Does Diabetes Prevention Pay for Itself? Evaluation of the M.O.B.I.L.I.S. Program for Obese Persons

Jan Häußler and Friedrich Breyer

Does Diabetes Prevention Pay for Itself? Evaluation of the M.O.B.I.L.I.S.

Program for Obese Persons

Jan Häußler* and Friedrich Breyer

March 24, 2014

Abstract

In response to the growing burden of obesity, public primary prevention programs against obesity have been widely recommended. Several studies estimated the cost effectiveness of diabetes prevention trials for different countries. Nevertheless, it is still controversial if prevention conducted in more real-world settings and among people with increased risk but not yet exhibiting Increased Glucose Tolerance can be a cost-saving strategy to cope with the obesity epidemic. We examine this question in a simulation model based on the results of the M.O.B.I.L.I.S program, a German lifestyle intervention to reduce obesity, which is directed on the high-risk group of people who are already obese. The contribution of this paper is the use of 4-year follow-up data on the intervention group and a comparison with a control group formed by SOEP respondents as inputs in a Markov model of the long-term cost savings through this intervention due to the prevention of type-2 diabetes. We show that from the point of view of a health insurer, these programs can pay for themselves.

JEL-classification: I12, H51

Keywords: diabetes prevention, cost analysis, Markov modeling

*Corresponding Author. Address: Department of Economics, University of Konstanz, Fach 135, 78457 Konstanz, Phone: +497531-882189, e-mail: Jan.Haeussler@uni-konstanz.de

1.   Introduction

One of the main challenges for population health in the developed world is the steady increase in obesity. In the US, in 2009/2010, 35.7 per cent of the adult population was obese (Ogden et al., 2012), and in several European countries such as Spain and Germany, the corresponding percentages lay between 14.7 and 23 per cent. (Brunello et al., 2009; Mensink et al., 2013). The reasons for this trend are a combination of increased intake of calories and reduced physical activity (Finkelstein et al., 2005) and the resulting energy imbalance not only leads to a continuous weight gain but also to severe chronic conditions such as type 2 diabetes. Globally, it is estimated that 438 million people (7.8% of the adult population) will have developed type 2 diabetes by 2030 unless effective prevention programs are implemented (International Diabetes Federation, 2009). Diabetes and other diseases emerging as consequences of excessive weight will also cause a sizable economic burden (Guh et al., 2009) through direct medical costs of treatment as well as indirect costs of illness such as disability and early retirement (Konnopka et al., 2011; Finkelstein et al., 2003).

In response to this growing burden of obesity, public primary prevention programs against obesity have been widely recommended (WHO 2004). The European guideline for the prevention of type 2 diabetes focuses on obesity and sedentary lifestyle as these are the main modifiable risk factors of the disease (Paulweber et al., 2010). Several studies (Lindgren et al., 2007; DPP Research Group 2003; Icks et al., 2007; Bertram et al., 2010) estimated the cost effectiveness of diabetes prevention trials for different countries. Thus the aim of these studies was to measure either the costs per T2D case prevented or per QALY gained (see reviews by Paulweber et al., 2010 and Klein et al., 2011). Furthermore, Li et al., (2010) found that among all different interventions recommended by the American Diabetes Association (ADA), evidence was strongest for the cost-effectiveness of intensive lifestyle modification among persons with impaired glucose tolerance (IGT). Nevertheless, it is still controversial if prevention programs conducted in more real-world settings and among people with increased risk but not yet exhibiting IGT really pay for themselves from the perspective of the health care system. We examine this question in a simulation model based on the results of the M.O.B.I.L.I.S program, a German lifestyle intervention to reduce obesity, which is directed on the high-risk group of people who are already obese. The contribution of this paper is the use of a Markov model to measure long-term cost savings of this intervention due to prevention of type-2 diabetes.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 is devoted to a description of data and methods and first presents an overview of the M.O.B.I.L.I.S. intervention program and the analyzed data, followed by a characterization of the Markov model framework and the analysis of cost savings. Section 3 presents the results of the medium-term simulation and some sensitivity analyses. In Section 4 we discuss our findings. Concluding remarks are offered in Section 5.

