

## Three-Year Maintenance of Improved Diet and Physical Activity.(Statistical Data Included)

by Philip R. Nader, Elaine J. Stone, Leslie A. Lytle, Cheryl L. Perry, Stavroula K. Osganian, Steve Kelder, Larry S. Webber, John P. Elder, Deanna Montgomery, Henry A. Feldman, Margaret Wu, Carolyn Johnson, Guy S. Parcel and Russell V. Luepker

**Objective:** To assess differences through grade 8 in diet, physical activity, and related health indicators of students who participated in the Child and Adolescent Trial for Cardiovascular Health (CATCH) school and family intervention from grades 3 through 5.

**Design:** Follow-up of the 4-center, randomized, controlled field trial with 56 intervention and 40 control elementary schools.

**Participants:** We studied 3714 (73%) of the initial CATCH cohort of 5106 students from ethnically diverse backgrounds in California, Louisiana, Minnesota, and Texas at grades 6, 7, and 8.

**Results:** Self-reported daily energy intake from fat at baseline was virtually identical in the control (32.7%) and intervention (32.6%) groups. At grade 5, the intake for controls remained at 32.2%, while the intake for the intervention group declined to 30.3% ( $P$ [is less than] .001). At grade 8, the between-group differential was maintained (31.6% vs 30.6%,  $P = .01$ ). Intervention students maintained significantly higher self-reported daily vigorous activity than control students ( $P = .001$ ), although the difference declined from 13.6 minutes in grade 5 to 11.2, 10.8, and 8.8 minutes in grades 6, 7, and 8, respectively. Significant differences in favor of the intervention students also persisted at grade 8 for dietary knowledge and dietary intentions, but not for social support for physical activity. No impact on smoking behavior or stages of contemplating smoking was detected at grade 8. No significant differences were noted among physiologic indicators of body mass index, blood pressure, or serum lipid and cholesterol levels.

**Conclusion:** The original CATCH results demonstrated that school-level interventions could modify school lunch and school physical education programs as well as influence student behaviors. This 3-year follow-up without further intervention suggests that the behavioral changes initiated during the elementary school years persisted to early adolescence for self-reported dietary and physical activity behaviors.

Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med. 1999;153:695-704

Increasing school-based exercise, improving the nutritional value of school cafeteria food, and teaching young students about healthy habits can effectively and persistently improve the diet and reduce cardiovascular disease risk factors in children. Researchers compared 3,714 students in grades 6-8 in 56 schools that participated in the student health intervention and 40 schools that did not (control group). Prior to the intervention, students ate about 33% of their daily calories as fat. By grade 8, students in the intervention schools ate only about 31% calories as fat, while students in the control schools did not significantly change their eating. Students in the intervention schools also vigorously exercised more often than students in the control schools.

© COPYRIGHT 1999 American Medical Association

The CATCH Cohort

Editor's Note: I'm almost as impressed with the 73% follow-up population as I am with the findings. CATCH-ing them early seems to stick.

Catherine D. DeAngelis, MD

SUBSTANTIAL epidemiological evidence links health behaviors of a population to cardiovascular disease.[1] These

## Three-Year Maintenance of Improved Diet and Physical Activity.(Statistical Data Included)

health behaviors include lack of vigorous and regular physical activity, overconsumption of food, especially high-fat

food, and smoking tobacco. A great deal of evidence points to the childhood and early adolescent years not only as key for the acquisition of these behaviors, but also as important in establishing the physiological antecedents of adult cardiovascular disease.[2-4] Recent data on the increasing prevalence of obesity,[5] the decline of physical activity,[6] and the importance of dietary habits in the establishment of adult chronic disease[7] underscore the relevance of interventions in childhood to improve diet and activity habits.

The importance of the child and adolescent years for cardiovascular disease risks is based on conclusions of several avenues of research. One body of research is pathologic evidence relating to vascular anatomical changes in children and the tracking of physiological parameters in children.[8-12] This research suggests that cardiovascular disease risk begins in childhood and has some stability during maturation. The acquisition and tracking of health behaviors that predispose children to cardiovascular risk are also being studied.[13] This research suggests that unhealthy behavioral patterns initiated in childhood, such as being sedentary, eating a diet high in fat and saturated fat, and (later) smoking, persist through adolescence.[2,14,15] While the evidence strongly supports implementing population-based risk reduction programs aimed at youth,[14-16] few such studies have examined the maintenance of behavior change after the intervention ceases.

Schools represent potentially important venues for primary prevention programs aimed at youth because they have access to large populations and have existing structures and systems to support health behavior change programs.[16,17] The National Institutes of Health--funded, multisite Child and Adolescent Trial for Cardiovascular Health (CATCH) study was designed to test the effectiveness of a feasible school-based program to reduce cardiovascular risk factors in elementary school--aged children. The CATCH intervention targeted increasing levels of physical activity; consuming foods that are low in fat, saturated fat, and sodium; and avoiding smoking initiation via a multicomponent program that included school environmental changes, a 3-year sequential classroom curriculum, and in some intervention schools, a family component. The details of the CATCH intervention are described elsewhere.[18] Previously reported results[19] indicated that CATCH, after 3 school years of intervention, positively affected the school environment and students' eating and physical activity behaviors. The amount of fat and saturated fat in foods offered in the school cafeteria was decreased. The amount of time students spent in moderate to vigorous physical activity was increased during physical education classes in intervention schools compared with control schools.[20,21] In addition, students exposed to the CATCH intervention reduced their intakes of fat and saturated fat, and reported being more physically active compared with students in the CATCH control schools.[19,22] The additional family component increased knowledge and attitudes, but did not add additional health behavior change.[19]

This article reports the 3-year persistence of intervention effects in dietary and physical activity behaviors among a geographically and ethnically diverse cohort of students at grade 8 who were participants in the elementary school CATCH intervention. No organized intervention was applied to the CATCH cohort beyond grade 5. The results of the study suggest important national implications for school health promotion interventions.

### RESULTS

#### PARTICIPATION

Approximately 70% of the CATCH II baseline cohort participated in CATCH risk factor or questionnaire measurements during grade 8. The participation rate did not differ significantly between the CATCH II intervention and control school conditions (Table 1). There were minor but statistically significant differences in participation rates according to sex, race, and site on selected measures (Table 1). Participation in the dietary recall interview was slightly lower for boys than for girls, and participation in risk factor screening and HBS was higher for white students than for others. For all measures, higher participation was recorded in Louisiana and Minnesota than in California and Texas. These demographic effects were comparable for control and intervention schools ( $P$  [is greater than or equal to] .12). Nonparticipants were slightly older at baseline screening (age 8.81 vs 8.74 years,  $P$  [is less than] .001) and had greater mean age-adjusted body mass index (17.81 vs 17.52 kg/[m.sup.2],  $P$  = .002) and skinfold thickness (12.6 vs 12.3 mm for triceps,  $P$  = .03; 8.7 vs 8.1 mm for subscapular,  $P$  = .007), but these differences applied equally to control and intervention schools ( $P$  [is greater than or equal to] .28 for interactions). No significant difference in participation was found with respect to age-adjusted baseline

## Three-Year Maintenance of Improved Diet and Physical Activity.(Statistical Data Included)

levels of serum cholesterol and blood pressure, dietary intake, HBS responses, or self-reported physical activity (with grade 5 as baseline). These results suggest that valid inferences can be made with regard to the effects of the CATCH II interventions at grade 8.

