

Accepted Manuscript

Using cost-effectiveness analysis to prioritize policy and programmatic approaches to physical activity promotion and obesity prevention in childhood

Angie L Cradock, Jessica L Barrett, Erica L Kenney, Catherine M Giles, Zachary J Ward, Michael W Long, Stephen C Resch, Andrea A Pipito, Emily R Wei, Steven L Gortmaker

PII: S0091-7435(16)30339-5
DOI: doi:[10.1016/j.ypmed.2016.10.017](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ypmed.2016.10.017)
Reference: YPMED 4818

To appear in: *Preventive Medicine*

Received date: 28 April 2016
Revised date: 17 October 2016
Accepted date: 18 October 2016



Please cite this article as: Cradock Angie L, Barrett Jessica L, Kenney Erica L, Giles Catherine M, Ward Zachary J, Long Michael W, Resch Stephen C, Pipito Andrea A, Wei Emily R, Gortmaker Steven L, Using cost-effectiveness analysis to prioritize policy and programmatic approaches to physical activity promotion and obesity prevention in childhood, *Preventive Medicine* (2016), doi:[10.1016/j.ypmed.2016.10.017](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ypmed.2016.10.017)

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

Using cost-effectiveness analysis to prioritize policy and programmatic approaches to physical activity promotion and obesity prevention in childhood

Angie L Cradock, ScD¹

Jessica L Barrett, MPH¹

Erica L Kenney, ScD¹

Catherine M Giles, MPH¹

Zachary J Ward, MPH²

Michael W Long, ScD³

Stephen C Resch, PhD²

Andrea A Pipito, MS¹

Emily R Wei, MS, MPH¹

Steven L Gortmaker, PhD¹

¹Department of Social and Behavioral Sciences, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Boston, MA, USA; ²Center for Health Decision Science, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health; ³Department of Prevention and Community Health, Milken Institute School of Public Health, The George Washington University, Washington D.C.

Author Information

Corresponding Author: Angie L. Cradock, ScD, Harvard Prevention Research Center, Harvard T. H. Chan School of Public Health, 677 Huntington Avenue 7th Floor, Boston, MA 02115, Phone Number: 617-384-8933, Fax Number: 617-384-8730, Email: acradock@hsph.harvard.edu

Abstract Word Count: 248 /250

Text Word Count: 3691(not exclusive of citations) /3500

References: 108

Tables:4/ 4

Key Words: Physical Activity; Cost Effectiveness Analysis; Youth; Afterschool; School; Childcare; Economic Analysis; Obesity

Abstract

Participation in recommended levels of physical activity promotes a healthy body weight and reduced chronic disease risk. To inform investment in prevention initiatives, we simulate the national implementation, impact on physical activity and childhood obesity and associated cost-effectiveness (versus the status quo) of six recommended strategies that can be applied throughout childhood to increase physical activity in US school, afterschool and childcare settings. In 2016, the Childhood Obesity Intervention Cost Effectiveness Study (CHOICES) systematic review process identified six interventions for study. A microsimulation model estimated intervention outcomes 2015-2025 including changes in mean MET-hours/day, intervention reach and cost per person, cost per MET-hour change, ten-year net costs to society and cases of childhood obesity prevented. First year reach of the interventions ranged from 90,000 youth attending a Healthy Afterschool Program to 31.3 million youth reached by Active School Day policies. Mean MET-hour/day/person increases ranged from 0.05 MET-hour/day/person for Active PE and Healthy Afterschool to 1.29 MET-hour/day/person for the implementation of New Afterschool Programs. Cost per MET-hour

change ranged from cost saving to \$3.16. Approximately 2,500 to 110,000 cases of children with obesity could be prevented depending on the intervention implemented. All of the six interventions are estimated to increase physical activity levels among children and adolescents in the US population and prevent cases of childhood obesity. Results do not include other impacts of increased physical activity, including cognitive and behavioral effects. Decision-makers can use these methods to inform prioritization of physical activity promotion and obesity prevention on policy agendas.

Introduction

Participation in recommended levels of physical activity promotes a healthy body weight and reduced chronic disease risk.¹ National guidelines recommend that children and adolescents engage in 60 minutes of moderate to vigorous physical activity (MVPA) each day and suggest the importance of strategies to promote activity in school and early care settings.^{1,2} Many children do not meet the recommended physical activity (PA) levels³ and consume excess empty calories.⁴ As children enter adolescence, PA opportunities at school decline dramatically,⁵ and overall levels of daily PA drop as well.³ The Institute of Medicine recommends that schools take a “whole-of-school approach” to provide students with 60 daily minutes of physical activity, at least half of which should occur during the school day.⁶ For US policymakers facing constrained societal resources, existing research provides limited guidance in how to prioritize implementation of policies based on their cost, effectiveness, population impact and feasibility.⁷⁻⁹

Within-school approaches to promoting physical activity

Key components of a school-based approach to promote physical activity include high quality physical education (PE) and opportunities for physical activity during the school day through recess.^{6,10-12} High-quality curricular PE during which students spend at least half of class time engaged in MVPA is recommended.⁶ However, less than one-quarter of students are provided with the recommended amount of PE.¹³ Recess, regularly scheduled periods for unstructured active play, is offered by nearly all elementary schools,¹³ and elementary school children typically spend more time in recess than PE classes each week.¹⁴ However, schools often lack optimal levels of resources (e.g., supervision, play facilities, equipment) that encourage physical activity among children.¹⁵ On average, children spend less than 50% of both PE¹⁶⁻¹⁹ and recess²⁰ time engaged in MVPA.

Promoting activity outside of school hours

Offering PA opportunities in afterschool programs may help children achieve the recommended daily PA not achieved during school hours. About 10.2 million children (18%) participate in after school programs, and many (45%) are from low-income households.²¹ However, there is considerable unmet demand for afterschool programs in the U.S. In 2014, an estimated 19.4 million children not enrolled in a program would be if one were available, with affordability of afterschool programs and transportation identified as key obstacles.²¹ Parents in low-income households are more likely to report a lack of available programs. Also, despite research showing the benefits of increased PA opportunities in afterschool programs,²²⁻³⁰ only five states require afterschool programs to provide a minimum amount of time for MVPA and state policies mandating adoption of national guidelines are lacking.^{31,32}

Physical activity in early childhood education settings

The early care and education (ECE) setting can have a profound influence on young children's PA. ECE programs serve 64.3% of 3-5 year olds in the U.S.³³ who attend for about 30 hours per week.³³ Almost 50% of the between-child variation in PA is associated with the ECE center a child attends.^{34,35} Few programs train staff in appropriate strategies to encourage young children to be physically active³⁶⁻³⁸ and few ECE programs allot 60 minutes daily for PA,³⁹ resulting in children spending very little of their ECE time—as little as 3%— in MVPA.^{34,40-43}

Research has documented effective strategies to promote physical activity in schools, afterschool programs, and early education settings. To inform investment in prevention initiatives, we simulate the national implementation, impact on physical activity and childhood obesity and associated cost-effectiveness (versus the status quo) of six recommended strategies that can be applied throughout childhood..

