

This is a repository copy of *Layperson-Led vs Professional-Led Behavioral Interventions for Weight Loss in Pediatric Obesity: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/163317/>

Version: Published Version

Article:

McGavock, J, Chauhan, B F, Rabbani, Rashida et al. (8 more authors) (2020) Layperson-Led vs Professional-Led Behavioral Interventions for Weight Loss in Pediatric Obesity: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. JAMA Network Open. pp. 1-17. ISSN: 2574-3805

<https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.10364>

Reuse

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) licence. This licence allows you to distribute, remix, tweak, and build upon the work, even commercially, as long as you credit the authors for the original work. More information and the full terms of the licence here:

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



Original Investigation | Pediatrics

Layperson-Led vs Professional-Led Behavioral Interventions for Weight Loss in Pediatric Obesity

A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis

Jonathan McGavock, PhD; Bhupendrasinh F. Chauhan, PhD; Rasheda Rabbani, PhD; Sofia Dias, PhD; Nika Klaprat, MSc; Sara Boissoneault, BSc; Justin Lys, MD; Aleksandra K. Wierzbowski, PhD; Mohammad Nazmus Sakib, MBBS, MSc; Ryan Zarychanski, MD; Ahmed M. Abou-Setta, MD, PhD

Abstract

IMPORTANCE The appropriate approach for weight loss among children and adolescents with overweight and obesity remains unclear.

OBJECTIVE To evaluate the difference in the treatment outcomes associated with behavioral weight loss interventions led by laypersons and professionals in comparison with unsupervised control arms among children and adolescents with overweight and obesity.

DATA SOURCES For this systematic review and meta-analysis, the Medical Literature Analysis and Retrieval System Online (MEDLINE), Embase, the Cochrane Library, and Cumulative Index of Nursing and Allied Health Literature (CINAHL) databases were searched from January 1, 1996, to June 1, 2019.

STUDY SELECTION Included in this study were randomized clinical trials (RCTs) of behavioral interventions lasting at least 12 weeks for children and adolescents (aged 5-18 years) with overweight and obesity. Exclusion criteria included non-RCT studies, interventions lasting less than 12 weeks, adult enrollment, participants with other medical diagnoses, pharmacological treatment use, and articles not written in English. Two of 6 reviewers independently screened all citations. Of 25 586 citations, after duplicate removal, 78 RCTs (5780 participants) met eligibility criteria.

DATA EXTRACTION AND SYNTHESIS A bayesian framework and Markov chain Monte Carlo simulation methods were used to combine direct and indirect associations. Random-effects and fixed-effect network meta-analysis models were used with the preferred model chosen by comparing the deviance information criteria. This study was registered with the International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO) and followed the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses (PRISMA) reporting guideline.

MAIN OUTCOMES AND MEASURES The immediate and sustained changes in weight and body mass index (BMI) standardized mean difference (SMD) were primary outcomes planned before data collection began, whereas waist circumference and percent body fat were secondary outcomes. The hypothesis being tested was formulated before the data collection.

RESULTS Of 25 586 citations retrieved, we included 78 RCTs (5780 participants), with a follow-up of 12 to 104 weeks. Compared with the control condition, random-effects models revealed that professional-led weight loss interventions were associated with reductions in weight (mean difference [MD], -1.60 kg [95% CI, -2.30 to -0.99 kg]; 68 trials; $P < .001$) and BMI (SMD, -0.30 [95% CI, -0.39 to -0.20]; 59 trials; $P < .001$) that were not sustained long term (weight MD, -1.02 kg [95% CI, -2.20 to 0.34 kg]; 21 trials; $P = .06$; BMI SMD, -0.12 [95% CI, -0.46 to 0.21]; 20 trials;

(continued)

Key Points

Question What are the short- and long-term associations of professional- and layperson-led behavioral interventions with weight loss for children and adolescents with overweight and obesity?

Findings In this network meta-analysis of 78 unique clinical trials including 5780 participants, professional-led, but not layperson-led, interventions were associated with short-term reductions in absolute and relative weight compared with standard care. These reductions were not sustained long term.

Meaning Professional-led behavioral weight loss interventions were associated with weight reduction among children and adolescents with overweight and obesity; there was a lack of direct evidence for the association of layperson-led approaches.

+ Supplemental content

Author affiliations and article information are listed at the end of this article.

Open Access. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the CC-BY License.

Abstract (continued)

$P < .001$). There was no association between layperson-led interventions and weight loss in the short-term (MD, -1.40 kg [95% CI, -3.00 to 0.26 kg]; 5 trials; $P = .05$) or long-term (MD, -0.98 kg [95% CI, -3.60 to 1.80 kg]; 1 trial; $P = .23$) compared with standard care. No difference was found in head-to-head trials (professional vs layperson MD, -0.25 kg [95% CI -1.90 to 1.30 kg]; 5 trials; $P = .38$).

CONCLUSIONS AND RELEVANCE This systematic review and meta-analysis found that professional-led weight loss interventions were associated with short-term but not sustained weight reduction among children and adolescents with overweight or obesity, and the evidence for layperson-led approaches was insufficient to draw firm conclusions.

JAMA Network Open. 2020;3(7):e2010364. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.10364

Introduction

Child and adolescent obesity are a global public health concern.¹ Intensive behavioral lifestyle therapy is considered the cornerstone for treatment of obesity in this age group.^{1,2} Systematic reviews of the literature show that intensive behavioral lifestyle interventions elicit modest short-term weight loss^{3,4} and improved cardiometabolic health^{4,5} among children and adolescents with overweight and obesity. While efficacious, these approaches are costly and often impractical in real-world settings. Less intensive interventions delivered in community settings are less costly but often yield less significant weight loss.⁶⁻⁸ Few studies have directly compared the association between short-term and sustained interventions on weight management in children and adolescents with overweight and obesity.⁹⁻¹¹

Engaging laypersons or community-based health workers to deliver health interventions is an attractive public health model for disease management, as it is cost-effective and can be tailored to local needs.^{12,13} In some settings, community health workers or peer leaders yield meaningful improvements in lifestyle behaviors and health outcomes among persons living with chronic disease.^{14,15} A series of recent trials suggested that behavioral interventions led by nonprofessionals yield similar results to those led by trained professionals.^{7,8} In the context of pediatric obesity, a limited number of trials suggest that peer- or layperson-led approaches may be associated with the achievement of successful weight loss.⁶⁻⁸ To the best of our knowledge, this has yet to be investigated by a systematic literature review with meta-analysis.

Network meta-analysis allows for the comparison of multiple treatments in 1 statistical model.¹⁶ Network meta-analyses can assess treatment outcomes or safety when few direct head-to-head trials exist.^{17,18} With the abundance of therapeutic trials for weight loss among children and adolescents with overweight or obesity,² a network meta-analysis is an attractive model for comparing the associations of layperson- and professional-led approaches with weight loss. Accordingly, we conducted a systematic review and network meta-analysis to assess the association of behavioral interventions led by lay individuals vs those led by professionals, compared with the standard of care, with short- and long-term weight loss among children and adolescents younger than 18 years with overweight or obesity.

Methods

Data Sources, Search Strategy, and Eligibility Criteria

This review was conducted according to the Methodological Expectations of Cochrane Interventional Reviews (MECIR) and reported according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses (PRISMA) reporting guideline. We searched the Medical Literature Analysis and

Retrieval System Online (MEDLINE), Ovid (Wolters Kluwer Health), Embase Ovid (Wolters Kluwer Health), Cumulative Index of Nursing and Allied Health Literature (CINAHL), EBSCOhost (EBSCO Information Services), and the Cochrane Library (Wiley) databases. A combination of controlled vocabulary (eg, weight, intervention) and keywords (eg, overweight, obese, child, youth, and adolescents), in addition to free-text terms, were used. A search for randomized clinical trials (RCTs) from January 1, 1996, to June 1, 2019, was conducted without any restriction on the language of publication (eTable 1 in the [Supplement](#)). The systematic review followed a priori eligibility criteria, and the protocol was registered on PROSPERO (CRD:42017052977). As determined by the Biomedical Research Ethics Board at the University of Manitoba, institutional ethics approval was not required for this systematic review and meta-analysis as individual-level data were not used for this analysis.