Table 1. Participation Rates, Child and Adolescent Trial for Cardiovascular Health, Phase III, 1991 Through 1997

	Full Cohort	Diet Sample
All	5106	20520
Control group	2117	837
Intervention group	2989	1215
Boys	2645	1038
Girls	2461	1014
White	3529	1418
African American	675	247
Hispanic	708	313
Native American	25	7
Asian	95	39
Other	74	28
California	1379	507
Louisiana	1299	488
Minnesota	1237	535
Texas	1191	522

  

	Participation, No. %(*)	
	Dietary Recall ([dagger]) ([double dagger])	Physical Activity ([double dagger])
All	1468 (72)	3396 (67)
Control group	601 (72)	1400 (66)
Intervention group	867 (71)	1996 (67)
Boys	722 (70)	1754 (66)
Girls	746 (74)	1642 (67)
White	1024 (72)	2408 (68)
African American	180 (73)	428 (63)
Hispanic	213 (68)	439 (62)
Native American	5 (71)	12 (48)
Asian	28 (72)	62 (65)
Other	18 (64)	47 (64)
California	340 (67)	861 (62)
Louisiana	375 (77)	932 (72)
Minnesota	402 (75)	876 (71)
Texas	351 (67)	727 (61)

  

	Participation, No. %(*)	
	Risk Factors ([double dagger]) ([sections])	Health Behavior ([double dagger]) ([sections])
All	3660 (72)	3649 (72)
Control group	1496 (71)	1502 (71)
Intervention group	2164 (72)	2152 (72)
Boys	1881 (71)	1884 (71)
Girls	1779 (72)	1770 (72)
White	2596 (74)	2595 (74)
African American	467 (69)	466 (69)
Hispanic	469 (66)	464 (66)
Native American	13 (52)	13 (52)
Asian	66 (69)	66 (69)
Other	49 (66)	49 (66)

## Three-Year Maintenance of Improved Diet and Physical Activity.(Statistical Data Included)

California	919 (67)	918 (67)
Louisiana	1023 (79)	1023 (79)
Minnesota	941 (76)	941 (76)
Texas	777 (65)	722 (65)

(\*) Grade 8 participation (1997) as a percentage of the baseline cohort (1991). For dietary recall, the subsample cohort was defined by participation in either grade 3 or 5. For other measure, the full cohort was defined by the availability of grade 3 cholesterol measurements.

([dagger]) Statistically significant variation by sex according to multiple logistic regression (P [is less than] .15).

([double dagger]) Statistically significant variation by site according to multiple logistic regression (P [is less than] .05).

([sections]) Statistically significant variation by race according to multiple logistic regression (P [is less than] .05).

### DIET

Table 2 shows the results from the 24-hour dietary recall interviews. Target nutrients for CATCH included percentage of energy from total fat and saturated fat, intake of sodium in milligrams, sodium per 4200 kJ (1000 kcal), and dietary cholesterol. At the end of the trial, students in the intervention schools had a significant reduction in energy intake relative to students in the control schools, although intake still met the recommended dietary allowances.[39] By the end of grade 8, the difference in change in energy intake by treatment group was not statistically significant.

Table 2. Dietary Intake (24-Hour Recall), Child and Adolescent Trial for Cardiovascular Health, Phases II and III, 1991 Through 1997(\*)

	Phase II	
	Grade 3 (Semester 1)	
Energy intake, KJ [kcal]		
Control	8435 (100)	[2016 (24)]
Intervention	8544 (84)	[2042 (20)]
I - C([dagger])	88 (55)	[21 (37)]
P	.58	
Energy from fat, %		
Control	32.7	(0.2)
Intervention	32.6	(0.2)
I - C([dagger])	0.0	(0.4)
P	.95	
Energy from saturated fat, %		
Control	12.7	(0.1)
Intervention	12.7	(0.1)
I - C([dagger])	0.1	(0.2)
P	.58	
Energy from carbohydrates, %		
Control	53.6	(0.3)
Intervention	54.1	(0.3)
I - C([dagger])	0.3	(0.5)
P	.50	
Energy from protein, %		
Control	14.9	(0.1)
Intervention	14.6	(0.1)
I - C([dagger])	-0.3	(0.2)
P	.14	
Dietary cholesterol, mg([double dagger])		
Control	215.7	(5.0)

## Three-Year Maintenance of Improved Diet and Physical Activity.(Statistical Data Included)

Intervention	223.3 (4.7)
I - C([dagger])	6.2 (6.5)
P	.34

Sodium, mg([double dagger])	
Control	2998 (45)
Intervention	2955 (38)
I - C([dagger])	-75 (51)
P	.15

### Phase II

Grade 5  
(Semester 6)

Energy intake, KJ [kcal]	
Control	9058 (138) [2165 (33)]
Intervention	8699 (113) [2079 (27)]
I - C([dagger])	-368 (184) [-88 (44)]
P	.04

Energy from fat, %	
Control	32.2 (0.3)
Intervention	30.3 (0.2)
I - C([dagger])	-1.8 (0.4)
P	.001

Energy from saturated fat, %	
Control	12.1 (0.1)
Intervention	11.5 (0.1)
I - C([dagger])	-0.6 (0.2)
P	.003

Energy from carbohydrates, %	
Control	54.4 (0.4)
Intervention	56.1 (0.3)
I - C([dagger])	1.5 (0.5)
P	.003

Energy from protein, %	
Control	14.4 (0.2)
Intervention	14.8 (0.1)
I - C([dagger])	0.3 (0.2)
P	.23

Dietary cholesterol, mg([double dagger])	
Control	226.8 (7.1)
Intervention	205.4 (5.2)
I - C([dagger])	-10.9 (7.6)
P	.15

Sodium, mg([double dagger])	
Control	3160 (61)
Intervention	3119 (46)
I - C([dagger])	81 (58)
P	.16

### Phase III:

Grade 8  
(Semester 12)

Energy intake, KJ [kcal]		.13
Control	9364 (176) [2238 (42)]	
Intervention	9238 (134) [2208 (32)]	
I - C([dagger])	-113 (172) [-27 (41)]	
P	.51	

Energy from fat, %		.002
Control	31.6 (0.3)	
Intervention	30.6 (0.3)	
I - C([dagger])	-1.0 (0.4)	

## Three-Year Maintenance of Improved Diet and Physical Activity.(Statistical Data Included)

P	.01	
Energy from saturated fat, %		.008
Control	11.8 (0.2)	
Intervention	11.3 (0.1)	
I - C([dagger])	-0.5 (0.2)	
P	.02	
Energy from carbohydrates, %		.11
Control	55.4 (0.4)	
Intervention	56.6 (0.3)	
I - C([dagger])	1.1 (0.5)	
P	.02	
Energy from protein, %		.09
Control	14.2 (0.2)	
Intervention	14.1 (0.1)	
I - C([dagger])	-0.1 (0.2)	
P	.68	
Dietary cholesterol, mg([double dagger])		.15
Control	216.4 (7.2)	
Intervention	207.3 (5.8)	
I - C([dagger])	-5.4 (7.2)	
P	.46	
Sodium, mg([double dagger])		.01
Control	3456 (79)	
Intervention	3298 (53)	
I - C([dagger])	-113 (56)	
P	.04	

(\*) Values are unadjusted means (SEMs). At baseline, that were 40 schools and 2117 students in the control group and 56 schools and 2989 students in the intervention group. I - C indicates intervention group minus control group. In column 2 through 4, the P value tests the hypothesis That I - C equals 0 in the pertinent semester; in the last column, it tests the hypothesis that I - C did not change between semesters.

