

1 **Original article**

2  
3 **An open-label randomised clinical trial to compare the efficacy of dietary caloric**  
4 **restriction and physical activity for weight loss in overweight pet dogs**

5  
6 M. Chapman<sup>a</sup>, G.R.T. Woods<sup>a</sup>, C. Ladha<sup>b</sup>, C. Westgarth<sup>a,c</sup>, A.J. German<sup>a,d,\*</sup>

7  
8 <sup>a</sup> Institute of Veterinary Science, Faculty of Health and Life Sciences, University of Liverpool,  
9 Leahurst Campus, Chester High Road, Neston, Cheshire, CH64 7TE

10 <sup>b</sup> VetSens, 53 Wellburn Park, Jesmond, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, NE2 2JY

11 <sup>c</sup> Department of Epidemiology and Population Health, Institute of Infection and Global Health,  
12 Faculty of Health and Life Sciences, University of Liverpool, Leahurst Campus, Chester High  
13 Road, Neston, Cheshire, CH64 7TE

14 <sup>d</sup> Institute of Ageing and Chronic Disease, Faculty of Health and Life Sciences, University of  
15 Liverpool, Leahurst Campus, Chester High Road, Neston, Cheshire, CH64 7TE

16  
17  
18 \* Corresponding author. Tel.: +44 151 795 6100

19 *E-mail address:* [ajgerman@liverpool.ac.uk](mailto:ajgerman@liverpool.ac.uk) (A.J. German)

20

21 **Abstract**

22 Canine obesity is usually managed with a combination of dietary caloric restriction and  
23 increasing physical activity, but no previous study has compared both of these strategies in a  
24 prospective randomised controlled trial.

25 Thirteen overweight dogs (body condition score 6-9/9) were randomised to one of two  
26 interventions: dietary caloric restriction or physical activity. The dietary caloric restriction  
27 intervention comprised feeding a therapeutic weight loss diet, whilst the physical activity  
28 intervention comprised increasing the dog's current physical activity pattern by at least a third.  
29 The primary outcome measure was change in body weight, whilst secondary outcome measures  
30 included change in neck, thorax and abdominal circumference and change in physical activity  
31 measured by triaxial accelerometer.

32 Bodyweight decreased significantly with the dietary caloric restriction (median -10% of  
33 starting body weight [SBW], 5 to -12%;  $P=0.028$ ) but not with the physical activity intervention  
34 (-2% SBW, +3% to -6%;  $P=0.107$ ). Abdominal circumference (dietary caloric restriction:  
35 median -12.0%; physical activity: median -7.8%,  $P=0.016$ ) and thoracic circumference (dietary  
36 caloric restriction: median -7.5%,  $P=0.031$ ; physical activity: median -3.6%,  $P=0.031$ ) changed  
37 significantly in both groups. There was no change in activity levels within the dietary caloric  
38 restriction group, but vigorous activity increased significantly in the physical activity group  
39 ( $P=0.016$ ).

40 Dietary caloric restriction is more effective than physical activity for controlled weight loss  
41 in overweight pet dogs. Although advising owners to increase their dog's activity by a third leads  
42 to a modest increase in measured vigorous physical activity, this is insufficient to promote  
43 weight loss on its own.

44

45 *Keywords:* Accelerometer; Canine; Diet; Exercise; Obesity

46

## 47 **Introduction**

48 Obesity is one of the most common medical disorders of domestic dogs (German et al.,  
49 2010) and is a significant health and welfare concern by predisposing to other diseases (Lund et  
50 al., 2006; Courcier et al., 2010; German et al., 2010), shortening lifespan (Kealy et al., 2002),  
51 causing metabolic derangements (German et al., 2009, Tvarijonaviciute et al., 2012 & 2013) and  
52 functional impairment (Mosing et al., 2013; Tropf et al., 2017), and adversely affecting quality  
53 of life (German et al., 2012). Recent studies have indicated that this is a problem of global  
54 significance (McGreevy et al., 2005; Colliard et al., 2006; Lund et al., 2006; Courcier et al.,  
55 2010; Mao et al., 2013). Most concerningly, prevalence has increased dramatically in recent  
56 years<sup>1</sup>, with many dogs now affected during their growth phase (German et al., 2018).

57 Obesity is managed with a combination of dietary caloric restriction, using a therapeutic  
58 diet, and increasing energy expenditure. Whilst there have been many studies reporting outcomes  
59 of such programmes, most studies have focused on the effect of caloric restriction (Blanchard et  
60 al., 2004; German et al., 2007a, 2007b, 2010b, 2012 & 2015; Flanagan et al., 2017), with few  
61 studies examining the effect of activity of the development and management of obesity in dogs.  
62 In one study, obese dogs were less physically active than healthy weight dogs and did not appear  
63 to increase their activity levels spontaneously with weight loss (Morrison et al., 2013). One study  
64 incorporated physical activity into a conventional canine weight loss programme using a  
65 treadmill, and rate of weight loss was reportedly increased as a result (Chauvet et al., 2011). In a  
66 more recent study that also used a treadmill, rate of weight loss was unchanged but there was  
67 better preservation of lean tissue mass (Vitger et al., 2016). In addition, compliance was  
68 challenging due to the need for 3-times-weekly treadmill sessions and the fact that many dogs  
69 appeared to be physically incapable of markedly increasing their physical activity level. To the

---

<sup>1</sup> See: <https://www.banfield.com/state-of-pet-health/obesity>. (accessed 17 July 2018).

70 authors' knowledge, the impact on weight loss of more practical methods of increasing physical  
71 activity have never been assessed, for example asking owners to increase the amount of their  
72 dog's usual activity (e.g. walking and play behaviour). Therefore, the primary aim of this study  
73 was to compare the efficacy of either dietary caloric restriction (using a therapeutic weight loss  
74 diet) or increased physical activity (e.g. increasing current activity by at least a third) for weight  
75 loss in overweight dogs.

76

## 77 **Materials and methods**

### 78 *Trial design, site, dates, objectives, and ethical considerations*

79 The study was an open-label randomised controlled trial, using a two-group parallel  
80 design, and the main objective was to compare the efficacy of dietary caloric restriction and  
81 increased physical activity for weight loss in dogs. The Consolidated Standards of Reporting  
82 Trials (CONSORT) statement guidelines<sup>2</sup> (S1 Checklist) were followed to ensure open and  
83 honest reporting of the study. The trial was conducted at the University of Liverpool, Small  
84 Animal Teaching Hospital (SATH). The recruitment phase for the study was between September  
85 2016 and December 2016, and the study itself was conducted between January 2017 and March  
86 2017.