Trial Inclusion Criteria

We included RCTs of parallel group design evaluating weight loss interventions administered for a minimum of 12 weeks in children and adolescents with overweight or obesity and younger than 18 years. The terms *overweight* (between 1 and 1.99 SD) and *obesity* (>2 SD for age and sex) were defined according to age- and sex-specific body mass index (BMI; calculated as weight in kilograms divided by height in meters squared) criteria for children and adolescents.^{19,20} We excluded trials evaluating pharmacotherapy for weight loss as well as cluster RCTs or quasi-experimental studies and those published in languages other than English. Cluster randomized trials were excluded as they would potentially increase trial heterogeneity, introduce difficulties in estimating intervention-type associations, and potentially be more common among layperson-led interventions, introducing a design bias into our analysis. RCTs that met inclusion criteria were classified into 3 comparisons: (1) professional-led vs standard, (2) layperson-led vs standard, and (3) professional-led vs layperson-led weight loss interventions.

Classification of Intervention Types

Professional-led interventions were defined as led by health care professionals, such as dietitians, nurses, kinesiologists, physicians, and other relevant certified health care professionals, at least twice during the conduct of the RCT. Direct involvement of laypeople (nonprofessionals) in participants' schools, communities, neighborhoods, and families was considered a layperson-led weight loss intervention. Standard weight loss interventions (ie, standard of care) were defined as receiving recommendations for behavioral change without additional support provided to the participants at or before the baseline.

Study Selection

Abstracts and titles of relevant citations were independently screened by 2 of 6 reviewers (B.F.C., J.L., A.K.W., M.N.S., N.K., S.B.) to determine eligibility. Two reviewers independently assessed the eligibility of full-text articles of citations using a standardized prepiloted form outlining the inclusion and exclusion criteria. Disagreements were resolved by consensus or with the involvement of a third reviewer.

Data Extraction

Data were extracted independently by 2 of the 6 reviewers, with disagreements resolved by consensus or with the involvement of a third reviewer. For continuous data, we extracted change over time and the final reported measures of weight, as well as measures of variances, for each intervention type. We extracted outcome data from 2 time points—(1) immediately following the intervention and (2) at the end of the follow-up period—to assess long-term associations of the intervention. We used DistillerSR, version 2 (Evidence Partners Inc) to manage study selection, data extraction, and trial-level risk of bias assessments.

Primary and Secondary Outcomes and Subgroup Analyses

The primary outcomes were the change from baseline in weight and any measure of BMI (BMI z score and BMI percentile) at the end of the intervention period. As outcomes for BMI were not consistently reported, we used the J correction factor for an unbiased estimate of the standardized mean difference (SMD).²¹ We also assessed change in percent body fat, waist circumference, and overall study withdrawals as secondary outcomes. For RCTs that reported long-term follow-up data after the end of the intervention, we also examined changes in these outcomes to assess the sustainability of the interventions. The change in the outcome variables was calculated as the difference between baseline and immediate postintervention measurements to calculate the short-term weight loss. The difference from baseline to the last follow-up after the intervention was completed was used to calculate the sustainability of the intervention.

Risk of Bias Assessment

We evaluated the internal validity of included RCTs using the Cochrane risk of bias tool.²² This tool consists of 6 domains (sequence generation, allocation concealment, blinding, incomplete outcome data, selective outcome reporting, and other sources of bias) and a categorization of the overall risk of bias. Each separate domain was judged as low, unsure, or high risk of bias. The overall assessment was based on the responses to individual domains. If 1 or more individual domains were assessed as having a high risk of bias, the trial was judged as having a high risk of bias. The overall risk of bias was considered low only if no domain was rated as having an either high or unclear risk of bias. The source of funding was also extracted.

Statistical Analysis

To rank the intervention types for relative effectiveness and to compare every intervention to each other using all available evidence, even when no studies contributed data directly, we used network meta-analyses (also termed as multiple, or mixed, treatment comparisons). We used a bayesian framework and Markov chain Monte Carlo simulation methods to combine direct and indirect evidence implemented in WinBUGS software, version 1.4.3 (University of Cambridge).²³ We fit both random-effects and fixed-effect network meta-analysis models²⁴ (code provided in eTable 2 of the [Supplement](#)). The preferred model was chosen by comparing the deviance information criteria²⁵ (eTable 2 in the [Supplement](#)). For all analyses, we assessed model convergence using the Brooks-Gelman-Rubin diagnostic tool,²⁶ history plots, autocorrelation, the form of the posterior density for the between-study heterogeneity, and the basic parameters (eFigures 1-4 in the [Supplement](#)). We used vague prior distributions for all parameters, a burn-in period of 50 000 iterations, a sampling period of 100 000 iterations, and 3 chains with varied initial values in all analyses (eTable 2 in the [Supplement](#)). The goodness of fit model was measured by the posterior mean of the residual deviance; in a well-fitting model, the residual deviance should be close to the number of data points included in the analysis.²⁷ Where possible, we evaluated the consistency between the direct and indirect evidence by calculating a bayesian 2-sided *P* value for the difference between the direct and indirect estimates using the Bucher method,²⁸ where the direct estimates were obtained from the inconsistency model (eTable 2 in the [Supplement](#)).²⁹⁻³¹ *P* < .05 was considered significant.

Results are summarized by point estimates presented as medians with 95% CIs established using the 2.5 and 97.5 percentiles obtained via Markov chain Monte Carlo simulations. The 95% CI represents the interval in which the pooled effect is expected to lie with 95% probability. We also generated treatment rankings from best to worst and their corresponding probability estimates.

Results

We initially identified 25 586 citations and, after removing duplicates, we reviewed 20 514 unique citations. Of those, 78 RCTs³²⁻¹¹⁵ (5780 participants) met the eligibility criteria (eFigure 1 in the [Supplement](#)). Details for each individual trial are presented in eTable 3 in the [Supplement](#). The

majority of RCTs were performed in children aged 1-12 years (n = 53)^{9,11,32,33,39,40,43-46,48,49,52-54,56,58,59,62-64,67-71,73,76,77,80,83-89,91-93,95,99-104,107,108,110-112,114}; 25 were conducted in adolescents aged 13-18 years,^{10,34-38,41,42,47,50,51,61,65,66,74,78,81,82,90,94,96,97,106,109,113,115-118} and 3 studies did not report the mean age of participants.^{72,98,106} The proportion of male participants ranged from 0%-100%. Mean BMI percentile, BMI z score, and percent body fat were 96.9 (interquartile range [IQR], 90.2-99.2), 2.3 (IQR, 1.4-4.5), and 37.5% (IQR, 25.7%-47.6%), respectively. Only 25% of the RCTs were judged to have a low risk of bias (eTable 4 in the Supplement). The number of trials available for the 3 possible comparisons for immediate and long-term primary outcomes are presented in Figure 1. Across all trials, there was no evidence of inconsistency for any of the outcome measures included in the analyses.

Intervention Details

Summary information for professional- and layperson-led interventions is provided in Table 1. The mean (SD) age (11.2 [3.5] vs 11.6 [3.9] years) and relative degree of obesity (mean [SD] BMI z score: 2.42 [0.57] vs 2.46 [0.31]) of participants that completed the trials was similar in professional- and layperson-led interventions. On average, each intervention type consisted of 1 to 1.5 hours of contact time, delivered 1 to 3 times per week for approximately 24 weeks.

Primary Outcomes

Data from each randomized trial on primary outcomes are presented in eFigure 2 in the Supplement. Random-effects models yielded better deviance information criteria than fixed-effects models for

Figure 1. Network of Trials That Examined Layperson- and Professional-Led Approaches to Weight Loss Among Children and Adolescents With Overweight and Obesity




Illustration of a network meta-analysis that combines direct evidence for the immediate postintervention change (A, B) and long-term change (C, D) in weight (A, C) and BMI (B, D) obtained from randomized clinical trials comparing 3 nodes: professional-led, layperson-led, and standard weight loss interventions. The size of the nodes is

proportional to the number of participants randomized to that intervention type. The thickness of lines and the numbers represent the number of studies that contributed data for the comparison. Standard treatment considered as reference treatment for all network meta-analysis. BMI indicates body mass index.

all models (eTable 2 in the Supplement). Total residual deviance and bayesian probability of inconsistency between direct and indirect effects in the models are presented in eTable 2 in the Supplement. Immediate and long-term changes in the 2 primary outcomes within the network meta-analysis are presented in Figure 2. The random-effects network meta-analysis revealed that professional-led behavioral interventions for children and adolescents were associated with a greater reduction in weight (mean difference [MD], -1.60 kg; 95% CI, -2.30 to -0.99 kg; $P < .001$) and BMI (SMD, -0.30; 95% CI, -0.39 to -0.20; $P < .001$) compared with standard care. Layperson-led weight loss interventions did not show an association with a difference in weight (MD, -1.40 kg; 95% CI, -3.00 to 0.26 kg; $P = .05$) or BMI (SMD, -0.12; 95% CI, -0.34 to 0.10; $P = .14$) compared with standard care. No differences were observed in RCTs that directly compared professional-led to layperson-interventions (weight MD, -0.25 kg; 95% CI, -1.90 to 1.30 kg; $P = .38$ and BMI SMD, -0.18; 95% CI, -0.41 to 0.05; $P = .06$).