([dagger]) Adjusted by repeated measure analysis of variance, controlling for site, sex, race, sex, x race interaction, and intraclass correlation within school and student.

([double dagger]) Cholesterol and sodium intakes were adjusted for total energy intake.

At the end of grade 5, a significant reduction in energy from total and saturated fat was seen in the intervention students compared with the control students. At the end of grade 5, students in the intervention schools had nearly reached the national and study goals of 30% of energy from total fat (Figure 1). A difference of 1.8% in energy from total fat was noted between experimental and control students at the immediate postintervention measurement in grade 5. This difference declined to 1.0% by grade 8 but remained statistically significant. At the end of grade 8, statistically significant differences in energy from total fat by treatment group persisted. Students exposed to the CATCH intervention had a mean intake of 30.6% of energy from fat, and students in the control group averaged 31.6% of energy from fat. Energy from saturated fat approached but did not reach the national and study goals of 10% of energy. The significant differences in energy intake from saturated fat by treatment group were also maintained from grade 5 through grade 8, with the mean energy intake from saturated fat in the grade 8 in intervention and control students being 11.3% and 11.8%, respectively. Carbohydrate consumption also remained significantly higher among the intervention group (56.6% vs 55.4% of energy,  $P = .02$ ). The differences noted in diet are both statistically and clinically significant; a reduction in fat and saturated fat consumption of the magnitude seen in the intervention group, along with the increase in carbohydrate consumption, would translate to an improved dietary intake in an individual student--a reduction of a dish of ice cream once a day, or switching from regular milk to skim milk.

[Figure 1 ILLUSTRATION OMITTED]

The FC, including 40 foods or food groups accounting for substantial amounts of daily fat and sodium intake, was administered on a group basis in grades 7 and 8. The students from intervention schools scored significantly lower than

## Three-Year Maintenance of Improved Diet and Physical Activity.(Statistical Data Included)

those from control schools, indicating healthier diets, on total fat ( $P = .003$ ), saturated fat ( $P = .02$ ), and sodium ( $P = .006$ ) intake, and the differences remained constant between grades 7 and 8 for all 3 nutrients ( $P$  [is greater than or equal to] .41) (Figure 2).

[Figure 2 ILLUSTRATION OMITTED]

### PHYSICAL ACTIVITY

Table 3 and Figure 3 display differences between intervention and control students in minutes of self-reported daily vigorous activity, characterized by hard breathing most of the time while exercising. Experimental students reported more minutes than did control students, but the differences narrowed over time. The intervention effect was maintained at grade 8, with experimental students reporting a mean of 30.2 minutes of daily vigorous activity compared with control students' 22.1 minutes. Total activity minutes demonstrated an overall decrease from grades 5 to 8, with intervention students reporting more total activity in grades 5 and 6 than control students ( $P = .02$  and  $P = .04$ , respectively). No differences between intervention and control students for total activity were present in grades 7 and 8.

[Figure 3 ILLUSTRATION OMITTED]

Table 3. Self-reported Physical Activity, Children and Adolescent Trial for Cardiovascular Health, Phases II and III, 1991 Through 1997(\*)

	Phase III		
	Phase II: Grade 5 (Semester 6)	Grade 6 (Semester 8)	Grade 7 (Semester 10)
<b>Vigorous</b>			
Control	45.5 (1.9)	42.2 (1.7)	30.6 (1.5)
Intervention	59.2 (1.9)	53.2 (1.7)	40.7 (1.4)
I - C([dagger])	13.6 (2.7)	11.2 (2.5)	10.8 (2.5)
P	.001	.001	.001
<b>Total physical activity, min</b>			
Control	163.2 (3.1)	172.1 (3.0)	145.4 (2.8)
Intervention	152.0 (2.5)	164.5 (2.4)	141.6 (2.2)
I - C([dagger])	-10.3 (4.5)	-8.7 (4.3)	-3.5 (4.3)
P	.02	.04	.41
	Phase III		
	Grade 8 (Semester 12)		
<b>Vigorous</b>			
Control	22.1 (1.4)		
Intervention	30.2 (1.3)		
I - C([dagger])	8.8 (2.7)		
P	.001		
<b>Total physical activity, min</b>			
Control	124.4 (2.6)		
Intervention	121.1 (2.1)		
I - C([dagger])	-2.4 (4.5)		
P	.59		

(\*) Values are unadjusted means (SEMs). There were 40 schools in the control group and 56 schools in the intervention group. I - C indicates intervention group minus control group. The P value tests the hypothesis that I - C equals 0 in the pertinent semester.

## Three-Year Maintenance of Improved Diet and Physical Activity.(Statistical Data Included)

([dagger]) Adjusted by repeated-measures analysis of variance, controlling for site, sex, race, sex x race interaction, and intraclass correlation within schools and student.

### PHYSIOLOGICAL RISK FACTORS

Table 4 presents physiological measures at grades 3, 5, and 8. No changes attributable to the CATCH intervention were demonstrated. The slight but nonsignificant decrease in serum cholesterol level noted in the intervention group at grade 5 was not maintained in grade 6.

Table 4. Physiological Measures, Child and Adolescent Trial for Cardiovascular Health, Phases II and III, 1991 Through 1997(\*)

	Phase II	
	Grade 3 (Semester 1)	
Height, cm		
Control	132.5 (0.1)	
Intervention	132.7 (0.1)	
I - C([dagger])	0.0 (0.2)	
P	.84	
Body mass index, kg/[m.sup.2]		
Control	17.6 (0.1)	
Intervention	17.6 (0.1)	
I - C([dagger])	0.0 (0.1)	
P	.72	
Triceps skinfold, mm		
Control	12.5 (0.1)	
Intervention	12.4 (0.1)	
I - C([dagger])	0.0 (0.2)	
P	.92	
Subscapular skinfold,mm		
Control	8.34 (0.12)	
Intervention	8.21 (0.10)	
I - C([dagger])	0.02 (0.26)	
P	.94	
Heart rate, bpm		
Control	86.8 (0.2)	
Intervention	86.8 (0.2)	
I - C([dagger])	-0.02 (0.4)	
P	.61	
Systolic blood pressure, mm Hg		
Control	104.8 (0.2)	
Intervention	105.1 (0.2)	
I - C([dagger])	0.3 (0.3)	
P	.33	
Diastolic blood pressure mm Hg		
Control	53.4 (0.1)	
Intervention	53.5 (0.1)	
I - C([dagger])	0.0 (0.2)	
P	.93	
Total cholesterol, mmol/L [mg/dL]		
Control	4.41 (0.02) [170.6 (0.6)]	
Intervention	4.39 (0.01) [169.9 (0.5)]	
I - C([dagger])	-0.01 (0.02) [-0.4 (0.9)]	
P	.64	
HDL cholesterol, mmol/L [mg/dL]		
Control	1.33 (0.01) [51.6 (0.4)]	
Intention	1.34 (0.01) [51.7 (0.3)]	
I - C([dagger])	0.01 (0.01) [0.4 (0.4)]	
P	.31	
Apolipoprotein B, g/L		