2.   Data and Methods

Overview of the M.O.B.I.L.I.S. Intervention

The M.O.B.I.L.I.S. program is a lifestyle intervention to reduce obesity. The program has been implemented in more than 100 sites throughout Germany since 2004, and with by now over 6000 participants (Lagerstrøm et al., 2013). The program addresses obese adults (BMI 30-40 kg/m^2) who have at least one additional obesity-related risk factor such as type-2 diabetes, high blood pressure or orthopedic problems, but who are still capable of light exercise. Individuals with type-1 diabetes or several other conditions (such as eating disorders, consumption of psychotropic drugs, or cancer treatment in the last 5 years) are not allowed to participate. The intervention takes place in a group setting (with 15-18 participants per group) and consists of a total of 60 group sessions over a time period of 12 months, with a higher frequency in the first 8 weeks. 40 of the sessions are devoted to light physical activity such as walking, aerobic, yoga and, if possible, jogging, and the remaining 20 sessions to nutritional and behavioral counseling. Participants are also encouraged to utilize sports facilities offered in their communities.

What makes the M.O.B.I.L.I.S. intervention particularly interesting for a health economic evaluation is the fact that participation fees are to a large extent reimbursed by public health insurance. The participants have to pay participation fees of €785 (before 2008: €685) in advance but upon completion of the program all but a co-payment of €100 is returned by the sickness fund provided the person has participated in at least 75% of all sessions. Thus, besides their intrinsic motivation to improve their health status, the participants have an additional monetary incentive to attend the program sessions regularly once they started the program. In fact, of the first 5025 starters, 4336 (or 87%) participated in the check-up scheduled at the end of the program and 3985 (or 92%) of those or 79% of all starters had fulfilled the condition of a 75% participation rate.

The effectiveness of the intervention in reducing weight and enhancing the physical activity of the participants over the intervention period has been documented in the studies by

Lagerstörm et al. (2013) and Berg et al. (2008). Frey et al. (2010) also show that the intervention effects are persistent one year after program termination. Compared to the initial levels, average weight was reduced by 6.8 kg (± 7.8) and weekly physical activity was significantly higher. Besides that, Göhner et al. (2012) find that compared to a quasi-experimental control group, the participants show significantly enhanced psychological variables (self-efficacy, strength of goal intention) at a two-year follow-up.

4 Year Follow-up

The present follow-up study conducted in 2011 and 2012 allows the evaluation of long-term effects of the M.O.B.I.L.I.S. program. The follow-up periods after completion of the intervention vary between 3 and 6 years with an average follow-up period of about 4 years after the completion of the program. To rule out seasonal effects the participants were contacted in the same calendar month in which they had completed the program. A total of N_0=958 individuals that had completed the program, had taken part in the one-year follow-up and fulfilled the inclusion criteria (before the intervention: age 40-60 yrs., BMI 30-40 kg/m^2, no type-2 diabetes) were asked by mail and additional personal phone calls to participate in the study. A response rate of 42% results in a study sample of N=401 individuals, with average age 49.8 yrs. (±5.7), average BMI 34.9 kg/m^2 (± 2.7) and a female share of 82.5%. All medical and anthropometric values of the sample are reliable, as they were measured and documented by physicians. Additional lifestyle related items (physical activity, nutrition) were raised on the basis of a questionnaire.

The descriptive statistics in Table 1 provide an overview of the sample characteristics before and after the intervention, as well as for the four-year follow-up. The obesity measures (BMI, Waist-to-Hip Ratio (WHR)) and reported physical activity have a common pattern over time. Compared to the baseline, the intervention still has a positive effect at the follow-up, though there is a clear rebound effect when we regard the development after completion of the program. However, looking at the other medical risk indicators, the interpretation is not as clear. For blood pressure, LDL cholesterol, and fasting blood sugar the initial improvements after the intervention vanish, as the follow-up levels meet the baseline values. HDL cholesterol and HbA1c show a rising time trend, which might be due to general age effects (Davidson et al., 2010) overlapping with possible effects of the intervention.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics of the M.O.B.I.L.I.S. Sample Development

Variable	Baseline	Completion	Follow-up
Weight (kg)	98.603	91.305	95.683
	(12.246)	(13.046)	(14.299)
BMI (kg/m^2)	34.887	32.317	33.850
	(2.692)	(3.509)	(3.862)
WHR	0.926	0.909	0.917
	(0.078)	(0.078)	(0.082)
Heart rate (bpm)	78.005	73.990	70.972
	(12.269)	(11.036)	(9.478)
Blood pressure[1] (mmHg)	132.5 / 85.8	126.1 / 82. 3	132.1 / 82.5
	(15.9 / 9.1)	(15.3 / 10.6)	(15.0 / 9.4)
HDL (mg/dl)	57.197	59.784	61.714
	(13.666)	(14.322)	(15.742)
LDL (mg/dl)	133.418	131.811	133.952
	(33.015)	(32.639)	(33.798)
Fasting blood sugar (mg/dl)	92.970	91.636	93.870
	(13.152)	(12.737)	(16.490)
HbA1c (in %)	5.625	5.637	5.649
	(0.341)	(0.281)	(0.435)
Physical Activity[2]	22.879	37.031	34.305
	(21.416)	(27.352)	(27.269)

N = 401, Standard errors in parenthesis.
[1] Systolic / Diastolic.   [2] Measured as MET per week. Based on the evaluation of the physical activity questionnaire developed by Frey et al. (1999).

