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Over 25% of Australian children are overweight or obese (8% obese) = >1 million Australian children.

Almost 2 in 3 Australian adults (63%) were overweight or obese in 2014–15, similar to 2011–12.
**PEACH™ Program:** To enable parents to support healthy growth in their children via a whole-of-family lifestyle, parenting, problem-solving approach.

- **Concept and Intervention Developed**
- **Pilot/Feasibility Study** — Healthy Eating & Activity through Positive Parenting (HELPP)
- **Randomised Controlled Trial** — PEACH™ RCT
- **Small Scale Community Trial** — PEACH™ IC
- **Upscaled Community Program** — PEACH™ QLD

---

**Could parenting skills be a strategy to treat overweight in young children?**

**Clinical setting:** single-city RCT (Adelaide, SA)
- \( n = 111 \) children
- ~10% reduction in waistz after 12m (\( p<0.05 \))

**Clinical setting:** multi-city RCT (Adelaide and Sydney)
- \( n = 169 \) children
- Significant ~10% reduction in BMIz after 6m, **maintained** up to 24m post-baseline

**Community setting** (Adelaide)
- \( n = 78 \) children
- Significant ~6% reduction in BMIz after 6m
- Trained local practitioners as program facilitators

**State-wide community setting** (Queensland)
- \( n = 1122 \) children
- Trained local practitioners as program facilitators
- Significant ~5% reduction in BMIz after 6m

---

**Moores et al BMC Public Health 2017**
The PEACH™ approach aligns with WHO recommendation 6

Provide family-based, multicomponent, lifestyle weight management services for children and young people who are obese

Next generation research questions

• How can programs be integrated into existing service delivery opportunities?
• How can the program impact be enhanced, including at scale?
• How can the program be tailored for specific populations?
A narrative account of implementation lessons learnt from the dissemination of an up-scaled state-wide child obesity management program in Australia: PEACH™ (Parenting, Eating and Activity for Child Health) Queensland

Highlights

- Translation of a child weight management intervention to practice is described.
- Organisational and political changes prevented maximum reach and adoption.

Parent engagement and attendance in PEACH™ QLD – an up-scaled parent-led childhood obesity program

Enrolment of families with overweight children into a program aimed at reducing childhood obesity with and without a weight criterion: a natural experiment.
Feasibility of a group-based, facilitator-directed online family lifestyle program

Lucinda K Bell, Rebecca Golley, Carly J Moores, Rebecca Perry, Jo Hartley, Michelle Miller, Louisa Matwiejczyk, Jacqueline Miller, Anthea M Magarey

Channel 7 Children’s Research Foundation
Methods

Objectives:
To deliver PEACH™ Lifestyle as a facilitated group-based online program

Design and sample:
Pre-post feasibility study with parents (n=79) of children aged 7.9±2.9 years (25% healthy weight, 23% obese).

Online program:
Website with self directed learning modules (n=10) and facilitated group-based video conferencing sessions (n=6)
Results

- All parents would recommend program to others
  - 90% families reported household lifestyle changes BUT

- Engagement with web content and video conferencing sessions was low
  - Only half of parents attended at least one video conferencing session (n=1 all six)
  - Only 33% of parents completed all 10 online modules

- Lack of time was a barriers to engagement.

- PEACH™ Lifestyle may promote healthy lifestyles.
- The potential for digital health technologies to address barriers to engagement were not realised.
“Thinking outside the box”: novel touchpoints for obesity prevention

- How to support health professionals to support parents/caregivers?
- What should the messaging to caregivers be around child obesity to increase awareness and motivation?
- How to integrate child obesity prevention into existing service structures?
- Nominal group technique process
- Stakeholder group workshops
- Idea generation, collate, clarify, collapse, consensus
- Second half of 2019
whole-of-community obesity prevention
Reach the multitude of settings where children and families live, eat, work or learn. Empower families to eat appropriately and be active.
Australian children’s diet quality

- Meta-analysis of 21 schools programs n=26,361
  - fruit intake (excluding juice) +0.24 portions (95%CI 0.05, 0.43)
  - vegetable intake +0.07 portions (95%CI: 0.03, 0.16)

- Overall diet quality
  - DGI-CA is a measure of compliance with dietary guidelines including recommended serves, healthier choices and diet variety
  - Median **DGI-CA total score 48.3 out of 100** (IQR 47.5, 48.9) of 2-16yo children national survey

Australian children’s intake of discretionary choice

99% exceed recommendations for unhealthy foods (ABS 2014)

Discretionary choices contribute >25% to ~40% of children’s energy intake (ABS 2014)

Increase risk of chronic disease (NHMRC 2013, Ogata & Hayes 2014)

Displace core foods from the diet (Hess & Slavin 2014)
How can we support parents?