## Three-Year Maintenance of Improved Diet and Physical Activity.(Statistical Data Included)

Control	0.89 (0.06)
Intervention	0.90 (0.05)
I - C([dagger])	0.00 (0.07)
P	.99
Phase II	
Grade 5 (Semester 6)	
Height, cm	
Control	146.3 (0.2)
Intervention	146.5 (0.2)
I - C([dagger])	-0.1 (0.2)
P	.75
Body mass index, kg/[m.sup.2]	
Control	19.7 (0.1)
Intervention	19.7 (0.1)
I - C([dagger])	0.1 (0.1)
P	.59
Triceps skinfold, mm	
Control	15.3 (0.2)
Intervention	15.2 (0.1)
I - C([dagger])	0.0 (0.2)
P	.99
Subscapular skinfold, mm	
Control	11.20 (0.18)
Intervention	11.04 (0.15)
I - C([dagger])	0.01 (0.26)
P	.96
Heart rate, bpm	
Control	82.9 (0.3)
Intervention	83.0 (0.2)
I - C([dagger])	-0.2 (0.4)
P	.60
Systolic blood pressure, mm Hg	
Control	109.7 (0.2)
Intervention	110.0 (0.2)
I - C([dagger])	0.2 (0.3)
P	.48
Diastolic blood pressure, mm Hg	
Control	55.5 (0.2)
Intervention	55.9 (0.1)
I - C([dagger])	0.3 (0.2)
P	.16
Total cholesterol, mmol/L [mg/dL]	
Control	4.38 (0.02) [169.5 (0.7)]
Intervention	4.35 (0.02) [168.3 (0.6)]
I - C([dagger])	-0.02 (0.2) [-0.8 (0.9)]
P	.39
HDL cholesterol, mmol/L [mg/dL]	
Control	1.27 (0.01) [49.1 (0.4)]
Intervention	1.27 (0.01) [49.0 (0.3)]
I - C([dagger])	0.01 (0.01) [0.2 (0.4)]
P	.61
Apolipoprotein B, g/L	
Control	0.89 (0.07)
Intervention	0.89 (0.06)
I - C([dagger])	-0.00 (0.08)
P	.21
Phase III: Grade 8 (Semester 12)	

## Three-Year Maintenance of Improved Diet and Physical Activity.(Statistical Data Included)

Height, cm	
Control	163.3 (0.2)
Intervention	63.7 (0.2)
I - C([dagger])	0.2 (0.2)
P	.33
Body mass index, kg/[m.sup.2]	
Control	22.1 (0.1)
Intervention	22.0 (0.1)
I - C([dagger])	0.0 (0.1)
P	.88
Triceps skinfold, mm	
Control	15.3 (0.2)
Intervention	15.1 (0.2)
I - C([dagger])	-0.1 (0.2)
P	.83
Subscapular skinfold, mm	
Control	12.76 (0.20)
Intervention	12.64 (0.17)
I - C([dagger])	0.13 (0.27)
P	.62
Heart rate, bpm	
Control	78.5 (0.3)
Intervention	79.6 (0.3)
I - C([dagger])	0.9 (0.4)
P	.03
Systolic blood pressure, mm Hg	
Control	114.0 (0.2)
Intervention	114.1 (0.2)
I - C([dagger])	0.1 (0.3)
P	.71
Diastolic blood press	
Control	56.0 (0.2)
Intervention	56.1 (0.2)
I - C([dagger])	0.1 (0.3)
P	.66
Total cholesterol, mmol/L [mg/dL]	
Control	4.14 (0.02) [160.1 (0.7)]
Intervention	4.15 (0.02) [160.4 (0.6)]
I - C([dagger])	0.03 (0.02) [1.2 (0.9)]
P	.21
HDL cholesterol, mmol/L [mg/dL]	
Control	1.20 (0.01) [46.5 (0.3)]
Intervention	1.21 (0.01) [46.8 (0.2)]
I - C([dagger])	0.01 (0.01) [0.4 (0.4)]
P	.29
Apolipoprotein B, g/L	
Control	0.90 (0.06)
Intervention	0.90 (0.05)
I - C([dagger])	0.05 (0.06)
P	.48
P	
Height, cm	
Control	.15
Intervention	
I - C([dagger])	
P	
Body mass index, kg/[m.sup.2]	
Control	.79
Intervention	
I - C([dagger])	

## Three-Year Maintenance of Improved Diet and Physical Activity.(Statistical Data Included)

P		
Triceps skinfold, mm	.95	
Control		
Intervention		
I - C([dagger])		
P		
Subscapular skinfold, mm	.73	
Control		
Intervention		
I - C([dagger])		
P		
Heart rate, bpm	.004	
Control		
Intervention		
I - C([dagger])		
P		
Systolic blood pressure, mm Hg	.84	
Control		
Intervention		
I - C([dagger])		
P		
Diastolic blood press	.23	
Control		
Intervention		
I - C([dagger])		
P		
Total cholesterol, mmol/L [mg/d	.02	
Control		
Intervention		
I - C([dagger])		
P		
HDL cholesterol, mmol/L [mg/dL]	.87	
Control		
Intervention		
I - C([dagger])		
P		
Apolipoprotein B, g/L	.10	
Control		
Intervention		
I - C([dagger])		
P		

(\*) Values are unadjusted means (SEMs). At baseline, there were 40 schools in the control group and 56 schools in the intervention group. I - C indicates intervention group minus control group. In columns 2 through 4, the P value tests the hypothesis that I - C equals 0 in the pertinent semester; in the last column, it tests the hypothesis that I - C did not change between semesters.

([dagger]) Adjusted by repeated-measures analysis of variance, controlling for site, sex, race, sex x race interaction, and intraclass correlation within school and student. Height, body mass index, and skinfold values were adjusted for age; heart rate, blood pressure, and lipid values were adjusted for height and body mass index.

### HEALTH BEHAVIOR SURVEY

Table 5 displays the results of the HBS for dietary knowledge and intention. Scores for healthy food choices (food intentions) and knowledge (food knowledge) were significantly higher among intervention group students compared with control group students. During grades 6 and 7, average scores progressively declined for both measures and in both conditions. However, scores remained significantly higher for intervention group children than for control group children in grades 6 and 7. Positive social support for physical activity did not differ significantly between the treatment groups in grade 8. As with food intentions and food knowledge, mean scores for positive support for physical activity decreased during grades 6 and 7 (data not shown).