In order to check for possible self-selection effects in the follow-up sample we compare the responders to the non-responders with respect to their initial weight loss during the program. The differences are not very striking, though we cannot exclude a self-selection bias for participation in the study. Among responders, 61.4% had experienced a weight loss of more than 5% while participating in the program, whereas the respective number among the non-responders was only 49.9%, see Figure 2 (in the Appendix) for details. The response rate of those with an initial weight loss of less than 5% was 35.7%, compared to 46.9 % for those who lost more than 5% during the program.

Control Group

For an informative evaluation of the economic benefits of the intervention based on the development of the risk factors, we need to account for the general age-related trend in the population, which is achieved by including a control group. Due to the real-world implementation of the M.O.B.I.L.I.S. program and the retrospective study design, we are lacking an original randomized control group. We overcome this problem with the aid of an artificial control group, formed from a subgroup of $N_0=1308$ individuals from the German socio-economic panel (SOEP) who meet the same inclusion criteria at the beginning of the intervention. The SOEP sample (Wagner et al., 2007) is representative of the German population so that comparability for socio-economic and other background variables should be reasonably high. We performed propensity score matching estimated on the baseline covariates BMI[1], age, and gender for the two nearest neighbors in the SOEP sample to build our artificial control group. The SOEP dataset only contains information on weight and BMI as risk factors for diabetes, so we lose the information on the additional risk indicators included in the M.O.B.I.L.I.S. dataset in the control group. As data on weight is only available in the SOEP sample every two years, we compute the annual BMI development to account for the one-year period of the intervention.

The average development in the matched control group in comparison to the measured intervention group values can be found in the first column of Table 2. Being matched on the baseline BMI the control group shows no significant change in BMI in the period until completion of the program. Over the four years of the follow-up period the average BMI in the control group grows at a low rate from 34.458 to 35.088 kg/m^2, and compared to the baseline value of 34.887 kg/m^2 the overall rise in weight in the control group is not significantly different from zero. Thus the average BMI in the control group is more or less constant over the observed period, while the intervention group shows the pattern of initial weight loss and a rebound in the following four years as described before.

---

[1] The BMI and weight values in the SOEP are based on self-reported data. We are aware of possible underreporting bias compared to the values in the intervention group that were collected by physicians. Nevertheless, we abstract from any corrections that would necessarily be speculative and rely on the quality of the SOEP questionnaire.

Table 2: BMI Means and Subgroup Development

	BMI [1]	$BMI < 30$	$30 \leq BMI < 35$	$35 \leq BMI$
Baseline Intervention [2]	34.887 (2.692)	0.0	0.5287	0.4713
Completion Intervention	32.317 (3.509)	0.2718	0.5037	0.2244
Completion Control	34.458 (2.792)	0.0698	0.4589	0.4713
Follow-up Intervention	33.850 (3.862)	0.1621	0.4514	0.3865
Follow-up Control	35.088 (3.277)	0.0474	0.4638	0.4888

N=401.
[1] measured in (kg/m^2).
[2] Control matched on BMI at the baseline before the intervention.

The observed reduction in BMI from the start to the end of the intervention is 7.4%, while the estimated average treatment effect (ATE) of BMI development is a 5.9% reduction for the intervention group, compared to the control group. In the period between completion and four-year follow-up the observed BMI in the intervention group grows by 4.6%, whereas the ATE in this period only shows a 2.8% rise in BMI for the intervention group. As the ATE is significantly below the observed rebound effect in the intervention group, we can state that the effects of regaining weight in the intervention group at the follow-up are on average lower when we take the representative control into account. The differences in distribution over the three obesity subgroups overweight, obese, and severely obese (BMI<30, 30≤BMI≤35, BMI>35) in the M.O.B.I.L.I.S. population and the control group are presented in Table 2. All statistical analyses were performed using Stata 12.

Simulation Framework

Evaluating the long term effects of the M.O.B.I.L.I.S. intervention requires information on the development of obesity related diseases beyond the data of the four year follow-up. Abstracting from other diseases such as myocardial infarction and stroke, our analyses focus on the development of diabetes based on the individual obesity level. Using a Markov cohort simulation we estimate the long-term effects of the M.O.B.I.L.I.S. intervention on the prevalence of type-2 diabetes in the control and the intervention group. The Markov model is

a variation of the model used in a previous study to evaluate the Finnish GOAL Intervention (Haeussler et al., 2012).