Methods

Economic Evaluation Approach

We used the Childhood Obesity Intervention Cost Effectiveness Study (CHOICES) systematic review process to identify the six interventions with substantial evidence for effectiveness in various settings and age groups. The CHOICES evaluation process is modeled after the Australian Assessing Cost-Effectiveness approach^{44,45} and includes a structured process of engaging a group of national stakeholders in selection of intervention strategies, consultation regarding evidence for effectiveness, potential to reduce obesity, and discussion of implementation and equity issues.⁴⁶⁻⁵¹

We used an individual level microsimulation model of the population in the United States to project outcomes of the national implementation of each intervention using US population, mortality, and health care cost data from 2015-2025; the model has been described in detail elsewhere.⁴⁶ Briefly, the model uses data from several national data systems including the Census Bureau, American Community Survey, National Survey of Children's Health, National Health and Nutrition Examination Surveys and the

Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System. The microsimulation modeling strategy allows researchers to model heterogeneity of individual differences, including exposure to an intervention. In order to assess impact on body mass index (BMI), we compiled longitudinal weight and height data from multiple national longitudinal studies. We conducted probabilistic sensitivity analysis to account for uncertainty in underlying model inputs to calculate 95% uncertainty intervals (UI) using 1000 Monte Carlo iterations for a simulated population of one million individuals scaled to the national population.⁴⁴

Intervention and Health Care Cost Calculations

We modeled the impact of national implementation of each intervention using the best available data for population eligibility, intervention impact, and implementation cost. Details for each intervention are provided in the Appendices A-G. Further specifics on CHOICES costing protocols following standard guidelines^{52,53} are available elsewhere.⁴⁶ All costs were calculated in 2014 dollars and future costs were discounted at 3% annually.⁵⁴ For each intervention, researchers estimated the incremental costs of national implementation of the intervention by 1) identifying key activities and resources necessary for each activity, 2) measuring the quantity of

resources needed to implement (per person, per state or nationally), and 3) valuing those resources in monetary terms. We used a fringe rate of 45.56% based on data from the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics on the proportion of total compensation due to wages and amortized capital costs over the useful life.⁵⁵ We used a modified societal perspective,⁵⁴ accounting for all costs of the implementation of the intervention, regardless of payer, except the time of the participant in the intervention. Based on a published analysis of data from the 2001-2003 Medical Expenditure Panel survey,⁵⁶ annual incremental health care costs among children with obesity were estimated to be \$220 for children 6-19 years. For adults, annual incremental health care costs increased with age and ranged from \$240 at age 20 to \$2,147 for ages 74 years and older. Health care cost savings were estimated based on the estimated (lower) annual obesity prevalence due to the intervention. Net costs of the intervention were calculated by summing the cost of implementing the intervention and the health care cost savings due to the intervention over the period 2015-2025. Further details are available elsewhere.⁴⁶

Intervention Effectiveness Estimates

CHOICES project stakeholders and researchers systematically reviewed and prioritized intervention selection based on evidence for effectiveness of physical activity interventions within several settings consistent with the GRADE approach used in the Cochrane Collaboration.^{57,58} A total of 25,378 articles were reviewed, with 109 abstracted and 19 experimental studies were used in estimating effectiveness; details of systematic reviews are provided in the appendices. In all but one case (New Afterschool), intervention effect estimates used for modeling changes in physical activity were derived from objective assessments of changes in MVPA or physical activity intensity. We used a standard conversion from change in MVPA to BMI (Active PE, Active Recess, Active School Day) derived from published literature, or where available, we used objectively measured changes in BMI associated with the intervention (New Afterschool and Hip Hop to Health) (Table 2).

To convert changes in daily minutes of MVPA or vigorous physical activity (VPA) into MET-hours, a metric that incorporates physical activity intensity and duration, we used thresholds of 4 METs for moderate activity and 6 METs for vigorous activity.⁵⁹ Each additional minute spent in MVPA was assigned an incremental increase of 4 METs. Each additional minute spent in VPA was assigned an incremental increase of 2 METs. We converted minutes at a particular activity level to MET-hours by dividing by 60 minutes/hour and multiplying by the MET increase to estimate the daily changes in mean minutes of MVPA per day and mean change in MET-hours per day.

Outcomes

Primary short-term metrics include estimated additional minutes of MVPA per day and change in MET-hours per day. Other outcomes included intervention cost per person, cost per MET-hour change and cost per BMI unit reduction, and health care cost reductions due to changes in obesity cases. We also modeled the net cost of the intervention over the period 2015-2025 and reductions in BMI associated with implementation to determine the cases of childhood obesity in 2025 prevented by each intervention if implemented at the

national level. We assume that effects on BMI are maintained over the period of follow-up (2015-2025).

The interventions discussed here include:

1) **Active Physical Education** (Active PE) is a state-level policy requiring that 50% of time during physical education class be of moderate-to-vigorous activity intensity in classes for children enrolled in public elementary and middle schools in grades K-8 (Appendix A). We assume that the active PE intervention requires state level coordination and monitoring, training for physical education instructors annually, portable equipment and other physical education materials, and school principal training to improve teacher performance through evaluation. We assume that all states without a current comparable physical education policy will adopt and implement all of the intervention activities.

2) **Active Recess** is a district-level, voluntary program increasing physical activity through different strategies including structured physical activities, the installation of playground markings, and/or the provision of portable play equipment implemented at recess, during the school day, within public elementary schools for children grades

K-5 (Appendix B). The active recess intervention requires initial and ongoing training for teachers and recess monitors to implement structured play activities. Schools opt to provide portable play equipment and/ or install playground markings in play spaces. We assume that 90% of elementary schools do not currently use active recess strategies and that 50% of these schools adopt and implement the voluntary program. Volunteers install playground markings and schools purchase and replace portable play equipment as necessary. We assume at least one trained monitor per 200 children is present on the playground and that schools implement at least one strategy.

3) Active School Day is a district-level policy requiring schools to provide opportunities for at least 150 minutes of physical activity for children in public elementary and middle schools during the school day via strategies that include active PE and active recess, classroom activity breaks, or other evidence-based strategies (Appendix C).

Implementation requires the coordination between the school district and School Wellness Champions to promote physical activity and policy implementation. We assume an annual training for the physical education teachers, School Wellness Champions, and recess monitors in implementing districts. Schools purchase portable play

equipment as necessary. We assume that 90% of public elementary and middle schools do not have an active school day policy and that 100% of these schools adopt and implement the intervention.

4) **Healthy Afterschool** is a state policy that establishes a voluntary recognition program for state-administered 21st Century Community Learning Center Afterschool Programs (CCLC) serving children 5-11 years of age (Appendix D). State agencies oversee the recognition and monitoring systems and establish a website. A state trainer facilitates learning collaboratives for afterschool program staff, during which staff receive training on policy and environmental strategies to promote healthy eating and physical activity through improved program practices. Educational materials, incentives, and Continuing Education Units are provided for participants. We assume that 20% of eligible programs will voluntarily participate.

