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**Abstract**

**Aim:** In Australian adults, this study seeks to describe the experiences and factors associated with the perceived outcomes of using a VLCD program for ≥4-weeks.

**Methods:** A mixed method study using the method perspective was conducted to analyse individual semi-structured interviews conducted via videoconference and cross-sectional survey data. Australians 18-65-years were eligible if they were currently consuming at least one VLCD product daily for ≥4-weeks or had ceased consumption within 4-weeks. Interviews were thematically analysed.

**Results:** Weight-loss (19kg [SD: 18kg]) and duration (5-months (SD: 5-months) of VLCD product use of the 31 participants (female: 97%, 44 (SD: 11) years, BMI >30kg/m²: 84%) were strongly correlated (r= 0.73, p<0.001). Participants’ experiences were influenced by a journey of learning from their previous weight loss attempts, discerned the VLCD program has credible, and chose to commence the VLCD due to a convergence of internal motivators. Early health-related outcomes were a reinforcing stimulus and participants developed new health behaviours but felt dependent on the VLCD long term. Throughout these experiences the participants identified various individual, program structure, and environment related factors which either facilitated their VLCD program use or created barriers to achieving their goals. Health care professionals were minimally engaged.

**Conclusions:** A model of care to support facilitators and overcome barriers would mean more meaningful engagement of HCPs to ultimately improve the experience and adherence of the VLCD program users in Australia.
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**Introduction**

The mean body mass index (BMI) of the Australian adult population has steadily increased over the past several decades, with 66.4% of adults having a BMI ≥25kg/m². Due to the positive association
of increased population BMIs with non-communicable disease rates including cancer, cardiovascular disease, and type 2 diabetes; surgical, medical, and lifestyle weight loss treatments have been a research priority nationally and internationally. There is high level evidence supporting the efficacy of VLCDs for weight loss and favourable changes in biochemistry for adults with and without type 2 diabetes. This has seen widespread translation to practice in the use of VLCDs internationally. For example, VLCDs are part of the standard preoperative treatment for bariatric surgery candidates and may be prescribed and funded by health services or insurance schemes internationally; however, regulation and prescription requirements frequently change. In Australia, the recommendations for obesity (BMI ≥30kg/m²) management in general practice include VLCDs as an intensive weight loss strategy.

VLCDs are usually achieved by meal replacement products, where meals with or without snacks are replaced with pre-packaged nutritionally complete products such as shakes, soups, and bars, plus additional intake of low-starch vegetables. VLCD programs and products are widely available in Australian pharmacies. This availability reflects a key difference in the use of VLCDs in Australia and New Zealand compared to many other countries. In Australia, VLCD programs may be self-initiated rather than prescribed by a health care professional (HCP) such as doctors and dietitians. Although it is recommended by many VLCD programs, HCP guidance is not mandated. As VLCD programs are available in Australia for self-initiation, an individual may choose how to follow the program and if they will engage support. Therefore, Australian adults’ experiences with VLCD programs, their outcomes, and the level of support that they receive with VLCD programs is likely to be different compared to adults living in countries where VLCDs are only available by HCP prescription or mandate medical supervision.

A model of care is a multidimensional concept that defines the way in which health care services are delivered; and qualitative explorations are essential to ensure models of are patient-centred. Although there have been several randomised trials published on clinical efficacy, there is
currently a lack of qualitative research to understand the perspective and experience of adults who have undertaken VLCD programs. Three qualitative studies in Europe concluded that with targeted and effective support, participants felt VLCDs were easily adhered to and reinforced positive lifestyle habits to maintain clinical outcomes\(^\text{19}\). However, due to the differences in how VLCDs are accessed, such findings may not be generalisable to Australian adults. Understanding the Australian experience will help identify the factors associated with the perceived outcomes of VLCD programs and inform models of care to facilitate engagement with HCP support. In Australian adults, this study seeks to describe the experiences and factors associated with the perceived outcomes of using a VLCD program for $\geq 4$-weeks.
Methods

This was a mixed methods study using the methods perspective, also known a quasi-mixed methods approach, which collected, analysed, and then connected both quantitative and qualitative data to answer the single research question. Quantitative data were collected by a cross-sectional survey. Qualitative data were collected and analysed using qualitative description which has been reported according to the Standards for Reporting Qualitative Research (SRQR) 21.

The research team were all female researchers with a health professional degree, BMI in the recommended range (18.5 to 24.9 kg/m²) and had never used nor researched a VLCD program. The data analysts were aware of, but had minimal initial knowledge of VLCD programs. This limited experience with VLCDs facilitated open and balanced questioning of positive and negative experiences. The interviewer had prior experience conducting and analysing semi-structured 1:1 interviews. Therefore, she established a good rapport with participants and was conscious to avoid judgmental or assumptive statements or questions. All data analysts had prior experience in conducting and analysing qualitative data.

English-speaking adults aged up to 65 years living in Australia were eligible to participate in the study if they were currently consuming at least one VLCD product, from a single brand, daily for ≥4-weeks or had ceased such consumption within the last 4-weeks. The VLCD brand is well-known and widely available to both the public and within health services in Australia. Exclusion criteria were contraindications of the VLCD program: if adults were pregnant or breastfeeding; BMI was <25.0 kg/m² when they began the program; had been diagnosed with porphyria, renal or liver disease; and experienced a heart attack or chest pain within the past 12 months. The target sample size was 30 participants as theoretical sufficiency has been reported to occur at this number from various sources 22,23.
Participants were recruited between August 2019 and February 2020. A combination of convenience and snowball sampling, followed by purposive sampling, was used in an attempt to obtain a diverse sample. Participants were recruited from the community via online advertising in social media peer support groups, advertising on the VLCD program home page and through an VLCD online support forum. Interested individuals were asked to click a link that directed them to the study landing page that contained a brief description of the study, the Participant Information Form, and an online eligibility screening questionnaire. Potential participants were asked to provide contact details to enable investigators to confirm their interest, eligibility, and enrolment. Eligible participants who consented to participate were enrolled sequentially until the recruitment targets were met. A unique study ID was allocated to each participant and identifying information was removed from the qualitative transcript data.