87 The trial complied with the University of Liverpool Guidelines on Animal Welfare and  
88 Experimentation, and was approved by the University of Liverpool Research Ethics Committee  
89 (VREC474). Prior to enrolment, the nature of the study was explained to both owners and their  
90 primary care veterinarians (see below), and both gave their informed consent in writing to enable  
91 the dog to participate. At the end of the trial, all owners were asked to complete a trial feedback  
92 form to ensure that they were happy with trial conduct. As far as possible (for a trial in a

---

<sup>2</sup> See: <http://www.consort-statement.org/media/default/downloads/consort%202010%20checklist.pdf>. (accessed 17 July 2018).

93 veterinary species), the studied complied with the principles of Good Clinical Practice<sup>3</sup>. No  
94 financial incentive (e.g. monetary payment) was given to any of the owners for participating in  
95 the study. However, as a reasonable reimbursement for their time and expense of participating  
96 (e.g. travel costs to and from the SATH), the costs of all clinical assessments, weight  
97 management support and interventions themselves (e.g. therapeutic weight loss diet, modified  
98 feeding bowl, toys) were waived.

99

#### 100 *Roles and responsibilities*

101 Two investigators (GW and AG) were responsible for liaising with the owners, performing  
102 all clinical examinations and weight assessments, implementing the interventions, and follow up.  
103 The respective primary care veterinarian was informed of case progress by letter. Two further  
104 investigators (MC, CW) were responsible for the activity measurements, and also monitoring the  
105 wellbeing of all participants during the study visits. The final investigator (CL) was responsible  
106 for technical support and data analysis for the activity monitors.

107

#### 108 *Eligibility criteria*

109 Dogs were eligible for the study if both the owner and primary care veterinarian consented  
110 to their involvement, they were overweight (i.e. body condition score [BCS] 6-9/9), and if they  
111 had a good temperament (i.e. easy to handle, not nervous or fearful, and not aggressive to other  
112 dogs or people). Further, dogs could not have any pre-existing medical problem that would make  
113 it clinically inappropriate to undergo controlled weight loss (e.g. significant systemic disease  
114 such as chronic kidney disease, cardiac disease, liver disease, metastatic neoplasia etc),  
115 inappropriate to change their food (e.g. on a therapeutic diet for a pre-existing medical disease or

---

<sup>3</sup> See: <http://www.ich.org/products/guidelines/efficacy/efficacy-single/article/integrated-addendum-good-clinical-practice.html>. (accessed 17 July 2018).

116 have known dietary intolerances), or alter their level of physical activity (e.g. pre-existing  
117 cardiac or severe orthopaedic disease). Finally, dogs were not eligible if they were already on a  
118 weight loss regimen or had undertaken a weight loss regimen in the last 6-months prior to the  
119 study.

120

#### 121 *Recruitment process and veterinary pre-screening*

122 The study was featured on a British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) television  
123 documentary series entitled “Trust Me, I’m a Vet”, and was advertised with a combination of  
124 social media, radio advertisements and leaflets sent to local veterinary practices. Before deciding  
125 to participate, interested owners were sent an information sheet and discussed the study with  
126 their primary care veterinarian. The veterinarian then conducted a pre-trial assessment to confirm  
127 eligibility, by reviewing clinical history and performing a physical examination. In addition, the  
128 veterinarian measured bodyweight, assessed body condition using a 9-point system BCS system  
129 comprising a set of five size-specific BCS charts, for small, medium, large, and giant breeds,  
130 respectively (Flanagan et al., 2017). The system was adapted from the system originally  
131 described (Laflamme, 1997) and validated against body fat mass measured by dual-energy X-ray  
132 absorptiometry (Flanagan et al., 2017). In addition, the temperament of each dog was assessed to  
133 ensure that it would be suitable for participation (e.g. neither aggressive nor nervous meaning  
134 that participation would be stressful). If the dog was deemed to be eligible, the dog was formally  
135 referred to the SATH for inclusion in the study.

136

137 When the official referral request was received, one investigator (GW) reviewed the  
138 paperwork to confirm study eligibility and contacted the owners by telephone. Details of the  
139 study were again discussed in detail, and, provided that owners confirmed that they were happy

140 to participate, a study pack was sent to them by post. This pack contained a second copy of the  
141 information sheet, a consent form, a questionnaire to obtain information about diet and activity, a  
142 3-day food diary, and an activity monitor along with collar and written instructions on its use  
143 (see below). Owners completed the questionnaire and sent it back to the study researcher before  
144 the enrolment visit, and also ensured that their dog wore the accelerometer for at least 7 days.

145

#### 146 *Enrolment visit*

147 All owners and dogs attended an enrolment visit at the SATH during the same 2-day period  
148 in January 2017. During this visit, each dog had a 30-minute individual consultation with two of  
149 the study investigators, one of whom was an EBVS<sup>®</sup> European Veterinary Specialist in Small  
150 Internal Medicine (AG), and the other (GW) was a Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons  
151 Registered Veterinary Nurse (RVN). After checking the paperwork and confirming that the  
152 owners had read the information leaflet, owners signed the consent form. The medical history  
153 and pre-study questionnaire were reviewed, and a full physical examination was performed.  
154 Measurements taken included body weight, BCS, circumferential measurements, and physical  
155 activity using activity monitors (see below). Once these screening procedures had been  
156 performed the treatment arm was revealed to the owner and their individualised plan was  
157 described in detail (see below).

158

#### 159 *Interventions*

160 Dogs received one of two interventions, dietary caloric restriction or physical activity. The  
161 dietary caloric restriction intervention comprised feeding a high protein high fibre purpose-  
162 formulated weight loss diet (Satiety Support, Royal Canin; Table 1), for the duration of the study  
163 period. The initial food allocation for weight loss was based upon an estimate of maintenance

164 energy requirement ( $MER = 440 \text{ [kJ]} \times \text{body weight [kg]}^{0.75}/\text{day}$ ) using the ideal weight of the  
165 dog, as determined by current body condition score (German et al., 2015). The degree of  
166 restriction for each dog was then individualised based upon sex, neuter status and, if necessary,  
167 other factors that might influence MER (i.e. presence of associated diseases such as orthopaedic  
168 disease). The starting energy allocation was typically between 50-60% of MER at ideal weight.  
169 Owners were instructed to measure out food portions using electronic weigh scales, and to feed  
170 this in divided meals, using a provided modified feeding bowl (Slow Down Dog Bowl, Royal  
171 Canin). They were also asked to avoid feeding any additional foodstuffs (e.g. table scraps or  
172 treats) and not to change the dog's current physical activity plan.