Figure 1: States of the Markov Model

The state-transition Markov model consists of five mutually exclusive (disease) states and discrete one-year intervals. The model structure depicted in Figure 1 allows us to follow the starting population over a 20-year time horizon, using the annual forecasts for every state of interest. We limit the time horizon of the Markov model to 20 years because we think that any weight differences observed between the groups at a later time can no longer be traced back to the intervention. This is in line with findings of previous follow-up studies (DPP Research Group 2009). Members of the intervention and control groups move between the Markov states according to given transition probabilities (see Table 3 for an overview). Both groups enter the model at stage zero according to the observed (estimated) distributions over the model states at the one-year follow-up. The five Markov states are: 1) no diagnosed diabetes and BMI < 30, 2) no diagnosed diabetes and 30 < BMI < 35, 3) no diagnosed diabetes and BMI > 35 (afterwards we will refer to all three of these states as "non-diabetes"), 4) diagnosed diabetes and 5) the absorbing Markov state death. The initial average age of the individuals entering the Markov model is 54 years, which is consistent with the average age at the follow-up in both groups. With respect to the gender shares we simulate the model according to the mixed composition in the follow-up sample and in a separate subgroup analysis for females only. We do not run a separate subgroup for males, as the low number of male participants makes a sound analysis impossible.

Table 3: Annual Transition Probabilities in the Markov Model

transition to from	BMI < 30	30 ≤ BMI < 35	35 ≤ BMI	Diabetes[2]	Death[2]
BMI < 30	0.80298[1] 0.63606	0.18302[1] 0.34994	0	0.00834	0.00566
30 ≤ BMI < 35	0.02467[1] 0.01526	0.83391[1] 0.89981	0.11256[1] 0.05607	0.02320	0.00566
35 ≤ BMI	0	0.04142[1] 0.03502	0.90911[1] 0.91551	0.04381	0.00566
Diabetes[2]	0	0	0	0.99425	0.00575

Upper line: intervention group, lower line: control group
[1] Depending on the assumed further weight development in the intervention group the values adjust to the control group over time.
[2] Values for the age 55-60. Age-dependent in 5-year steps.

The annual transition probabilities between the three non-diabetes states are computed from the analysis of the BMI development between the end of the M.O.B.I.L.I.S. intervention and the follow-up four years later, and the respective changes in the control group. We do not further consider the BMI progress within the year of the program for the computation of the transition probabilities, as this would implicitly assume regular repetition of the intervention. However, the singular one-year intervention effect is captured by the composition of the intervention group and control group with respect to the Markov states at the start of the simulation. To account for a further equalization in weight development of the intervention group to the general time trend reflected by the control group, we assume a linear adjustment of the non-diabetes transition probabilities starting after the 4-year follow-up to the control group values over 10 years. This assumption is in line with previous findings on long-term effects of weight reduction (DPP Research Group, 2009; Norris et al.; 2005).[2] In line with the data for the development in the intervention group and the control group, we assume that annual weight changes are not big enough to jump from the lowest to the highest non-diabetes state (or vice versa) in one step.

All other annual transition probabilities are based on the results of other studies and German epidemiological data: non-diabetes to diabetes (Rathmann et al., 2009; Bonora et al., 2004), non-diabetes to death and diabetes to death (Statistisches Bundesamt, 2010; GBE, 2006; Bender et al., 2006), are all one way. The transition probabilities to the state of death are

---

[2] Since after the end of the program members of the intervention group on average gain weight faster than members of the control group due to the rebound effect, this assumption also prevents the implausible outcome that after a number of years the former are on average heavier than the latter.

adjusted to the gender composition of the samples and they are age-dependent in five-year steps. Due to missing data the transition from non-diabetes to death does not differ by BMI category. All of the people who die remain in this state forever and we only regard diagnosed cases of type-2 diabetes mellitus where no cure is feasible. Those probabilities are assumed to be equal for the two groups of individuals, but they vary by age and are adjusted to the gender composition of the groups. All simulations were performed using TreeAge Pro Healthcare (Release 1.0 b1, 2001; TreeAge Software Inc.).

Cost Analysis

The results of the Markov simulation are the foundation of the subsequent analysis of expected cost savings. The cost analysis (CA) adopts the perspective of the health insurance system and abstracts from effects on human capital, work loss etc. Also, subjective utility from the health state does not enter the CA. We measure the direct costs of diabetes by monetizing the simulation outcomes for diabetes prevalence in each year and in both groups.