Once enrolled, participants completed a cross-sectional survey to collect quantitative data, followed by a semi-structured 1:1 interview to collect qualitative data. Survey data were collected on participant demographics (country of birth, sex, education level, ethnicity, income, work situation, and marital status) and health characteristics (BMI, weight loss on the VLCD, comorbidities, medications, smoking), perceptions of the VLCD program and products, and awareness and use of the official VLCD program online support.

All quantitative survey data manipulation and analyses were conducted using SPSS (Version 26, IBM Corp, Armonk, NY, 2019). Variables used in analyses were tested for normality using a histogram and the Shapiro-Wilk test. To compare the difference between participants who completed the study and those who withdrew prior to the interview, comparisons were performed by using 2-sample t-tests or the Mann-Whitney U test for continuous data and the chi-square statistic or Fisher’s exact test for categorical data. Correlations between variables were assessed using Pearson coefficient. P-values <0.05 were considered statistically significant.
Fundamental qualitative description methodology was used to collect and analyse qualitative data. Qualitative description is a method in which analysts use and describe low-interference interpretation of the subjective experiences of participants. Interpretation is inductive rather than seen through the lens of an a-priori framework or system; and the description offers a comprehensive summary of a phenomena, thus being useful for HCPs who need to translate findings to practice. Qualitative data were collected via a semi-structured 1:1 interview via videoconference by a single investigator not involved in the recruitment process. After pilot testing, the interview used 10 open-ended questions with prompts to elucidate further detail (Table S1). Participants who completed the interview received an AUD$30 gift card as compensation for their time. Interviews were recorded via the videoconferencing software by Zoom Video Communications Inc (San Jose, USA) and were transcribed verbatim by GoTranscript Ltd (United Kingdom). Most participants opted to have their video disabled for the interview.

Interview data were analysed thematically, using an inductive approach, reflecting the steps proposed by Braun and Clarke. NVivo software (Version 12 Pro, QSR International Pty Ltd) was used for coding the data. Constant comparative analysis was used from step 2 with the aim of refining the developing concepts. The specific steps employed in the qualitative data analysis were:

1. Two Analysts familiarised themselves with data then performed open line-by-line coding for the first five transcripts.
2. The incidents and generated codes were compared and collapsed into categories to develop higher-level ‘focus codes’.
3. Two analysts met to gain consensus on focus codes and a codebook was generated. The first five transcripts were re-coded based on the focus codes. As analysis proceeded, the codebook was revised and updated for new codes.
4. The remaining 26 transcripts were divided and between two analysts for further coding. The analysts met during their analyses to discuss changes and emerging findings. During this process, some codes were collapsed into a larger category or separated into smaller categories.

5. After generating focus codes, memoing was used. Memos were about: (a) codes or categories, (b) links between codes or categories, (c) gaps in codes or categories, (d) usefulness of a category, or (e) practical implications. Memos were treated analytically and were also used for an audit trail. A second series of memoing was performed so that both analysts could be involved in reflecting on their thoughts and ideas for each transcript.

6. Emerging codes were compared based on participant characteristics. Patterns were compared between participants who reported negative or positive experiences.

7. After all data were coded and memoing was completed, analysts met to develop a list of potential themes and outline a framework. Every developed theme was defined by what was involved in it, its properties, under which condition the properties emerged, and what constituted the data informing the theme.

8. The themes were reviewed and refined further by re-reading transcripts to compare incidents and codes against the themes to ensure the data formed a coherent pattern. Analysts refined their earlier codes in light of later codes, and had regular meetings to discuss how the themes were changing. As themes changed, the analysts looked for the new or modified themes in the data they read thereafter.

9. The two analysts met with a third analyst to confirm the themes, connect quantitative findings to the qualitative themes, and refined the framework via triangulation and a fourth reviewed the audit trail and contributed to the description and interpretation of themes after data familiarisation.
Several techniques were used to enhance trustworthiness and credibility of the findings. Firstly, an audit trail of all the steps and decisions made during the research process was recorded. The researcher triangulation method was used by involving four analysts to bring different perspectives into the findings. An analyst also contacted a random sample of five participants by email to conduct a respondent validation; no corrections or changes were requested.

The study was approved by the Bellberry Human Research Ethics Committee (Protocol ID: 2019-03-170). Electronic informed consent was obtained for all participants with further verbal consent before each interview.
Results

Seventy of the 178 adults that completed the screening questionnaire were eligible and 31 were interviewed. The most common reason for ineligibility was related to how the VLCD program was used, such as not using products daily or using the program for less than 4-weeks (Figure 1).

There were no significant differences in demographic or medical characteristics between those that completed the interview and those that withdrew (Table 1). Most participants (84%) had a BMI \(\geq 30\) kg/m\(^2\), where 19% reported a perceived need for weight loss surgery and 94% reported having one or more comorbidities (Table 1). Participants were mostly married (81%), females (97%), aged 44 (SD: 11) years, and born in Australia (84%). Participants were highly educated and the majority were employed, where more than half reported a household income of \(\geq \$100,000/\text{year}\) (Table 1). The most reported comorbidities were back pain/joint pain/poor mobility (52%) and depression/anxiety (48%); accordingly, the most common type of prescription medication used was anti-depressant or anti-anxiety (43%).

