

Free-Living Energy Balance Behaviors Are Associated With Greater Weight Loss During a Weight Loss Program

MYERS, Anna <<http://orcid.org/0000-0001-6432-8628>>, CAMIDGE, Diana, CRODEN, Fiona, GIBBONS, Catherine, STUBBS, R. James, BLUNDELL, John, FINLAYSON, Graham and BUCKLAND, Nicola

Available from Sheffield Hallam University Research Archive (SHURA) at:

<http://shura.shu.ac.uk/29104/>

This document is the author deposited version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

Published version

MYERS, Anna, CAMIDGE, Diana, CRODEN, Fiona, GIBBONS, Catherine, STUBBS, R. James, BLUNDELL, John, FINLAYSON, Graham and BUCKLAND, Nicola (2021). Free-Living Energy Balance Behaviors Are Associated With Greater Weight Loss During a Weight Loss Program. *Frontiers in Nutrition*, 8.

Copyright and re-use policy

See <http://shura.shu.ac.uk/information.html>

Supplementary Material

1 Supplementary Data

Supplementary table 1. LOCF hierarchical linear regression analyses predicting change in % BM between baseline and week 14 from early-late change in movement and eating behaviours.

Model	Variables	B (95% CI)	SE B	β	p	F	R ²	ΔR^2
Predictor variable: Early-late change (Δ) in movement and eating behaviours								
2	-	-	-	-	-	28.30	.71	.02
	Constant	-2.82 (-3.67, -1.97)	0.43	-	< .001	-	-	-
	Programme type	-1.13 (-2.30, 0.05)	0.59	-0.13	= .060	-	-	-
	Δ Vigorous PA (min/d)	-0.48 (-0.62, -0.33)	0.07	-0.46	< .001	-	-	-
	Δ Total EE (kcal/d)	0.03 (0.03, 0.04)	0.01	1.74	< .001	-	-	-
	Δ Moderate PA (min/d)	-0.14 (-0.17, -0.10)	0.02	-1.12	< .001	-	-	-
	Δ Light PA (min/d)	-0.05 (-0.07, -0.04)	0.01	-0.75	< .001	-	-	-
	Energy density (kcal/g)	2.18 (0.21, 4.16)	0.99	0.14	= .031	-	-	-

Unstandardised beta (B), standard error for the unstandardised beta (SE B), standardised beta (β), N = 77.

Model two was conducted using the LOCF sample.

Supplementary table 2. LOCF analyses exploring change in energy expenditure (EE), free-living physical activity (from light to vigorous physical activity [PA]), sedentary behaviour (SB), energy intake and macronutrient composition between week 3 and 12. Data are adjusted $M \pm SD$ (95% confidence intervals).

	Group n	Week 3 (early)	Week 12 (late)	Early-late change (Δ)
Total EE (kcal/d)	CWL 40	2605.257 \pm 346.69 (2495.90, 2714.61)	2553.877 \pm 362.42 (2439.56, 2668.20)	-51.38 \pm 233.36 (-124.98, 22.23)
	NWL 32	2572.882 \pm 347.74 (2450.25, 2695.52)	2541.994 \pm 64.26 (2413.80, 2670.19)	-30.89 \pm 234.06 (-113.43, 51.66)
Light PA (min/d)	CWL 40	199.19 \pm 72.26 (176.40, 221.99)	189.15 \pm 76.74 (164.94, 213.35)	-10.04 \pm 62.28 (-29.69, 9.60)
	NWL 32	185.52 \pm 72.49 (159.96, 211.09)	167.43 \pm 76.97 (140.28, 194.58)	-18.09 \pm 62.46 (-40.12, 3.93)
Moderate PA (min/d)	CWL 40	74.64 \pm 47.08 (59.79, 89.48)	86.80 \pm 53.75 (69.85, 103.76)	12.17 \pm 37.03 (0.486, 23.85)
	NWL 32	65.06 \pm 47.22 (48.41, 81.72)	63.99 \pm 53.91 (44.98, 83.00)	-1.07 \pm 37.14 (-14.17, 12.03)
Vigorous PA (min/d) †	CWL 40	2.10 \pm 3.65 (0.95, 3.25)	3.99 \pm 4.81 (2.47, 5.51)	1.89 \pm 4.31 (0.53, 3.25)*
	NWL 32	1.20 \pm 3.66 (-0.09, 2.49)	0.72 \pm 4.83 (-.98, 2.42)	-0.48 \pm 4.32 (-2.00, 1.05)
SB (min/d)	CWL 40	719.58 \pm 95.69 (689.40, 749.76)	710.29 \pm 105.43 (677.03, 743.55)	-9.29 \pm 93.28 (-38.71, 20.13)