## Three-Year Maintenance of Improved Diet and Physical Activity.(Statistical Data Included)

Table 5. Health Behavior Survey, Child and Adolescent Trial for Cardiovascular Health, Phases II and III, 1991 Through 1997(\*)

Phase II		
	Grade 3 (Semester 1)	Grade 3 (Semester 2)
Dietary intention, common items([dagger])		
Control	5.8 (0.1)	6.1 (0.1)
Intervention	6.0 (0.0)	7.7 (0.0)
I - C([double dagger])	0.1 (0.1)	1.5 (0.1)
P	.37	.001
Dietary knowledge, common items([sections])		
Control	3.7 (0.0)	4.1 (0.0)
Intervention	3.9 (0.0)	5.3 (0.0)
I - C([double dagger])	0.2 (0.1)	1.1 (0.1)
P	.001	.001

Phase II		
	Grade 4 (Semester 4)	Grade 5 (Semester 6)
Dietary intention, common items([dagger])		
Control	5.9 (0.1)	5.2 (0.1)
Intervention	7.2 (0.1)	5.9 (0.1)
I - C([double dagger])	1.2 (0.1)	0.7 (0.1)
P	.001	.001
Dietary knowledge, common items([sections])		
Control	4.5 (0.0)	4.7 (0.0)
Intervention	5.5 (0.0)	5.5 (0.0)
I - C([double dagger])	0.9 (0.1)	0.7 (0.1)
P	.001	.001

Phase III		
	Grade 6 (Semester 8)	Grade 7 (Semester 10)
Dietary intention, common items([dagger])		
Control	4.3 (0.1)	4.1 (0.1)
Intervention	4.8 (0.1)	4.7 (0.0)
I - C([double dagger])	0.4 (0.1)	0.5 (0.1)
P	.001	.001
Dietary knowledge, common items([sections])		
Control	4.6 (0.0)	4.6 (0.0)
Intervention	5.1 (0.0)	5.1 (0.0)
I - C([double dagger])	0.5 (0.1)	0.4 (0.1)
P	.001	.001

Phase III	
Grade 8 (Semester 12)	P

Dietary intention,  
common items([dagger]) <.001

## Three-Year Maintenance of Improved Diet and Physical Activity.(Statistical Data Included)

Control	4.1 (0.1)	
Intervention	4.6 (0.1)	
I - C([double dagger])	0.4 (0.1)	
P	.001	
Dietary knowledge, common items[sections]		<.001
Control	4.9 (0.0)	
Intervention	5.2 (0.0)	
I - C([double dagger])	0.3 (0.1)	
P	.001	

(\*) Values are unadjusted means (SEMs). There were 40 schools in the control group and 56 schools in the intervention group. I - C indicates intervention group minus control group. In columns 2 through 8, the P value tests the hypothesis that I - C equals 0 in the pertinent semester; in the last column, it tests the hypothesis that I - C did not change between semesters.

([dagger]) Scale, 0-10.

([double dagger]) Adjusted by repeated-measures analysis of variance, controlling for site, sex, race, sex x race interaction, and intraclass correlation within school and student.

([sections]) Scale, 0-6.

### SMOKING

Current smoking was assessed by agreement with the item, "I have started to smoke a little," in grade 5, and then, "I have smoked on 2 or more of the last 30 days," in grades 6 through 8. Overall smoking prevalences for the control and intervention conditions, respectively, were 6.3% and 6.2% in grade 5, 5.9% and 4.5% in grade 6, 10.2% and 11.2% in grade 7, and 15.6% and 16.2% in grade 8. None of these differences reached statistical significance.

### COMMENT

The CATCH project is the largest school-based randomized trial ever conducted. It was conducted in 4 geographically different sites, involved multiethnic and multiracial groups, and included longer follow-up (3 years) than similar school interventions. Since no additional intervention occurred after grade 5, the study results suggest that the behavior changes resulting from a multicomponent intervention, including classroom curricula, food service modifications, physical education changes, and family reinforcement, were sufficient to produce an intervention effect that could still be detected after 3 years. The program has been carefully evaluated and found to be feasible to implement.[25] These findings combine to suggest that CATCH or similar multicomponent approaches may qualify as suitable models for school-based primary prevention programs.

It has been assumed that reduction of adult cardiovascular risk of morbidity and mortality will occur only if behavioral change continues through adolescence and adulthood. Much of the evidence for intermediate and long-term effectiveness of behavioral intervention programs has targeted single risk factors, such as obesity and smoking prevention. Some long-term positive effects were seen with the Know Your Body program,[40,41] a school- and family-based cardiovascular risk reduction program; the San Diego Family Health Project,[42] a family-based intensive diet and activity intervention; and the Class of 1989 Study,[43] a school- and community-based cardiovascular health promotion study. In addition, the Life Skills Training Program[44] showed long-term effects on smoking behavior, alcohol use, and marijuana use after it was initiated in grade 7. However, all of these studies occurred in single sites and did not involve school environmental changes as intervention elements.

The differences between experimental and control students noted in this follow-up, while statistically significant, are narrowing in magnitude over time. If the trends continue, soon no differences will be detectable. This calls for additional research to investigate the best modalities for maintaining intervention effects beyond the elementary school level, especially as youth continue through adolescence. It also suggests that programs to alter the environments of middle,

## Three-Year Maintenance of Improved Diet and Physical Activity.(Statistical Data Included)

junior, and senior high schools are warranted.

In CATCH, although detectable behavioral differences persisted for 3 years after the intervention, there were no differences in physiological measures such as body mass index or serum cholesterol level either in the elementary school intervention or in the present follow-up.[19,24] In fact, most population-based education studies that have reported on intervention effects on physiological variables have shown modest change or no change.[40,45-47] It may be unrealistic to expect dramatic physiological changes in a young population, given the level of intensity of a primary prevention program and the relatively healthy general population at which it is targeted.

A potential limitation of this study is the reliance on self-reported data. To overcome this, validation studies were conducted on the major behavioral measures, eg, the SAPAC and the 24-hour dietary recall interview.[29,32] These proved to be valid and reliable measures. In the field, several procedures were employed to reduce bias,[48] including national and local training with standardized measurement protocols, on-site quality-control observations, and an adequate ratio of field staff per student. The 24-hour recall interview included probes to complement standardized questions on the HBS. Furthermore, it is difficult to provide socially desirable or "correct" answers on a 24-hour dietary recall interview. Previous analyses of the HBS correlating student responses on knowledge and attitudes have suggested that response bias was not responsible for the positive results seen in grades 5 and 8.[28] Furthermore, not all results obtained were in the positive or desired direction (eg, smoking, or social support for physical activity). In future studies, use of direct observation methods (diet) or motion sensors (activity) on randomly selected subsamples might add to the validity of self-reported data.

These results, if valid, have important implications for public health policy. Schools could be an important setting for programs to influence the development of healthful behaviors at an early age. In addition to interventions that provide education for children, the study suggests that for behavior change to occur and persist, interventions must create and maintain school environments that support healthful behavior. To sustain the benefits of elementary school programs, health promotion should probably continue through junior and senior high school. Additional research is required to assess the valid impact of such programs as well as how programs can be more widely implemented.

Accepted for publication November 12, 1998.

From the Division of Community Pediatrics, University of California, San Diego (Dr Nader); National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute, Bethesda, Md (Drs Stone and Wu); Division of Epidemiology, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis (Drs Lytle, Perry, and Luepker); New England Research Institutes Inc, Watertown, Mass (Drs Osganian and Feldman); University of Texas Health Science Center Houston Center for Health Promotion, Research, and Development, Houston (Drs Kelder, Montgomery, and Parcel); Tulane University School of Public Health and Tropical Medicine, New Orleans, La (Drs Webber and Johnson); and San Diego State University, San Diego, Calif (Dr Elder).

This study was supported by grants HL39927, HL39852, HL39870, HL33906, and HL39880 from the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Md.

Corresponding author: Philip R. Nader, MD, Division of Community Pediatrics, 9500 Gilman Dr, Department 092 7, La Jolla, CA 9203 7-092 7 (e-mail: pnader@ucsd.edu).