Most participants were current (90%) and first time (52%) users, and almost all participants (97%) reported they would recommend the VLCD program to a friend or family member. Only 40% of participants reported using the official VLCD program online support platform which provided access to HCP support, despite 97% being aware of the support. The VLCD products most consumed were shakes (97%), non-cereal bars (74%), and desserts (61%).

All participants reported losing weight since commencing the VLCD program \(\geq 4\)-weeks prior to the interview, which ranged from 3-90kg (mean 19.1kg [SD: 17.8kg]) over a mean of 5.2-months (SD: 4.9-months) (Table S2). All but one participant reported that their main goal was weight loss, where weight maintenance was their primary objective. There was a strong correlation between weight loss and duration of VLCD program use (r= 0.73, \(p<0.001\)). No association was found between weight loss and age (r=0.27, \(p=0.17\)) or number of times using the VLCD program (r=-0.26, \(p=0.18\)).
The median duration of the 31 interviews was 49-minutes (IQR: 16-minutes). Data analysis of participants’ experiences identified a theoretical framework which described how Australian adults chose and followed the VLCD program, and the factors which facilitated or acted as a barrier to their perceived outcome (Figure 2). Thematic analysis identified two domains: “choosing the VLCD program” and “following the VLCD program”. Overlapping themes within the “choosing the VLCD program” domain were “a journey of learning”, “convergence of internal motivations”, and “differentiating credibility”. Overlapping themes within the “following the VLCD program” domain were “outcome as a reinforcing stimulus”, “learning healthy behaviours”, and “fear-based dependency”.

The interrelationship of the domains, themes, and factors are represented in Figure 3. Specifically, this study found that participants who self-initiated the VLCD program were influenced by a journey of learning from their previous weight loss attempts, discerned the VLCD program has credible, and despite having low expectations of success still chose to commence the VLCD due to a convergence of internal motivators. In this sample, early health-related outcomes acted as a reinforcing stimulus to adhere to the program, and for many this led to learning new health behaviours. Although new behaviours were learned, participants reported feeling dependent on the VLCD program due to fear of losing the gained benefits if the program was completely ceased. Throughout these experiences the participants identified various individual, program structure, and environment related facilitators and barriers to VLCD program use and to achieving their goals (Table 2). Engagement with HCPs was minimal and was not perceived by participants as important facilitators for perceived success nor for supporting program structure, environment, or individual factors. Each of the themes is described below.

A “journey of learning” was a theme identified when exploring why participants chose the VLCD program and their perceived outcome. Participants described various weight loss journeys they had
taken and how their previous experiences, learnings, and outcomes provided a foundation of
knowledge on which to build their current weight loss efforts.

“[description of previous weight loss programs]... but learning stuff all along that journey.”

The “journey of learning” was heavily influenced by previous negative, demotivating, and
unsustainable weight loss experiences which ultimately lead to the cost or burden of the weight loss
strategy outweighing the benefits.

“I just stopped doing it. So then... the weight crept on and then... obviously then... you feel
crap about yourself.” (02)

Despite historical negative experiences with weight loss strategies, a theme of “convergence of
internal motivations” led participants to attempt weight loss again. Many overlapping internal
motivations were described by participants and were predominately those which affect weight-
related quality of life including the impact of weight on health, social participation, physical
functioning, discrimination, and self-esteem.

“... then I got to this stage of... having the health problems and ... basically deciding I needed
to do something about it ... I need to be around for my kids basically.” (32)

Although, internal motivations were influenced by external pressures on body size, such as seat sizes
and clothing comfort, and external experiences of obesity stigmatisation.

“...and [he] said, ‘you have to be honest about [your weight to the helicopter pilot]’ and I said
‘Yes, I know’...and I said to him ‘I’m 115 kilos’...it blew him away. I was embarrassed... and
ashamed.” (41)
Diverging within the theme of internal motivations, a few participants reported external pressure to lose weight imposed by family and HCPs.

“Differentiating credibility” was a theme identified across interviews when exploring how participants were introduced to and decided to use the VLCD program. Most participants perceived that they were introduced to the program by a credible source, which included a HCP or a friend who they had observed as having a good outcome. However, a key benefit of the program was described by the participants as fast weight loss. “Fast” or “rapid weight loss” is a phrase usually associated with and considered a red flag for non-evidence based “fad” diets. Despite this red flag terminology, the VLCD programs’ association with HCPs and recommendation by HCPs led participants to identify the program as evidence-based and credible.

“When I read that [VLCD] were offered to people by doctors, that’s when I thought, ‘Okay, that’s a good one then if doctors are recommending them’ ... it sort of gave a bit more credibility. More legitimate, and I didn’t feel like I was just doing a fad diet.” (47)

Nutrition also contributed to the participants differentiating the VLCD brand as credible, with participants describing the program as nutritionally complete and appropriate for diabetes and lactose-intolerance. However, despite the program being perceived as credible, participants’ “journey of learning” led to low expectations of success, sustainability, and adaptability to special events.

“[the shakes] won’t work and, you know, I’ll just go and have my stomach stapled or I’ll just go on to the medication...it’s not gonna work.” (21)

“Outcome as a reinforcing stimulus” represents how early health- and weight-related improvements led to maintained and renewed motivation to continue the program. Linking back to internal motivators, rather than focusing solely on weight loss, the perceived program outcome was often...
described in terms of quality of life. This included domains of vitality, physical health, social
engagement, mental health, discrimination, and physical functioning.

“... my whole life has changed... I'm a better... person, better wife, better mum, better daughter.” (02)

“feeling less anxious about engaging with people in general and feeling judged.” (11)

Although such outcomes were subjective, participants also valued objective clinical markers of
health improvement such as blood sugar levels, blood pressure, serum cholesterol, and decreased
medication dose. Some participants described negative health outcomes such as vitamin A
deficiency and gall stones; however, in neither case were such adverse events strongly linked to
VLCD in the minds of the participants. Participants reported that the speed of weight loss varied
depending on their adherence to the program, but that ultimately seeing initial weight loss and
improvements to their health positively impacted their motivation to continue the program.