For trials with prolonged follow-up, neither professional-led interventions (MD, -1.02 kg; 95% CI, -2.20 to 0.34 kg; $P = .06$) or layperson-led interventions (MD, -0.98 kg; 95% CI, -3.60 to 1.80 kg; $P = .23$) were associated with reduction in weight following discontinuation of the intervention, compared with standard care (Figure 2).

Secondary Outcomes


Results for associations between layperson- and professional-led behavioral interventions and secondary outcomes are presented in Table 2. Professional-led interventions were associated with significant reductions in percent body fat (MD, -1.70%; 95% CI, -2.60% to -0.81%; $P < .001$) and

Table 1. Behavioral Lifestyle Intervention Characteristics Between Layperson- and Professional-Led Trials for Children and Adolescents Living With Obesity

Intervention characteristic	Mean (SD)	
	Professional-led intervention	Layperson-led intervention
Trials, No.	78	5
Age, y	11.2 (3.5)	11.6 (3.9)
BMI z score	2.42 (0.57)	2.46 (0.31)
Contact time, h/wk ^a	1.6 (2.0)	1.2 (1.1)
Duration, wk	29 (22)	23 (7)

Abbreviation: BMI, body mass index.
^a Contact time is estimated time spent with person delivering the intervention each week during the intervention period.

Figure 2. Short- and Long-term Efficacy of Layperson- and Professional-Led Weight Loss Interventions in Children and Adolescents With Overweight and Obesity



A, Differences for weight outcomes are shown. B, Differences for body mass index are shown (standard mean difference). Results of the 3 possible comparisons within the network for the 2 primary outcome measures, body weight and body mass index, are displayed. From top to bottom in each panel, we compare professional-led interventions to standard of care, layperson-led interventions to standard of care, and head-to-head

comparisons of professional- and layperson-led interventions. Blue circles represent immediate changes in outcomes; orange circles represent long-term (sustained) changes in outcomes. Horizontal lines reflect no difference between the intervention arm and the comparison arm. Whiskers indicate 95% CIs.

waist circumference (MD, -1.30 cm; 95% CI, -2.06 to -0.58 cm; $P < .001$) compared with standard care. No differences in percent body fat (MD, -0.52%; 95% CI, -3.90% to 2.80%; $P = .38$) or waist circumference (MD, -0.94 cm; 95% CI, -2.70 to 0.71 cm; $P = .13$) following layperson-led interventions were seen compared with standard care (Table 2). There were insufficient data to analyze long-term associations of secondary outcomes. No differences were observed in either professional- or layperson-led interventions for study withdrawals.

Treatment Rankings

Treatment rankings for the 3 intervention types for both primary outcomes, immediately following the intervention and during long-term follow-up, are presented in **Figure 3**. The cumulative probabilities of each treatment are presented in eTables 4 and 5 in the [Supplement](#). For both primary outcomes, professional-led interventions were considered the best approach to achieve short-term absolute (mean [SD] rank, 1.38 [0.48]) and relative (mean [SD] rank, 1.06 [0.24]) weight reduction (Figure 3). Layperson-led interventions were considered the second-best intervention for absolute (mean [SD] rank, 1.67 [0.56]) weight loss and relative (mean [SD] rank, 2.08 [0.45]) weight loss immediately following the intervention. For long-term follow-up, professional- and layperson-led interventions were ranked nearly equal for their association with achieving absolute and relative weight loss (Figure 3).

Discussion

The main finding from this systematic review and network meta-analysis was that professional-led behavioral weight loss interventions were associated with significant short-term, but not long-term, reductions in weight and BMI in children and adolescents with overweight or obesity. There was no association between layperson-led behavioral weight loss interventions and weight reduction among children and adolescents with overweight or obesity. In the absence of direct evidence and low precision for the indirect evidence, it is unclear how layperson-led interventions compare with professional-led interventions for achieving weight loss among children and adolescents with overweight or obesity. Finally, the degree of weight loss achieved with behavioral lifestyle interventions was modest (-1.0 to -2.3 kg) regardless of intervention type.

In 2017, the US Preventive Services Task Force released the results from an extensive systematic review of trials examining weight loss interventions for children and adolescents with overweight or obesity.⁴ This review tested for differences in treatment outcomes across studies that had different contact time with participants, but did not directly compare different intervention models. Among the 42 behavioral therapeutic trials included in the analysis, several were not randomized, cluster trials were included, and no long-term follow-up data were provided. Despite these differences between the network meta-analysis presented here and the analysis from the US Preventive Services Task Force, the effect size for professional-led interventions was similar and comparable to previous systematic reviews of weight loss interventions among children and adolescents with overweight or obesity.^{3,116,117} The data presented here extend previous systematic reviews by demonstrating that

Table 2. Secondary Outcomes of Layperson- and Professional-Led Weight Loss Interventions for Children and Adolescents With Overweight and Obesity for Body Composition and Study Withdrawals

Outcome	No. ^a	Professional vs standard, mean difference (95% CI)	No. ^a	Layperson vs standard, mean difference (95% CI)	No. ^a	Professional vs layperson, mean difference (95% CI)
Body fat, %	36	-1.70 (-2.60 to -0.81)	0	-0.52 (-3.90 to 2.80)	2	-1.13 (-4.40 to 2.20)
Waist circumference, cm	33	1.30 (-2.06 to -0.58)	5	-0.94 (-2.70 to 0.71)	1	-0.34 (-2.15 to 1.50)
BMI, %	12	-0.59 (-1.45 to 0.23)	0	0.01 (-1.93 to 2.05)	2	-0.59 (-2.49 to 1.14)
Study withdrawals, OR (95% CI)	65	0.92 (0.78 to 1.11)	7	0.99 (0.63 to 1.58)	5	0.93 (0.59 to 1.47)


Abbreviations: BMI, body mass index; OR, odds ratio.

^a Indicates the number of trials included in the analysis.

the short-term benefits of professional-led weight loss interventions are not sustained following the end of the intervention and that similar effect sizes may be achieved with layperson-led interventions. Adherence to lifestyle change is a critical determinant of intervention effectiveness. Unfortunately, very few trials reported adherence to prescribed lifestyle change, and therefore it is unclear whether the lack of maintenance and the relatively modest weight loss following these interventions are associated with low adherence to intervention attributes. Collectively, these data provide robust evidence that professional-led behavioral interventions are associated with achieving modest weight loss among children and adolescents with overweight or obesity; however, this association was not sustained in the long term.

Systematic reviews of home-,¹¹⁹ school-,¹¹⁸ and community-based¹²⁰ behavioral interventions for obesity prevention in children and adolescents suggest that these nonprofessional-led interventions yield minimal or no weight change. In contrast to previous systematic reviews, we excluded cluster randomized trials, quasi-experimental trials, trials lasting less than 12 weeks, and trials that included children and adolescents of a healthy weight. For the current review, layperson-led interventions were delivered either by parents or older peers without formal training in a health profession. In contrast to results from quasiexperimental^{6,7,121} or cluster randomized trials,⁸ the RCTs of layperson-led interventions examined here did not show an association in the short or long term. The effect sizes for absolute (-1.60 vs -1.40 kg) and relative (BMI, -0.3 vs -0.12) weight loss were similar between layperson- and professional-led interventions. The few trials of

Figure 3. Ranked Intervention Types for Short- and Long-term Weight Loss Among Children and Adolescents With Overweight and Obesity



Surface under the cumulative ranking curve—based treatment rankings for immediate postintervention change (A, B) and long-term change (C, D) in weight (A, C) and BMI (B, D) obtained from randomized clinical trials. Data represent the probability of being

ranked as the best (1), next best (2), and least effective (3) intervention. BMI indicates body mass index.

layperson-led interventions, however, lacked precision. Larger trials of layperson-led interventions, particularly trials directly comparing layperson- and professional-led interventions, are needed to understand the association of this approach for weight management among children and adolescents with overweight or obesity.