173         The physical activity intervention comprised increasing the dog's current physical activity  
174 pattern and was tailored to the capabilities of both the dog and the owner, with the intention that  
175 the total weekly amount of physical be increased by at least a third. During the enrolment visit,  
176 detailed information on the current physical activity undertaken by the dog was collected, and  
177 tailored suggestions were given on increasing this activity through discussion with the owner.  
178 This could involve increasing the frequency or duration (or both) of physical activity sessions  
179 that the dog was currently undertaking. For example, an owner who was walking their dog once  
180 daily for 30 min could be asked to walk their dog for 40 min, whilst an owner who exercised  
181 their dogs three times a week could be asked to exercise them for four times per week. These  
182 suggestions provided a guide to the minimum desired increase in activity for each dog, but  
183 owners could increase activity levels beyond this if time allowed and if their dog could cope. In  
184 addition, owners were provided with a toy (Kong® Squeezz stick, Kong Company Ltd.) and  
185 encouraged to implement regular play sessions, with the number and frequency again determined  
186 by what the owner and dog could manage. Besides the changes to physical activity, owners were

187 instructed not to alter any other aspect of their dog's lifestyle most notably their food and meal  
188 pattern.

189

### 190 *Measurements*

191 Measurements taken at both the enrolment and final visits included bodyweight, BCS, and  
192 circumferential measurements. For bodyweight measurements, dogs were weighed on a single  
193 set of electronic scales (Veterinary Scale, Soehnle Professional), which were regularly calibrated  
194 to verify precision and accuracy using certified test weights (Blake and Boughton Ltd). The 9-  
195 point BCS system was used for body condition by two experienced investigators (AG, GW).  
196 Initially, after each investigator had first independently assessed the dog, a final score was agreed  
197 by discussion and consensus. One investigator (GW) took three circumferential measurements at  
198 the enrolment and final visits using a fabric tape measure with measurements recorded in cm.  
199 The measurements taken were mid-neck (mid-point of the neck, approximately half way between  
200 occiput and cranial edge of the scapula), thorax (immediately caudal to the thoracic limb) and  
201 abdomen (immediately cranial to the pelvic limb). Other measurements, for example muscle  
202 condition scoring or measurement of thigh circumference, were not performed due to time  
203 constraints.

204 Physical activity was monitored for a period of seven consecutive days before the study  
205 commenced and for 7 days during the final two weeks of the study using a triaxial accelerometer  
206 and ActivityScope analysis software (VetSens<sup>®</sup>) which had previously been validated in dogs  
207 (Westgarth and Ladha, 2017). Before the enrolment visit, owners were sent the accelerometer by  
208 post, along with a fabric collar<sup>4</sup>, modified with an elastic and Velcro pouch to secure the  
209 accelerometer snugly, and instructions on its use. Owners fitted the collar around the dog's neck,

---

<sup>4</sup> See: <https://www.dog-games-shop.co.uk/20mm-top-piece.html>. (accessed 17 July 2018)

210 and then left it in place for the 7-day period. Owners were instructed to keep the collar on except  
211 for bathing or swimming activities. They also completed a diary where particular events and  
212 times could be recorded, for instance if the collar had been removed.

213

214 After each 7-day period, data were downloaded from the accelerometers, and  
215 ActivityScope software was used to translate the raw actigraphy into VM3 (vector magnitude)  
216 counts, in order to filter out movement originating from mechanical sources such as vehicles  
217 (Westgarth and Ladha, 2017). The time spent in states of light, moderate and vigorous activity  
218 was calculated using a threshold approach (Table 2) as previously reported (Yam et al., 2011,  
219 Morrison et al., 2013), and percentages were derived from the time spent in each state for the  
220 whole 7-day period. The VetSens system automatically calculates non-wear periods, enabling  
221 these to be excluded from calculations. Percentage rather than absolute values were compared  
222 both within and between groups on account of the fact that the wear time for each 7-day period  
223 varied between dogs.

224

#### 225 *Owner support and study monitoring*

226 Owners maintained a diary in which they recorded feeding of the purpose-formulated diet  
227 (amount offered and consumed), and any additional food that had been consumed (either given  
228 as treats or stolen). These records were used subjectively to determine compliance with the  
229 allocated intervention (see below). One study investigator (GW) contacted all owners every 2  
230 weeks to monitor progress but, in addition, owners could contact the study investigators directly  
231 by telephone at any stage if they needed urgent guidance. For dogs on the physical activity  
232 intervention, compliance was discussed and encouragement was provided as required. As far as  
233 possible, further encouragement was given to attempt to increase activity further, again

234 dependent on the capabilities of the individual dog. For the dietary caloric restriction  
235 intervention, counselling was provided regarding maintaining compliance with the food  
236 allocation, measuring food out, avoiding the feeding of additional foodstuffs, and strategies to  
237 mitigate any food-seeking behaviour that manifested during the trial.

238

### 239 *Final visit and support after the trial*

240 Dogs and their owners returned to the SATH 8 weeks later for a follow-up visit, with  
241 assessments for all dogs conducted over two consecutive days in March 2017. Each was re-  
242 examined by the same two study investigators (AG, GW). The diary record was reviewed, and  
243 the same measurements taken as for the enrolment visit (bodyweight, BCS, circumferential  
244 measurements).

245

246 After the trial was completed, all owners were given either a complimentary toy (Kong®  
247 Squeezz stick, caloric restriction intervention) or modified feeding bowl (Slow Down Dog Bowl,  
248 Royal Canin; physical activity intervention), and given further guidance on its use. In addition,  
249 all owners offered follow-up weight management support for their dog at SATH, and the  
250 opportunity to implement a long-term weight loss plan involving both dietary caloric restriction  
251 and increased activity. In total, the owners of six dogs chose to pursue this, comprising two dogs  
252 originally on the dietary caloric restriction intervention and four dogs originally on the physical  
253 activity intervention.

254

### 255 *Compliance with intervention*

256 The diary records of owners were reviewed to determine compliance with the allocated  
257 intervention. Given that only limited handwritten text notes were available, only a subjective

258 assessment was possible. For the dietary caloric restriction group, compliance with the  
259 therapeutic diet (amount and meal frequency), the recommendation to maintain the same  
260 physical activity level, and the consumption of additional food (either offered or stolen) were  
261 considered. For the physical activity group, compliance with the recommended increase in  
262 physical activity, and with the recommendation to maintain the same feeding pattern were  
263 considered.