“And once the weight started coming off... then it... just made my resolve stronger, and after
a period of time, I noticed that I wasn't coughing anymore... I can now sleep.” (05)

Participants recognised that these perceived positive outcomes contrasted with their low
expectations. The reinforcing stimulus extended beyond self-motivation, leading to role modelling
behaviour, where participants reported widely recommending the program within their social
networks.

Over time, participants moved beyond the reinforcing stimulus of outcomes to describe a
phenomenon of “learning healthy behaviours”. Once motivation had sustained them on the
program, participants described that they noticed changes to their food preferences and eating
patterns.
“So it’s... teaching me to enjoy... veggies and salad again. And it’s also just making me realise I don’t actually need the other stuff to feel happy or content or fulfilled.” (28)

“Cause I was in a terrible habit of not eating three meals a day, so if anything, it’s improved. I’ve improved in that way that I would actually eat.” (44)

Although participants identified improved food and eating behaviours, their perceived outcomes were strongly linked to the VLCD program rather than the behaviour change.

“It’s like magic in a container.” (21)

Associating the VLCD but not behaviour change with their perceived outcomes led to participants describing hesitation through to outright fear of returning to a diet without VLCD products, in the theme “fear-based dependency”. Although participants mostly reported not yet reaching their goal weight, many reported that they planned to use the VLCD program in the long term, for either years or their entire life. Dependency upon the program was both theoretically anticipated in first time users and a known experience in those who had experienced weight regain after ending use of the program.

“All I can tell you is, if you’re a kid and you touch a hotplate on the stove when your mum says, ‘Don’t touch the hotplate’ Only an idiot goes back to the hotplate.” (40)

One aspect identified by participants as a contributing factor to this fear is the variety of food available when consuming a regular diet, which they associated with a loss of control and subsequent weight regain.
Discussion

This is the first study to explore and describe the real world experience of VLCD program usage in Australia, with a focus on understanding the factors that are associated with perceived outcomes. Themes identified within the “choosing” and “following” VLCD domains were not only interrelated with each other but were also linked to many of the factors associated with perceived outcomes. The theoretical framework captures the process by which Australians choose, follow, and engage with a VLCD program and this differs significantly to how the program is used internationally. In particular, this study found that HCPs were minimally engaged by participants, and that engaging support from HCPs was not considered a factor associated with improved adherence to the program. This theme is further supported by the survey data which reveal that less than one in two users chose to access the online HCP support. This is in direct contrast to the three qualitative studies from Europe which found targeted and effective HCP support were critical factors in the achievement of a positive outcome.

The experiences interpreted from the interviews are largely defined by how long the participants had been using the VLCD program. All participants had been using the program daily for at least 4 weeks as reflected in the eligibility criteria; however, many participants had been using the products for months, or in some cases years. This means the findings represent those who have been able to continue the VLCD program for this period with a self-perceived successful outcome. Although the findings do not represent those who tried the program but ended it within the month, this study provides valuable understanding of facilitators to maintain motivation and program adherence for a product which is widely utilised in health care environments. This is immediately evident in the first theme described, “journey of learning”. Across interviews, previous experiences of weight loss attempts built wisdom in the participants, which enabled them to adhere to the program. Such learnings are captured in the factors associated with perceived outcomes and included self-compassion, and avoiding an “all or nothing” mindset which is a characteristic of rigid restraint.
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eating behaviour \(^{34}\). It also included more practical learnings such as the importance of engaging peer and family support and planning and preparing meals.

A “journey of learning” was further linked to the “differentiating credibility” theme. Previous weight loss experiences were used by participants to make judgements on integrity and trustworthiness. Whilst this theme did not seem to share any commonality with other themes, it was closely linked to environmental factors associated with perceived outcomes. Participants showed health literacy by drawing upon multiple sources to make such judgements including packaging, educational information, and engaging HCPs. Recommendations by trusted HCPs has previously been described as assisting individuals to initiate weight loss interventions \(^{35}\). This finding may not be translatable to other VLCD programs in Australia which are not endorsed by HCPs or advertised in health care environments. However, common to other health care settings \(^{36}\), participants still placed high value in the experiences of others and recommendations from social networks. This may be explained by social cognitive theory, which considers behaviours as learnt through observational learning and modelling \(^{37}\). Participants described acting or wanting to act as health literacy mediators, or otherwise sought support from health literacy mediators via their participation in social media groups. This mediation was seen as valuable, reflecting the findings by Edwards et al \(^{38}\), who reported that health literacy was distributed through social networks. This finding may also reflect the unique participant group which was predominately recruited via non-official social media support groups.

The “journey of learning” theme looks to have influenced the motivations of participants to follow the VLCD program. Although a goal may have been weight-related, aligning with other VLCD research \(^{19}\), motivators were not. Through their previous journeys, participants placed motivating value on quality of life, a finding which reflects patient values of health care treatments \(^{39}\). Whilst the “convergence of internal motivators” was a theme across interviews, the internal motivators represented both intrinsic and extrinsic aspirations when looking through the lens of self-
determination theory. For example, motivators related to mental health, physical health, and social engagement were intrinsic; whereas aiming to improve appearance and avoid discrimination were extrinsic. The dominance of intrinsic motivations may be a characteristic of recruiting a sample which had been able to adhere to the program for ≥4-weeks. According to the self-determination theory, intrinsic motivation is an important facet of self-determination and consequent behaviour change. Intrinsic motivations are more likely to support satisfaction of the psychological needs, which helps to understand why “outcome as reinforcing stimulus” was a theme related to maintaining motivation. It also explains why early outcomes described by participants were predominately related to improvements in quality of life rather than solely or heavily dependent upon weight loss. Social cognitive theory suggests that this early achievement of weight loss and quality of life improvements built self-efficacy and maintained motivation.