### PARTICIPANTS, MATERIALS, AND METHODS

#### DESIGN

The CATCH project's phase I was a feasibility study of 2 schools in each of 4 sites. The CATCH phase II was a 4-center field trial that evaluated the effectiveness of a feasible, elementary school-based cardiovascular health promotion program in 56 intervention schools and 40 control schools during grades 3 through 5. The CATCH phase III (tracking study) was a longitudinal study in which a 3-year follow-up of the CATCH II cohort of students was conducted. The study design[23] and results of CATCH II are described in detail elsewhere.[19,21,22,24,25] Briefly, significant intervention effects were observed in CATCH II for students' levels of vigorous physical activity and daily intakes of energy from total fat and saturated fat as well as dietary knowledge and intention scores.

## Three-Year Maintenance of Improved Diet and Physical Activity.(Statistical Data Included)

The CATCH III was designed to measure eating and activity attitudes and behaviors as well as cardiovascular disease risk factors in the original CATCH II cohort of students during grades 6 through 8 to assess maintenance of intervention effects achieved at the end of CATCH II (grade 5). End point comparisons were made between students from the 56 CATCH II intervention schools and the 40 CATCH II control schools to determine whether changes observed at the end of the intervention (grade 5) were maintained through grade 8. The intention-to-treat principle was adhered to throughout the study, with students retaining their original school assignment from baseline (grade 3) for all CATCH III analyses. This means that on follow-up, all students possible were measured according to their original study assignment (treatment or control) whether or not they remained in their original school during the study and follow-up period. Primary end points of interest for CATCH III included daily intakes of dietary fat and saturated fat, levels of moderate to vigorous physical activity, and psychosocial factors. In addition, levels of physiological risk factors, including total serum cholesterol, high-density lipoprotein (HDL) cholesterol, and apolipoprotein B levels; body mass index (BMI); skinfold thickness; and blood pressure as well as (self-reported) smoking behavior were examined.

Psychosocial measures and physical activity behavior were assessed at 3 follow-up points: at grades 6, 7, and 8. A measure of food choices, the CATCH Food Checklist (FC), was administered at grades 7 and 8. Physiological measurements, including serum lipid levels, height, weight, skinfold thickness, blood pressure, and self-reported dietary nutrient intakes, were taken at baseline (grade 3), at the end of the intervention (grade 5), and once at follow-up (grade 8). Tracking efforts were designed to contact and measure cohort students within a 100-mile radius of the original CATCH II school districts. Because all students had left the original CATCH II schools, data collectors could be blinded to participants' treatment status for all measures in grades 6 through 8.

### STUDY PARTICIPANTS

The CATCH III study involved the grade 3 cohort of students ( $n = 5106$ ) recruited from the 96 CATCH II public elementary schools with parental consent to participate and a blood sample result at baseline.[19,26] The ethnic composition of the baseline cohort of students was 69% white, 14% Hispanic, 13% African American, and 4% other. The study was conducted at the original 4 field centers, located at the University of California at San Diego; University of Minnesota, Minneapolis; University of Texas-Houston School of Public Health, Austin; and Tulane University School of Public Health and Tropical Medicine, New Orleans, La.

At grade 8, 3714 students (73% of the baseline cohort) had parental consent to participate in CATCH measurements. An additional 34 students (1%) had parental consent for all measures except venipuncture, while 286 parents (6%) refused their child's participation. The remaining 1072 students (21%) did not respond, were living beyond a 100-mile radius of a study center, or were lost to follow-up.

### MEASURES

All methods, training techniques, and quality controls developed and implemented as part of CATCH II and used during CATCH III have been described in the literature.[22,24,27,28] These measurements, as well as newly developed measures for CATCH III, are briefly described below.

#### 24-HOUR DIETARY RECALL

During the spring of grade 8, a single 24-hour dietary recall interview was administered to a random subsample ( $n = 1533$ ) of the cohort who had also completed a dietary recall interview in either grade 3 or grade 5. The dietary recall interview measured each student's total daily nutrient intake, including energy from total fat and saturated fat. The face-to-face interviews were conducted using the multiple pass approach according to the standard CATCH protocol.[29] Dietary recall results were entered directly into laptop computers using the Minnesota Nutrition Data System software (Food Database version 12A, Nutrient Database 27; Nutrition Coordinating Center, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis). Based on CATCH quality assurance procedures, results from 49 dietary recall interviews were omitted from the analysis. The final sample size for analysis was 1468 students.

#### FOOD CHECKLIST

## Three-Year Maintenance of Improved Diet and Physical Activity.(Statistical Data Included)

The Food Checklist (FC) was developed during CATCH III to assess whether selected foods high in total fat, saturated fat, or sodium had been consumed within the past 24 hours. The list of high-fat and high-sodium food items was developed from published and nutritionist-accepted standard food tables and an analysis of commonly eaten foods reported on a random sample of CATCH II dietary recall interviews completed during grade 5.[30] A system for scoring the FC was developed in which higher scores reflect higher intakes of total fat, saturated fat, and sodium. The FC was administered during grades 7 and 8 to all cohort students. Test-retest reliability ( $r$ , 0.83-0.89) and validity for 24-hour dietary recall data, based on a sample of grade 7 students who completed the FC and a single dietary recall interview, were adequate.[31] Food checklist data were significantly correlated with 24-hour recall data (percentage of total fat:  $r = 0.36$ ; percentage of saturated fat:  $r = 0.36$ ; sodium per 4200 kJ [1000 kcal]:  $r = 0.34$ ).

### SELF-ADMINISTERED PHYSICAL ACTIVITY CHECKLIST

The Self-Administered Physical Activity Checklist (SAPAC), developed, tested, and administered during CATCH II, was administered to all cohort members during grades 6, 7, and 8 to assess the type, duration, and intensity of physical activity performed by the student during the previous day. The SAPAC was a group-administered 1-day recall of 22 common physical activities. The instrument also asked whether and for how long the child watched television or played video games. During CATCH II, the SAPAC was validated against heart rate monitors ( $r = 0.57$ ) and Caltrac accelerometers (Hemokinetics Inc, Madison, Wis) ( $r = 0.30$ ) in grade 5 children.[32]

### HEALTH BEHAVIOR SURVEY

The Health Behavior Survey (HBS) was a 45-minute group-administered instrument designed to measure the psychosocial variables thought to influence the dietary, physical activity, and smoking behaviors targeted by the CATCH II interventions. These factors included knowledge of foods low in fat and sodium, intentions for heart-healthy food selections, perceived reinforcement and social support for physical activity, and smoking behavior and acquisition, with reference to the transtheoretical model of change theory.[33] No physiological measure of smoking was taken. During CATCH II, the HBS measured the impact of the intervention on student learning outcomes in diet knowledge, but not on physical activity knowledge or smoking knowledge. In CATCH III, the HBS was used to examine postintervention differences in psychosocial variables between students who had been exposed to the different school conditions during each spring of grades 6, 7, and 8. Reliability of the instrument assessed during the pilot phase of CATCH II was found to be adequate (for diet knowledge,  $[\text{Alpha}] = .75$ ; for diet intentions,  $[\text{Alpha}] = .78$ ).[34] The CATCH III HBS was revised for age appropriateness during grade 6.

### PHYSIOLOGICAL VARIABLES

A full risk-factor screening profile, including blood samples for total cholesterol, HDL cholesterol, and apolipoprotein B levels, and measurements of height, weight, skinfold thickness, and blood pressure, was conducted once during the spring of grade 8 (1997).