The diabetes costs in year i are defined by the following equation:

$Costs_{\_i\_group} = [Costs_{\_w/o\ complications} + Rate_{\_i\_complications} * Costs_{\_with\ comp}] * Prevalence_{\_i\_group.}$

Discounted overall costs of diabetes for each group are respectively:

$$COSTS_{group} = \sum_{i=0}^{20} \frac{1}{(1+r)^i} Costs_{i\_group}.$$

Based on the results by Guh et al., 2009, we assume no complications for the first five years and afterwards a linear increase to an average complication rate of 25% from 10 years on. Regarding the treatment costs of diabetes in Germany we use the value of 850 € for the disease without complications and €8,830 with complications (Köster et al. 2006 and 2011). The intervention costs - for a sickness fund – are €685 (€585 before 2009), resulting in average intervention costs according to the sample composition of €673. For our evaluation, we only take into account the costs without the deductible of €100, as we adopt the perspective of the sickness fund. All costs are expressed in 2011 euros and all future costs were compounded at an annual discount rate r of 3 per cent.

Sensitivity Analyses

To check for the validity of our results we conduct one-way sensitivity analyses regarding the values of all parameters of the model.

3. Results

3.1 Mortality

The simulated cumulative annual mortalities depicted in Figure 3 (in the Appendix), for the mixed gender groups, indicate that the intervention has no significant effect on the longevity of the individuals. The overall time trend of the mortality rates is the same for the intervention group and the control group, with the annual rates differing only at insignificantly low margins. The cumulative mortality after 20 years is 27.00% in the control group compared to 27.28% in the intervention group. Similarly, the difference in average annual mortality rates between 1.35% in the control group and 1.36% in the intervention group is not significantly different from zero. The simulation results for the female subgroup show that the described mortality effects are independent of the gender composition of the groups. In this case, the cumulative mortality rate after 20 years is 20.26% (20.05%) in the intervention (control) group. Summarizing the results, we can state that, at least in our model setup, the M.O.B.I.L.I.S. intervention has no effects on long-term mortality rates.

3.2 Diabetes Prevalence

The annual prevalence rates of diabetes over the 20 years of the simulated time horizon are depicted for the intervention group and the control group in Figure 4 (in the Appendix). The prevalence level in the intervention group is markedly below that in the control group over all the 20 years, with an average annual rate of 4.59% in the intervention group compared to 6.87% in the control group. The simulated diabetes prevalence at the end of the simulation is 31.9% lower in the intervention group than in the control group, with an absolute difference of 4.73 percentage points. The estimated diabetes prevalence in the M.O.B.I.L.I.S. population would be considerably lower if the success of the intervention persisted over the whole period. Looking at the literature on the long-term effects of other interventions (Norris et al., 2005; Tuomilehto et al., 2001) this scenario seems unrealistic but we included the simulation as a benchmark in the sensitivity analysis.

The prevalence of diabetes for the female subgroup shows the same pattern as described above for the mixed group, though the differences in prevalence rates are a bit less pronounced. On average, the annual prevalence rate is 3.67% (5.10%) in the intervention (control) group. At the end of the simulated time horizon the diabetes prevalence is 8.04% in the intervention group compared to 10.97% in the control group. This prevalence being 26.7%

lower in the intervention group compared to 31.9% in total indicates that the male share of the mixed sample has a positive influence on the effectiveness of the intervention as a whole.

3.3   Cost Analysis

As discussed in the methods part, the extent of the net cost savings depends on the average time between the onset of type-2 diabetes and the onset of complications (see Table 4 for an overview). In the extreme case of no complications at all, the M.O.B.I.L.I.S. intervention does not pay off from the perspective of a sickness fund. In that situation with annual type-2 diabetes costs of €850, the difference in the discounted (avoided) diabetes costs between control and intervention group amounts to €446. With average intervention costs of €673 for a sickness fund, this leads to net costs per participant of €227 for the mixed group and €269 for the female subgroup.[3]

Following the rationale of the computation described in the methods part – with an average time till the onset of complications of 10 years – the M.O.B.I.L.I.S. intervention is cost saving. Based on the assumption that the costs of type-2 diabetes rise linearly from €850 (cost without complications) in the first five years after diagnosis to €3057 (25% complications on average) in year 10 and afterwards, the differences in the costs of diabetes are as follows: The discounted diabetes costs cumulated over the whole period of 20 years are €1000 lower for individuals from the intervention group than for those from the control group. For the mixed gender group this results in net cost savings of €327 from the perspective of a sickness fund. The positive result also holds for the female subgroup, with net cost savings of €299.