264

#### 265 *Patient welfare, adverse events and early trial discontinuation*

266 Throughout the study, all efforts were made to safeguard the welfare of the dogs enrolled.  
267 For both the enrolment and final visits, two RCVS-registered veterinary nurses, one animal  
268 behaviourist, and one veterinary student were on hand to supervise and monitor all dogs. During  
269 the 8-week intervention period, owners observed the wellbeing of their dogs and alerted the  
270 investigators if they were concerned. One study investigator (GW) was responsible for recording  
271 the details of any welfare issues, protocol deviations, suspected adverse events, and development  
272 of concurrent medical problems. If any adverse event was thought to be related to either  
273 intervention, participation in the study was to be suspended immediately. If it was thought to be  
274 unlikely that an adverse event was related to the intervention, the dog was allowed to continue  
275 with the trial, provided that the owners agreed. Participation could also be suspended if an  
276 enrolled dog developed an unrelated condition whilst enrolled in the trial. Finally, owners were  
277 free to withdraw their dog at any stage, without needing to give a reason.

278

#### 279 *Randomisation procedure and allocation concealment*

280 The *a priori* power calculation (see below) suggested that six dogs per group would be  
281 sufficient to demonstrate a clinical difference between interventions and, as a result, we aimed to

282 recruit at least 12 and up to 24 dogs during the recruitment phase. Prior to recruitment, one  
283 investigator (AG) used the random number generator of a computer statistics programme (Stats  
284 Direct version 2.6.2, Stats Direct Ltd.) to create a random sequence of 24 treatments, with 12  
285 labelled A and 12 labelled B. Given that it was unclear how many eligible dogs would ultimately  
286 be available, a block size of 2 was used (i.e. each sequential block of two treatments contained  
287 either an A or a B in random order). Therefore, the number of dogs assigned to each treatment  
288 arm always remain closely balanced throughout the list. Once created, the list was placed in a  
289 sealed envelope and not examined again until after recruitment was completed. A second study  
290 investigator without knowledge of the treatment allocation (GW) assigned the study numbers to  
291 the dogs as recruitment proceeded. Study numbers were assigned in strict chronological order  
292 according to the date that their referral request was received. After all referral requests for any  
293 eligible dogs had been received and the recruitment phase was closed, but before the treatment  
294 allocation list was revealed, the second study investigator decided at random which treatment  
295 (diet or physical activity) would be assigned to which treatment label (A or B). Only then, did  
296 the first study investigator open the sealed envelope to reveal the final treatment allocation for  
297 each dog. Once the treatment (diet or physical activity) was known, no attempt was made to  
298 blind the study investigators because the treatments were distinct and needed to be tailored to the  
299 individual.

300

### 301 *Outcome measures*

302 The primary outcome measure was change in body weight expressed as a percentage of the  
303 starting (i.e. pre-intervention) weight (i.e.  $[\text{pre-study measurement} - \text{post-study measurement}] /$   
304  $[\text{pre-study measurement}] \times 100$ ). Secondary outcome measures included change in neck, thorax  
305 and abdominal circumference and change in physical activity, all of which were again expressed

306 as a percentage of the starting measurement. All of these outcome measures were decided prior  
307 to commencement of the trial.

308

### 309 *Sample size*

310 During the design phase of the study, one investigator (AG) performed a sample size  
311 calculation using a statistical software package (Stats Direct version 2.6.2). The primary outcome  
312 measure (percentage change in body weight) was used. The expected effect size (mean  $\pm$   
313 standard deviation) for the dietary caloric restriction was  $8.7 \pm 4.85\%$ , which was based upon the  
314 percentage weight lost over 8 weeks in a recent study using the same therapeutic diet (Flanagan  
315 et al., 2017). Given that a recent study incorporating physical activity using a treadmill did not  
316 reveal a significant additional effect over dietary caloric restriction (Vitger et al., 2016), the  
317 expected effect size was assumed to be equivalent to that of placebo as seen in previous  
318 experimental weight loss studies, e.g. 2.6% body weight over an 8-week period (Gossellin et al.,  
319 2007). A 1:1 test:control recruitment rate was used and calculations assumed that a power of  
320 80% was required to identify this difference with a two-sided  $P$  of  $<0.05$ . Based upon these  
321 criteria, it was determined that six animals per group would be needed. In order to take account  
322 of possible study drop-outs, the investigators attempted to recruit at least 12 and up to 24 dogs  
323 within the short recruitment window.

324

### 325 *Data handling and statistical analysis*

326 Data were entered into an electronic spreadsheet (Microsoft Excel® for Mac version  
327 16.19) and checked for errors, and this dataset is available as supporting information (S1  
328 dataset). Two computer statistical packages were used for data analysis: StatsDirect version 2.6.2  
329 and SPSS version 23.0 (IBM Corporation). The level of statistical significance was set at  $P < 0.05$

330 for 2-sided analyses. Standard descriptive statistics were used to report continuous (age,  
331 bodyweight, circumferential measurements, percentage change in weight and circumference) and  
332 ordinal (BCS) data as median and range given the small study numbers, whilst categorical  
333 variables were expressed as proportions (number with percentage in brackets). Given the small  
334 group sizes, non-parametric tests were used throughout. Data comparisons were made with  
335 Fisher's exact test (for proportions), and either the Wilcoxon signed ranks test or the Mann-  
336 Whitney test (for continuous and ordinal variables). The Mann-Whitney test was used to  
337 compare absolute continuous data at baseline between groups (e.g. age, starting bodyweight,  
338 duration of physical activity before weight loss; Table 3), whilst Fisher's exact test was used to  
339 compare differences in sex and the Cochran-Armitage trend test used for BCS. The Mann-  
340 Whitney test was used to compare percentage changes in weight loss outcomes (e.g. body  
341 weight, bodyweight, circumference and physical activity) between groups, and the Cochran-  
342 Armitage trend test was used for changes in BCS again between groups. For within-group  
343 comparisons (pre- vs. post-weight loss), a Chi square test for trend was used to assess changes in  
344 BCS, whilst Wilcoxon signed ranks tests were used to compare changes (pre- and post-weight-  
345 loss) in bodyweight, circumferential measurements, and physical activity. Outcome data were  
346 analysed on an intention to treat basis. Full datasets were available for all dogs, with the  
347 exception one dog where pre- and post-weight-loss zoometric data were missing (due to time  
348 pressures) and post-weight-loss physical activity data were not available (because the owner did  
349 not return the accelerometer after the second period of activity monitoring). In order to account  
350 for missing data in the intention to treat analysis, imputation was performed using the method of  
351 multivariate normal imputation (Lee and Carlin, 2010).

352

353 *Protocol changes*

354 Two protocol changes were made to study protocol during the enrolment visit due to  
355 unexpected findings at this stage. During the enrolment visit, it was discovered that one dog  
356 assigned to physical activity intervention was already on a weight loss regimen using a  
357 therapeutic weight loss diet, and one dog in the dietary caloric restriction group was fed a dry  
358 hydrolysed diet (Hypoallergenic Diet dry, Royal Canin), implying the presence of an adverse  
359 reaction to food. These details had not been reported by the referring veterinarians or owners  
360 before during the recruitment phase. These dogs had already been allocated to an intervention  
361 arm and, therefore, were allowed to remain within the trial (according to the intention-to-treat  
362 principle). In addition, the owner of dog already on the therapeutic weight loss diet was  
363 instructed to continue feeding the current daily food allocation.