	NWL	32	740.60 ± 95.98 (706.76, 774.45)	756.26 ± 105.75 (718.96, 793.55)	15.65 ± 93.56 (-17.34, 48.65)
	CWL	41	1558.50 ± 464.34 (1413.91, 1703.10)	1558.96 ± 455.11 (1417.24, 1700.69)	0.46 ± 388.72 (-120.59, 121.51)
Total EI (kcal/d)	NWL	33	1710.02 ± 465.97 (1548.28, 1871.75)	1606.19 ± 456.71 (1447.66, 1764.72)	-103.83 ± 390.10 (-239.23, 31.58)
	CWL	41	46.15 ± 6.29 (44.19, 48.10)	44.85 ± 8.13 (42.32, 47.39)	-5.91 ± 45.65 (-20.13, 8.30)
Carbohydrate intake (%)	NWL	33	43.38 ± 6.31 (41.19, 45.57)	41.99 ± 8.16 (39.17, 44.83)	-12.43 ± 45.81 (-28.33, 3.47)
	CWL	41	31.96 ± 4.62 (30.52, 33.40)	32.73 ± 5.89 (30.90, 34.57)	1.88 ± 19.83 (-4.30, 8.05)
Fat intake (%) †	NWL	33	33.68 ± 4.64 (32.07, 35.29)	35.74 ± 5.92 (33.68, 37.79)	-1.75 ± 19.90 (-8.66, 5.16)
	CWL	41	19.08 ± 3.00 (18.15, 20.02)	18.96 ± 3.59 (17.84, 20.08)	-0.83 ± 17.63 (-6.32, 4.66)
Protein intake (%)	NWL	33	19.53 ± 3.02 (18.48, 20.57)	19.88 ± 3.60 (18.63, 21.13)	0.36 ± 4.13 (-1.12, 1.84)
	CWL	41	1.24 ± 0.29 (1.15, 1.33) ^a	1.36 ± 0.32 (1.25, 1.45)	0.11 ± 0.30 (0.02, 0.21)
Energy density (kcal/g) †	NWL	33	1.42 ± 0.30 (1.31, 1.52) ^a	1.49 ± 0.32 (1.38, 1.60)	0.08 ± 0.30 (-0.03, 0.18)

Data from the SenseWear Armband were missing for 2 participants because they did not want to wear the SWA or they did not comply with the wear procedure. Asterisks indicates early-late change is significant (* $p < .05$); † indicates main effect of group is significant; and when necessary superscript letters are used to indicate differences between groups, i.e., the same letter is used for any pair when there is a significant difference observed (if bold $p < 0.01$, otherwise $p < 0.05$).

2 Supplementary data

2.1 Between group comparison of changes in body mass index and body composition

BMI significantly differed between all three time points [$\eta p^2 = 0.256$; $p < .001$; post hoc results all $p < .001$], see table 3. There was also a week x group interaction [$\eta p^2 = 0.511$; $p < .001$] that revealed that compared with NWL, CWL had a significantly greater reduction in BMI at all three timepoints: baseline and week 2 [CWL: $-1.16 \pm 0.43 \text{ kg/m}^2$ (-1.29, -1.03 kg/m^2); NWL: $-0.57 \pm 0.43 \text{ kg/m}^2$ (-0.72, -0.43 kg/m^2), $\eta p^2 = 0.321$; $p < .001$]; baseline and week 14 [CWL: $-2.68 \pm 0.97 \text{ kg/m}^2$ (-2.98, -2.38 kg/m^2); NWL: $-0.43 \pm 0.98 \text{ kg/m}^2$ (-0.77, -0.09 kg/m^2), $\eta p^2 = 0.570$; $p < .001$]; and weeks 2 and 14 [CWL: $-1.52 \pm 0.90 \text{ kg/m}^2$ (-1.80, -1.24 kg/m^2); NWL: $0.15 \pm 0.90 \text{ kg/m}^2$ (-0.17, -0.46 kg/m^2), $\eta p^2 = 0.459$; $p < .001$]. There was a significant interaction between week and programme type for BMI [$p = .04$].

On average, FM was higher early in the intervention (week 2 [$41.91 \pm 7.26 \text{ kg}$ (39.35, 44.48 kg)] compared to late in the intervention (week 14 [$40.00 \pm 6.99 \text{ kg}$ (37.45, 42.56 kg), $\eta p^2 = 0.157$; $p = .01$]). CWL experienced a significant early-late decrease in FM [$-3.83 \pm 2.14 \text{ kg}$ (-4.60, -3.06 kg)] whereas NWL did not [$0.01 \pm 2.18 \text{ kg}$ (-0.79, 0.81 kg), $\eta p^2 = 0.438$; $p < .001$]. The main effect of group was not significant [$\eta p^2 = 0.052$; $p = .08$]. Similarly, for FFM the main effect of week and group and the week x group interaction were not significant [largest $\eta p^2 = 0.044$; smallest $p = .11$].