Nonfasting blood samples were obtained via venipuncture, and serum was analyzed for total cholesterol, HDL cholesterol, and apolipoprotein B levels in the same central laboratory (Miriam Hospital, Providence, RI) used for the CATCH II baseline and follow-up determinations. The laboratory participates in the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Lipid Standardization Program. Reliability was assessed by taking blind duplicate blood samples from a 10% random sample of subjects. Intraclass correlation coefficients for serum total cholesterol, HDL cholesterol, and apolipoprotein B levels were high: 0.996, 0.977, and 0.993, respectively.

Five recordings (1 minute apart) of systolic and diastolic blood pressure and heart rate were obtained for each subject after a 5-minute rest period using the Dinamap automatic blood pressure device (model 8100XT; Critikon Inc, Tampa, Fla). Cuff size selection was based on arm length and circumference measurements.[35] The average of the last 3 readings was used for analysis. The Dinamap device was calibrated against a mercury manometer at the start of each day of blood pressure measurement.

Three consecutive replicate measurements of triceps and subscapular skinfolds were conducted using Lange calipers. The average of the 3 measurements was used for analysis. Height was measured using a portable stadiometer, and



## Three-Year Maintenance of Improved Diet and Physical Activity.(Statistical Data Included)

weight was measured using the SECA electronic portable scale (SECA Ltd, Birmingham, England). Height was measured to the nearest 0.1 cm, weight to the nearest 0.1 kg, and skinfolds to the nearest millimeter. Body mass index was calculated as the weight in kilograms divided by the square of the height in meters.[2] Interrater reliability was assessed by repeating a set of anthropometric measurements on 2 randomly selected children on each day of measurement. Intraclass correlation coefficients were 0.998 for height and weight scales. The intraclass correlation coefficients were similarly high for triceps and subscapular skinfolds, 0.981 and 0.983, respectively.

### STATISTICAL METHODS

Multivariate repeated-measures analysis was used for virtually all of the outcome variables (the exceptions are explained below).[36-38] For dietary recall and physiological risk factors, each participant's observation vector included up to 3 measurements (grades 3, 5, and 8); for self-reported physical activity, up to 4 measurements (grades 5, 6, 7, and 8); and for health behavior surveys, up to 7 measurements (semesters 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, and 12). Cases with 1 or more observations missing were included as well as complete cases, on the assumption that missing observations were random. Some anomalous data and some plausible but extreme values were deleted to avoid undue influence, as follows: height decreasing more than 1 cm between grades (8 cases); BMI greater than 50 kg/[m.sup.2] (1 case); serum cholesterol level greater than 10.35 mmol/L (400 mg/dL) (3 cases); 1 day's energy intake greater than 50 200 kJ (12 000 kcal) (1 case); and 1 day's physical activity greater than 10.5 hours (99 cases).

The repeated-measures model included individual-level covariates (sex, race, sex x race interaction, and in some cases, age, height, BMI, or total energy intake) as well as fixed effects for CATCH design features (site, intervention group, time, and group x time interaction). Random effect was included for the student's CATCH school of origin (the randomized unit) and for students within the school. Inclusion of student random effect was equivalent to assuming compound-symmetric covariance for the observation vector, ie, uniform pairwise correlation between time points within student.

The group x time interaction term was used to test whether the time course of the end point mean was parallel in intervention-school and control-school students. A nonparallel course represented a significant impact of the CATCH intervention (except in the case of physical activity, which did not include baseline measurements).

Scalar contrasts were constructed from the fitted model to estimate the mean outcome at each time point in intervention-school and control-school participants and the difference between them, adjusted for all other factors in the model. The contrast at grade 8 was used to test the particular hypothesis of CATCH III: that a difference still existed 3 years after the end of intervention.

Smoking, a dichotomous variable, was analyzed by a repeated-measures logistic regression model similar to the linear model, omitting only the student random effect for computational stability.

To control type I error in the presence of multiple outcome measures and time points, we limited formal inference to a single test (with a critical value of  $P = .05$ ) of the primary CATCH hypothesis for each end point: group x time interaction for end points measured at baseline (dietary recall, risk factors, health behavior) and group main effect for end points measured only at follow-up (physical activity, FC).

The expected number of type I errors was therefore 1.05 ( $0.05 \times 21$ ) for the variables reported in Tables 2 through 5.

Multiple logistic regression analysis was conducted to determine whether the likelihood of grade 8 participation, given baseline participation, differed by site, sex, race, intervention group, or baseline end point variables. The participants' and non-participants' baseline levels of CATCH III end points were compared using a mixed model, controlling for site, sex, race, sex x race interaction, intervention group, and the same additional individual-level covariates used in repeated-measures analysis.

### REFERENCES

[1.] National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute. Report of the Task Force on Research in Epidemiology and Prevention of Cardiovascular Diseases. Washington, DC: National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute, National Institutes of Health, Dept

## Three-Year Maintenance of Improved Diet and Physical Activity.(Statistical Data Included)

of Health and Human Services; 1994.

- [2.] Kelder SH, Perry CL, Klepp K-I, Lytle LA. Longitudinal tracking of adolescent smoking, physical activity, and food choice behaviors. *Am J Public Health.* 1994;84:1121-1126.
- [3.] Kannel WB, Dawber TR. Atherosclerosis as a pediatric problem. *J Pediatr.* 1972;80:544-554.
- [4.] Lenfant C. Improving the health of America's youth: the NHLBI perspective. *J Health Educ.* 1995;26:6-8.
- [5.] Troiano RP, Flegal KM. Overweight children and adolescents: description, epidemiology, and demographics. *Pediatrics.* 1998;101:497-504.
- [6.] Stone EJ, McKenzie TL, Welk GJ, Booth ML. Effects of physical activity interventions in youth: review and synthesis. *Am J Prev Med.* 1998;15:298-315.
- [7.] Van Horn L, Kavey R. Diet and cardiovascular disease prevention: what works? *Ann Behav Med.* 1997;19:197-212.
- [8.] Enos WF, Beyer JO, Holmes RH. Pathogenesis of coronary disease in American soldiers killed in Korea. *JAMA.* 1955;158:912-914.
- [9.] McNamara JJ, Molot MA, Stremple JF, Cutting RT. Coronary artery disease in combat casualties in Vietnam. *JAMA.* 1971;216:1185-1187.
- [10.] Kemper HC, Snel J, Verschuur R, Storm-van Essen L. Tracking of health and risk indicators of cardiovascular diseases from teenager to adult: Amsterdam Growth and Health Study. *Prev Med.* 1990;19:642-655.
- [11.] Webber LS, Srinivasan SR, Wattigney WA, Berenson CS. Tracking of serum lipids and lipoproteins from childhood to adulthood: the Bogalusa Heart Study. *Am J Epidemiol.* 1991;133:884-899.
- [12.] Newman WP III, Freedman DS, Voors AW, et al. Relation of serum lipoprotein levels and systolic blood pressure to early atherosclerosis: the Bogalusa Heart Study. *N Engl J Med.* 1986;314:138-144.
- [13.] Stone EJ, Perry CL, Luepker RV. Synthesis of cardiovascular behavior research for youth health promotion. *Health Educ Q.* 1989;16:155-169.
- [14.] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Guidelines for school health programs to promote lifelong healthy eating. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 1996;45(RR-9):1-42.
- [15.] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Guidelines for school and community programs to promote lifelong physical activity among young people. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 1997;46(RR-6):1-42.
- [16.] Perry CL, Klepp K-I, Shultz JM. Primary prevention of cardiovascular disease: communitywide strategies for youth. *J Consult Clin Psychol.* 1988;56:358-364.
- [17.] Perry CL, Parcel GS, Stone E, et al. The Child and Adolescent Trial for Cardiovascular Health (CATCH): overview of the intervention program and evaluation methods. *Gardiiovasc Risk Factors.* 1992;2:36-44.
- [18.] Perry CL, Stone EJ, Parcel CS, et al. School-based cardiovascular health promotion: the Child and Adolescent Trial for Cardiovascular Health (CATCH). *J Sch Health.* 1990;60:406-413.
- [19.] Luepker RV, Perry CL, McKinlay SM, et al. Outcomes of a field trial to improve children's dietary patterns and physical activity: the Child and Adolescent Trial for Cardiovascular Health (CATCH). *JAMA.* 1996;275:768-776.
- [20.] Osganian SK, Ebzery MK, Montgomery DH, et al. Changes in nutrient content of school lunches: results from the

