reported here are more comparable to intensive MTM programs than to prior digital intervention reports. The likely explanation is that precision nutrition empowers the members to improve their meals on a daily basis, and additionally, it targets multimorbid individuals with overlapping obesity, digestive, and mental health conditions, allowing improvements across multiple health outcomes simultaneously.

The digestive health subgroup demonstrated the largest effect size (-$770 PMPM; -$9,240 PMPY). While this figure is higher than estimates from cost-utility analyses of low-FODMAP diets for irritable bowel syndrome, which report incremental values of $75-150 PMPM (Shah et al., 2021, 2022), two points must be emphasized. First, medical claims data do not allow precise attribution of costs to a single condition, since services and codes frequently overlap across comorbidities. Second, precision nutrition interventions target individuals with multiple co-occurring conditions; as such, improvements may occur in gastrointestinal symptoms, metabolic health, and mental well-being simultaneously. These combined effects, when categorized under digestive-related diagnostic codes, may inflate apparent subgroup savings. For this reason, the results should not be interpreted to suggest that diet-based interventions can fully reverse the economic burden of digestive conditions such as IBS or GERD. Rather, they highlight the potential for cost reductions in complex, high-utilizing populations where digestive disease commonly coexists with obesity and anxiety disorders (Buono et al., 2017; Peery et al., 2019).

Mental health effects were more modest but still significant for anxiety-related conditions (-$113 PMPM; -$1,356 PMPY), while depression showed a non-significant reduction. This heterogeneity mirrors prior evidence that dietary interventions may have stronger effects on anxiety-predominant conditions or subclinical mental distress (Firth et al., 2019). International randomized controlled trials reinforce the plausibility of these findings: the SMILES trial demonstrated health-sector savings of approximately $218 PMPM and societal savings of $660 PMPM alongside improved depression outcomes, while the HELFIMED trial established favorable cost-utility ratios for Mediterranean diet programs in major depression (Chatterton et al., 2018). The present analysis extends this evidence into the U.S. employer context, where cost-effectiveness data for nutritional psychiatry remain scarce.

The observed obesity-related savings (-$407 PMPM; -$4,884 PMPY) also merit attention. Employer-based digital nutrition programs generally report far smaller effects, averaging $30-$45 PMPM (Horstman et al., 2021). Precision nutrition may therefore represent a viable alternative to pharmacologic strategies, particularly given the high costs and adherence challenges associated with anti-obesity medications such as GLP-1 receptor agonists (Ryan & Yockey, 2017). Unlike pharmacotherapies, which increase drug benefit expenditures, dietary interventions generate savings within the medical benefit by preventing hospitalizations, procedures, and outpatient visits.

Exploratory analyses of CPT and HCPCS codes provided further insight into the mechanisms of observed savings. Among digestive disorder participants, reductions in medical nutrition therapy codes were observed, consistent with prior reports that dietitian-guided interventions reduce ongoing service demand once symptom control is achieved (Halmos et al., 2014; Shah et al., 2021, 2022). In mental health, lower utilization of psychotherapy codes mirrored findings from the SMILES and HELFIMED trials, where dietary improvement was associated with reduced reliance on adjunctive mental health services (Chatterton et al., 2018). Similarly, in obesity, decreases in weight-related outpatient visits and procedures align with evidence that intensive dietary interventions lower healthcare utilization compared with usual care (Ryan & Yockey, 2017; Horstman et al., 2021). These results suggest that the observed claims reductions are consistent with prior clinical and economic evaluations of diet-based interventions. However, given the modest subgroup sample sizes, these findings must be considered with caution.

From an employer perspective, these findings carry important implications. The average reduction of -$3,012 PMPY in diet-responsive spending translates into a gross reduction of approximately $3.0 million in medical expenditures per 1,000 members enrolled, excluding pharmacy and program costs. Because pharmacy claims and program delivery costs were not available, these estimates do not represent net savings or ROI. However, such reductions are particularly relevant for self-insured employers, who bear direct risk for rising healthcare costs in obesity, gastrointestinal disorders, and mental health. Moreover, the true return on investment is likely underestimated, as medical claims do not capture improvements in productivity, absenteeism, or disability, which represent major cost drivers in working-age populations. The scalability of a digital precision nutrition platform further differentiates this model from medically tailored meal delivery, which, although effective, is resource-intensive and challenging to deploy at employer scale.