Outcomes achieved by the participant themselves were not the only motivators, but many participants drew upon the experiences of others as shared on social media support groups. “Outcome as a reinforcing stimulus” from the perspective of observing other peoples’ outcome can be understood within social cognitive theory. By seeing someone else role model a behaviour successfully, belief was created in the participants that they could also complete the behaviour. A snowballing effect was observed, where participants then wanted to act as role models themselves. Participants were able to recognise that positively-perceived outcomes were associated with their ability to “learn healthy behaviours”. It is interesting that despite recognising new healthy food and eating behaviours, participants still felt dependent upon the VLCD program, as described within the theme “fear of the hotplate”. The program structure flexibly used by participants, whilst a facilitator to adherence, may also be contributing to the fear of ending the program entirely. This may be a phenomenon unique to the Australian setting, as using the program as prescribed with close supervision of health professionals may prevent this dependence from forming. Whilst dependence can be considered a negative outcome, it is also rational. Sixty percent of weight lost on VLCDs is...
commonly regained over an average of 1.9 years\textsuperscript{42,43}; a phenomenon common to most weight loss interventions\textsuperscript{44}.

Models of care which facilitate access to HCPs for Australians using VLCD programs should focus on improving self-efficacy in the adults’ health behaviour change; with a particular focus on eating behaviours. One Australian study suggested that HCPs lack knowledge about obesity treatment\textsuperscript{45} and patient needs for weight loss support are not met by HCPs\textsuperscript{46}. McVay et al found that participants who completed a weight loss diet without engaging support wanted to maintain autonomy, as having external monitoring provided a risk of disappointment and judgement\textsuperscript{35}. This suggests a lack of trust in HCPs, and models of care which overcome these barriers to support adults on VLCD diets should be designed using a translation to practice model to ensure relevance and patient-centredness. Further profiling of the eating behaviours of Australian adult VLCD users would improve the patient-centredness of HCP models of care.

Barriers to VLCD program use included adverse events. Although the adverse events described by participants were minor and commonly reported in VLCDs\textsuperscript{47}, they could be traumatising, particularly those related to gastrointestinal function and hair loss. All participants who had adverse events in this study continued the program. Considering the minimal engagement of HCPs and the self-customised VLCD programs used by participants, adverse events experienced by Australians who did not continue the program for ≥4-weeks should be explored. Further, quantitative surveys and observational cohort studies are needed to fully describe how VLCD programs and products are utilised and modified over time by Australian adults.

The qualitative component of this study was limited by not utilising field notes to ensure confirmability; however, credibility was established by asking a random subsample of participants to confirm the interpretation and description of their subjective experiences. Dependability was established by using the method of constant comparison and having a fourth analyst review the audit trail to confirm the accuracy of the findings and that they are integrated with the quantitative...
Further observational research is required to evaluate transferability and to fully characterise the experiences of Australian adults who use VLCD products, including those who end use in less than 4-weeks, and people from different socio-economic backgrounds.

In conclusion, this study found that Australian adults who self-initiated the VLCD program were influenced by a journey of learning from their previous weight loss attempts, discerned the VLCD program as credible, and despite having low expectations of success still chose to commence the VLCD due to a convergence of internal motivators. In this sample, who had continued the program for ≥4-weeks, early health-related outcomes acted as a reinforcing stimulus to adhere to the program, and for many this led to learning new health behaviours. Although new behaviours were learned, participants reported feeling dependent on the VLCD program due to fear of losing the gained benefits if the program was completely ceased. Throughout these experiences the participants identified various individual, program structure, and environment related factors which either facilitated their VLCD program use or created barriers to achieving their goals. These themes provide guidance and direction to HCPs to support Australian adults who have chosen to commence VLCDs; and should be viewed within the context that HCPs were not seen as essential and were minimally engaged. A model of care to support facilitators and overcome barriers would mean more meaningful engagement of HCPs to ultimately improve the experience, safety, adherence of VLCD program and product users in Australia.
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Completed screening questionnaire (n = 178)

Screened for eligibility (n = 178)

Eligible to participate (n = 70)

Consented and completed enrolment questionnaire (n = 40)

Completed interview (n = 31)

Excluded according to exclusion criteria (n = 108)
- Product or program usage pattern (n = 80)
- No contact details provided (n = 10)
- Health condition (n = 5)
- BMI <25kg/m² (n = 7)
- Reside outside of Australia (n = 3)
- Aged <18 or >65 years (n = 3)

Did not complete interview (n = 9)
- Loss to follow-up (n = 3)
- Withdrew (n = 6):
  - No reason provided (n = 2)
  - Busy (n = 2)
  - Ill health (n = 1)