Table 4: Overview of Net Cost Savings

Avg. Complications	Mixed Group	All Female
NO	-227 €	-269 €
after 5 years	411 €	349 €
after 10 years	**327 €**	**299 €**
after 15 years	269 €	228 €

With the assumed scenario in bold. 25% complications on average.

---

[3] As Table 4 contains cost *savings*, these differences of 227 and 269 € appear as negative numbers.

3.4   Sensitivity Analyses

The analysis in the previous section shows that the results of the CA are affected by the assumed timespan before diabetes with complications sets in. But only in the extreme case without any complications the results are affected qualitatively. Altering the timespan from 10 years to 5 or 15 years shows that the results are robust for moderate changes to the parameters of this model and provides a confidence interval for the magnitude of the cost savings. In the mixed group, if 5 years pass before the onset of complications, the net cost savings are €411, while the figure is reduced to €269 if 15 years pass before complications arise.

As discussed above, the results of the CA are sensitive to the assumed parameters. After checking for the effect of the variation of each parameter, the results of the model turn out to be robust for all sensible parameter values. A summary of the single variations is presented in the tornado diagram of Figure 5 (in the Appendix), where the width of a single bar reflects the sensitivity of the diabetes costs for a variation in the respective parameter. The dotted vertical line in the diagram stands for the breakeven point in the CA for the mixed group as discussed above. When a single parameter variation affects the breakeven of the CA in general this is depicted by a bold vertical line in the respective bar. Thus for example the variation of the start age of the individuals entering the model does not affect the result, in the sense that the intervention has net cost savings for the whole interval from 45 to 65 years. For all other parameters the choice of the assumed value might affect the evaluation of the intervention. However, looking at the parameters in detail the assumed values in the model specification are for each of them far away from the critical values. Thus, we can summarize that the specification of the model parameters does not drive the positive results of the net cost analysis.

4.   Discussion

We are well aware of the limitations and shortcomings of the current study that have to be considered. The first point to look at is the lack of a randomized control group for the evaluation. Although we are missing socioeconomic background variables for the intervention group to compare them directly with our matched control group, differences with respect to socioeconomic status should be considered a minor problem since the intervention group was recruited from all over Germany and the control group is a matched representative subsample of the German population. The main problem with the artificial control group is, of course, that we cannot account for a possible selection bias with respect to participation in the

intervention for the control group. This might exaggerate the effects for the intervention group – as participants have the intention to lose weight – but this will not alter the implications of the analysis for the evaluation of public prevention programs. As long as prevention programs offered by sickness funds are voluntary, we will always observe comparable self-selection of participants.

Besides this selection effect at the baseline, we have to consider the differences between responders and non-responders at the four year follow-up, as mentioned in the data section and depicted in Figure 2. The follow-up responders had on average a larger weight loss by the end of the program, which might in general exaggerate the long-term effectiveness of the whole intervention in the present analysis. However, looking at BMI development between the completion of the program and the follow-up in detail, it appears that this self-selection of responders does not obviously bias our findings in one direction. The effect of an initial BMI decline on the BMI development in the 4 year follow-up period is significantly negative, with an estimated coefficient of -0.429 (SE: 0.054). Thus the observed rebound effect is stronger for those who lost more weight during the program. This larger regain in BMI has in turn negative consequences for the long-term effectiveness of the intervention. Considering these two points it is not clear that the larger share of initially successful responders in the follow-up overstates the effects of the intervention.

Regarding the structure of the Markov model two points can be criticized, the pure foundation on BMI changes and the focus on diabetes as the only cost relevant outcome. We think the former issue is justified by the fact that our control group dataset does not allow for a richer model, as the BMI is the only relevant risk factor we can observe. The focus on the cost of diabetes might understate the effectiveness of the intervention in the CA as we omit possible cost savings due to other obesity associated diseases. Consequently we regard our positive cost saving results as a lower benchmark for the total cost effects of the M.O.B.I.L.I.S. intervention and think that considering further diseases should add further cost savings. The effect on the simulated mortality should on the other hand be minimal, as the overall mortality rates for obese persons used in the model as transition probabilities reflect the other diseases as well.

Conducting the cost analysis from the perspective of the health care system might neglect some additional benefits for the society at large. Nevertheless we think the health care system perspective is the right one for this analysis as we evaluate a program advertised and reimbursed by sickness funds. Besides looking at the simulation results we think there is another point for our perspective. As projected mortality rates in the intervention group and

control group do not differ significantly, taking those effects into account would not change the CA results we found from the perspective of the health care system. A further issue is that our analysis neglects sick leave costs of diabetes. This is a valid point, although in our model framework these costs – for a population with a starting age of 54 and a time horizon of 20 years – could only occur in the first years.