This study has several strengths, including its multi-employer design, rigorous two-stage difference-in-differences methodology, and focus on diet-responsive conditions most relevant to employer expenditures. However, limitations must also be acknowledged. As participation was voluntary, participants may have been more motivated or health-conscious than non-enrollees. Although member and calendar month fixed effects mitigate time-invariant bias, they cannot address time-varying confounders such as changes in motivation or health behaviors coinciding with enrollment. This bias could contribute to some observed savings.Sample sizes in subgroups, particularly digestive health and CPT-level analyses, were modest, and confidence intervals were wide. Importantly, claims data do not allow precise attribution of costs to single conditions, and multimorbidity may inflate apparent savings in subgroup analyses. For example, reductions categorized under digestive disorders may reflect simultaneous improvements in obesity, glycemic control, or anxiety, leading to larger apparent PMPY effects than condition-specific

studies have reported. This interpretive limitation underscores the need for caution in comparing subgroup estimates to prior single-condition interventions. In addition, pharmacy claims and program delivery costs were not included, precluding a full net-cost analysis. Finally, the analysis was limited to twelve months, and the long-term durability of savings remains uncertain.

Future research should address these limitations by extending follow-up beyond one year, integrating pharmacy and productivity data, and conducting randomized or quasi-randomized trials to minimize confounding. Comparative evaluations against pharmacotherapies for obesity and mental health would clarify relative cost-effectiveness. Finally, further work should assess equity and scalability to ensure that precision nutrition interventions can be deployed broadly across diverse employer populations.

Conclusions

This multi-employer claims analysis found that participation in a precision nutrition digital therapeutic was associated with significant reductions in diet-responsive medical expenditures, averaging -$251 PMPM (-$3,012 PMPY), with the largest effects in digestive disorders (-$770 PMPM; -$9,240 PMPY), obesity (-$407 PMPM; -$4,884 PMPY), and anxiety-related conditions (-$113 PMPM; -$1,356 PMPY). These savings are directionally consistent with prior evidence on diet-based interventions, although of greater magnitude. An hypothesis here is that the greater magnitud may reflect improvements across multiple comorbidities.

Results should be interpreted with caution given the modest subgroup sizes, the inability of claims data to attribute costs to single conditions, and the exclusion of pharmacy and program costs. Nonetheless, the findings suggest that precision nutrition may represent a scalable, economically favorable strategy for employers seeking to address the rising burden of diet-related diseases.

Author Contributions

IP: designed the study, performed the analyses, and drafted the manuscript. SKS: contributed to the analyses. SVK, GS, RS, and DEA: contributed to study design, interpretation of results, and critical revision of the manuscript. All authors reviewed and approved the final version of the manuscript.

Acknowledgements

We thank the following individuals and organizations for their contributions to this study. We are grateful to the employers and plan administrators who allowed access to claims data for research use. We also thank the anonymous peer reviewers and editorial staff for their thoughtful comments on earlier drafts. We thank Alec Thompson for his insightful comments that helped contextualize the relevance of the results for self-insured employers. We are also grateful to Vidhya Singaravel for her technical insights on the structure, coding, and interpretation of claims data, which informed the rigor of our analyses.
The individuals acknowledged above contributed helpful feedback but were not involved in drafting or approving the final manuscript. They are not responsible for the content, analysis, or conclusions presented here.

References

Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ). 2025.Clinical Classifications Software Refined (CCSR) for ICD-10-CM Diagnoses. *Available at https://hcup-us.ahrq.gov/toolssoftware/ccsr/dxccsr.jsp* (accessed September 30, 2025).

Berkowitz SA, Terranova J, Hill C, Ajayi T, Linsky T, Tishler LW, DeWalt DA. 2018. Meal Delivery Programs Reduce The Use Of Costly Health Care In Dually Eligible Medicare And Medicaid Beneficiaries. *Health Affairs* 37:535–542. DOI: 10.1377/hlthaff.2017.0999.