Figure 1. Flowchart of the recruitment process.
Figure 2. Theoretical framework of how Australian adults choose and follow the VLCD program, and the factors which impact upon those experiences, from the perspective of adults who have continued the program for ≥4-weeks.
Figure 3: Representation of the domains, themes, and influencing factors which were interpreted from the experiences of Australian adults who participating in interviews regarding their experience with a VLCD program.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic characteristics</th>
<th>All (n = 40)</th>
<th>Completed interview (n = 31)</th>
<th>Withdrew b (n = 9)</th>
<th>p-value c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>38 (95)</td>
<td>30 (97)</td>
<td>8 (89)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (y)</td>
<td>44 ± 11</td>
<td>44 ± 11</td>
<td>44 ± 10</td>
<td>0.924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI d ≥25-29.9kg/m²</td>
<td>6 (15)</td>
<td>5 (16)</td>
<td>1 (12)</td>
<td>0.642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI d ≥30kg/m²</td>
<td>33 (85)</td>
<td>26 (84)</td>
<td>7 (88)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born in Australia e</td>
<td>35 (88)</td>
<td>26 (84)</td>
<td>9 (100)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian f</td>
<td>38 (95)</td>
<td>31 (100)</td>
<td>7 (78)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as first language</td>
<td>37 (92)</td>
<td>28 (90)</td>
<td>9 (100)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest level of education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>29 (73)</td>
<td>24 (77)</td>
<td>5 (56)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>11 (27)</td>
<td>7 (23)</td>
<td>4 (44)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married or de facto</td>
<td>29 (74)</td>
<td>25 (81)</td>
<td>4 (50)</td>
<td>0.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated, divorced, single or widowed</td>
<td>10 (26)</td>
<td>6 (19)</td>
<td>4 (50)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children living at home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>18 (45)</td>
<td>14 (45)</td>
<td>4 (45)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>9 (22)</td>
<td>7 (23)</td>
<td>2 (22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ Two</td>
<td>13 (33)</td>
<td>10 (32)</td>
<td>3 (33)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>26 (65)</td>
<td>20 (65)</td>
<td>6 (67)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours worked in past week</td>
<td>21 ± 20</td>
<td>20 ± 20</td>
<td>25 ± 20</td>
<td>0.711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household income xh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; $30,000</td>
<td>5 (15)</td>
<td>3 (11)</td>
<td>2 (33)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000-$59,999</td>
<td>4 (12)</td>
<td>3 (11)</td>
<td>1 (17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,000-$99,999</td>
<td>8 (24)</td>
<td>5 (19)</td>
<td>3 (50)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ $100,000</td>
<td>16 (49)</td>
<td>16 (59)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoker</td>
<td>2 (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥1 Comorbidity</td>
<td>29 (94)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of comorbidity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back/joint pain/poor mobility</td>
<td>16 (52)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression/anxiety</td>
<td>15 (48)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asthma</td>
<td>9 (29)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypertension</td>
<td>8 (26)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gall bladder disease</td>
<td>7 (23)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family history of heart disease</td>
<td>7 (23)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypercholesterolaemia</td>
<td>6 (19)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleep apnoea</td>
<td>4 (13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 2 diabetes</td>
<td>4 (13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autoimmune condition</td>
<td>4 (13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epilepsy or seizures</td>
<td>3 (10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Believes requires weight loss surgery 6 (19)
Using prescribed medication 21 (68)

Prescription medication type
- Antidepressant or anti-anxiety 9 (43)
- Antihypertensive 7 (23)
- Anti-reflux 5 (16)
- Cholesterol 5 (16)
- Pain 4 (13)
- Asthma 4 (13)
- Other 2 (6)

Uses over-the-counter medication 10 (32)

Over-the-counter medication type
- NSAID 4 (13)
- Allergy relief 3 (10)
- Paracetamol 2 (7)
- Anti-reflux 2 (7)

Uses a supplement 15 (48)

Supplement type
- Vitamin D 5 (16)
- Zinc or iron 4 (13)
- Folate or B vitamins 4 (13)
- Hair, skin, nails formula 3 (10)
- Multivitamin 3 (10)
- Magnesium 2 (7)
- Fish oil 2 (7)
- Other 4 (13)

BMI, body mass index; NSAID, non-steroidal anti-inflammatory; SD, standard deviation; y, years.