There is some evidence that layperson- or peer-led approaches support positive behavioral change and improved health outcomes among adults living with obesity¹²²⁻¹²⁵ or obesity-related comorbidities.¹²⁶ Layperson- or community-led interventions have proved to be associated with low-resource areas or settings in which culturally tailored approaches are preferred by community members.^{12,13} The meta-analysis conducted here found that layperson-led behavioral trials were not associated with statistically significant reductions in body weight among children and adolescents living with obesity. Weight status is only 1 of multiple measures of health that can be influenced by behavioral change in children and adolescents with overweight or obesity, particularly cardiometabolic risk factors. Children and adolescents with overweight or obesity also are more likely to live in families with low income,^{127,128} to have been exposed to adverse childhood experiences, and to suffer from mental health comorbidities. We did not include these outcomes in our analysis; however, it is possible that these outcomes could be responsive to layperson-led interventions. The promising association of layperson-led approaches in other settings and populations^{129,130} reinforces the need for large-scale, well-designed, multiarm RCTs to determine the effectiveness of interventions led by lay individuals for supporting weight change among children and adolescents with overweight or obesity.

The advantage of conducting a network meta-analysis, relative to a conventional meta-analysis, lies in the capacity to estimate the relative efficacy of 2 given interventions when few or no direct head-to-head trials exist. We were only able to identify 3 to 5 trials that directly compared layperson- to professional-led interventions for weight loss in children and adolescents with overweight or obesity. Performing a meta-analysis on the results of these RCTs did not reveal an association with either intervention. The few RCTs directly comparing layperson- and professional-led interventions were relatively low-powered and were considered to have a high risk of bias. Based on the limited available evidence, professional-led approaches were ranked as being associated with short-term weight loss; however, over the long-term, layperson- and professional-led interventions appeared to perform equally. Adequately powered, head-to-head trials of layperson- and professional-led approaches with long-term follow-up are needed to confirm these observations.

Strengths and Limitations

The study is strengthened by limiting the analyses to trials focused exclusively on children and adolescents with overweight or obesity, an a priori published protocol, and the relatively large number of RCTs available for the network meta-analysis. Despite these strengths, there are limitations to consider. The strict criteria we imposed on the search limited the inclusion of designs, including cluster RCTs and quasi experiments, which limits the generalizability of our findings. Additionally, differences in intervention designs could have influenced the point estimates between professional- and layperson-led trials; however, with only 5 trials led by laypersons, we were underpowered to adjust for these differences. We also recognize that age- and sex-standardized measures of adiposity are the best practice for reporting weight-related outcomes in children. As we relied on published outcome data and not individual-level data, we were largely unable to use BMI or waist circumference z scores. Additionally, we only searched for trials appearing in the last 20 years in an effort to limit the number of low-quality RCTs. We did not include non-English publications or RCTs that were unpublished in order to increase feasibility and the homogeneity between weight loss interventions; this may have introduced selective reporting bias (eg, publication bias). Furthermore, only 25% of the included trials were judged as having a low risk of bias. As these were behavioral trials, blinding was not possible; however, as the outcomes are semiobjective, blinding may not be as effective as in pharmaceutical trials with subjective outcomes.¹³¹ As mentioned previously, this review was restricted to weight-related outcomes and did not include

other outcomes that could be responsive to behavioral lifestyle change. Finally, there were very few trials that directly compared the effectiveness of layperson- and professional-led interventions. This limits our ability to provide an accurate estimate of the effects and also resulted in very low precision. Similarly, with so few layperson-led interventions with long-term follow-up, the precision was very low for the indirect comparisons generated by the network meta-analysis.

Conclusions

In this systematic review and meta-analysis, professional-led behavioral interventions were associated with modest but statistically significant weight loss among children and adolescents with overweight or obesity, compared with standard weight loss interventions. Layperson-led behavioral interventions were not associated with weight loss. Weight loss achieved by both professional and layperson-led interventions were not sustained following the intervention among children and adolescents with overweight or obesity. These findings suggest a need for trials assessing the immediate and sustained effectiveness of layperson-led behavioral weight loss interventions among children and adolescents with overweight or obesity.

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Accepted for Publication: May 2, 2020.

Published: July 13, 2020. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.10364

Open Access: This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the [CC-BY License](#). © 2020 McGavock J et al. *JAMA Network Open*.

Corresponding Author: Jonathan McGavock, PhD, Children's Hospital Research Institute of Manitoba, 715 McDermot Ave, Winnipeg, MB R3E 3P4, Canada (jmcgavock@chril.ca).

Author Affiliations: Children's Hospital Research Institute of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Canada (McGavock, Klprat, Boissoneault); Department of Pediatrics and Child Health, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Canada (McGavock, Klprat, Boissoneault); Diabetes Research Envisioned and Accomplished in Manitoba, Children's Hospital Research Institute of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Canada (McGavock, Klprat, Boissoneault); George & Fay Yee Centre for Healthcare Innovation, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada (Chauhan, Rabbani, Lys, Wierzbowski, Zarychanski, Abou-Setta); I. H. Asper Clinical Research Institute, St. Boniface Hospital Research Centre, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada (Chauhan); Centre for Reviews and Dissemination, University of York, York, United Kingdom (Dias, Zarychanski); School of Public Health and Health Systems, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada (Sakib); Department of Haematology and Medical Oncology, CancerCare Manitoba, Winnipeg, Canada (Zarychanski); Department of Internal Medicine, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Canada (Zarychanski).

Author Contributions: Dr McGavock had full access to all of the data in the study and takes responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

Concept and design: McGavock, Chauhan, Sakib, Zarychanski, Abou-Setta.

Acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data: McGavock, Chauhan, Rabbani, Dias, Klprat, Boissoneault, Lys, Wierzbowski, Sakib, Abou-Setta.

Drafting of the manuscript: McGavock, Chauhan, Wierzbowski, Sakib, Abou-Setta.

Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content: McGavock, Chauhan, Rabbani, Dias, Klprat, Boissoneault, Lys, Sakib, Zarychanski, Abou-Setta.

Statistical analysis: Rabbani, Dias, Boissoneault, Abou-Setta.

Obtained funding: McGavock.

Administrative, technical, or material support: McGavock, Chauhan, Klprat, Lys, Wierzbowski, Sakib, Zarychanski, Abou-Setta.

Supervision: McGavock, Chauhan, Zarychanski, Abou-Setta.

Conflict of Interest Disclosures: Drs McGavock and Zarychanski reported receiving a salary and operating support from the Canadian Institutes of Health Research outside the submitted work. No other disclosures were reported.

Funding/Support: This study was supported by grant CPP-137910 from the Canadian Institutes of Health Research Applied Public Health Chair and Obesity (Drs McGavock and Zarychanski), grant 314565 from the Diabetes Research Envisioned & Accomplished in Manitoba (DREAM) Theme at the Children's Hospital Research Institute of Manitoba (Dr McGavock), and grant MR/MO05232/1 from the Medical Research Council (Dr Dias).

Role of the Funder/Sponsor: The funders had no role in the design and conduct of the study; collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of the data; preparation, review, or approval of the manuscript; and decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

Additional Contributions: Becky Skidmore, MLS, assisted in designing and executing the search strategy. Ms. Skidmore received financial compensation for her contributions.