The difference in the magnitude of effects between the mixed group and the female subgroup basically reflects the lower diabetes prevalence over the whole simulation horizon of women. On the other hand this effect is decreased by the higher female life expectancy. In combination with effects due to the composition of the mixed group we cannot make any predictions on the effectiveness of this intervention for a subgroup of male participants.

5. Conclusion

In this paper we have shown that from the perspective of the health care system, real-world diabetes prevention programs for obese people such as the M.O.B.I.L.I.S. intervention may pay for themselves in the long run. We consider the net cost savings found in our study as a lower bound for the total cost effects of the intervention as we only evaluate the costs of diabetes. Taking avoided costs of further obesity related diseases into account would presumably raise the net effects of the intervention. On the other hand, the estimated cost savings themselves may be slightly biased upward due to the (mild) self-selection of participants. It seems, however, reasonable to assume that this upward bias is smaller than the downward bias mentioned before. From a policy point of view, the results indicate that allowing sickness funds to invest in prevention might help to reduce health care expenditures, if the funds are able to detect effective programs and address the appropriate target groups.

References

Bender R., Zeeb H., Schwartz M., Joeckel K.-H., Berger M. (2006): Causes of death in obesity: Relevant increase in cardiovascular but not in all-cancer mortality. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology;* 59: 1064-1071.

Berg A., Berg A. jr., Frey I., König D., Predel H.G. (2008): Ergebnisse zu M.O.B.I.L.I.S. – einem Bewegungsorientierten Schulungsprogramm für adipöse Erwachsene. *Deutsches Ärzteblatt;* 105 (11): 197-203.

Bertram M.Y., Lim S.S., Barendregt J.J., Vos T. (2010): Assessing the cost-effectiveness of drug and lifestyle intervention following opportunistic screening for pre-diabetes in primary care. *Diabetologia;* 53(5): 875-81.

Bonora E., Kiechl S., Willeit J., Oberhollenzer F., Egger G., Meigs J.B., Bonadonna R.C., Muggeo M. (2004): Population-Based Incidence Rates and Risk Factors for Type 2 Diabetes in White Individuals - The Bruneck Study. *Diabetes*; 53: 1782-1789.

Brunello G., Michaud P.-C., Sanz-de-Galdeano A. (2009): The rise of obesity in Europe: an economic perspective. *Economic Policy*; 24: 551-596.

Davidson M.B., Schriger D.L. (2010): Effect of age and race/ethnicity on HbA1c levels in people without known diabetes mellitus: Implications for the diagnosis of diabetes. *Diabetes Research and Clinical Practice*; 87: 415-421.

Diabetes Prevention Program (DPP) Research Group (2003): Within-Trial Cost-Effectiveness of lifestyle intervention or Metformin for the primary prevention of type 2 Diabetes. *Diabetes Care*; 26: 2518-2523.

Diabetes Prevention Program (DPP) Research Group (2009): 10-year follow-up of diabetes incidence and weight loss in the DPPOS. *The Lancet*; 374: 1677-86.

Finkelstein E.A., Ruhm C.J., Kosa K.M. (2005): Economic causes and consequences of obesity. *Annual Review of Public Health*; 26: 239–257.

Finkelstein E.A., Fiebelkorn I.C., Wang G. (2003): National medical spending attributable to overweight and obesity: how much and who's paying? *Health Affairs* (Web Exclusive): W3-219-226.

Frey I., Dapp N., König D., Deibert P., Predel H.G., Berg A. (2010): Weight Management trough M.O.B.I.L.I.S., an Exercise Based Weight Loss Program: 2-Year Results. *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Sportmedizin*; 61: 19-22.

Frey I., Berg A., Grathwohl D., Keul J. (1999): Freiburger Fragebogen zur körperlichen Aktivität – Entwicklung, Prüfung und Anwendung. *Sozial- und Präventivmedizin*; 44: 55-64.

Göhner W, Schlatterer M, Seelig H, Frey I, Berg A jr, Fuchs R. (2012): Two-Year Follow-Up of an Interdisciplinary Cognitive-Behavioral Intervention Program for Obese Adults. *The Journal of Psychology*; 146: 371-391.

Guh D.P., Zhang W., Bansback N., Amarsi Z., Birmingham C.L., Anis A.H. (2009): The incidence of co-morbidities related to obesity and overweight: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC Public Health*; 9: 88.

