Behavioral interventions to reduce obesity for adults: Low-intensity, in-person programs

Health Care: Obesity and Diabetes

Benefit-cost estimates updated December 2023. Literature review updated December 2014.

Current estimates replace old estimates. Numbers will change over time as a result of model inputs and monetization methods.

The WSIPP benefit-cost analysis examines, on an apples-to-apples basis, the monetary value of programs or policies to determine whether the benefits from the program exceed its costs. WSIPP's research approach to identifying evidence-based programs and policies has three main steps. First, we determine "what works" (and what does not work) to improve outcomes using a statistical technique called meta-analysis. Second, we calculate whether the benefits of a program exceed its costs. Third, we estimate the risk of investing in a program by testing the sensitivity of our results. For more detail on our methods, see our Technical Documentation.

Program Description: Behavioral interventions for obesity include behavioral counseling, therapy, and educational components—often including diet and exercise components. For this review of interventions for obese adults, we excluded studies that targeted diabetic populations as well as those aimed at preventing obesity.

Programs in this specific category are delivered to obese adults, and conducted face-to-face, with fewer than 12 sessions a year or for less than 12 months.

Benefit-Cost Summary Statistics Per Participant

Benefits to:

Taxpayers	$63
Participants	$119
Others	$33
Indirect	($61)
Total benefits	$154
Net program cost	($217)
Benefits minus cost	($63)

Benefit to cost ratio	$0.71
Benefits minus costs	($63)
Chance the program will produce benefits greater than the costs	49%

The estimates shown are present value, life cycle benefits and costs. All dollars are expressed in the base year chosen for this analysis (2022). The chance the benefits exceed the costs are derived from a Monte Carlo risk analysis. The details on this, as well as the economic discount rates and other relevant parameters are described in our Technical Documentation.

Meta-Analysis of Program Effects

Outcomes measured	Treatment age	No. of effect sizes	Treatment N	Adjusted effect sizes and standard errors used in the benefit-cost analysis						Unadjusted effect size (random effects model)	
				First time ES is estimated			Second time ES is estimated				
				ES	SE	Age	ES	SE	Age	ES	p-value
Weight change	51	10	1004	-0.084	0.057	51	0.000	0.012	53	-0.084	0.138
Diastolic blood pressure^	51	6	697	-0.146	0.073	51	n/a	n/a	n/a	-0.146	0.047
Systolic blood pressure^	51	6	697	-0.112	0.078	51	n/a	n/a	n/a	-0.112	0.154
HDL cholesterol^	51	4	474	0.069	0.181	51	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.069	0.705
LDL cholesterol^	51	4	474	-0.205	0.100	51	n/a	n/a	n/a	-0.205	0.041
Obesity	51	4	554	-0.040	0.079	51	0.000	0.086	53	-0.040	0.610

^WSIPP's benefit-cost model does not monetize this outcome.

Meta-analysis is a statistical method to combine the results from separate studies on a program, policy, or topic in order to estimate its effect on an outcome. WSIPP systematically evaluates all credible evaluations we can locate on each topic. The outcomes measured are the types of program impacts that were measured in the research literature (for example, crime or educational attainment). Treatment N represents the total number of individuals or units in the treatment group across the included studies.

An effect size (ES) is a standard metric that summarizes the degree to which a program or policy affects a measured outcome. If the effect size is positive, the outcome increases. If the effect size is negative, the outcome decreases.

Adjusted effect sizes are used to calculate the benefits from our benefit cost model. WSIPP may adjust effect sizes based on methodological characteristics of the study. For example, we may adjust effect sizes when a study has a weak research design or when the program developer is involved in the research. The magnitude of these adjustments varies depending on the topic area.

WSIPP may also adjust the second ES measurement. Research shows the magnitude of some effect sizes decrease over time. For those effect sizes, we estimate outcome-based adjustments which we apply between the first time ES is estimated and the second time ES is estimated. We also report the unadjusted effect size to show the effect sizes before any adjustments have been made. More details about these adjustments can be found in our Technical Documentation.

Detailed Monetary Benefit Estimates Per Participant

Affected outcome:	Resulting benefits:[1]	Benefits accrue to:				
		Taxpayers	Participants	Others[2]	Indirect[3]	Total
Obesity	Labor market earnings associated with obesity	$46	$109	$0	$0	$155
Obesity	Health care associated with obesity	$16	$7	$33	$8	$63
Obesity	Mortality associated with obesity	$1	$3	$0	$40	$44
Program cost	Adjustment for deadweight cost of program	$0	$0	$0	($109)	($109)
Totals		$63	$119	$33	($61)	$154

[1]In addition to the outcomes measured in the meta-analysis table, WSIPP measures benefits and costs estimated from other outcomes associated with those reported in the evaluation literature. For example, empirical research demonstrates that high school graduation leads to reduced crime. These associated measures provide a more complete picture of the detailed costs and benefits of the program.

[2]"Others" includes benefits to people other than taxpayers and participants. Depending on the program, it could include reductions in crime victimization, the economic benefits from a more educated workforce, and the benefits from employer-paid health insurance.

[3]"Indirect benefits" includes estimates of the net changes in the value of a statistical life and net changes in the deadweight costs of taxation.

Detailed Annual Cost Estimates Per Participant

	Annual cost	Year dollars	Summary	
Program costs	$182	2014	Present value of net program costs (in 2022 dollars)	($217)
Comparison costs	$0	2014	Cost range (+ or -)	25%

On average, these programs provide approximately six contact hours over seven months, including both group and individual sessions. The average per-participant cost of these programs was computed using contact hours and average Washington State 2014 hourly wages of the appropriate professionals who conducted the intervention (generally dietitians, nurses, general practitioners, or therapists).