5) **New Afterschool Programs** assumes Title I federal funding is made available to state departments of education to provide children 5-11 years of age with afterschool programs that offer daily 2-hour supervised sessions that include physical activity (80 minutes), academic enrichment activities, homework assistance, and a snack at no cost to families following the FitKid model (Appendix E). New

afterschool program staff and coordinators would attend a multi-day training. Programs would provide a snack meeting USDA standards, transportation for 50% of attending children from the school-based program to their home, and relevant program materials. We assume that all children whose parents or guardians would like them to be in an afterschool program and are not currently enrolled in afterschool and attend schools eligible for school-wide Title I status would participate (12%) (Table 1). Federal, state, and district level personnel collaborate in coordination of the afterschool programs and programs are staffed with classroom teachers and para-professionals, with custodial support for each day of programming to enable use of program space. We consider the cost of child care by parents, relatives, and non-relatives in the absence of afterschool programming to be a cost offset owing to the more efficient use of labor in afterschool programs (due to the greater child to caregiver ratio) when compared with other options.

6) **Hip Hop to Health, Jr.** assumes a regulatory policy establishing a mandatory structured physical activity promotion training requirement for licensed ECE programs. State-level child care licensing staff provide oversight and monitoring and state coordinators provide

trainings for ECE program staff in implementation of Hip Hop to Health, Jr. to meet this requirement (Appendix F). Resources for implementing the Hip Hop to Health, Jr. program include portable equipment, curricular materials, and specialized CDs and handouts. We assume that all states without an existing licensing requirement for staff training in providing structured physical activity will adopt and implement this training requirement.

Further details on each of the interventions, assumptions on intervention uptake and population reached, effect and key activities included in costing are presented in Tables 1-3 and Appendices.

Results

The estimated national reach for each intervention in the first year varies widely and ranges from 90,000 youth attending a designated healthy afterschool program to more than 31.3 million youth reached by Active School Day policies (Table 4). The limited reach of the Healthy Afterschool program is primarily due to the small proportion of all US children served by existing federally funded, state administered 21st CCLC afterschool programs⁶⁰ and the proportion of those programs that are assumed to voluntarily participate.⁶¹

Conversely, the majority of children in the US are enrolled in public schools, most of which do not have strong existing policies regarding provision of physical activity during the school day,^{62,63} resulting in a larger population reach (Table 4).

The average annual intervention cost per person reached ranged from -\$1,423 for the New Afterschool Program intervention to \$54 for the Active School Day and Healthy Afterschool Interventions (Table 4). The cost-savings for the New Afterschool Program are primarily due to the cost-offset for caregiver costs borne by families for care during the afterschool hours for children (Table 3) due to the substantial efficiencies from higher child to afterschool staff ratios compared to other care options (Appendix E). For other interventions such as the Active School Day and Healthy Afterschool, total costs are driven by costs for labor and materials (including food in afterschool programs) necessary to implement the intervention (Table 3).

Mean MET-hour/day increases ranged from 0.05 MET-hour/day for Active PE and Healthy Afterschool to 1.29 MET-hour/day for the implementation of the New Afterschool Programs (Table 4). The afterschool sector was host to interventions with a large range in estimated cost per MET-hour/day change, ranging from cost saving (New Afterschool) to \$3.16 per MET-hour/day (Healthy Afterschool). The school sector interventions ranged in cost per MET-hour change from \$0.16 (Active Recess) to \$1.05 (Active School Day). For young children, the Hip Hop to Health, Jr. was estimated to cost \$0.13 per MET-hour/day.

All interventions were expected to result in a reduction in cases of childhood obesity in 2025 compared to the base case of no intervention (Table 4). However, the 95% UI for the estimate of the number of cases of childhood obesity prevented by national implementation of Hip Hop to Health, Jr. includes zero. In Healthy Afterschool, New Afterschool, and Hip Hop to Health, Jr., the impact on obesity prevention may also be attributable in part to nutrition education and the provision of healthier foods during program time. Based on our model, the New Afterschool intervention is expected to result in the largest reduction of cases of childhood obesity. It is

projected to prevent more than 109,000 cases of childhood obesity in 2025 and be cost-saving, with a projected net cost over 10 years of - \$4.6 billion (95% UI: -\$5.6 -\$1.5 billion) Note that the bulk of this cost-savings comes primarily from the more efficient use of labor for childcare in the afterschool hours. Other obesity prevention interventions ranged in 10-year net costs from \$47 million for Healthy Afterschool programs to \$15 billion for Active School day (Table 4).

Discussion

All of the six interventions studied have solid evidence for effectiveness in increasing physical activity based on evaluation of experimental studies. They are estimated to increase physical activity levels among children and adolescents in the US population and prevent cases of childhood obesity. These estimates of national implementation of interventions within schools, afterschool programs, and early childhood education settings, key sectors and settings for children and adolescents, include estimates of the expected short-term and 10-year outcomes that can inform prevention strategy implementation. If we are to make significant inroads in reducing the rate of increase in the prevalence of childhood obesity, action must be taken across a variety of sectors and settings.

The ability to systematically estimate the national impact and cost-effectiveness of implementation of physical activity promoting interventions enables our ability to compare within and across sector-specific interventions to inform investment in primary prevention. The average annual cost per person reached for each of these physical activity-promoting interventions implemented nationally would be less than \$54.00. Early childhood interventions, though implemented at a higher cost, may increase the likelihood that children enter elementary school at a healthy weight. Findings may help prioritize within sectors when comparable data are available. For example, within the school sector, Active Recess (\$0.16 per MET-hour/ day) and Active PE (\$0.27 per MET-hour/day) were superior to Active School Day (\$1.05 per MET-hour/day) based on a short-term metric of cost-effectiveness. However, Active Recess and Active PE interventions are anticipated to reach smaller total populations of youth each year compared to the Active School Day intervention, which would prevent over 73,000 cases of childhood obesity if implemented nationally.

It is critical to note these population impacts arise from interventions that vary in their expected cost, and the sectors on which these cost burdens (or offsets) would fall (Appendix G). For example, funding opportunities for New Afterschool Programs for elementary age children, on average, would result in considerable cost savings to society over 10 years, while also preventing some 110,000 cases of childhood obesity. We project the New Afterschool Programs will result in obesity-related health care cost savings of \$185 million in ten years. However, the majority of overall cost-savings is due to the cost-offset arising from greater efficiencies in care for children, including time that would otherwise be spent caring for children if the afterschool programs were not in place, a direct cost for families. There are projected 10-year obesity-related health care cost savings associated with each intervention (Table 4). All interventions will require investment in training, infrastructure and equipment to benefit child health. In many cases, intervention implementation costs are assumed to be borne by the school, district, state or program implementing the intervention. Efforts to offset costs to school or district budgets may be needed to foster implementation of these strategies.

Study Limitations and Strengths

This information may be useful for decision-making, funding, and state actions for implementation because it can help key stakeholders to understand the value of implementing effective evidence-based programs using estimates of cost, reach, and effect. Using a modified societal perspective on costing of interventions and determining payer may help with implementation and scaling of interventions because it identifies needed areas of alliances and funding support for implementation. Understanding the driving costs of interventions will also inform the development and testing of more efficient strategies for intervention implementation.

Ten-year metrics are based on measured changes using objective measures of physical activity or BMI derived from experimental studies in schools, afterschool programs, and early childhood education settings. This strategy has been employed in some⁸ but not all⁷ prior economic analyses of youth physical activity interventions. Furthermore, while there is evidence for success in scaling some similar interventions at the state-level,^{64,65} none of the interventions modeled have been implemented and evaluated on a national scale. Accuracy of modeled outcomes would depend on actual levels of

dissemination and implementation and assume that any effects on BMI experienced during the intervention are neither augmented nor erased in subsequent years. However, unlike prior studies,^{7,8} our microsimulation modeling strategy explicitly incorporates known uncertainty in intervention inputs for effect, cost, and reach (Table 1-3 and Appendix A-G).