a. All values are frequency and proportion as a percent in parentheses except as specified for ‘Age’ and ‘Hours worked in past week’ where values are mean and standard deviation in parentheses, with range below.
b. Defined as completed the screening questionnaire but did not attend the interview.
c. Comparison of completed and withdrawn participants.
d. Answered by n=39.
e. ‘Other’ included Germany (n=1), New Zealand (n=1), Papua New Guinea (n=1), United Kingdom (n=1), and United States (n=1) as countries of birth.
f. ‘Other’ ethnicities included White British (n=1) and Italian (n=1).
g. Income in AUD per annum.
h. Reasons for incomplete data included not all participants answered (n=33), not all interview completers answered (n=27).
i. Participants were able to select as many comorbidities and medications used as applicable. Reasons for incomplete data included: not all participants answered (n=29)
j. Autoimmune conditions reported included Lupus, Psoriasis, Hashimoto’s and Sjogren’s disease.
k. ‘Other’ comorbidities included anaemia, Subglottic stenosis, heart disease, endometriosis, gastric banding, surgery, dizziness, poly cyclic ovarian syndrome and pneumonia.
l. Reasons for incomplete data included: not all participants answered (n=21).
m. ‘Other’ OTC medications includes weight loss and glucocorticosteroids.
n. Reasons for incomplete data included: not all participants answered (n=15).
o. ‘Other’ supplements includes vitamin A, calcium, dietary fibre, glucosamine.
Table 2: Factors which were associated with the perceived outcomes of Australian adults who used the VLCD program for ≥4-weeks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Program structure| Participants described modifying the three levels of the program structure as well as designing their own program to suit their lifestyle (e.g. for special events, to make less restrictive, or to eat meals with family) and their weight loss (e.g. extension of intensive phase or return to intensive phase). However, modification of the program for these reasons may be perceived as a ‘failure’ by some participants. | “If... I’d gone on intensive and...stuck to it...I would have been at my goal weight months ago probably. But I didn’t want to. I wanted to do it where I felt comfortable and where it was sustainable for me and where I could pick and choose how I use the program.” (13)  
“... I’m just choosing my own path” (26)  
“I’ve had my [brand] shake, then I’m gonna have a scone and then I’m gonna have dinner tonight. You know, that’s not really, really well organized, but...I have to do it like that because if the diet is too restrictive, I’ll lose.” (19)  
“I have fallen off a couple of times, um, my daughter’s birthday, I made the cake.” (14) |
| Flexibility      | Choice limitation was seen as a barrier to weight loss by some, where the removal of choice was a factor associated with adherence. Conversely, some participants found the choice limitation as a barrier to adhering to the program leading to participants modifying the program to cope with the choice limitation. | “… using [a] diet where it’s quite prescriptive and restrictive... is useful to me because there’s not really options for... confusion.” (11)  
“I find it difficult because the options for eating on the [brand] are quite restrictive.” (27)  
“on the weekend, it was an Active 2 day. ... when I had visitors here or...f we go out...it’s generally an Active 2 day and then if we-- if I eat things like-- sometimes we do have a dessert, which is, you know, not really allowed, but if I do, then I know the next few days, then I go back to full intensive.” (23) |
| Choice limitation| The products were consistently seen as convenient due to the lack of food preparation required and the transportability of the meals. | “It’s easy ... if it’s going to be dinner time on the plane, if I’m traveling at that time or lunch, I just take a bottle of water with me, my [brand] [VLCD Program], mix it up there, have it on the plane.” (41)  
“it’s the ease of the use of the products as well ... the bars are handy if you’re on the go.” (28) |
| Convenience      | Although acknowledged to be affordable in comparison to a regular diet, the VLCD was consistently perceived to be costly. However, no participants stated that the cost was currently influencing their adherence to the program. | some people on these [social media] things are like, “Oh my gosh, it’s so expensive.” My argument is, from my point of view, it works out depending on where you’re shopping.” (19) |
| Flavour | Flavour pleasure and flavour variety were related to adherence by participants, drawing on both the current experience with and other VLCD products. | “[VLCD desserts] don’t taste like they should be allowed on a diet at all.” (09)  
“you get used to [the flavour] and you get into a habit, but eventually… it gets a bit monotonous. And from my own kind of mental wellbeing, you have to [have a] bit of a break...just to feel like you can participate in life.” (26)  
“I don’t know what to expect...I’d had...some [other branded VLCD] before that...taste was horrendous.” (01) |
| Adverse symptoms | Participants widely reported experiencing minor adverse events such as those related to gastrointestinal function, lethargy, mood, and hair loss. Participants preferred to find a solution for the symptom or continue experiencing the symptom despite concern, rather than ceasing the program. | “I eat a slice of toast and my body just decides it’s the worst thing in the world. That’s been a really big thing that I’m concerned about long term.” (16)  
“[describing explosive diarrhoea whilst on public transport] I had to go to the bathroom right then, which was terribly embarrassing.” (20) |
| Environment | | |
| Online support groups | Participants consistently expressed the need for support but reported diverse experiences with online support. Some participants found social media based online support groups enabled conversations amongst peers which improved their motivation. However, others expressed experiences with online peer engagement that could be harmful to motivation. | “I’d take it [the information on social media] with a grain and salt ’cause I know that some people are like stupid on there and they don’t know what they’re saying.” (47)  
“And I think seeing testimonials and real-life people doing it and the struggles that people have keeps me kind of going.” (06).  
“... the [social media] groups actually been great. You just have to keep in mind that everyone’s sort of starting at a different point, so you can’t feel bad when you’re not losing at the same rate as someone that’s, you know, double the size that you are.” (33) |
| Educational information | Online support groups were consistently utilised as a source of educational information or a method in which to understand the educational information provided by the official programs or HCPs. | “I’m in a [social media support] group, which I find more beneficial than the [official HCP] support page....the website I found is very basic and limited as to the meal suggestions they have....That’s why I love that [social media support] group because they do share things like [recipes].” (14)  
“So it’s great to have that [social media support group] group to bounce the ideas off rather than just having to read the standardized information that they have there.” (14). |
| Health care professionals | There were variations regarding the involvement of doctors, dietitians, and psychologists, but the unifying factor was that HCPs were infrequently involved. Participants who were on prescribed medication were more likely to involve their doctor in their experience; however, few followed the recommended check-ins with their usual doctor unless the program was being used as a preoperative phase for bariatric surgery. Some | “And the doctor has gone with the...meal replacements ... But, I guess no...further support in that sense... I can do it myself.” (02)  
“I checked in [with her doctor] when I first started and I haven’t been back. I need to go see him. He wasn’t overly fussled, really. He wasn’t as-as supportive as I thought he would be.” (06)  
“But I have decided to remain on intensive to lose as much weight as I can. So every 12 weeks I see [my doctor] and...she takes-- I have blood tests, et cetera to make sure that uh, liver and the kidneys and everything’s working okay... The dietitian, she knows...
participants purposefully did not tell their doctor about their experience because they believed the doctor didn’t know enough about the topic, whereas others were recommended to start the program by their doctor. Few participants reported seeing a dietitian.  

a little bit more about the program... and I can always email her too if I'm unsure about the particular food product that...I might wanna try, but I'm not sure if it fits in.” (05)

Family  
The type of family support was consistently noted as a factor important to the perceived outcome. Participants whose family were supportive felt they were more able to adhere to the program, whereas family who were not supportive led to more frequent intake of foods which were excluded from the program recommendations.  

"[in my last use of the VLCD program] I was living with family and so I had people around me that weren’t doing the diet, were eating different meals, and, it wasn’t fitting in with my lifestyle, you know. Whereas this time, it’s been very easy because we’ve, both my partner and I and the whole home environment has shifted and we’ve just done the [brand] [VLCD Program] together. And, you know, there hasn’t been much temptation to do anything different in our lifestyles.” (39)

Social gatherings  
Social gatherings were consistently reported a barrier by participants, leading to multiple changes in their social behaviour. This included either avoiding social engagements or modifying their behaviour during a social engagement. Participants reported social gatherings often led to deviating from program recommendations.  