364 A second dog in the physical activity arm had significant osteoarthritis, which again had  
365 not been reported by the primary care veterinarian or owner during the recruitment phase.  
366 Although the dog was physically active and receiving regular daily walks, increasing this further  
367 was not thought to be clinically appropriate. Instead, this dog received weekly 60-minute  
368 hydrotherapy sessions using an underwater treadmill, supervised by a trained veterinary  
369 physiotherapist. This dog also continued in the study and data was included in analyses.

370

## 371 **Results**

### 372 *Dogs*

373 Owners of 14 dogs expressed an interest in participating, 13 of which met the eligibility  
374 criteria and proceeded to the enrolment phase. These 13 dogs were then randomly allocated to  
375 the two treatment arms, with six dogs assigned to the dietary caloric restriction group and seven  
376 assigned to the physical activity intervention (Table 3). Before the trial, all dogs were fed adult  
377 maintenance diets, except for one dog in the dietary caloric restriction group that was fed a dry

378 hydrolysed diet (Hypoallergenic Diet dry, Royal Canin), and one dog in the physical activity  
379 group that was fed a was fed a dry therapeutic weight loss diet (Satiety Diet dry, Royal Canin).  
380 Owners also reported feeding a range of dog treats and table scraps on a regular basis. There  
381 were no significant differences between groups for any of the baseline variables (Table 3). All  
382 dogs finished the trial and complete datasets were available for all parameters, with the exception  
383 of activity data post-intervention for one dog as discussed below.

384

#### 385 *Adverse effects and withdrawals*

386 No significant adverse effects were reported, and no withdrawals occurred in any dogs  
387 during the study. However, one dog in the diet group sustained a leg injury and which required  
388 rest for 6 weeks. Despite this, it was possible to continue with the intervention as planned, and  
389 the physical activity recorded post-intervention was included in the analysis.

390

#### 391 *Compliance with intervention*

392 Diary records were available for ten of the dogs, comprising five of six and five of seven  
393 from the dietary caloric restriction and physical activity groups, respectively. In the dietary  
394 caloric restriction group, records indicated that all owners had fed the correct amount of the  
395 therapeutic diet, whilst a review of activity suggested a similar amount to what had been  
396 undertaken previously. However, against recommendations, all dogs received additional food,  
397 usually given as treats but occasionally stolen. Items fed included additional therapeutic diet,  
398 other dog food, meat (e.g. chicken, pate), yogurt, fruit (e.g. watermelon, orange, strawberry,  
399 pear), vegetables (e.g. courgette, carrot), rawhide chews and chocolate. Given the limited  
400 information written, it was not possible to estimate the energy intake from this food. In the  
401 physical activity group, the written notes suggested good compliance with the recommendations

402 in all dogs, consistent with an activity increase of at least a third compared with baseline, and no  
403 change in food intake.

404

#### 405 *Bodyweight and body condition*

406 Bodyweight and BCS data from before and after weight loss are shown in Table 4. The  
407 bodyweight of dogs in the dietary caloric restriction group changed by a median of -10% from  
408 starting baseline (range -5 to -12%,  $P=0.031$ ), but bodyweight in the physical activity group did  
409 not (median change -2% SBW, range +3% to -6%;  $P=0.109$ ). Therefore, weight loss was  
410 significantly greater with dietary caloric restriction than with physical activity ( $P=0.014$ ). There  
411 was a significant decrease in BCS in the dietary caloric restriction group ( $P=0.043$ ), with the  
412 BCS decreasing by one category in four of the dogs and by two categories in the remaining two  
413 dogs. In contrast, BCS did not change in 6 dogs in the physical activity group, and decreased by  
414 one category in the remaining dog, with no significant change in the group as a whole ( $P=0.798$ ).  
415 As a result, the decrease in body condition was significantly greater with dietary caloric  
416 restriction than with physical activity ( $P=0.003$ ).

417

#### 418 *Neck, thoracic and abdominal circumference*

419 Zoometric measurements taken from dogs from before and after weight loss are shown in  
420 Table 4. Abdominal circumference (dietary caloric restriction: median -12.0%, range -5.0 to -  
421 17.4,  $P=0.031$ ; physical activity: median -7.8%, range -6.2 to -13.0,  $P=0.016$ ) and thoracic  
422 circumference (dietary caloric restriction: median -7.5%, range -5.5 to -18.2,  $P=0.031$ ; physical  
423 activity: median -3.6%, range 0.0 to -12.0,  $P=0.031$ ) changed significantly in both groups. For  
424 thoracic circumference, the magnitude of change was greater for the diet intervention group than  
425 for the physical activity group ( $P=0.027$ ), but there was no difference between interventions for

426 the change in abdominal circumference ( $P=0.430$ ). Further, there was no change in neck  
427 circumference in either group (dietary caloric restriction: median -4.5%, range 4.0 to -6.9,  
428  $P=0.125$ ; physical activity: median -4.1%, range 0.0 to -13.3,  $P=0.062$ ), and no difference in the  
429 magnitude of change between groups ( $P=1.000$ ).

430

### 431 *Physical activity*

432 Physical activity was monitored during the trial using triaxial accelerometer (Table 5), and  
433 an example of the activity data for the trial for one dog in the physical activity group is shown in  
434 Figure 1. There was some difference amongst dogs in the time the accelerometers were worn,  
435 although there were no differences between groups or time periods (Table 5). There was no  
436 difference in the percentage time spent in sedentary ( $P=0.943$ ), light-moderate ( $P=1.000$ ), and  
437 vigorous ( $P=0.720$ ) physical activity between groups before weight loss. There was no change in  
438 activity levels within the dietary caloric restriction group, pre- and post-trial (sedentary:  
439  $P=1.000$ ; light-moderate:  $P=0.562$ ; vigorous:  $P=0.312$ ). There was also no change in sedentary  
440 ( $P=0.469$ ) or light-moderate ( $P=1.000$ ) activity in the physical activity group, but vigorous  
441 activity increased significantly ( $P=0.016$ ). However, there were no differences between groups  
442 for the change in activity within each category (sedentary  $P=0.617$ ; light-moderate,  $P=0.721$ ;  
443 vigorous  $P=0.054$ ).