The figures shown are estimates of the costs to implement programs in Washington. The comparison group costs reflect either no treatment or treatment as usual, depending on how effect sizes were calculated in the meta-analysis. The cost range reported above reflects potential variation or uncertainty in the cost estimate; more detail can be found in our Technical Documentation.

Benefits Minus Costs Over Time (Cumulative Discounted Dollars)



The graph above illustrates the estimated cumulative net benefits per-participant for the first fifty years beyond the initial investment in the program. We present these cash flows in discounted dollars. If the dollars are negative (bars below $0 line), the cumulative benefits do not outweigh the cost of the program up to that point in time. The program breaks even when the dollars reach $0. At this point, the total benefits to participants, taxpayers, and others, are equal to the cost of the program. If the dollars are above $0, the benefits of the program exceed the initial investment.

Benefits by Perspective Over Time (Cumulative Discounted Dollars)



The graph above illustrates the breakdown of the estimated cumulative benefits (not including program costs) per-participant for the first fifty years beyond the initial investment in the program. These cash flows provide a breakdown of the classification of dollars over time into four perspectives: taxpayer, participant, others, and indirect. “Taxpayers” includes expected savings to government and expected increases in tax revenue. “Participants” includes expected increases in earnings and expenditures for items such as health care and college tuition. “Others” includes benefits to people other than taxpayers and participants. Depending on the program, it could include reductions in crime victimization, the economic benefits from a more educated workforce, and the benefits from employer-paid health insurance. “Indirect benefits” includes estimates of the changes in the value of a statistical life and changes in the deadweight costs of taxation. If a section of the bar is below the $0 line, the program is creating a negative benefit, meaning a loss of value from that perspective.

Taxpayer Benefits by Source of Value Over Time (Cumulative Discounted Dollars)



The graph above focuses on the subset of estimated cumulative benefits that accrue to taxpayers. The cash flows are divided into the source of the value.

Citations Used in the Meta-Analysis

Cooper, Z., Doll, H.A., Hawker, D.M., Byrne, S., Bonner, G., Eeley, E., O'Connor, M.E., & Fairburn, C.G. (2010). Testing a new cognitive behavioural treatment for obesity: A randomized controlled trial with three-year follow-up. *Behaviour Research and Therapy, 48*(2010), 706-713

Davis, M.P., Rhode, P.C., Dutton, G.R., Redmann, S.M., Ryan, D.H., & Brantley, P J. (2006). A primary care weight management intervention for low-income African-American women. *Obesity, 14*(8), 1412-1420.

Hardcastle, S., Taylor, A., Bailey, M., & Castle, R. (2008). A randomised controlled trial on the effectiveness of a primary health care based counselling intervention on physical activity, diet and CHD risk factors. *Patient Education and Counseling, 70*(1), 31-39.

Jolly, K., Lewis, A., Beach, J., Denley, J., Adab, P., Deeks, J.J., Daley, A., & Aveyard, P. (2011). Comparison of range of commercial or primary care led weight reduction programmes with minimal intervention control for weight loss in obesity: Lighten Up randomised controlled trial. *BMJ,* 343.

Miller, E.R. ., Erlinger, T.P., Young, D.R., Jehn, M., Charleston, J., Rhodes, D., Wasan, S.K., & Appel, L.J. (2002). Results of the Diet, Exercise, and Weight Loss Intervention Trial (DEW-IT). *Hypertension, 40*(5), 612-618.

Nanchahal, K., Power, T., Holdsworth, E., Hession, M., Sorhaindo, A., Griffiths, U., Townsend, J., Thorogood, N., Haslam, D., Kessel, A., Ebrahim, S., Kenward, M., & Haines, A. (2012). A pragmatic randomised controlled trial in primary care of the Camden Weight Loss (CAMWEL) programme. *BMJ, 2*(3).

Sniehotta, F.F., Dombrowski, S.U., Avenell, A., Johnston, M., McDonald, S., Murchie, P., Ramsay, C.R., Robertson, K., & Araujo-Soares, V. (2011). Randomised controlled feasibility trial of an evidence-informed behavioural intervention for obese adults with additional risk factors. *PloS One, 6*(8).

ter Bogt, N.C., Bemelmans, W.J., Beltman, F.W., Broer, J., Smit, A.J., & van der Meer, K. (2009). Preventing weight gain: one-year results of a randomized lifestyle intervention. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 37*(4), 270-277.

Tsai, A.G., Wadden, T.A., Rogers, M.A., Day, S.C., Moore, R.H., & Islam, B.J. (2010). A primary care intervention for weight loss: results of a randomized controlled pilot study. *Obesity, 18*(8), 1614-1618.

Yardley, L., Ware, L.J., Smith, E.R., Williams, S., Bradbury, K.J., Arden-Close, E.J., Mullee, M.A., Moore, M.V., Peacock, J.L., Lean, M.E.J., Margetts, B.M., Byrne, C.D., Hobbs, R.F.D., & Little, P. (2014). Randomised controlled feasibility trial of a web-based weight management intervention with nurse support for obese patients in primary care. *The International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity, 11*(67), 1-11.

For further information, contact:
(360) 664-9800, institute@wsipp.wa.gov

Printed on 03-22-2024

Washington State Institute for Public Policy

The Washington State Legislature created the Washington State Insititute for Public Policy in 1983. A Board of Directors-representing the legislature, the governor, and public universities-governs WSIPP and guides the development of all activities. WSIPP's mission is to carry out practical research, at legislative direction, on issues of importance to Washington State.