Berkowitz SA, Terranova J, Randall L, Cranston K, Waters DB, Hsu J. 2019. Association Between Receipt of a Medically Tailored Meal Program and Health Care Use. *JAMA Internal Medicine* 179:786. DOI: 10.1001/jamainternmed.2019.0198.

Buono JL, Mathur K, Averitt AJ, Andrae DA. 2017. Economic burden of inadequate symptom control among US commercially insured patients with irritable bowel syndrome with diarrhea. *Journal of Medical Economics* 20:353–362. DOI: 10.1080/13696998.2016.1269016.

Burhans MS, Hagman DK, Kuzma JN, Schmidt KA, Kratz M. 2019. Contribution of Adipose Tissue Inflammation to the Development of Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus. *Comprehensive Physiology* 9:1–58. DOI: 10.1002/j.2040-4603.2019.tb00055.x.

Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. 2025.CPT/HCPCS Codes. *Available at https://www.cms.gov/medicare/regulations-guidance/physician-self-referral/list-cpt-hcpcs-codes* (accessed September 30, 2025).

Chatterton ML, Mihalopoulos C, O'Neil A, Itsiopoulos C, Opie R, Castle D, Dash S, Brazionis L, Berk M, Jacka F. 2018. Economic evaluation of a dietary intervention for adults with major depression (the "SMILES" trial). *BMC Public Health* 18:599. DOI: 10.1186/s12889-018-5504-8.

Cooper HM, Hedges LV, Valentine JC (eds.). 2019. *The handbook of research synthesis and meta-analysis*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Corella D, Carrasco P, Sorlí JV, Coltell O, Ortega-Azorín C, Guillén M, González JI, Sáiz C, Estruch R, Ordovas JM. 2012. Education modulates the association of the FTO rs9939609 polymorphism with body mass index and obesity risk in the Mediterranean population. *Nutrition, Metabolism and Cardiovascular Diseases* 22:651–658. DOI: 10.1016/j.numecd.2010.10.006.

Deana Bell, Clarkson Jason, Mike Gaal, Dave Liner, Annie Man, Andrew Naugle. 2024.2024 Milliman Medical Index. *Available at https://www.milliman.com/en/insight/2024-milliman-medical-index* (accessed September 30, 2025).

DiSantostefano J. 2009. International Classification of Diseases 10th Revision (ICD-10). *The Journal for Nurse Practitioners* 5:56–57. DOI: 10.1016/j.nurpra.2008.09.020.

Everhart JE, Ruhl CE. 2009. Burden of Digestive Diseases in the United States Part I: Overall and Upper Gastrointestinal Diseases. *Gastroenterology* 136:376–386. DOI: 10.1053/j.gastro.2008.12.015.

Firth J, Marx W, Dash S, Carney R, Teasdale SB, Solmi M, Stubbs B, Schuch FB, Carvalho AF, Jacka F, Sarris J. 2019. The Effects of Dietary Improvement on Symptoms of Depression and Anxiety: A Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. *Psychosomatic Medicine* 81:265–280. DOI: 10.1097/PSY.0000000000000673.

Galekop MMJ, Uyl-de Groot CA, Ken Redekop W. 2021. A Systematic Review of Cost-Effectiveness Studies of Interventions With a Personalized Nutrition Component in