444

## 445 **Discussion**

446 This is the first randomised controlled trial to compare dietary caloric restriction and  
447 physical activity as interventions for controlled weight loss in dogs. Although the study size was  
448 small, a difference between interventions was evident. All dogs in the dietary caloric restriction  
449 group lost weight, with the median percentage weight loss over being consistent with rates of

450 weight loss seen in previous studies (German et al., 2007 & 2010; Vitger et al., 2016; Flanagan  
451 et al., 2017). In contrast, although six of seven dogs in the physical activity group did lose some  
452 weight, the amount lost was relatively modest (i.e. up to 6%) and not statistically significant.  
453 These results are consistent with human studies where clinically significant weight loss is  
454 unlikely unless there is a high level of aerobic exercise training (reviewed by Swift et al., 2014).  
455 For example, in the Studies of a Targeted Risk Reduction Intervention through Defined Exercise  
456 (STRRIDE) study, average weight loss was only minimal when exercising at low-amount /  
457 moderate-intensity (~0.6 kg weight loss with ~176 min activity per week) or at low-amount /  
458 high-intensity (~0.2 kg weight loss with ~117 min activity per week), whilst even high-amount /  
459 high intensity activity (171 min per week) only led to modest (~1.5 kg) weight loss (Kraus et al  
460 2002). They are also consistent with other weight loss studies in dogs whereby exercise did not  
461 increase rate of weight loss (Vitger et al., 2016). Of course, whilst physical activity might not be  
462 suitable as a sole weight loss strategy, it arguably conveys other benefits that are desirable as part  
463 of a weight loss regimen (Vitger et al. 2016). In a recent 12-week study, adding physical activity  
464 to a canine weight loss regimen helped to minimise loss of lean tissue mass (Vitger et al., 2016).  
465 It could be argued that the reason there was no significant change in bodyweight in the current  
466 study was that loss of adipose tissue in the physical activity group was offset by an increase in  
467 muscle mass. Although plausible, it is unclear as to whether the strategy for increasing physical  
468 activity we used (which relied on owners increasing their dog's activity by at least a third) is  
469 equivalent to the 3-times-weekly treadmill activity that the dogs of the previous study received.  
470 For example, although an underwater treadmill was used in one dog in the physical activity  
471 group, it was only used once weekly. Measurements of body composition, for instance using  
472 dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry (German et al., 2007, Vitger et al., 2016), would have been

473 required to determine whether lean tissue mass was maintained but, unfortunately, this was not  
474 performed.

475 Thoracic and abdominal circumferential measurements decreased in dogs on both  
476 interventions. These zoometric changes are likely to be the result of loss of adipose tissue,  
477 suggesting that body shape changed significantly even despite the short study duration. The  
478 reason why thoracic and abdominal girth decreased, but neck circumference did not, is not  
479 known, but might be due to differences in the relative change of visceral versus subcutaneous fat.  
480 Most visceral fat is present within the abdomen whilst subcutaneous fat is distributed more  
481 widely (Merlotti et al., 2017), and human weight loss studies have shown that the percentage  
482 decrease in visceral fat is greater than the percentage decrease in subcutaneous fat (Merlotti et  
483 al., 2017). Nonetheless, given that the study was short, it is unclear what might have happened in  
484 the longer term, and whether or not other changes would have been seen. Alternatively, the  
485 differences might have been caused by the known variability in zoometric measurements, since  
486 this technique lacks precision even when conducted by the same person (German, 2016). Whilst  
487 such variability would again not necessarily be expected to affect such measurements  
488 systematically, we must accept that the study was unblinded and we cannot discount the effect of  
489 unconscious bias.

490 Changes in physical activity were measured as another secondary outcome variable. Given  
491 the logistic challenges involved in posting out and receiving accelerometers, it was only possible  
492 to compare two 7-day periods of activity, one before and one at the end of the weight loss period.  
493 There was no significant change in physical activity in dogs on the dietary caloric restriction  
494 intervention but vigorous physical activity increased significantly in the physical activity group.  
495 Although this suggests that owners in both groups were compliant with the instructions given  
496 over physical activity (e.g. increasing exercise in the physical activity group, but not in the diet

497 group), the magnitude of increase seen in the physical activity group was less than would be  
498 expected from the recommendation made (e.g. to increase activity by at least a third). In this  
499 respect, the typical time that the devices were worn over the course of the week was 9998 min,  
500 and a 0.6% increase equates to ~8 min additional vigorous activity per day, or 56 min per week.  
501 It is unclear as to the amount of vigorous physical activity necessary for health benefits in dogs  
502 (Wakshlag et al., 2012), but World Health Organization guidelines recommend that adult people  
503 should have at least 75 min of vigorous physical activity per week<sup>5</sup>. Irrespective of whether the  
504 increase was sufficient for a health benefit, it may well have been that maximum increase that  
505 was feasible for the dogs and their owners. Indeed, previous work has suggested that it can be  
506 challenging for both owner and dog to introduce meaningful amounts of physical activity into the  
507 daily routine of an obese dog. In a previous weight loss study involving 3-times-weekly treadmill  
508 sessions, dogs were often reluctant or unable to work energetically and, therefore, activity rarely  
509 exceeded a light-to-moderate intensity (Vitger et al., 2016). Additional work is required to  
510 explore the best forms of physical activity for obese dogs in order to maximise the benefits  
511 during a weight loss regimen.

512 On a related note, a limitation of the study was that the recommendation to owners  
513 regarding increasing physical activity was not based on previous scientific publications, for  
514 example, those confirming that such a change in activity would be enough to lead to significant  
515 weight loss. To the authors' knowledge, studies examining this have not been conducted in dogs.  
516 It is possible that significant weight loss could have been achieved had owners been advised to  
517 increase physical activity even more and, therefore, it could be argued that the current study  
518 actually compared dietary caloric restriction with placebo, rather than physical activity. The

---

<sup>5</sup> See: [http://www.who.int/dietphysicalactivity/factsheet\\_adults/en/](http://www.who.int/dietphysicalactivity/factsheet_adults/en/). (accessed July 2018)

519 recommendation made (i.e. increasing physical activity by at least a third) was based upon what  
520 we believed would be feasible for the majority of owners, having made similar recommendations  
521 on weight management to clients in the past. A review of diary records suggested that most  
522 owners complied with this recommendation, although the increase in physical activity measured  
523 by accelerometer was less marked. This suggests that it can be difficult for owners to increase  
524 the physical activity of their dog even modestly, implying this is unlikely to be a suitable strategy  
525 for managing overweight client-owned dogs.