## Three-Year Maintenance of Improved Diet and Physical Activity.(Statistical Data Included)

CATCH Eat Smart Food Service intervention. *Prev Med.* 1996;25:400-412.

[21.] McKenzie T, Nader P, Strikmiller PK, et al. School physical education: effects of the Child and Adolescent Trial for Cardiovascular Health. *Prey Med.* 1996;25:423-431.

[22.] Lytle LA, Stone EJ, Nichaman MZ, et al. Changes in nutrient intakes of elementary school children following a school-based intervention: results from the CATCH study. *Prey Med.* 1996;25:465-477.

[23.] Zucker DM, Lakatos E, Webber LS, et al. Statistical design of the Child and Adolescent Trial for Cardiovascular Health (CATCH): implications of cluster randomization. *Control Clin Trials.* 1995;16:96-118.

[24.] Webber LS, Osganian SK, Feldman HA, et al. Cardiovascular risk factors among children after a 2 1/2-year intervention--the CATCH study. *Prev Med.* 1996;25:432-441.

[25.] Perry CL, Sellers DE, Johnson C, et al. The Child and Adolescent Trial for Cardiovascular Health (CATCH): intervention, implementation, and feasibility for elementary schools in the United States. *Health Educ Behav.* 1997;24:716-735.

[26.] Webber LS, Osganian V, Luepker RV, et al. Cardiovascular risk factors among third grade children in four regions of the United States: the CATCH study. *Am J Epidemiol.* 1995;141:428-439.

[27.] Stone EJ, Osganian SK, McKinlay SM, et al. Operational design and quality control in the CATCH multicenter trial. *Prev Med.* 1996;25:384-399.

[28.] Edmundson E, Parcel GS, Feldman HA, et al. The effect of the Child and Adolescent Trial for Cardiovascular Health upon psychosocial determinants of diet and physical activity behavior. *Prev Med.* 1996;25:442-454.

[29.] Lytle LA, Nichaman MZ, Obarzanek E, et al. Validation of 24-hour recalls assisted by food records in third-grade children. *JAm Diet Assoc.* 1993;93:1431-1436.

[30.] Dwyer JT, Montgomery DH, Ebzery MK, et al. Development of a food checklist for fat, saturated fat, and sodium intakes in seventh- and eighth-grade students. In: Final Program and Abstracts of the 124th Annual Meeting and Exposition of the American Public Health Association; November 17-21, 1996; New York, NY.

[31.] Smith KW, Dwyer JT, Lytle LA, et al. Calibration and reliability of a food checklist for the CATCH cohort. In: Final Program and Abstracts of the 124th Annual Meeting and Exposition of the American Public Health Association; November 17-21, 1996.

[32.] Sallis JF, Strikmiller PK, Harsha DW, et al. Validation of interviewer- and self-administered physical activity checklists for fifth grade students. *Meal Sci Sports Exerc.* 1996;28:840-851.

[33.] Prochaska JO, DiClemente CC. *The Transtheoretical Approach: Crossing Traditional Boundaries of Change.* Homewood, Ill: Dorsey Press; 1984.

[34.] Voors AW. Cuff bladder size in a blood pressure survey of children. *Am J Epidemiol.* 1975;101:489-494.

[35.] Edmundson E, Parcel CS, Perry CL, et al. The effects of the the Child and Adolescent Trial for Cardiovascular Health intervention on psychosocial determinants of CVD risk behavior among third grade students. *Am J Health Promotion.* 1996;10:217-225.

[36.] Koepsell TD, Martin DC, Diehr PH, et al. Data analysis and sample size issues in evaluations of community-based health promotion and disease prevention programs: a mixed-model analysis of variance approach. *J Clin Epidemiol.* 1991;44:701-713.

## Three-Year Maintenance of Improved Diet and Physical Activity.(Statistical Data Included)

[37.] SAS Technical Report P-229. In: SAS/STAT Software: Changes and Enhancements, Release 6.07. Cary, NC: SAS Institute Inc; 1992:289-368.

[38.] Murray DM, Wolfinger RD. Analysis issues in the evaluation of community trials: progress toward solution in SAS/STAT MIXED. J Community Psychol. 1994a; special issue:140-154.

[39.] Subcommittee on the Tenth Edition of the Recommended Dietary Allowances, National Research Council. Recommended Dietary Allowances. 10th ed. Washington, DC: National Academy Press; 1989.

[40.] Walter HJ, Hofman A, Vaughan RD, Wynder EL. Modification of risk factors for coronary heart disease: five year results of a school-based intervention trial. N Engl J Med. 1988;318:1093-1100.

[41.] Bush PJ, Zuckerman AE, Taggart VS, Theiss PK, Peleg EO, Smith SA. Cardiovascular risk factor prevention in black school children: the "Know Your Body" evaluation project. Health Educ Q. 1989;16:215-227.

[42.] Nader PR, Sallis JF, Abramson IS, et al. Family-based cardiovascular risk reduction education among Mexican- and Anglo-Americans. Fam Community Health. 1992;15:57-74.

[43.] Perry CL, Kelder SH, Klepp KI. Communitywide cardiovascular disease prevention with young people: long-term outcomes of the Class of 1989 Study. Eur J Public Health. 1994;4:188-194.

[44.] Botvin GJ, Baker E, Dusenbury L, Botvin EM, Diaz T. Long-term follow-up results of a randomized drug abuse prevention trial in a white middle-class population. JAMA. 1995;273:1106-1112.

[45.] Walter HJ, Hofman A, Connelly PA, Barrett LT, Kost KL. Primary prevention of chronic disease in childhood: changes in risk factors after one year of intervention. Am J Epidemiol. 1985;122:772-781.

[46.] Arbeit ML, Johnson CO, Mott DS, et al. The Heart Smart cardiovascular school health promotion: behavior correlates of risk factor changes. Prev Med. 1992;21:18-32.

[47.] The Writing Group for the DISC Collaborative Research Group. Efficacy and safety of lowering dietary intake of fat and cholesterol in children with elevated low-density lipoprotein cholesterol: the Dietary Intervention Study in Children (DISC). JAMA. 1995;273:1429-1435.

[48.] Stone EJ, McGraw SA, Osganian SK, Elder JP. Process evaluation in the multicenter Child and Adolescent Trial for Cardiovascular Health (CATCH). Health Educ O. 1994;suppl 2:S1-S144.

The affiliations of the authors appear in the acknowledgment section.