REFERENCES

1. Lobstein T, Jackson-Leach R, Moodie ML, et al. Child and adolescent obesity: part of a bigger picture. *Lancet*. 2015;385(9986):2510-2520. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(14)61746-3
2. Grossman DC, Bibbins-Domingo K, Curry SJ, et al; US Preventive Services Task Force. Screening for obesity in children and adolescents: US Preventive Services Task Force recommendation statement. *JAMA*. 2017;317(23):2417-2426. doi:10.1001/jama.2017.6803
3. Oude Luttikhuis H, Baur L, Jansen H, et al. Interventions for treating obesity in children. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2009;(1):CD001872. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD001872.pub3
4. O'Connor EA, Evans CV, Burda BU, Walsh ES, Eder M, Lozano P. Screening for obesity and intervention for weight management in children and adolescents: evidence report and systematic review for the US Preventive Services Task Force. *JAMA*. 2017;317(23):2427-2444. doi:10.1001/jama.2017.0332
5. Cai L, Wu Y, Wilson RF, Segal JB, Kim MT, Wang Y. Effect of childhood obesity prevention programs on blood pressure: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Circulation*. 2014;129(18):1832-1839. doi:10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.113.005666
6. Black MM, Hager ER, Le K, et al. Challenge! health promotion/obesity prevention mentorship model among urban, black adolescents. *Pediatrics*. 2010;126(2):280-288. doi:10.1542/peds.2009-1832
7. Eskicioglu P, Halas J, Sénéchal M, et al. Peer mentoring for type 2 diabetes prevention in First Nations children. *Pediatrics*. 2014;133(6):e1624-e1631. doi:10.1542/peds.2013-2621
8. Santos RG, Durksen A, Rabbanni R, et al. Effectiveness of peer-based healthy living lesson plans on anthropometric measures and physical activity in elementary school students: a cluster randomized trial. *JAMA Pediatr*. 2014;168(4):330-337. doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2013.3688
9. Lisón JF, Real-Montes JM, Torró I, et al. Exercise intervention in childhood obesity: a randomized controlled trial comparing hospital-versus home-based groups. *Acad Pediatr*. 2012;12(4):319-325. doi:10.1016/j.acap.2012.03.003
10. Jelalian E, Mehlenbeck R, Lloyd-Richardson EE, Birmaher V, Wing RR. 'Adventure therapy' combined with cognitive-behavioral treatment for overweight adolescents. *Int J Obes (Lond)*. 2006;30(1):31-39. doi:10.1038/sj.ijo.0803069
11. Hystad HT, Steinsbekk S, Ødegård R, Wichstrøm L, Gudbrandsen OA. A randomised study on the effectiveness of therapist-led v. self-help parental intervention for treating childhood obesity. *Br J Nutr*. 2013;110(6):1143-1150. doi:10.1017/S0007114513000056
12. Neupane D, Kallestrup P, McLachlan CS, Perry H. Community health workers for non-communicable diseases. *Lancet Glob Health*. 2014;2(10):e567. doi:10.1016/S2214-109X(14)70303-1
13. Hill J, Peer N, Oldenburg B, Kengne AP. Roles, responsibilities and characteristics of lay community health workers involved in diabetes prevention programmes: a systematic review. *PLoS One*. 2017;12(12):e0189069. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0189069
14. Chopra M, Sharkey A, Dalmiya N, Anthony D, Binkin N; UNICEF Equity in Child Survival, Health and Nutrition Analysis Team. Strategies to improve health coverage and narrow the equity gap in child survival, health, and nutrition. *Lancet*. 2012;380(9850):1331-1340. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(12)61423-8
15. Raphael JL, Rueda A, Lion KC, Giordano TP. The role of lay health workers in pediatric chronic disease: a systematic review. *Acad Pediatr*. 2013;13(5):408-420. doi:10.1016/j.acap.2013.04.015
16. Mills EJ, Thorlund K, Ioannidis JP. Demystifying trial networks and network meta-analysis. *BMJ*. 2013;346:f2914. doi:10.1136/bmj.f2914
17. Mbuagbaw L, Rochweg B, Jaeschke R, et al. Approaches to interpreting and choosing the best treatments in network meta-analyses. *Syst Rev*. 2017;6(1):79. doi:10.1186/s13643-017-0473-z

18. Pillay J, Armstrong MJ, Butalia S, et al. Behavioral programs for type 2 diabetes mellitus: a systematic review and network meta-analysis. *Ann Intern Med*. 2015;163(11):848-860. doi:[10.7326/M15-1400](https://doi.org/10.7326/M15-1400)
19. Rodd C, Sharma AK. Recent trends in the prevalence of overweight and obesity among Canadian children. *CMAJ*. 2016;188(13):E313-E320. doi:[10.1503/cmaj.150854](https://doi.org/10.1503/cmaj.150854)
20. Rolland-Cachera MF. Childhood obesity: current definitions and recommendations for their use. *Int J Pediatr Obes*. 2011;6(5-6):325-331. doi:[10.3109/17477166.2011.607458](https://doi.org/10.3109/17477166.2011.607458)
21. Borenstein M, Hedges LV, Higgins JPT, Rothstein H. *Introduction to Meta-Analysis*. John Wiley & Sons; 2009. doi:[10.1002/9780470743386](https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470743386)
22. Higgins JPT, Altman DG, Gøtzsche PC, et al; Cochrane Bias Methods Group; Cochrane Statistical Methods Group. The Cochrane Collaboration's tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *BMJ*. 2011;343:d5928. doi:[10.1136/bmj.d5928](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.d5928)
23. Lunn DJC, Best N, Thomas A, Spiegelhalter D. *The BUGS Book*. CRC Press; 2013.
24. Watt JA, Goodarzi Z, Veroniki AA, et al. Comparative efficacy of interventions for aggressive and agitated behaviors in dementia: a systematic review and network meta-analysis. *Ann Intern Med*. 2019;171(9):633-642. doi:[10.7326/M19-0993](https://doi.org/10.7326/M19-0993)
25. Spiegelhalter DJ, Best NG, Carlin BP, van der Linde A. Bayesian measures of model complexity and fit. *J R Stat Soc B*. 2002;64(4):583-616. doi:[10.1111/1467-9868.00353](https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9868.00353)
26. Brooks SP, Gelman A. General methods for monitoring convergence of iterative simulations. *J Comput Graph Stat*. 1998;7(4):434-455.
27. Dias S, Sutton AJ, Welton NJ, Ades AE. Evidence synthesis for decision making 3: heterogeneity-subgroups, meta-regression, bias, and bias-adjustment. *Med Decis Making*. 2013;33(5):618-640. doi:[10.1177/0272989X13485157](https://doi.org/10.1177/0272989X13485157)
28. Bucher HC, Guyatt GH, Griffith LE, Walter SD. The results of direct and indirect treatment comparisons in meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 1997;50(6):683-691. doi:[10.1016/S0895-4356\(97\)00049-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0895-4356(97)00049-8)
29. Dias S, Welton NJ, Sutton AJ, Caldwell DM, Lu G, Ades AE. *Inconsistency in Networks of Evidence Based on Randomised Controlled Trials*. National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence; 2014.
30. Dias S, Welton NJ, Sutton AJ, Caldwell DM, Lu G, Ades AE. Evidence synthesis for decision making 4: inconsistency in networks of evidence based on randomized controlled trials. *Med Decis Making*. 2013;33(5):641-656. doi:[10.1177/0272989X12455847](https://doi.org/10.1177/0272989X12455847)
31. Dias S, Ades AE, Welton NJ, Jansen JP, Sutton AJ. Network meta-analysis of survival outcomes. In: *Network Meta-Analysis for Decision Making*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd; 2018.
32. Norman G, Huang J, Davila EP, et al. Outcomes of a 1-year randomized controlled trial to evaluate a behavioral 'stepped-down' weight loss intervention for adolescent patients with obesity. *Pediatr Obes*. 2016;11(1):18-25. doi:[10.1111/ijpo.12013](https://doi.org/10.1111/ijpo.12013)
33. Serra-Paya N, Ensenyat A, Castro-Vinuales I, et al Effectiveness of a multi-component intervention for overweight and obese children (Nereu Program): a randomized controlled trial. *PLoS One*. 2015;10(12):e0144502. doi:[10.1371/journal.pone.0144502](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0144502)
34. Leite N, Carvalho HM, Padez C, et al. Age and menarcheal status do not influence metabolic response to aerobic training in overweight girls. *Diabetol Metab Syndr*. 2013;5(1):7. doi:[10.1186/1758-5996-5-7](https://doi.org/10.1186/1758-5996-5-7)
35. Kulik N, Ennett ST, Ward DS, Bowling JM, Fisher EB, Tate DF. Brief report: a randomized controlled trial examining peer support and behavioral weight loss treatment. *J Adolesc*. 2015;44:117-23. doi:[10.1016/j.adolescence.2015.07.010](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2015.07.010)
36. Vos RC, Wit JM, Pijl H, Houdijk EC. Long-term effect of lifestyle intervention on adiposity, metabolic parameters, inflammation and physical fitness in obese children: a randomized controlled trial. *Nutr Diabetes*. 2011;1(10):e9. doi:[10.1038/nutd.2011.5](https://doi.org/10.1038/nutd.2011.5)
37. Wengle JG, Hamilton JK, Manhiot C, et al. The 'Golden Keys' to health - a healthy lifestyle intervention with randomized individual mentorship for overweight and obesity in adolescents. *Paediatr Child Health*. 2011;16(8):473-478. doi:[10.1093/pch/16.8.473](https://doi.org/10.1093/pch/16.8.473)
38. Ball GD, Mackenzie-Rife KA, Newton MS, et al. One-on-one lifestyle coaching for managing adolescent obesity: findings from a pilot, randomized controlled trial in a real-world, clinical setting. *Paediatr Child Health*. 2011;16(6):345-350. doi:[10.1093/pch/16.6.345](https://doi.org/10.1093/pch/16.6.345)
39. Crabtree VM, Moore JB, Jacks DE, Cerrito P, Topp RV. A transtheoretical, case management approach to the treatment of pediatric obesity. *J Prim Care Community Health*. 2010;1(1):4-7. doi:[10.1177/2150131909357069](https://doi.org/10.1177/2150131909357069)