526         There are a number of other limitations for this study that should be considered when  
527 interpreting findings. First, sample size was small and the group of dogs studied was  
528 heterogeneous. Therefore, although designed to be adequately-powered for the primary outcome  
529 measure (percentage weight loss), we cannot be certain that it was adequately-powered for  
530 secondary outcome measures such as zoometric measurements and physical activity. This was  
531 compounded by the fact that we analysed data on an intention-to-treat basis, not least given that  
532 the original study protocol was modified twice on account of unexpected findings at enrolment.  
533 For example, eligibility criteria were not met for three dogs, one in the dietary caloric restriction  
534 group that was fed a hydrolysed diet before the study, and two in the physical activity group, one  
535 of which was already on a therapeutic weight loss diet, and the other that had pre-existing  
536 osteoarthritis. These might feasibly have affected the response to each intervention although, to  
537 an extent the effects might have counteracted one another. In this regard, greater weight loss  
538 might be expected in the dog in the physical activity group that was already being fed a weight  
539 loss diet; in contrast, it is possible that the efficacy of this intervention might be less for the dog  
540 with pre-existing osteoarthritis. An alternative approach would have been to consider analysing  
541 data on a 'per protocol' basis, whereby only dogs that complied with the intervention were  
542 included. However, this approach is not recommended because it can introduce bias and

543 invalidate the randomisation process (Moher et al., 2010). These protocol deviations, whilst  
544 unfortunate, are commonly-encountered when conducting trials in a clinical setting. Nonetheless,  
545 the authors recommend further studies to explore physical activity effects during weight loss, and  
546 the results of the current study could be used as a basis for a sample size estimation.

547         Second, unintended bias could have resulted from differences in owner compliance  
548 between interventions. As discussed above, owners might have struggled to increase physical  
549 activity by the expected amount whilst, conversely, owners used to feeding treats to their dog  
550 might have struggled to comply with dietary recommendations. Although not all owners  
551 completed the diary, the available records indicated relatively good compliance with both  
552 interventions, with the main exception being feeding extra food in the dietary caloric restriction  
553 intervention. Nonetheless, since these were based on self-reporting, these results should be  
554 interpreted with caution, not least since under-reporting is known to be a problem in human  
555 nutrition studies (Heitmann et al., 2000). In the current study, inaccurate self-reporting is  
556 suggested by the fact that the magnitude of increase in physical activity was less than expected  
557 based on the accelerometer data. Therefore, the extent to which poor compliance influenced the  
558 current results is not known. Third, the study was only 8 weeks in duration, which is shorter than  
559 most previous weight loss studies in dogs. Thus, the true effect of the interventions might have  
560 been under-estimated. As a result, it would be sensible to consider repeating the study in a larger  
561 population of dogs and following them for a longer period. Finally, the study was open-label  
562 with no attempt made to mask the treatments from either owners or study investigators. The  
563 decision not to mask the treatments was partly because they were completely different from each  
564 other, and also that each required a degree of tailoring to the individual unique to that  
565 intervention. With the dietary caloric restriction intervention, daily food portion recommended  
566 for weight loss was calculated based upon patient factors such as sex, neuter status and estimated

567 ideal weight; for the physical activity intervention, the recommended increase was based on the  
568 existing exercise pattern, any concurrent medical diseases, and the lifestyle of owner to ensure  
569 the changes were feasible. For similar reasons, it was also not possible to mask the owner from  
570 these interventions. Nonetheless, this is a study limitation and, as a consequence, we can be  
571 certain that the results were affected by bias, for example if either study investigators or owners  
572 had pre-conceived ideas as to which intervention would be more effective.

573 In conclusion, the results of the current study confirm that dietary caloric restriction is  
574 more effective than physical activity for controlled weight loss in overweight pet dogs. A  
575 recommendation to owners to increase the activity of their dog by a third resulted in a modest  
576 increase in vigorous physical activity, but this was insufficient to promote weight loss. Further  
577 studies should consider health benefits of physical activity in overweight dogs beyond weight  
578 loss in overweight dogs.

579

## 580 **Acknowledgements**

581 The trial was televised by the BBC and broadcast in May 2017 on BBC2 as part of the  
582 “Trust Me I’m A Vet” series. The authors would like to acknowledge the staff of Small Animal  
583 Teaching Hospital, University of Liverpool for support provided during the study. AG’s  
584 academic post at the University of Liverpool is financially supported by Royal Canin.

585 Funding: This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the  
586 public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors. However, the food used for the dietary caloric  
587 restriction group, as well as all modified feeding bowls and toys were provided by Royal Canin.

588

## 589 **Competing interests**

590           The diets used in this study was produced by Royal Canin. AG and GW are employees of  
591 the University of Liverpool, but their posts are financially supported by Royal Canin. AG has  
592 also received financial remuneration for providing educational material, speaking at conferences,  
593 and consultancy work from this company; all such remuneration has been for projects unrelated  
594 to the work reported in this manuscript. CL is an employee of VetSens, who supplied the triaxial  
595 accelerometers for measuring physical activity during the trial. Neither Royal Canin nor VetSens  
596 were involved in study design, data analysis, interpretation of results, drafting of the manuscript  
597 or the decision to submit the work for publication.

598

599 **References**

- 600
- 601 Blanchard, G., Nguyen, P., Gayet, C., Leriche, I., Siliart, B., Paragon, B.M., 2004. Rapid weight  
602 loss with a high-protein low energy diet allows the recovery of ideal body composition and  
603 insulin sensitivity in obese dogs. *Journal of Nutrition* 134, 2148S-2150S
- 604
- 605 Chauvet, A., Laclair, J., Elliott, D.A., German, A.J., 2011. Exercise and Active Client Motivation  
606 Improve Rate of Weight Loss in Obese Dogs. *Canadian Veterinary Journal*, 52, 491-496.
- 607
- 608 Colliard, L., Ancel, J., Benet, J.J., Paragon, B.M., Blanchard, G., 2006. Risk factors for obesity  
609 in dogs in France. *Journal of Nutrition* 36, 1951S-1954S.
- 610
- 611 Courcier, E.C., Thompson, R.M., Mellor, D.J., Yam, P.S., 2010. An epidemiological study of  
612 environmental factors associated with canine obesity. *Journal of Small Animal Practice* 51,  
613 362-367.
- 614
- 615 Flanagan, J., Bissot, T., Hours, M.A., Moreno, B., Feugier, A., German, A.J., 2017. Success of a  
616 weight loss plan for overweight dogs: the results of an international weight loss study.  
617 *PLOS ONE*, 12(9). Doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0184199
- 618
- 619 German, A.J., Holden, S.L., Bissot, T., Hackett, R.M., Biourge V., 2007. Dietary Energy  
620 Restriction and Successful Weight Loss in Obese Client-Owned Dogs. *Journal of*  
621 *Veterinary Internal Medicine* 21, 1174-1180.
- 622
- 623 German, A.J., Hervera, M., Hunter, L., Holden, S.L., Morris, P.J., Biourge, V., Trayhurn, P.,  
624 2009. Insulin resistance and reduction in plasma inflammatory adipokines after weight loss  
625 in obese dogs. *Domestic Animal Endocrinology* 37, 214-226.
- 626
- 627 German, A.J., Ryan, V.H., German, A.C., Wood, I.S., Trayhurn, P., 2010. Obesity, its associated  
628 disorders and the role of inflammatory adipokines in companion animals. *The Veterinary*  
629 *Journal* 185, 4-9.
- 630
- 631 German, A. J., Holden, S. L., Bissot, T., Morris, P. J., Biourge, V., 2010. A high protein high  
632 fibre diet improves weight loss in obese dogs. *Veterinary journal* 183, 294-297.
- 633
- 634 German, A.J., Holden, S.L., Wiseman-Orr, M.L., Reid, J., Nolan, A.M., Biourge, V., Morris,  
635 P.J., Scott, E.M., 2012. Quality of life is reduced in obese dogs but improves after  
636 successful weight loss. *The Veterinary Journal* 192, 428-434.
- 637
- 638 German, A.J., Holden, S.L., Morris, P.J., Biourge, V., 2012. Long-term follow-up after weight  
639 management in obese dogs: The role of diet in preventing regain. *The Veterinary Journal*  
640 192, 65-70.
- 641
- 642 German, A.J., Titcomb, J.M., Holden, S.L., Queau, Y., Morris, P.J., Biourge, V., 2015. Cohort  
643 study of the success of controlled weight loss programs for obese dogs. *Journal of*  
644 *Veterinary Internal Medicine* 29, 1547-1555
- 645