This study moves beyond the short-term cost effectiveness estimates found in prior studies^{7,8} comparing school-based physical activity interventions among youth by estimating the ten-year population reach, intervention costs and impacts of physical activity promotion interventions on childhood obesity. However, these are conservative estimates of the overall impact of these physical activity interventions as we have focused solely on the health care costs attributed to obesity within a ten-year modeling framework. Physical activity is associated with many other important health benefits separate from obesity prevention,¹ that are not captured by this modeling framework. While consistent across interventions, this strategy does not account for potential cost-offsets related to morbidity and mortality due to insufficient physical activity, independent of BMI,⁶⁶ assuming that physical activity gains are maintained in adulthood. While there is

little existing evidence for preventive effects of physical activity on health care costs and utilization in childhood,⁶⁷ there is evidence that physical activity patterns⁶⁸ and BMI^{69,70} track into adulthood. Physical inactivity is associated with increased health-related costs in adults⁷¹. Thus, using a 10-year modeling horizon does not account for those diseases attributable to physical inactivity that may occur later in life but is a conservative choice based on the increase in uncertainty after many decades of child growth and development.

Conclusion

All six interventions studied are estimated to increase physical activity levels among children and adolescents in the US population and prevent cases of childhood obesity. Decision-makers can use these methods to inform prioritization of physical activity promotion and obesity prevention on policy agendas.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare there is no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgment

This work was supported in part by grants from The JPB Foundation, the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (Grant No. 66284), the Donald and Sue Pritzker Nutrition and Fitness Initiative, and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (Grant No. U48/DP001946). This work is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not represent the official views of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention or any of the other funders.

1. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. 2008 Physical Activity Guidelines for Americans. 2008.
2. Physical Activity Guidelines for Americans Midcourse Report Subcommittee of the President's Council on Fitness SN. Physical Activity Guidelines for Americans Midcourse Report: Strategies to Increase Physical Activity Among Youth. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2012.
3. Troiano RP, Berrigan D, Dodd KW, Masse LC, Tilert T, McDowell M. Physical activity in the United States measured by accelerometer. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* Jan 2008;40(1):181-188.
4. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2015–2020 Dietary Guidelines for Americans. 8th Edition. December 2015. Available at <http://health.gov/dietaryguidelines/2015/guidelines/>.
5. Lee SM, Burgeson CR, Fulton JE, Spain CG. Physical education and physical activity: results from the School Health Policies and Programs Study 2006. *Journal of School Health.* 2007;77(8):435-463.
6. Institute of Medicine. *Educating the Student Body: Taking Physical Activity and Physical Education to School.* Washington, DC: The National Academies Press;2013.
7. Babey SH, Wu S, Cohen D. How can schools help youth increase physical activity? An economic analysis comparing school-based programs. *Prev Med.* Dec 2014;69 Suppl 1:S55-60.
8. Wu S, Cohen D, Shi Y, Pearson M, Sturm R. Economic analysis of physical activity interventions. *Am J Prev Med.* Feb 2011;40(2):149-158.
9. Dietz WH, Gortmaker SL. New strategies to prioritize nutrition, physical activity, and obesity interventions. *Am J Prev Med.* 2016; 51(5):e145-e150.
10. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Comprehensive School Physical Activity Program (CSPAP). <http://www.cdc.gov/healthyyouth/physicalactivity/cspap.htm>. Accessed May 25, 2015.
11. National Association for Sport and Physical Education. *Comprehensive school physical activity programs [Position statement]*. Reston, VA: Comprehensive School Physical Activity Programs Task Force, National Association for Sport and Physical Education;2008.

- 12.** American Academy of Pediatrics Council On School Health. Policy statement: the crucial role of recess in school. *Pediatrics*. 2013;131(1):183-188.
- 13.** Turner L, Chaloupka FJ, Sandoval A. *School Policies and Practices for Improving Children's Health: National Elementary School Survey Results: School Years 2006–07 through 2009–10*. Chicago, IL: Bridging the Gap Program Health Policy Center, Institute for Health Research and Policy, University of Illinois at Chicago;2012.
- 14.** Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. *Recess rules: why the undervalued playtime may be America's best investment for healthy kids and healthy schools*. Princetown, NJ: Robert Wood Johnson Foundation;2007.
- 15.** National Association for Sport and Physical Education. Position statement: recess for elementary school students. 2006; <http://www.aahperd.org/naspe/standards/upload/Recess-for-Elementary-School-Students-2006.pdf>. Accessed May 17, 2013.
- 16.** Nader PR, National Institute of Child Health and Human Development Study of Early Child Care and Youth Development Network. Frequency and intensity of activity of third-grade children in physical education. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med*. Feb 2003;157(2):185-190.
- 17.** McKenzie TL, Nader PR, Strikmiller PK, et al. School physical education: effect of the Child and Adolescent Trial for Cardiovascular Health. *Prev Med*. Jul-Aug 1996;25(4):423-431.
- 18.** Sallis JF, McKenzie TL, Alcaraz JE, Kolody B, Faucette N, Hovell MF. The effects of a 2-year physical education program (SPARK) on physical activity and fitness in elementary school students. Sports, Play and Active Recreation for Kids. *Am J Public Health*. Aug 1997;87(8):1328-1334.
- 19.** UCLA Center to Eliminate Health Disparities and Samuels & Associates. *Failing Fitness: Physical Activity and Physical Education in Schools*. Los Angeles, CA: The California Endowment;January 2007. www.calendow.org.
- 20.** Stratton G. Promoting children's physical activity in primary school: an intervention study using playground markings. *Ergonomics*. 2000;43(10):1538-1546.
- 21.** Afterschool Alliance. *America After 3PM: Afterschool Programs in Demand*. 2013.

- 22.** Salcedo Aguilar F, Martinez-Vizcaino V, Sanchez Lopez M, et al. Impact of an after-school physical activity program on obesity in children. *J Pediatr*. Jul 2010;157(1):36-42.e33.
- 23.** DeRenne C, Maeda JK, Chai DX, Ho K, Kaluhiokalani N, Braun KL. Afterschool physical activity program to reduce obesity-related cancer risk: a feasibility study. *Journal of cancer education : the official journal of the American Association for Cancer Education*. 2008;23(4):230-234.
- 24.** Madsen KA, Thompson HR, Wlasiuk L, Queliza E, Schmidt C, Newman TB. After-school program to reduce obesity in minority children: a pilot study. *Journal of Child Health Care*. Dec 2009;13(4):333-346.
- 25.** Martinez Vizcaino V, Salcedo Aguilar F, Franquelo Gutierrez R, et al. Assessment of an after-school physical activity program to prevent obesity among 9- to 10-year-old children: a cluster randomized trial. *Int J Obes (Lond)*. Jan 2008;32(1):12-22.
- 26.** Weintraub DL, Tirumalai EC, Haydel KF, Fujimoto M, Fulton JE, Robinson TN. Team sports for overweight children: The Stanford sports to prevent obesity randomized trial (SPORT). *Archives of pediatrics & adolescent medicine*. 2008;162(3):232-237.
- 27.** Madsen K, Thompson H, Adkins A, Crawford Y. School-community partnerships: A cluster-randomized trial of an after-school soccer program. *JAMA pediatrics*. 2013;167(4):321-326.
- 28.** Kaestner R, Xu X. Effects of Title IX and sports participation on girls' physical activity and weight. *Advances in health economics and health services research*. 2007;17:79-111.
- 29.** Kaestner R, Xin X. Title IX, girls' sports participation, and adult female physical activity and weight. *Evaluation review*. Feb 2010;34(1):52-78.
- 30.** Lubans D, Morgan P. Evaluation of an extra-curricular school sport programme promoting lifestyle and lifetime activity for adolescents. *Journal of Sports Sciences*. 2008;26(5):519-529.
- 31.** Beets MW, Wallner M, Beighle A. Defining standards and policies for promoting physical activity in afterschool programs. *The Journal of school health*. Aug 2010;80(8):411-417.
- 32.** California After School Physical Activity Guidelines - After School Network. 2013; <http://www.afterschoolnetwork.org/resource/california-after-school-physical-activity-guidelines>.