40. Broccoli S, Davoli AM, Bonvicini L, et al. Motivational interviewing to treat overweight children: 24-month follow-up of a randomized controlled trial. *Pediatrics*. 2016;137(1):137. doi:10.1542/peds.2015-1979
41. Jelalian E, Hadley W, Sato A, et al. Adolescent weight control: an intervention targeting parent communication and modeling compared with minimal parental involvement. *J Pediatr Psychol*. 2015;40(2):203-213. doi:10.1093/jpepsy/jsu082
42. Abraham AA, Chow WC, So HK, et al. Lifestyle intervention using an internet-based curriculum with cell phone reminders for obese Chinese teens: a randomized controlled study. *PLoS One*. 2015;10(5):e0125673. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0125673
43. Stark LJ, Clifford LM, Towner EK, et al. A pilot randomized controlled trial of a behavioral family-based intervention with and without home visits to decrease obesity in preschoolers. *J Pediatr Psychol*. 2014;39(9):1001-1012. doi:10.1093/jpepsy/jsu059
44. Kokkvoll A, Grimsgaard S, Steinsbekk S, Flægstad T, Njølstad I. Health in overweight children: 2-year follow-up of Finnmark Activity School—a randomised trial. *Arch Dis Child*. 2015;100(5):441-448. doi:10.1136/archdischild-2014-307107
45. Bocca G, Corpeleijn E, van den Heuvel ER, Stolk RP, Sauer PJ. Three-year follow-up of 3-year-old to 5-year-old children after participation in a multidisciplinary or a usual-care obesity treatment program. *Clin Nutr*. 2014;33(6):1095-1100. doi:10.1016/j.clnu.2013.12.002
46. Looney SM, Raynor HA. Examining the effect of three low-intensity pediatric obesity interventions: a pilot randomized controlled trial. *Clin Pediatr (Phila)*. 2014;53(14):1367-1374. doi:10.1177/0009922814541803
47. Love-Osborne K, Fortune R, Sheeder J, Federico S, Haemer MA. School-based health center-based treatment for obese adolescents: feasibility and body mass index effects. *Child Obes*. 2014;10(5):424-431. doi:10.1089/chi.2013.0165
48. Quattrin T, Roemmich JN, Paluch R, Yu J, Epstein LH, Ecker MA. Treatment outcomes of overweight children and parents in the medical home. *Pediatrics*. 2014;134(2):290-297. doi:10.1542/peds.2013-4084
49. Hamilton-Shield J, Goodred J, Powell L, et al. Changing eating behaviours to treat childhood obesity in the community using Mandolean: the community Mandolean randomised controlled trial (ComMando)—a pilot study. *Health Technol Assess*. 2014;18(47):i-xxiii, 1-75. doi:10.3310/hta18470
50. Hofsteenge GH, Chinapaw MJ, Delemarre-van de Waal HA, Weijs PJ. Long-term effect of the Go4it group treatment for obese adolescents: a randomised controlled trial. *Clin Nutr*. 2014;33(3):385-391. doi:10.1016/j.clnu.2013.06.002
51. Kong AP, Choi KC, Chan RS, et al. A randomized controlled trial to investigate the impact of a low glycemic index (GI) diet on body mass index in obese adolescents. *BMC Public Health*. 2014;14:180. doi:10.1186/1471-2458-14-180
52. Bocca G, Corpeleijn E, Stolk RP, Wolffenbuttel BH, Sauer PJ. Effect of obesity intervention programs on adipokines, insulin resistance, lipid profile, and low-grade inflammation in 3- to 5-y-old children. *Pediatr Res*. 2014;75(2):352-357. doi:10.1038/pr.2013.216
53. Stovitz SD, Berge JM, Wetzsteon RJ, Sherwood NE, Hannan PJ, Himes JH. Stage 1 treatment of pediatric overweight and obesity: a pilot and feasibility randomized controlled trial. *Child Obes*. 2014;10(1):50-57. doi:10.1089/chi.2013.0107
54. Savoye M, Caprio S, Dziura J, et al. Reversal of early abnormalities in glucose metabolism in obese youth: results of an intensive lifestyle randomized controlled trial. *Diabetes Care*. 2014;37(2):317-324. doi:10.2337/dc13-1571
55. Berkowitz RI, Rukstalis MR, Bishop-Gilyard CT, et al. Treatment of adolescent obesity comparing self-guided and group lifestyle modification programs: a potential model for primary care. *J Pediatr Psychol*. 2013;38(9):978-986. doi:10.1093/jpepsy/jst035
56. Davis AM, Sampilo M, Gallagher KS, Landrum Y, Malone B. Treating rural pediatric obesity through telemedicine: outcomes from a small randomized controlled trial. *J Pediatr Psychol*. 2013;38(9):932-943. doi:10.1093/jpepsy/jst005
57. Wake M, Lycett K, Clifford SA, et al. Shared care obesity management in 3-10 year old children: 12 month outcomes of HopSCOTCH randomised trial. *BMJ*. 2013;346:f3092. doi:10.1136/bmj.f3092
58. Bocca G, Corpeleijn E, Stolk RP, Sauer PJ. Results of a multidisciplinary treatment program in 3-year-old to 5-year-old overweight or obese children: a randomized controlled clinical trial. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med*. 2012;166(12):1109-1115. doi:10.1001/archpediatrics.2012.1638
59. DeBar LL, Stevens VJ, Perrin N, et al. A primary care-based, multicomponent lifestyle intervention for overweight adolescent females. *Pediatrics*. 2012;129(3):e611-e620. doi:10.1542/peds.2011-0863

60. Kalavainen M, Utriainen P, Vanninen E, Korppi M, Nuutinen O. Impact of childhood obesity treatment on body composition and metabolic profile. *World J Pediatr*. 2012;8(1):31-37. doi:10.1007/s12519-011-0324-2
61. Pedrosa C, Oliveira BM, Albuquerque I, Simões-Pereira C, Vaz-de-Almeida MD, Correia F. Metabolic syndrome, adipokines and ghrelin in overweight and obese schoolchildren: results of a 1-year lifestyle intervention programme. *Eur J Pediatr*. 2011;170(4):483-492. doi:10.1007/s00431-010-1316-2
62. Chae HW, Kwon YN, Rhie YJ, et al. Effects of a structured exercise program on insulin resistance, inflammatory markers and physical fitness in obese Korean children. *J Pediatr Endocrinol Metab*. 2010;23(10):1065-1072. doi:10.1515/jpem.2010.168
63. Jelalian E, Lloyd-Richardson EE, Mehlenbeck RS, et al. Behavioral weight control treatment with supervised exercise or peer-enhanced adventure for overweight adolescents. *J Pediatr*. 2010;157(6):923-928.e1. doi:10.1016/j.jpeds.2010.05.047
64. Ellis DA, Janisse H, Naar-King S, et al. The effects of multisystemic therapy on family support for weight loss among obese African-American adolescents: findings from a randomized controlled trial. *J Dev Behav Pediatr*. 2010;31(6):461-468. doi:10.1097/DBP.0b013e3181e35337
65. Faude O, Kerper O, Multhaupt M, et al. Football to tackle overweight in children. *Scand J Med Sci Sports*. 2010;20, suppl 1:103-110. doi:10.1111/j.1600-0838.2009.01087.x
66. Berntsen S, Mowinkel P, Carlsen KH, et al. Obese children playing towards an active lifestyle. *Int J Pediatr Obes*. 2010;5(1):64-71. doi:10.3109/17477160902957166
67. Díaz RG, Esparza-Romero J, Moya-Camarena SY, Robles-Sardín AE, Valencia ME. Lifestyle intervention in primary care settings improves obesity parameters among Mexican youth. *J Am Diet Assoc*. 2010;110(2):285-290. doi:10.1016/j.jada.2009.10.042
68. Kalarchian MA, Levine MD, Arslanian SA, et al. Family-based treatment of severe pediatric obesity: randomized, controlled trial. *Pediatrics*. 2009;124(4):1060-1068. doi:10.1542/peds.2008-3727
69. Weigel C, Kococinski K, Lederer P, Dötsch J, Rascher W, Knerr I. Childhood obesity: concept, feasibility, and interim results of a local group-based, long-term treatment program. *J Nutr Educ Behav*. 2008;40(6):369-373. doi:10.1016/j.jneb.2007.07.009
70. Kelishadi R, Hashemipour M, Mohammadifard N, Alikhassy H, Adeli K. Short- and long-term relationships of serum ghrelin with changes in body composition and the metabolic syndrome in prepubescent obese children following two different weight loss programmes. *Clin Endocrinol (Oxf)*. 2008;69(5):721-729. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2265.2008.03220.x
71. Nemet D, Barkan S, Epstein Y, Friedland O, Kowen G, Eliakim A. Short- and long-term beneficial effects of a combined dietary-behavioral-physical activity intervention for the treatment of childhood obesity. *Pediatrics*. 2005;115(4):e443-e449. doi:10.1542/peds.2004-2172
72. Doyle AC, Goldschmidt A, Huang C, Winzelberg AJ, Taylor CB, Wilfley DE. Reduction of overweight and eating disorder symptoms via the internet in adolescents: a randomized controlled trial. *J Adolesc Health*. 2008;43(2):172-179. doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2008.01.011
73. Hughes AR, Stewart L, Chapple J, et al. Randomized, controlled trial of a best-practice individualized behavioral program for treatment of childhood overweight: Scottish Childhood Overweight Treatment Trial (SCOTT). *Pediatrics*. 2008;121(3):e539-e546. doi:10.1542/peds.2007-1786
74. Johnston CA, Tyler C, Fullerton G, et al. Results of an intensive school-based weight loss program with overweight Mexican American children. *Int J Pediatr Obes*. 2007;2(3):144-152. doi:10.1080/17477160701305864
75. Savoye M, Shaw M, Dziura J, et al. Effects of a weight management program on body composition and metabolic parameters in overweight children: a randomized controlled trial. *JAMA*. 2007;297(24):2697-2704. doi:10.1001/jama.297.24.2697
76. Williamson DA, Walden HM, White MA, et al. Two-year internet-based randomized controlled trial for weight loss in African-American girls. *Obesity (Silver Spring)*. 2006;14(7):1231-1243. doi:10.1038/oby.2006.140
77. Epstein LH, Roemmich JN, Stein RI, Paluch RA, Kilanowski CK. The challenge of identifying behavioral alternatives to food: clinic and field studies. *Ann Behav Med*. 2005;30(3):201-209. doi:10.1207/s15324796abm3003_4
78. Balagopal P, George D, Yarandi H, Funanage V, Bayne E. Reversal of obesity-related hypoadiponectinemia by lifestyle intervention: a controlled, randomized study in obese adolescents. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab*. 2005;90(11):6192-6197. doi:10.1210/jc.2004-2427
79. Saelens BE, Sallis JF, Wilfley DE, Patrick K, Cella JA, Buchta R. Behavioral weight control for overweight adolescents initiated in primary care. *Obes Res*. 2002;10(1):22-32. doi:10.1038/oby.2002.4