Adults. *Value in Health* 24:325–335. DOI: 10.1016/j.jval.2020.12.006.
Goodman-Bacon A. 2021. Difference-in-differences with variation in treatment timing. *Journal of Econometrics* 225:254–277. DOI: 10.1016/j.jeconom.2021.03.014.
Halmos EP, Power VA, Shepherd SJ, Gibson PR, Muir JG. 2014. A Diet Low in FODMAPs Reduces Symptoms of Irritable Bowel Syndrome. *Gastroenterology* 146:67-75.e5. DOI: 10.1053/j.gastro.2013.09.046.
Harris CR, Millman KJ, Van Der Walt SJ, Gommers R, Virtanen P, Cournapeau D, Wieser E, Taylor J, Berg S, Smith NJ, Kern R, Picus M, Hoyer S, Van Kerkwijk MH, Brett M, Haldane A, Del Río JF, Wiebe M, Peterson P, Gérard-Marchant P, Sheppard K, Reddy T, Weckesser W, Abbasi H, Gohlke C, Oliphant TE. 2020. Array programming with NumPy. *Nature* 585:357–362. DOI: 10.1038/s41586-020-2649-2.
Hedges LV, Olkin I. 2014. *Statistical Methods for Meta-Analysis*. Saint Louis: Elsevier Science.
Horstman CM, Ryan DH, Aronne LJ, Apovian CM, Foreyt JP, Tuttle HM, Williamson DA. 2021. Return on Investment: Medical Savings of an Employer‐Sponsored Digital Intensive Lifestyle Intervention for Weight Loss. *Obesity* 29:654–661. DOI: 10.1002/oby.23117.
Kibirige H. 2025. A Grammar of Graphics for Python.
Ibis dev team. 2025 GitHub - ibis-project/ibis: the portable Python dataframe library.
Kumbhare SV, Francis-Lyon PA, Kachru D, Uday T, Irudayanathan C, Muthukumar KM, Ricchetti RR, Singh-Rambiritch S, Ugalde J, Dulai PS, Almonacid DE, Sinha R. 2022. Digital Therapeutics Care Utilizing Genetic and Gut Microbiome Signals for the Management of Functional Gastrointestinal Disorders: Results From a Preliminary Retrospective Study. *Frontiers in Microbiology* 13:826916. DOI: 10.3389/fmicb.2022.826916.
Kumbhare SV, Pedroso I, Joshi B, Muthukumar KM, Saravanan SK, Irudayanathan C, Kochhar GS, Dulai PS, Sinha R, Almonacid DE. 2024. Longitudinal gut microbial signals are associated with weight loss: insights from a digital therapeutics program. Frontiers in Nutrition 11. DOI: 10.3389/fnut.2024.1363079.
Kumbhare SV, Pedroso I, Muthukumar KM, Saravanan SK, Irudayanathan C, Sharma G, Sinha R, Almonacid DE. 2025. Interactions Between Gut Microbiome, Genetic Risk, and Obesity: Insights into Metabolic Pathways and Host-Microbe Dynamics. DOI: 10.1101/2025.06.18.25329842.
Lowe M, Miller-Kovach K, Phelan S. 2001. Weight-loss maintenance in overweight individuals one to five years following successful completion of a commercial weight loss program. *International Journal of Obesity* 25:325–331. DOI: 10.1038/sj.ijo.0801521.
Pedroso I, Kumbhare SV, Joshi B, Saravanan SK, Mongad DS, Singh-Rambiritch S, Uday T, Muthukumar KM, Irudayanathan C, Reddy-Sinha C, Dulai PS, Sinha R, Almonacid DE. 2022. Mental Health Symptom Reduction Using Digital Therapeutics Care Informed by Genomic SNPs and Gut Microbiome Signatures. *Journal of Personalized Medicine* 12:1237. DOI: 10.3390/jpm12081237.
Peery AF, Crockett SD, Murphy CC, Lund JL, Dellon ES, Williams JL, Jensen ET, Shaheen NJ, Barritt AS, Lieber SR, Kochar B, Barnes EL, Fan YC, Pate V, Galanko J, Baron TH, Sandler RS. 2019. Burden and Cost of Gastrointestinal, Liver, and Pancreatic Diseases in the United States: Update 2018. *Gastroenterology* 156:254-272.e11. DOI: 10.1053/j.gastro.2018.08.063.
Raasveldt M, Mühleisen H. 2019. DuckDB: an Embeddable Analytical Database. In: *Proceedings of the 2019 International Conference on Management of Data*. Amsterdam Netherlands: ACM, 1981–1984. DOI: 10.1145/3299869.3320212.
Ricchetti RR, Sinha R, Muthukumar KM, Singh-Rambiritch S, Underwood B, Junaid I,

Reddy-Sinha C, Kottini J, Irudayanathan C. 2020. Outcomes of a Precision Digital Care Program for Obesity and Associated Comorbidities: Results in Real World Clinical Practice. *International Journal of Clinical and Medical Cases* 3.7:11. DOI: 10.31021/ijcmc.20203160.