33. U.S. Department of Education Ioes, National Center for Education Statistics. Digest of Education Statistics, 2012. NCES 2014-015. In: Table 58. Number of children under 6 years old and not yet enrolled in kindergarten pic-bp, average weekly hours in nonparental care, and percentage in various types of primary care arrangements, by selected child and family characteristics: 2005, ed. Washington, D.C.2013.
34. Pate RR, Pfeiffer KA, Trost SG, Ziegler P, Dowda M. Physical activity among children attending preschools. *Pediatrics*. 2004;114(5):1258-1263.
35. Finn K, Johannsen N, Specker B. Factors associated with physical activity in preschool children. *The Journal of pediatrics*. 2002;140(1):81-85.
36. Gooze RA, Hughes CC, Finkelstein DM, Whitaker RC. Reaching staff, parents, and community partners to prevent childhood obesity in Head Start, 2008. *Prev Chronic Dis*. May 2010;7(3):A54.
37. Whitaker RC, Gooze RA, Hughes CC, Finkelstein DM. A national survey of obesity prevention practices in Head Start. *Archives of pediatrics & adolescent medicine*. 2009;163(12):1144-1150.
38. Trost SG, Messner L, Fitzgerald K, Roths B. Nutrition and physical activity policies and practices in family child care homes. *American journal of preventive medicine*. 2009;37(6):537-540.
39. McWilliams C, Ball SC, Benjamin SE, Hales D, Vaughn A, Ward DS. Best-practice guidelines for physical activity at child care. *Pediatrics*. 2009;124(6):1650-1659.
40. Pate RR, McIver K, Dowda M, Brown WH, Addy C. Directly observed physical activity levels in preschool children. *Journal of School Health*. 2008;78(8):438-444.
41. Sugiyama T, Okely AD, Masters JM, Moore GT. Attributes of child care centers and outdoor play areas associated with preschoolers' physical activity and sedentary behavior. *Environment and Behavior*. 2012;44(3):334-349.
42. Reilly JJ, Kelly L, Montgomery C, et al. Physical activity to prevent obesity in young children: cluster randomised controlled trial. *BMJ*. 2006;333(7577):1041.
43. Cardon GM, De Bourdeaudhuij IM. Are preschool children active enough? Objectively measured physical activity levels. *Res Q Exerc Sport*. Sep 2008;79(3):326-332.

44. Carter R, Moodie M, Markwick A, et al. Assessing cost-effectiveness in obesity (ACE-obesity): an overview of the ACE approach, economic methods and cost results. *BMC Public Health*. 2009;9:419.
45. Carter R, Vos T, Moodie M, Haby M, Magnus A, Mihalopoulos C. Priority setting in health: origins, description and application of the Australian Assessing Cost-Effectiveness initiative. *Expert Rev Pharmacoecon Outcomes Res*. Dec 2008;8(6):593-617.
46. Gortmaker SL, Wang YC, Long MW, et al. Three Interventions That Reduce Childhood Obesity Are Projected To Save More Than They Cost To Implement. *Health Aff (Millwood)*. Nov 1 2015;34(11):1932-1939.
47. Gortmaker SL, Long MW, Resch SC, et al. Cost Effectiveness of Childhood Obesity Interventions: Evidence and Methods for CHOICES. *Am J Prev Med*. Jul 2015;49(1):102-111.
48. Long MW, Gortmaker SL, Ward ZJ, et al. Cost Effectiveness of a Sugar-Sweetened Beverage Excise Tax in the U.S. *Am J Prev Med*. Jul 2015;49(1):112-123.
49. Sonnevile KR, Long MW, Ward ZJ, et al. BMI and Healthcare Cost Impact of Eliminating Tax Subsidy for Advertising Unhealthy Food to Youth. *Am J Prev Med*. Jul 2015;49(1):124-134.
50. Wright DR, Kenney EL, Giles CM, et al. Modeling the Cost Effectiveness of Child Care Policy Changes in the U.S. *Am J Prev Med*. Jul 2015;49(1):135-147.
51. Barrett JL, Gortmaker SL, Long MW, et al. Cost Effectiveness of an Elementary School Active Physical Education Policy. *Am J Prev Med*. Jul 2015;49(1):148-159.
52. Gold MR, Siegel JE, Russell LB, Weinstein MC. *Cost-effectiveness in health and medicine*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press; 1996.
53. Drummond MF, Sculpher MJ, Torrance GW, O'Brien BJ, Stoddart GL. *Methods for the economic evaluation of health care programmes*. 3rd ed. New York, NY: Oxford University Press; 2005.
54. Siegel JE, Weinstein MC, Russell LB, Gold MR. Recommendations for reporting cost-effectiveness analyses. Panel on Cost-Effectiveness in Health and Medicine. *Jama*. Oct 23-30 1996;276(16):1339-1341.
55. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Employer Costs for Employee Compensation - June 2014. In: Labor USDo, ed. Washington, DC2014.

56. Finkelstein EA, Trogon JG. Public health interventions for addressing childhood overweight: analysis of the business case. *Am J Public Health*. Mar 2008;98(3):411-415.
57. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Vist GE, Falck-Ytter Y, Schunemann HJ. What is "quality of evidence" and why is it important to clinicians? *Bmj*. May 3 2008;336(7651):995-998.
58. The Cochrane Collaboration. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions. In: Higgins J, Green S, eds 2011: www.cochrane-handbook.org.
59. Trost SG, Loprinzi PD, Moore R, Pfeiffer KA. Comparison of accelerometer cut points for predicting activity intensity in youth. *Med Sci Sports Exerc*. Jul 2011;43(7):1360-1368.
60. Afterschool Alliance. Afterschool in Your State. 2015; <http://www.afterschoolalliance.org/policyStateMap.cfm>. Accessed April 14, 2014.
61. Assembly Committee on Appropriations. SB-949 After school programs: Distinguished After School Health Recognition Program. In: Assembly CS, ed 2014.
62. Chiqui JF, Resnick EA, Schneider L, et al. *School District Wellness Policies: Evaluating Progress and Potential for Improving Children's Health Five Years after the Federal Mandate. School Years 2006–07 through 2010–11*. Chicago IL: Bridging the Gap Program, Health Policy Center, Institute for Health Research and Policy, University of Illinois at Chicago; 2013.
63. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and Bridging the Gap Research Program. Strategies For Supporting Quality Physical Education and Physical Activity in Schools, Update for the 2012–13 School Year. Atlanta, GA: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services; 2014.
64. Hoelscher DM, Feldman HA, Johnson CC, et al. School-based health education programs can be maintained over time: results from the CATCH Institutionalization study. *Prev Med*. May 2004;38(5):594-606.
65. McKenzie TL, Li D, Derby CA, Webber LS, Luepker RV, Cribb P. Maintenance of effects of the CATCH Physical Education Program: results from the CATCH-ON Study. *Health Education & Behavior*. 2003;30(4):447-462.
66. Schmid D, Ricci C, Leitzmann MF. Associations of objectively assessed physical activity and sedentary time with all-cause mortality in US adults: the NHANES study. *PLoS One*. 2015;10(3):e0119591.