First, need to understand:

- Children’s current intake

Dietary approaches to reduce unhealthy foods:
- moderation
- substitution
- reformulation

What skills and supports parents already have and where additional supports are needed.
What supports are needed

• Simply knowing unhealthy foods should be limited and wanting to limit provision is not enough to see action
  • ~80% know the dietary guidelines
  • High concern for excessive unhealthy food intake, in general and for their child
  • 50% intended to change provision
  • Children exceeded recommended limits of unhealthy foods

• But what is needed?
  • Range of qualitative literature relating to current eating patterns highlighting the barriers and enablers to healthy (and unhealthy) eating patterns.
The influence of cost, time, food availability, child resistance, support from co-parents and friends on parents’ provision of snacks to their children: **A discrete choice experiment**

B Johnson, Dorota Zarnowiecki, Gilly Hendrie, Elisabeth Huynh, Rebecca Golley
Background

Current gaps in research examining barriers / influences:

- to reducing unhealthy food provision, relative importance
- in social and non-social occasions.

(Petrunoff et al. 2012; Pettigrew et al. 2017)

Aim to compare the relative importance of physical resources and social supports when parents are choosing snacks to provide to their 3-7 year old child in social and non-social occasions.
Methods – discrete choice experiments
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Methods – discrete choice experiments

**Common approaches:**
- Self-reported barriers
- Check boxes
- Ranking

Factors

Choice task

Relative importance of factors

TRADE-OFFS

(Louviere, Hensher & Swait 2000)
Methods

Online discrete choice experiment (5 choice tasks per social context per parent)
Scenarios: snack provision on a Saturday with or without family friends present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Snack A</th>
<th>Snack B</th>
<th>Neither</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost of snack</td>
<td>Cheaper</td>
<td>More expensive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to prepare</td>
<td>Quick</td>
<td>Quick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your child’s likely response</td>
<td>Resistant</td>
<td>Accepting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant family members (e.g. co-parent)</td>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>Unsupportive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family friends</td>
<td>Unsupportive</td>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of food</td>
<td>Everyday foods</td>
<td>Sometimes foods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Which would you choose?</strong></td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results

225 parents completed the study

1125 choice decisions per social context

Parents:
- 99.6% mothers
- 94.7% living with partner
- 51.6% of parents were employed part-time

Children:
- Child mean age 5.2y (SD 1.3)
- 56% healthy wt
- 15% overweight
- 15% with obesity

72.5% of parents had tertiary degree or higher

Socio-economic status:
- Lower 14.7%
- 14.7%
- 23.7%
- 25.9%
- Higher 21.0%
Results

Non-social occasion:
1) Food availability
2) Child resistance
3) Co-parent support

Social occasion:
1) Child resistance
2) Food availability
3) Co-parent support

Cost - more expensive
Time - quick
Time - more time consuming
Child - resistance
Co-parent - supportive
Friends - supportive
Type of food - everyday foods

* p < 0.01
n.s. p > 0.05
Take home message

Our study highlights the relative importance of home food availability, the influence of children and co-parent support in parent snack provision decision making, regardless of social context.
Family resource drivers of unhealthy food intake in Australian toddlers

Mrs Chelsea Mauch, APD, BNutrdiet, BSc (Hons), PhD candidate

Co-authors:
Dr Tom Wycherley, University of South Australia
Dr Rachel Laws, Deakin University
Dr Rebecca Byrne, Queensland University of Technology
Dr Lucinda Bell, Flinders University
Associate Professor Rebecca Golley, Flinders University
Aim
To explore sociodemographic characteristics as resource-related drivers of unhealthy food intake in toddlers
**Methods**

- 2yo Australian children - 2008 to 2014 (Daniels et al, 2009; Byrne et al, 2014)
  - Demographic data - birth, 4-7mo and 2 yrs
  - 2-3 days of dietary intake data – 2 yrs

- **Outcome:** proportion daily energy intake from unhealthy foods

- **Predictors:**
  - Maternal working hours: Not working, 1 to <21hrs/wk, 21 to <35hrs/wk, 35+ hrs/wk
  - Paternal working hours: Not working, 1 to <35hrs/wk, 35 to 40hrs/wk, >40hrs/wk
  - Household income: > and < 50k (AUD) per annum