80. Schwingshandl J, Sudi K, Eibl B, Wallner S, Borkenstein M. Effect of an individualised training programme during weight reduction on body composition: a randomised trial. *Arch Dis Child*. 1999;81(5):426-428. doi:10.1136/adc.81.5.426
81. Taylor RW, Cox A, Knight L, et al. A tailored family-based obesity intervention: a randomized trial. *Pediatrics*. 2015;136(2):281-289. doi:10.1542/peds.2015-0595
82. Gerards SM, Dagnelie PC, Gubbels JS, et al. The effectiveness of lifestyle triple P in the Netherlands: a randomized controlled trial. *PLoS One*. 2015;10(4):e0122240. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0122240
83. Kokkvoll A, Grimsgaard S, Ødegaard R, Flægstad T, Njølstad I. Single versus multiple-family intervention in childhood overweight-Finnmark Activity School: a randomised trial. *Arch Dis Child*. 2014;99(3):225-231. doi:10.1136/archdischild-2012-303571
84. Gesell SB, Scott TA, Barkin SL. Accuracy of perception of body size among overweight Latino preadolescents after a 6-month physical activity skills building intervention. *Clin Pediatr (Phila)*. 2010;49(4):323-329. doi:10.1177/0009922809339386
85. Golley RK, Magarey AM, Baur LA, Steinbeck KS, Daniels LA. Twelve-month effectiveness of a parent-led, family-focused weight-management program for prepubertal children: a randomized, controlled trial. *Pediatrics*. 2007;119(3):517-525. doi:10.1542/peds.2006-1746
86. Epstein LH, Paluch RA, Gordy CC, Saelens BE, Ernst MM. Problem solving in the treatment of childhood obesity. *J Consult Clin Psychol*. 2000;68(4):717-721. doi:10.1037/0022-006X.68.4.717
87. Hofsteenge GH, Weijs PJ, Delemarre-van de Waal HA, de Wit M, Chinapaw MJ. Effect of the Go4it multidisciplinary group treatment for obese adolescents on health related quality of life: a randomised controlled trial. *BMC Public Health*. 2013;13:939. doi:10.1186/1471-2458-13-939
88. Regaieg S, Charfi N, Kamoun M, et al. The effects of an exercise training program on body composition and aerobic capacity parameters in Tunisian obese children. *Indian J Endocrinol Metab*. 2013;17(6):1040-1045. doi:10.4103/2230-8210.122619
89. Stark LJ, Spear S, Boles R, et al. A pilot randomized controlled trial of a clinic and home-based behavioral intervention to decrease obesity in preschoolers. *Obesity (Silver Spring)*. 2011;19(1):134-141. doi:10.1038/oby.2010.87
90. Barkin SL, Gesell SB, Póe EK, Ip EH. Changing overweight Latino preadolescent body mass index: the effect of the parent-child dyad. *Clin Pediatr (Phila)*. 2011;50(1):29-36. doi:10.1177/0009922810379039
91. Kim JY, Kim ES, Jeon JY, Jekal Y. Improved insulin resistance, adiponectin and liver enzymes without change in plasma vaspin level after 12 weeks of exercise training among obese male adolescents. *Korean J Obes*. 2011;20:138-146. doi:10.7570/kjo.2011.20.3.138
92. Seo YG, Lim H, Kim Y, et al. The effect of a multidisciplinary lifestyle intervention on obesity status, body composition, physical fitness, and cardiometabolic risk markers in children and adolescents with obesity. *Nutrients*. 2019;11(1):E137. doi:10.3390/nu11010137
93. Soltero EG, Olson ML, Williams AN, et al. Effects of a community-based diabetes prevention program for latino youth with obesity: a randomized controlled trial. *Obesity (Silver Spring)*. 2018;26(12):1856-1865. doi:10.1002/oby.22300
94. Boff RM, Dornelles MA, Feoli AMP, Gustavo ADS, Oliveira MDS. Transtheoretical model for change in obese adolescents: MERC randomized clinical trial. *J Health Psychol*. 2018;1359105318793189. doi:10.1177/1359105318793189
95. Cvetković N, Stojanović E, Stojiljković N, Nikolić D, Scanlan AT, Milanović Z. Exercise training in overweight and obese children: recreational football and high-intensity interval training provide similar benefits to physical fitness. *Scand J Med Sci Sports*. 2018;28(suppl 1):18-32. doi:10.1111/sms.13241
96. Md Yusop NB, Mohd Shariff Z, Hwu TT, Abd Talib R, Spurrier N. The effectiveness of a stage-based lifestyle modification intervention for obese children. *BMC Public Health*. 2018;18(1):299. doi:10.1186/s12889-018-5206-2
97. Yackobovitch-Gavan M, Wolf Linhard D, Nagelberg N, et al. Intervention for childhood obesity based on parents only or parents and child compared with follow-up alone. *Pediatr Obes*. 2018;13(11):647-655. doi:10.1111/ijpo.12263
98. Wilfley DE, Saelens BE, Stein RI, et al. Dose, content, and mediators of family-based treatment for childhood obesity: a multisite randomized clinical trial. *JAMA Pediatr*. 2017;171(12):1151-1159. doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2017.2960
99. Anderson YC, Wynter LE, Grant CC, et al. A novel home-based intervention for child and adolescent obesity: the results of the Whānau Pakari randomized controlled trial. *Obesity (Silver Spring)*. 2017;25(11):1965-1973. doi:10.1002/oby.21967