"Well yeah, I tend to go, if I’m doing something like that, I’ll get an undressed salad. And depending on if it’s like a dinner I’ll get a grilled piece of fish or chicken.“ (14)

Workplace  
Working environments were also consistently identified as presenting barriers to program adherence due to practical aspects such as travel, dealing with stressful situations, and feelings of judgement from colleagues.  

"I think there was a lot of negativity when I used to flip my shake container at work, even though I had great results.” (35).  
"The only struggle I have is when I’m working just cause I’m always on like-- I’m running on 12-hour shifts.” (06)

Individual  

All or nothing mindset  
Participants described an “all or nothing” mindset as something they were currently experiencing or something they needed to avoid.  

"...I think if you just restrict yourself too much then you completely lose the plot and binge.” (23)  
"I think that’s the thing with diets. The minute you break the diet, you can feel that that’s the end of it, you know, I’m a failure, that’s it, forget it.” (13)

Self-compassion  
Participants consistently described the need for having realistic expectations about both weight loss and level of adherence to the program. Having self-compassion formed a core part of this, where allowing for flexibility and periods of high and low adherence were important behaviours they had learned from previous experiences.  

"So, I try to sort of use it as a guideline, but I don’t knock myself out if I don’t. I try to be a bit realistic and make it work well with them.” (19)  
"Where I’m trying to be a bit more kind to myself this time.” (26)

Planning and preparation  
Participants frequently described that planning and preparation were important factors that they associated

"So, I planned out my days probably a bit better [than the last time they attempted VLCD]. Better planning, but also I didn’t have that gnawing hunger.” (26)
with adherence to the program. This included examples of planning the meals for the week, leaving the house with recommended snacks, and reviewing restaurant menus in advance.

| Mental health          | Some participants identified emotional distress, emotional eating, and symptoms of depression as being associated with not being able to adhere to the program. Some participants reported finding methods to help manage the impact of mental health on program adherence.                                                                 | “I’ve always been a comfort food eater... when things get tough, I start eating. So I kind of steered off the [branded VLCD] program for a while, before the 12 weeks was actually up.” (32)  
“I think it’s the fact that I have got a result and even though... the depression and the instinct to binge eat ... is there, I’ll go grab a big handful of nuts and I’ll eat them instead.” (44) |

HCP, health care professional; VLCD, very low calorie diet.
### Table S1. Semi-structured interview guide

**Opening**

Thank you for participating in our research study, we really appreciate your time. Now I'd like to remind you that this interview is being recorded. Are you happy for me to begin the recording now?

Before we begin, can you please tell me your name and date of birth and confirm that you have signed the electronic consent form to participate in this interview today?

Do you have any questions about the study you wanted to ask me?

In your own words, can you please tell me a little about your understanding of the study?

**Interview**

1. Could you tell me a bit about yourself? (Ice-breaker question)
   - a. What are your interests?

2. I would like to hear about your weight loss journey so far. What have you tried in the past to lose or maintain your weight and what sort of response did you have?
   - a. How has your weight changed during the program? (capture lost vs. maintained)

3. Can you recall and describe about when and how you first heard about [brand] VLCD?
   - a. Prompt idea: Have you previously used [brand] VLCD or any other VLCD program?

4. What was happening in your life, your circumstances and your feelings, that lead you to decide to commence [brand] VLCD?
   - a. Did someone recommend it to you? If so, who?
   - b. What motivated you to try [brand] VLCD?
   - c. What was your goal when you first started [brand] VLCD? (i.e. weight loss, weight maintenance, another reason?)
   - d. What results or changes were you hoping for or expecting from using [brand] VLCD?

5. What has been your experience using [brand] VLCD so far?
   - a. Prompt ideas:
     - i. Have you had any positive or negative experiences?
     - ii. What do you like/dislike about the program?

6. What has been your experience with health professionals regarding [brand] VLCD? (e.g. GP/doctor, dietician, other health professional?)
   - a. How often do you check in with your healthcare provider?
   - b. What support has your healthcare provider given you with the program?

7. Can you describe the positive and negative experiences you have had with [brand] VLCD?
   - a. Prompt idea:
     - i. What have you found to be the best part of using [brand] VLCD/the [brand] VLCD program? (e.g. convenience, efficacy, taste)
     - ii. What have you found to be the most challenging part of using [brand] VLCD/the [brand] VLCD program? (e.g. lack of support, social isolation, hunger, eating out, family conflict, affordability, taste)
     - iii. Have you noticed any effect that [brand] VLCD has had on your health? (e.g. blood markers such as HbA1c/Tg, more active, improved breathing, reduced pain, mental health such as depression or anxiety?)
   - b. If applicable, have you changed your medication usage since starting on [brand] VLCD (e.g. reduced/ceased any medications)?

8. **Current users only:** How long do you intend to use [brand] VLCD?
   - a. Why?

9. **Previous users only:** How long did you use [brand] VLCD?
   - a. What was your reason for ceasing the [brand] VLCD program?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10. Is there anything about the program that you’d like me to know that hasn’t been included in any other questions so far?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Closing</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table S2. Characteristics and weight loss of 31 Australian adults who participated in interviews regarding their experience with the VLCD program presented according to duration of program use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age (y)</th>
<th>Times using VLCD program</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Weight loss (kg)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4w</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6w</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6w</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7w</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7w</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8w</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8w</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8w</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9w</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9w</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10w</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11w</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12w</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12w</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12w</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12w</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14w</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3m</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3m</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4m</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4m</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6m</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9m</td>
<td>66.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9m</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9m</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10m</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11m</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12m</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15m</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>≥5</td>
<td>4m (and 18m of maintenance)</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F, female; M, male; w, weeks; m, months; y, years; NR, not reported.

a. Reflects number of times using the VLCD program; does not reflect use of other VLCD programs or products.