Häußler J., Hankonen N., Absetz P. (2013): Economic evaluation of the GOAL Lifestyle Intervention to prevent type 2 diabetes. Working Paper

Icks A., Rathmann W., Haastert B., Gandjour A., Holle R., John J., Giani G.; KORA Study Group (2007): Clinical and cost-effectiveness of primary prevention of Type 2 diabetes in a 'real world' routine healthcare setting: model based on the KORA Survey 2000. *Diabetic Medicine;* 24: 473-80.

International Diabetes Federation: IDF Diabetes Atlas. Retrieved September 19, 2009, http://www.diabetesatlas.org/ (2009). Accessed 6. December 2013

Klein A., Chernyak N., Brinks R., Genz J., Icks, A. (2012): Kosteneffektivität der Primärprävention des Typ-2-Diabetes. *Prävention und Gesundheitsförderung;* 6: 102-110.

Konnopka A., Bödemann M., König H.-H.: Health burden and costs of obesity and overweight in Germany (2011). *European Journal of Health Economics*; 12: 345-352.

Köster I., Huppertz E., Hauner H., Schubert I. (2011): Direct costs of diabetes mellitus in Germany - CoDiM 2000-2007. *Experimental and Clinical Endocrinology & Diabetes*; 119: 377-385.

Köster I., von Ferber L., Ihle P., Schubert I., Hauner H. (2006): The cost burden of diabetes mellitus: the evidence from Germany - the CoDiM Study. *Diabetologia*; 49: 1498-1504.

Lagerstrøm D, Berg A jr, Haas U, Hamm M, Göhner W, Fuchs R, Predel HG, Berg A. (2013): Das M.O.B.I.L.I.S.-Schulungsprogramm. Bewegungstherapie und Lebensstilintervention bei Adipositas und Diabetes. *Diabetes aktuell*; 11 (1): 5-11.

Li R., Zhang P., Barker L.E., Chowdhury F.M and Zhang X. (2010): Cost-effectiveness of interventions to prevent and control diabetes mellitus: a systematic review. *Diabetes Care*; 33: 1872-1894.

Lindgren P., Lindström J., Tuomilehto J., Uusitupa M., Peltonen M., Jönsson B., de Faire U., Hellenius M.L.; DPS Study Group (2007): Lifestyle intervention to prevent diabetes in men and women with impaired glucose tolerance is cost-effective. *International Journal of Technology Assessment in Health Care*; 23:177-83.

Mensink G.B.M., Schienkiewitz A., Haftenberger M., Lampert T., Ziese T., Scheidt-Nave C. (2013): Übergewicht und Adipositas in Deutschland. *Bundesgesundheitsblatt*; 56: 786–794.

Norris S.L., Zhang X., Avenell A., Gregg E., Schmid C.H., Lau J. (2005): Long-term non-pharmacological weight loss interventions for adults with prediabetes. Cochrane *Database of Systematic Reviews*; 18: CD005270.

Ogden C.L., Carroll M.D., Kit B.K., Flegal K.M. (2012): Prevalence of obesity in the United States, 2009–2010. *NCHS data brief*, no 82. Hyattsville, MD: National Center for Health Statistics.

Paulweber B., Valensi P., Lindström J., Lalic N.M., Greaves C.J., McKee M., et al. (2010): A European Evidence-Based Guideline for the Prevention of Type 2 Diabetes. *Hormone and Metabolic Research*; 42 (S 01): 3-36.

Rathmann W., Strassburger K., Heier M., Holle R., Thorand B., Giani G., Meisinger C. (2009): Incidence of Type 2 diabetes in the elderly German population and the effect of clinical and lifestyle risk factors: KORA S4/F4 cohort study. *Diabetic Medicine*; 26: 1212-1219.

Tuomilehto J., Lindstrom J., Eriksson J.G., Valle T.T., Hamalainen H., Ilanne-Parikka P., Keinanen-Kiukaanniemi S., Laakso M., Louheranta A., Rastas M., Salminen V., Uusitupa M. (2001): Prevention of type 2 diabetes mellitus by changes in lifestyle among subjects with impaired glucose tolerance. *The New England Journal of Medicine*; 344, 1343-1350.

Wagner G. G., Frick J.R., Schupp J. (2007): The German Socio-Economic Panel Study (SOEP) - Scope, Evolution and Enhancements. *Schmollers Jahrbuch*; 127, no. 1, 139-169.

WHO (2004): The Global Strategy on Diet, Physical Activity and Health, http://www.who.int/dietphysicalactivity/strategy/eb11344/en/index.html. Accessed 18 September 2013.

Appendix

Figure 2: Influence of Initial Program Success

*Figure 3: Cumulative Mortality Rates*

Figure 4: Annual Diabetes Prevalence Rates

Figure 5: Tornado Diagram of the Model Parameters