100. Arlinghaus KR, Moreno JP, Reesor L, Hernandez DC, Johnston CA. Compañeros: high school students mentor middle school students to address obesity among Hispanic adolescents. *Prev Chronic Dis*. 2017;14:E92. doi:10.5888/pcd14.170130
101. Dias KA, Ingul CB, Tjønnå AE, et al. Effect of high-intensity interval training on fitness, fat mass and cardiometabolic biomarkers in children with obesity: a randomised controlled trial. *Sports Med*. 2018;48(3):733-746. doi:10.1007/s40279-017-0777-0
102. Butte NF, Hoelscher DM, Barlow SE, et al. Efficacy of a community- versus primary care-centered program for childhood obesity: TX CORD RCT. *Obesity (Silver Spring)*. 2017;25(9):1584-1593. doi:10.1002/oby.21929
103. Christie D, Hudson LD, Kinra S, et al. A community-based motivational personalised lifestyle intervention to reduce BMI in obese adolescents: results from the Healthy Eating and Lifestyle Programme (HELP) randomised controlled trial. *Arch Dis Child*. 2017;102(8):695-701. doi:10.1136/archdischild-2016-311586
104. Sauder KA, Dabelea D, Bailey-Callahan R, et al. Targeting risk factors for type 2 diabetes in American Indian youth: the Tribal Turning Point pilot study. *Pediatr Obes*. 2018;13(5):321-329. doi:10.1111/ijpo.12223
105. Cohen TR, Hazell TJ, Vanstone CA, Rodd C, Weiler HA. A family-centered lifestyle intervention for obese six- to eight-year-old children: results from a one-year randomized controlled trial conducted in Montreal, Canada. *Can J Public Health*. 2016;107(4-5):e453-e460. doi:10.17269/CJPH.107.5470
106. Wesnigk J, Bruyndonckx L, Hoymans VY, et al. Impact of lifestyle intervention on HDL-induced eNOS activation and cholesterol efflux capacity in obese adolescent. *Cardiol Res Pract*. 2016;2016:2820432. doi:10.1155/2016/2820432
107. Zehsaz F, Farhangi N, Ghahramani M. The response of circulating omentin-1 concentration to 16-week exercise training in male children with obesity. *Phys Sportsmed*. 2016;44(4):355-361. doi:10.1080/00913847.2016.1248223
108. Nobre GG, de Almeida MB, Nobre IG, et al. Twelve weeks of plyometric training improves motor performance of 7- to 9-year-old boys who were overweight/obese: a randomized controlled intervention. *J Strength Cond Res*. 2017;31(8):2091-2099. doi:10.1519/JSC.0000000000001684
109. Foster BA, Aquino CA, Gil M, Gelfond JA, Hale DE. A Pilot study of parent mentors for early childhood obesity. *J Obes*. 2016;2016:2609504. doi:10.1155/2016/2609504
110. Racil G, Coquart JB, Elmontassar W, et al. Greater effects of high- compared with moderate-intensity interval training on cardio-metabolic variables, blood leptin concentration and ratings of perceived exertion in obese adolescent females. *Biol Sport*. 2016;33(2):145-152. doi:10.5604/20831862.1198633
111. Davis AM, Stough CO, Black WR, et al. Outcomes of a weight management program conjointly addressing parent and child health. *Child Health Care*. 2016;45(2):227-240. doi:10.1080/02739615.2014.979923
112. Racil G, Zouhal H, Elmontassar W, et al. Plyometric exercise combined with high-intensity interval training improves metabolic abnormalities in young obese females more so than interval training alone. *Appl Physiol Nutr Metab*. 2016;41(1):103-109. doi:10.1139/apnm-2015-0384
113. Hay J, Wittmeier K, MacIntosh A, et al. Physical activity intensity and type 2 diabetes risk in overweight youth: a randomized trial. *Int J Obes (Lond)*. 2016;40(4):607-614. doi:10.1038/ijo.2015.241
114. Sigal RJ, Alberga AS, Goldfield GS, et al. Effects of aerobic training, resistance training, or both on percentage body fat and cardiometabolic risk markers in obese adolescents: the healthy eating aerobic and resistance training in youth randomized clinical trial. *JAMA Pediatr*. 2014;168(11):1006-1014. doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2014.1392
115. Shaibi GQ, Cruz ML, Ball GD, et al. Effects of resistance training on insulin sensitivity in overweight Latino adolescent males. *Med Sci Sports Exerc*. 2006;38(7):1208-1215. doi:10.1249/01.mss.0000227304.88406.0f
116. Whitlock EP, O'Connor EA, Williams SB, Beil TL, Lutz KW. Effectiveness of weight management interventions in children: a targeted systematic review for the USPSTF. *Pediatrics*. 2010;125(2):e396-e418. doi:10.1542/peds.2009-1955
117. Ho M, Garnett SP, Baur L, et al. Effectiveness of lifestyle interventions in child obesity: systematic review with meta-analysis. *Pediatrics*. 2012;130(6):e1647-e1671. doi:10.1542/peds.2012-1176
118. Harris KC, Kuramoto LK, Schulzer M, Retallack JE. Effect of school-based physical activity interventions on body mass index in children: a meta-analysis. *CMAJ*. 2009;180(7):719-726. doi:10.1503/cmaj.080966
119. Showell NN, Fawole O, Segal J, et al. A systematic review of home-based childhood obesity prevention studies. *Pediatrics*. 2013;132(1):e193-e200. doi:10.1542/peds.2013-0786
120. Bleich SN, Segal J, Wu Y, Wilson R, Wang Y. Systematic review of community-based childhood obesity prevention studies. *Pediatrics*. 2013;132(1):e201-e210. doi:10.1542/peds.2013-0886

121. Stock S, Miranda C, Evans S, et al. Healthy Buddies: a novel, peer-led health promotion program for the prevention of obesity and eating disorders in children in elementary school. *Pediatrics*. 2007;120(4):e1059-e1068. doi:10.1542/peds.2006-3003
122. Lorig K, Ritter PL, Villa FJ, Armas J. Community-based peer-led diabetes self-management: a randomized trial. *Diabetes Educ*. 2009;35(4):641-651. doi:10.1177/0145721709335006
123. Lorig K, Ritter PL, Villa F, Piette JD. Spanish diabetes self-management with and without automated telephone reinforcement: two randomized trials. *Diabetes Care*. 2008;31(3):408-414. doi:10.2337/dc07-1313
124. Park PH, Wambui CK, Atieno S, et al. Improving diabetes management and cardiovascular risk factors through peer-led self-management support groups in western Kenya. *Diabetes Care*. 2015;38(8):e110-e111. doi:10.2337/dc15-0353
125. Bennett D, Owen T, Bradley DT. *The £ for lb. Challenge*: evaluation of a novel, workplace-based peer-led weight management programme, 2014-2016. *Public Health*. 2017;150:93-100. doi:10.1016/j.puhe.2017.05.007
126. Neupane D, McLachlan CS, Mishra SR, et al. Effectiveness of a lifestyle intervention led by female community health volunteers versus usual care in blood pressure reduction (COBIN): an open-label, cluster-randomised trial. *Lancet Glob Health*. 2018;6(1):e66-e73. doi:10.1016/S2214-109X(17)30411-4
127. Miech RA, Kumanyika SK, Stettler N, Link BG, Phelan JC, Chang VW. Trends in the association of poverty with overweight among US adolescents, 1971-2004. *JAMA*. 2006;295(20):2385-2393. doi:10.1001/jama.295.20.2385
128. Elgar FJ, Pfortner TK, Moor I, De Clercq B, Stevens GW, Currie C. Socioeconomic inequalities in adolescent health 2002-2010: a time-series analysis of 34 countries participating in the Health Behaviour in School-Aged Children study. *Lancet*. 2015;385(9982):2088-2095. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(14)61460-4
129. Khetan AK, Purushothaman R, Chami T, et al. The effectiveness of community health workers for CVD prevention in LMIC. *Glob Heart*. 2017;12(3):233-243.e6. doi:10.1016/j.gheart.2016.07.001
130. Josephson RA, Khetan AK. Community health workers for blood pressure control in Nepal. *Lancet Glob Health*. 2018;6(1):e6-e7. doi:10.1016/S2214-109X(17)30455-2
131. Wood L, Egger M, Gluud LL, et al. Empirical evidence of bias in treatment effect estimates in controlled trials with different interventions and outcomes: meta-epidemiological study. *BMJ*. 2008;336(7644):601-605. doi:10.1136/bmj.39465.451748.AD

SUPPLEMENT.

eFigure 1. PRISMA Flow Diagram for Trials That Were Included in the Analyses

eFigure 2. Individual Results From Randomized Trials of Weight Loss Interventions Delivered by Professionals or Lay Persons on Weight Loss Among Overweight and Obese Children and Adolescents

eFigure 3. Bayesian Model Inference Data for Weight Change Immediately Following the Intervention

eFigure 4. Treatment Rankings for Intervention Types for Immediate and Long-term Weight Change

eTable 1. Search Strategy for Medline

eTable 2. Additional Statistical Methods

eTable 3. Baseline Characteristics of Included Randomized Clinical Trials

eTable 4. Cochrane Risk of Bias Assessment for Eligible RCTs

eTable 5. Mean and Median Probabilities of Treatment Ranks