67. Idler N, Teuner CM, Hunger M, et al. The association between physical activity and healthcare costs in children--results from the GINIplus and LISApplus cohort studies. *BMC Public Health*. 2015;15:437.
68. Craigie AM, Lake AA, Kelly SA, Adamson AJ, Mathers JC. Tracking of obesity-related behaviours from childhood to adulthood: A systematic review. *Maturitas*. Nov 2011;70(3):266-284.
69. Freedman DS, Khan LK, Serdula MK, Dietz WH, Srinivasan SR, Berenson GS. Racial differences in the tracking of childhood BMI to adulthood. *Obes Res*. May 2005;13(5):928-935.
70. Power C, Lake JK, Cole TJ. Measurement and long-term health risks of child and adolescent fatness. *Int J Obes Relat Metab Disord*. Jul 1997;21(7):507-526.
71. Peeters GM, Mishra GD, Dobson AJ, Brown WJ. Health care costs associated with prolonged sitting and inactivity. *Am J Prev Med*. Mar 2014;46(3):265-272.
72. Child Trends. Full-day Kindergarten: Indicators on Children and Youth. February 2015; http://www.childtrends.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/06/102_Full-day-kindergarten.pdf. Accessed February 12, 2016.
73. Office of the New York State Comptroller. *School Districts' Compliance with Physical Education Regulations*. Albany, NY: Office of the New York State Comptroller, Division of Local Government and School Accountability;2008.
74. Health Impact Assessment Group, UCLA School of Public Health. *Health Impact Assessment (HIA) of Potential Modifications to Physical Education Requirements in California*. Los Angeles, CA: UCLA School of Public Health;June 9, 2007. <http://www.ph.ucla.edu/hs/health-impact/>.
75. Afterschool Alliance. 21st Century Community Learning Centers Providing Afterschool and Summer Learning Support to Communities Nationwide. 2014.
76. *The 50-State Child Care Licensing Study: 2011-2013 Edition*. 2011.
77. Carlson J, Sallis J, Chiqui J, Schneider L, McDermid L, Agron P. State Policies About Physical Activity Minutes in Physical Education or During School. *Journal of School Health*. March, 2013 2013;83(3):150-156.
78. Levi J, Vinter S, Richardson L, Laurent R, Segal L. *F as in Fat: How obesity policies are failing in America*. Washington, DC: Trust for America's Health, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation;2009 (Supplement).

- 79.** Lounsbery MA, McKenzie TL, Trost S, Smith NJ. Facilitators and barriers to adopting evidence-based physical education in elementary schools. *J Phys Act Health*. Jan 2011;8 Suppl 1:S17-25.
- 80.** U.S. Department of Education IoES, National Center for Education Statistics. Digest of Education Statistics, 2012. NCES 2012-325. In: Table 3. National Center for Education Statistics Nosimiopeass, by school type, charter, magnet, Title I, and Title I schoolwide status, and state or jurisdiction: School year 2010–11, ed. Washington, D.C.2012.
- 81.** Ward DS, Benjamin SE, Ammerman AS, Ball SC, Neelon BH, Bangdiwala SI. Nutrition and physical activity in child care: results from an environmental intervention. *Am J Prev Med*. Oct 2008;35(4):352-356.
- 82.** Turner L, Chaloupka FJ, Chiqui JF, Sandoval A. *School Policies and Practices to Improve Health and Prevent Obesity: National Elementary School Survey Results: School Years 2006–07 and 2007–08. Vol 1*. Chicago, IL: Bridging the Gap Program, Health Policy Center, Institute for Health Research and Policy, University of Illinois at Chicago;2010.
- 83.** Johnston LD, O'Malley PM, Terry-McElrath YM, Colabianchi N. *School Policies and Practices to Improve Health and Prevent Obesity: National Secondary School Survey Results: School Years 2006-07 through 2012-13. Volume 5*. Ann Arbor, MI: Bridging the Gap Program, Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research;2014.
- 84.** Lonsdale C, Rosenkranz RR, Peralta LR, Bennie A, Fahey P, Lubans DR. A systematic review and meta-analysis of interventions designed to increase moderate-to-vigorous physical activity in school physical education lessons. *Prev Med*. Feb 2013;56(2):152-161.
- 85.** Huberty J, Beets M, Beighle A, Saint-Maurice P, Welk G. Effects of ready for recess, an environmental intervention, on physical activity in 3rd-6th grade children. *J Phys Act Health*. 2013.
- 86.** Janssen M, Twisk JW, Toussaint HM, van Mechelen W, Verhagen EA. Effectiveness of the PLAYgrounds programme on PA levels during recess in 6-year-old to 12-year-old children. *British journal of sports medicine*. 2013;bjsports-2012-091517.
- 87.** Kelly A, Arjunan P, van der Ploeg HP, Rissel C, Borg J, Wen LM. The implementation of a pilot playground markings project in four Australian primary schools. *Health Promotion Journal of Australia*. 2012;23(3):183-187.

- 88.** Ridgers ND, Fairclough SJ, Stratton G. Twelve-month effects of a playground intervention on children's morning and lunchtime recess physical activity levels. *Journal of physical activity & health*. 2010;7(2):167-175.
- 89.** Stratton G, Mullan E. The effect of multicolor playground markings on children's physical activity level during recess. *Preventive medicine*. 2005;41(5):828-833.
- 90.** Verstraete SJ, Cardon GM, De Clercq DL, De Bourdeaudhuij IM. Increasing children's physical activity levels during recess periods in elementary schools: the effects of providing game equipment. *The European Journal of Public Health*. 2006;16(4):415-419.
- 91.** Yildirim M, Arundell L, Cerin E, et al. What helps children to move more at school recess and lunchtime? Mid-intervention results from Transform-Us! cluster-randomised controlled trial. *British journal of sports medicine*. 2014;48(3):271-277.
- 92.** Blaes A, Ridgers ND, Aucouturier J, Van Praagh E, Berthoin S, Baquet G. Effects of a playground marking intervention on school recess physical activity in French children. *Preventive medicine*. 2013;57(5):580-584.
- 93.** Cradock AL, Barrett JL, Carter J, et al. Impact of the Boston Active School Day Policy to Promote Physical Activity Among Children. *American Journal of Health Promotion*. 2014;28(sp3):S54-S64.
- 94.** Cradock AL, Barrett JL, Giles CM, et al. Promoting Physical Activity With the Out of School Nutrition and Physical Activity (OSNAP) Initiative: A Cluster-Randomized Controlled Trial. *JAMA pediatrics*. Feb 1 2016;170(2):155-162.
- 95.** Howe CA, Harris RA, Gutin B. A 10-month physical activity intervention improves body composition in young black boys. *Journal of obesity*. 2010;2011.
- 96.** Fitzgibbon ML, Stolley MR, Schiffer LA, et al. Hip-Hop to Health Jr. Obesity Prevention Effectiveness Trial: postintervention results. *Obesity (Silver Spring)*. May 2011;19(5):994-1003.
- 97.** Lee RM. *Advancing implementation science for community health: results from the Out-of-School Nutrition and Physical Activity Group-Randomized Trial*. Boston, MA, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health; 2013.