Ryan DH, Yockey SR. 2017. Weight Loss and Improvement in Comorbidity: Differences at 5%, 10%, 15%, and Over. *Current Obesity Reports* 6:187–194. DOI: 10.1007/s13679-017-0262-y.

Segal L, Twizeyemariya A, Zarnowiecki D, Niyonsenga T, Bogomolova S, Wilson A, O'Dea K, Parletta N. 2020. Cost effectiveness and cost-utility analysis of a group-based diet intervention for treating major depression – the HELFIMED trial. *Nutritional Neuroscience* 23:770–778. DOI: 10.1080/1028415X.2018.1556896.

Seligman HK, Angell SY, Berkowitz SA, Elkind MSV, Hager K, Moise N, Posner H, Muse J, Odoms-Young A, Ridberg R, Troxel AB, Yaroch AL, Volpp KG. 2025. A Systematic Review of "Food Is Medicine" Randomized Controlled Trials for Noncommunicable Disease in the United States: A Scientific Statement From the American Heart Association. *Circulation* 152. DOI: 10.1161/CIR.0000000000001343.

Severin R, Sabbahi A, Mahmoud AM, Arena R, Phillips SA. 2019. Precision Medicine in Weight Loss and Healthy Living. *Progress in Cardiovascular Diseases* 62:15–20. DOI: 10.1016/j.pcad.2018.12.012.

Shah ED, Salwen-Deremer JK, Gibson PR, Muir JG, Eswaran S, Chey WD. 2021. Pharmacologic, Dietary, and Psychological Treatments for Irritable Bowel Syndrome With Constipation: Cost Utility Analysis. *MDM Policy & Practice* 6:2381468320978417. DOI: 10.1177/2381468320978417.

Shah ED, Salwen-Deremer JK, Gibson PR, Muir JG, Eswaran S, Chey WD. 2022. Comparing Costs and Outcomes of Treatments for Irritable Bowel Syndrome With Diarrhea: Cost-Benefit Analysis. *Clinical Gastroenterology and Hepatology* 20:136-144.e31. DOI: 10.1016/j.cgh.2020.09.043.

Sinha R, Kachru D, Ricchetti RR, Singh-Rambiritch S, Muthukumar KM, Singaravel V, Irudayanathan C, Reddy-Sinha C, Junaid I, Sharma G, Francis-Lyon PA. 2021. Leveraging Genomic Associations in Precision Digital Care for Weight Loss: Cohort Study. *Journal of Medical Internet Research* 23:e25401. DOI: 10.2196/25401.

The pandas development team. 2025. pandas-dev/pandas: Pandas. DOI: 10.5281/ZENODO.3509134.

The PyFixest Authors. 2025. pyfixest: Fast high-dimensional fixed effect estimation in Python.

Tuomilehto J, Lindström J, Eriksson JG, Valle TT, Hämäläinen H, Ilanne-Parikka P, Keinänen-Kiukaanniemi S, Laakso M, Louheranta A, Rastas M, Salminen V, Aunola S, Cepaitis Z, Moltchanov V, Hakumäki M, Mannelin M, Martikkala V, Sundvall J, Uusitupa M. 2001. Prevention of Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus by Changes in Lifestyle among Subjects with Impaired Glucose Tolerance. *New England Journal of Medicine* 344:1343–1350. DOI: 10.1056/NEJM200105033441801.

Wen L, Duffy A. 2017. Factors Influencing the Gut Microbiota, Inflammation, and Type 2 Diabetes. *The Journal of Nutrition* 147:1468S-1475S. DOI: 10.3945/jn.116.240754.

Zalvan CH, Hu S, Greenberg B, Geliebter J. 2017. A Comparison of Alkaline Water and Mediterranean Diet vs Proton Pump Inhibition for Treatment of Laryngopharyngeal Reflux. *JAMA Otolaryngology–Head & Neck Surgery* 143:1023. DOI: 10.1001/jamaoto.2017.1454.