- **Covariates:** family, parental and child factors
Results

- Median age 2 yrs
- 55% only child in household
- 54% female
- 20% 85% of families income > 50k
- 40% mothers not yet returned to work
- 57% fathers working 35 to 40 hours / wk

Flinders University
## Results – Multiple regression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>B (95% CI)</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maternal working hours (21 to &lt;35hrs/wk vs not working)</td>
<td>2.81 (0.27, 5.35)</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.030*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal working hours (more than 40 hrs vs 35 to 40 hrs)</td>
<td>-1.96 (-4.06, 0.14)</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household income</td>
<td>-4.60 (-7.48, -1.72)</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.002**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td><strong>0.117 (p&lt;0.001)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Controlling for family structure, parental factors and child factors
- Covert restriction, child satiety responsiveness & slowness in eating and rewarding for eating also contributed significantly to the model
0.5 serves fruit
1 small mandarin (75g)

1.5 serves vegetables
120g peas, corn, carrot
**What we know:**

- Prior research suggests a non-linear relationship between maternal work hrs & weight / weight-related behaviours (Li et al, 2017; Brown et al, 2014)
- Research in older children, with maternal (not paternal) work hours & weight as outcome
- Low income assoc with diet quality in adult & child/adolescent samples (Darmon et al, 2008)

**What this study adds:**

- Non-linear relationship between maternal time & toddlers diet quality
- Independent of fathers work hours & other covariates
- Interplay between resources / how we ‘flex’ or use resources may be important

**Where to from here:**

- Investigate weight outcomes
- Repeat model for main meals / snacks
- Consider measurement of time use to better understand time scarcity
- Perception of time scarcity
Conclusions

- Recipe / recipe managers, meal planners, family organisers, with integrated meal planning and shopping list generation
  - Scored well for functionality, and incorporated a range of behavioural support features for addressing food provision
- Apps biased toward ‘planning’ behaviours
- Features mapped to relatively few Behaviour Change Techniques
- Failure to capitalise on Ecological Momentary Intervention
- Low engagement rating a concern
- **Future apps** – focus on engagement & incorporation of BCT’s, features that reduce burden of food provision
https://www.earlychildhoodobesity.com/
VegKIT: developing tools and interventions to increase vegetable intake by Australian kids

Australia’s leading experts in nutrition have come together to increase children’s vegetable consumption.

1. Setting the scene
- We value the health of children and their future.
- It’s estimated that only five percent of Australian children are consuming the recommended serves of vegetables.
- Australia’s leading nutrition experts have come together for a new five-year project to help address the significant underconsumption of vegetables by Australian children.
- Hort Innovation has funded researchers from CSIRO, Flinders University and Nutrition Australia to deliver a national integrated approach to improving vegetable consumption, through education of children, training for educators and engagement with industry.

2. Translating the research
- We’ll review the latest evidence and findings to develop best practice guidelines for a range of stakeholders including educators, health practitioners and researchers to increase vegetable intake.

3. Foundation for policy
- Updated dietary advice for maternal, infant and early years, using evidence based knowledge of flavour exposure and food preference development, to facilitate vegetable acceptance.

4. Increase knowledge, co-ordinate efforts and influence policy
- A national online register of initiatives for the community to increase children’s vegetable intake.
- Development and coordination of a Vegetable Intake Strategic Alliance (VISA) made up of cross-sector stakeholders.

5. Interventions
- Initiatives in the community (for long day-care settings) to increase children’s vegetable intake.
- Supply chain initiatives (industry innovations and early Primary school settings) to increase children’s vegetable intake.

Flinders University
Australia
Hort Innovation
Nourish Port Lincoln
Horticulture Futures
Dunbarton Farms Kitchen

This project has been funded by Hort Innovation, using the vegetable research and development levy and contributions from the Australian Government. Hort Innovation is the grower-owned, not-for-profit research and development corporation for Australian horticulture.
For research into better care and health outcomes
CARING FUTURES INSTITUTE


The Caring Futures Institute, to be officially launched in August 2019, will be Australia’s first ever fully dedicated research centre for the study of self-care and caring solutions leading to better lives, better communities and better health systems.

Vision
To redefine how self-care and caring inform and positively impact health outcomes, quality of life and social and economic prosperity for all across the lifespan.

Mission
Our mission is to co-design innovative and self-care and caring solutions with consumers, carers, industry, government and health services that lead to better lives, better communities and better health systems.

Engaging strongly with leading care industry and healthcare professionals, this expert body will pioneer outcome-driven applied research, redefining how caring informs and impacts health outcomes, quality of life and social and economic prosperity, bringing together multiple academic and clinical disciplines.