- 98.** Kriemler S, Zahner L, Schindler C, et al. Effect of school based physical activity programme (KISS) on fitness and adiposity in primary schoolchildren: cluster randomised controlled trial. *BMJ*. 2010;340:c785.
- 99.** Hall KD, Butte NF, Swinburn BA, Chow CC. Dynamics of childhood growth and obesity: development and validation of a quantitative mathematical model. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol*. Oct 2013;1(2):97-105.
- 100.** Barbeau P, Johnson MH, Howe CA, et al. Ten months of exercise improves general and visceral adiposity, bone, and fitness in black girls. *Obesity*. 2007;15(8):2077-2085.
- 101.** Yin Z, Moore JB, Johnson MH, et al. The Medical College of Georgia FitKid project: the relations between program attendance and changes in outcomes in year 1. *International Journal of Obesity*. 2005;29:S40-S45.
- 102.** Hillman CH, Pontifex MB, Castelli DM, et al. Effects of the FITKids Randomized Controlled Trial on Executive Control and Brain Function. *Pediatrics*. Oct 2014;134(4):E1063-E1071.
- 103.** Kong A, Buscemi J, Stolley MR, et al. Hip-Hop to Health Jr. Randomized Effectiveness Trial: 1-Year Follow-up Results. *American journal of preventive medicine*. Feb 2016;50(2):136-144.
- 104.** Long MW, Sobol AM, Cradock AL, Subramanian SV, Blendon RJ, Gortmaker SL. School-day and overall physical activity among youth. *Am J Prev Med*. Aug 2013;45(2):150-157.
- 105.** Baggett CD, Stevens J, Catellier DJ, et al. Compensation or displacement of physical activity in middle-school girls: the Trial of Activity for Adolescent Girls. *Int J Obes (Lond)*. Jul 2010;34(7):1193-1199.
- 106.** Goodman A, Mackett RL, Paskins J. Activity compensation and activity synergy in British 8-13 year olds. *Prev Med*. Oct 2011;53(4-5):293-298.
- 107.** Dale D, Corbin CB, Dale KS. Restricting opportunities to be active during school time: do children compensate by increasing physical activity levels after school? *Res Q Exerc Sport*. Sep 2000;71(3):240-248.
- 108.** Morgan CF, Beighle A, Pangrazi RP. What are the contributory and compensatory relationships between physical education and physical activity in children? *Res Q Exerc Sport*. Dec 2007;78(5):407-412.

Table 1. Estimated reach of interventions for six childhood obesity prevention interventions in the United States, 2015-2025

	Intervention					
	Active PE	Active Recess	Active School Day	Healthy Afterschool	New Afterschool	Hip Hop to Health, Jr.
Population Target	Ages 5-14	Ages 5-11	Ages 5-14	Ages 5-11	Ages 5-11	Ages 3-5
Enrolled/ Participating	Public school students grades K-8 100% grades 1-8 and 77% Kindergarten enrolled full day ⁷² 96% receiving PE ^{73,74}	Public school students grades K-5	Public school students grades K-8 100% grades 1-8 and 77% Kindergarten enrolled full day ⁷²	2.1% of children ages 5-11 attend 21 st Century Learning afterschool programs ^{60, 75}	Attend schools with school wide Title I status	41.2% of children attend a licensed ECE program ⁷⁶

Without Policy or Program ^a	All states but TX, AZ, OK, & DC ^{77,78}	90% of schools without active recess strategy ⁷⁹	88% of grade K-5 and 91% of grade 6-8 students without current policy specifying 150 physical activity minutes per week ⁷²	All states but CA ^c	12% of all elementary school age children attend schools with school wide Title I status and do not participate in afterschool programming but would if it were available ^{75,80}	All states without an existing licensing requirement for staff training in promoting structured physical activity (all states) ^c
Adopting Policy or Program ^a	100% of states without a policy ^b	50% of eligible schools adopt active recess strategies ^b	100% of districts adopt policy ^b	19.6% of eligible programs voluntarily adopt standards ⁶¹	100% of eligible schools adopt the program ^b	100% of states without policy ^b
Implementation of Policy or Program ^a	71% of trained PE teachers implement the policy ^{64,65}	100% among schools adopting ^b	100% among districts adopting ^b	100% among programs adopting ^b	100% among programs adopting ^b	73% of trained programs implement the curriculum ⁸¹

PE, physical education; ECE, early care and education.

^aAll values presented are means estimated using 1000 model iterations based on evidence from studies as described in Appendices. ^bValues are based on assumptions (uniformly used across all similar types of interventions based on intervention description of either a mandatory policy (100%) or voluntary program adoption (50%))

^cData derived from author review of state policy or regulation

Table 2. Estimated^a effect of interventions on physical activity, Kcal and body mass index change for six childhood obesity prevention interventions in the United States, 2015-2025

	Intervention					
	Active PE ^b	Active Recess ^c	Active School Day	Healthy Afterschool	New Afterschool	Hip Hop to Health, Jr.
Change in physical activity	6.26 percentage point increase in % PE class time spent in MVPA ⁸⁴	13.4 percentage point increase in % MVPA during recess ^{20,85-92}	3.9 minute per school day increase in MVPA ⁹³	3.2 minute per day increase in VPA during afterschool programming ⁹⁴	0.32 hours per day increase in MVPA ⁹⁵	7.43 minute per day increase in MVPA ⁹⁶
Change in kcal	N/A	N/A	N/A	1.53 kcal/minute reduction per minute change in VPA 47 kcal reduction in snack consumed per day attending afterschool programs ⁹⁷	N/A *Estimate of intervention impact directly on BMI incorporate s changes in kcal consumption due to snack provision during program time	N/A *Estimate of intervention impact on BMI also incorporates possible changes in child energy intake attributable to intervention

Change in weight/BMI	0.02 BMI reduction per 1-minute change in MVPA per day ^{98d}	0.02 BMI reduction per 1-minute change in MVPA per day ^{98d}	0.02 BMI reduction per 1-minute change in MVPA per day ^{98d}	1 kg change in weight per 46 kcal/day change in energy balance (range 38-56 kcal/day per kg based on age and sex) ^{99e}	0.33 BMI reduction directly due to the intervention ^{95,100-102}	0.13 BMI reduction directly due to the intervention ¹⁰³
----------------------	---	---	---	--	---	--

PE, physical education; MVPA, moderate to vigorous physical activity; VPA, vigorous physical activity; N/A, not applicable; BMI, body mass index.

^a All values presented are means estimated using 1000 model iterations based on evidence from studies as described in Appendices

^bAt baseline 94.2 weekly minutes of PE for elementary school students and 149.5 for middle school students^{82,83}

^cAt baseline 19.4 daily minutes of recess⁷⁷

^dChange in total MVPA on school days was assumed to equal the change in MVPA during school.¹⁰⁴⁻¹⁰⁸ Average daily change in MVPA was calculated by multiplying change on school days by 180 school days / 365.25 calendar days per year.

^e Children attend afterschool programming on average for 32 weeks per year and 5 days per week, out of 365.25 calendar days per year.

Table 3. Estimated intervention costs (US \$ millions) over 10 years^a for six childhood obesity prevention interventions in the United States, 2015-2025

Cost Category	Active PE	Active Recess	Active School Day	Healthy Afterschool	New Afterschool	Hip Hop to Health, Jr.
Coordination	<p><1% of Costs: \$3.05</p> <p>State PE coordinator for coordination & monitoring</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>83% of Costs: \$12,800</p> <p>District staff time for coordination and development and purchasing of materials</p>	<p>41% of Costs: \$21.0</p> <p>Regulation communications, compliance monitoring, and website maintenance</p>	<p>15% of Costs: \$4,700</p> <p>Federal, state, district and transportation coordinators</p>	<p>1% of Costs: \$11.4</p> <p>Compliance review during site visits</p>
Training	<p>30% of Costs: \$330</p> <p>PE teacher, principal, and facilitator time; training materials; and travel</p>	<p>64% of Costs: \$407</p> <p>Teacher, recess monitor, and facilitator time and travel</p>	<p>2% of Costs: \$285</p> <p>PE, recess, and movement breaks training costs, including substitute teachers, training materials, and travel</p>	<p>8% of Costs: \$3.92</p> <p>Train-the-trainer and Learning Community costs, including facilitator and program staff time, materials and incentives, and travel</p>	<p>3% of Costs: \$925</p> <p>Group leader, program site director, food service director, and facilitator time</p>	<p>58% of Costs: \$624</p> <p>Program staff, program administrator, and facilitator time and travel</p>

Materials & Equipment	69% of Costs: \$759 Active PE curricula & materials	36% of Costs: \$229 Portable equipment & playground marking materials	2% of Costs: \$380 Active PE and movement breaks curricula & equipment and policy implementation guidance materials	NA	1% of Costs: \$425 Intervention curriculum, handbook, and physical activity equipment	41% of Costs: \$446 Hip Hop to Health, Jr. materials package
Implementation	NA	NA	13% of Costs: \$1,640 Wellness Champion stipend and PE instructional coach time	51% of Costs: \$25.8 Changing individual snacks to meet requirements	80% of Costs: \$26,400 Transportation, snacks, and personnel for program operations	NA

Cost Offsets (Cost Savings)	NA	NA	NA	NA	-\$78,700 Time of caregivers (parents, relatives and non-relatives) who would have otherwise been providing care for children in the absence of afterschool programming	NA
Total Cost including Offsets	\$1,090	\$636	\$15,100	\$50.7	- \$46,200	\$ 1,080

PE, physical education; NA, not applicable. Total Cost including Offsets may not reflect the sum of individual Cost Category costs due to rounding.

^a All values presented are means estimated using 1000 model iterations (rounded to three significant digits) based on evidence from studies as described in Appendices. Additional details in Appendix A through G.

Table 4. Estimated short-term and ten-year cost-effectiveness and economic outcomes for six childhood obesity prevention interventions in the United States, 2015-2025

	Short-term outcome metrics ^a					Ten-year outcome metrics ^b		
Intervention	First year population reached, millions	Mean change in MET-hour per day per person (UI)	Average annual cost per person reached (UI)	Cost per MET-hour per day change (UI) ^c	Cost per BMI unit change per person (UI)	Health Care Cost Savings US \$ millions (UI) ^e	Net Cost US \$ millions (UI)	Cases of Childhood Obesity Prevented in 2025 ^f (UI)
Sector: School								
Active PE	21.7	0.05 (0.01, 0.12)	\$5.04 (\$4.15, \$6.42)	\$0.27 (\$0.11, \$1.85)	\$962 (\$632, \$3,286)	\$35.6 (\$4.71, \$53.2)	\$1,057 (\$1,000, \$1,285)	13,650 (129, 21,051)
Active Recess	11.3	0.09 (0.01, 0.27)	\$5.64 (\$3.21, \$8.03)	\$0.16 (\$0.05, \$1.76)	\$541 (\$236, \$2,471)	\$41.8 (\$8.30, \$61.1)	\$594 (\$315, \$870)	24,738 (5,087, 36,612)
Active School Day	31.3	0.13 (0.06, 0.19)	\$48.48 (\$48.06, \$48.92)	\$1.05 (\$0.68, \$2.32)	\$2,825 (\$2,467, \$5,591)	\$171 (\$79.8, \$203)	\$14,982 (\$14,872, \$15,110)	73,589 (35,709, 89,126)
Sector: Afterschool								
Healthy Afterschool	0.09	0.05 (0.03, 0.07)	\$53.87 (\$41.16, \$91.82)	\$3.14 (\$1.97, \$6.42)	\$367 (\$237, \$717)	\$4.01 (\$1.67, \$7.01)	\$47 (\$32, \$68) ^b	2,558 (951, 4,786) ^b

New Afterschool Programs	3.3	1.29 (1.11, 1.47)	- \$1,423 (- \$1,696 , - \$530)	Cost-savings ^d	Cost-savings ^d	\$185 (\$98.9, \$277)	-\$46,435 (-\$56,165, - \$15,004) ^b	109,973 (58,558, 168,455) ^b
Sector: Early Care and Education								
Hip Hop to Health, Jr.	4.8	0.50 (0.10, 0.88)	\$22.64 (\$22.15, \$23.13)	\$0.13 (\$0.07, \$0.54)	\$361 (\$-2,031, \$3,454)	\$67.2 (- \$63.2, \$179)	\$1,014 (\$900, \$1,143) ^b	93,065 (-88,279, 248,174) ^b

Note: Costs are in 2014 US Dollars; UI, 95% Uncertainty Interval; ^a Based on published estimate of change in minutes of moderate to vigorous physical activity or physical activity intensity only; ^b Based on estimate of change in minutes of moderate to vigorous physical activity or physical activity intensity and energy intake, or where available, measured change in Body Mass Index; ^c Average Annual Intervention Cost per person / (Average annual MET-hour per /day * 365.25 days/year); ^d It is customary not to report a negative incremental cost-effectiveness ratio⁵³; ^e The difference in obesity-related costs between the baseline and intervention scenario; ^f Cases of obesity prevented is estimated at the end of the period 2015-2025

Highlights

- Cost-effectiveness & obesity impact modeled for 6 physical activity-increasing interventions.
- All interventions would increase youth physical activity levels (0.05 to 1.29 MET-hour/day).
- Cost per MET-hour change/day ranged from cost-saving to \$3.16.
- Interventions could prevent between 2,500 and 110,000 cases of children with obesity.