646 German, A.J., 2016. Inaccuracy when using tape measures for zoometry in dogs. *Journal of*  
647 *Veterinary Internal Medicine* 30, 394.

648

649 German, A.J., Woods, G.R.T., Holden, S.L., Brennan, L., Burke, C., 2018. Dangerous trends in  
650 pet obesity. *Veterinary Record* 182, 25.

651

652 Gossellin, J., McKelvie, J., Sherington, J., Wren, J.A., Eagleson, J.S., Rowan, T.G., Sunderland,  
653 S.J., 2007. An evaluation of dirlotapide to reduce body weight of client-owned dogs in two  
654 placebo-controlled clinical studies in Europe. *Journal of Veterinary Pharmacology and*  
655 *Therapeutics* 30, 73-80.

656

657 Heitmann, B.L., Lissner, L., Osler, M., 2000. Do we eat less fat, or just report so? *International*  
658 *Journal of Obesity* 24, 435-442.

659

660 Kealy, R.D., Lawler, D.F., Ballam, J.M., Mantz, S.L., Biery, D.N., Greeley, E.H., Lust, G.,  
661 Segre, M., Smith, G.K., Stowe, H.D., 2002. Effects of diet restriction on life span and age-  
662 related changes in dogs. *Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association* 220,  
663 1315-1320.

664

665 Kienzle, E., Opitz, B., Earle, K.E., Smith, P.M., Maskell, I.E., 1998. The influence of dietary  
666 fibre components on the apparent digestibility of organic matter and energy in prepared  
667 dog and cat foods. *Journal of Animal Physiology and Animal Nutrition* 79, 46-56.

668

669 Kraus, W.E., Houmard, J.A., Duscha, B.D., Knetzger, K.J., Wharton, M.B., McCartney, J.S.,  
670 Bales, C.W., Sarah Henes, R.D., Samsa, G.P., Otvos, J.D., et al. 2002. Effects of the  
671 amount and intensity of exercise on plasma lipoproteins. *N England Journal of Medicine*  
672 347, 1483-1492.

673

674 Laflamme D., 1997. Development and validation of a body condition score system for dogs.  
675 *Canine Practice* 22, 10-15.

676

677 Lund, E.M., Armstrong, P.J., Kirk, C.A., Klausner, J.S., 2006. Prevalence and risk factors for  
678 obesity in adult dogs from private US veterinary practices. *International Journal of Applied*  
679 *Research in Veterinary Medicine* 4, 177-186.

680

681 Mao, J., Xia, J., Chen, J., Yu, J., 2013. Prevalence and risk factors for canine obesity surveyed in  
682 veterinary practices in Beijing, China. *Preventive Veterinary Medicine* 112, 438-442.

683

684 McGreevy, P.D., Thomson, P.C., Pride, C., Fawcett, A., Grassi, T., Jones, B., 2005. Prevalence  
685 of obesity in dogs examined by Australian veterinary practices and the risk factors  
686 involved. *The Veterinary Record*, 156, 695-702.

687

688 Merlotti, C., Ceriani, V., Morabito, A., Pontiroli, A.E., 2017. Subcutaneous fat loss is greater  
689 than visceral fat loss with diet and exercise, weight-loss promoting drugs and bariatric  
690 surgery: a critical review and meta-analysis (abstract). *International Journal of Obesity* 41,  
691 672-682.

692

693 Moher D, Hopewell S, Schulz KF, Montori V, Gøtzsche PC, Devereaux PJ, Elbourne D, Egger  
694 M, Altman DG, 2010. CONSORT 2010 explanation and elaboration: updated guidelines  
695 for reporting parallel group randomised trials. *British Medical Journal*; 340: 1-28.  
696

697 Morrison, R., Penpraze, V., Beber, A., Reilly, J.J., Yam, P.S., 2013. Associations between  
698 obesity and physical activity in dogs: A preliminary investigation. *Journal of Small Animal  
699 Practice* 54, 570–574.  
700

701 Mosing, M., German, A.J., Holden, S.L., MacFarlane, P., Biourge, V., Morris, P.J., Iff, I., 2013.  
702 Oxygenation and ventilation characteristics in obese sedated dogs before and after weight  
703 loss: A clinical trial. *The Veterinary Journal* 198, 367-371.  
704

705 Swift, D.L., Johannsen, N.M., Lavie, C.J., Earnest, C.P., Church, T.S., 2014. The role of exercise  
706 and activity in weight loss and maintenance. *Progress in Cardiovascular Disease* 56, 441-  
707 447.  
708

709 Tropf, M., Nelson, O.L., Lee, P.M., Weng, H.Y., 2017. Cardiac and metabolic variables in obese  
710 dogs. *Journal of Veterinary Internal Medicine* 31, 1000-1007.  
711

712 Tvarijonaviciute, A., Ceron, J.J., Holden, S.L., Cuthbertson, D.J., Biourge, V., Morris, P.J.,  
713 German, A.J., 2012. Obesity-related metabolic dysfunction in dogs: a comparison with  
714 human metabolic syndrome. *BMC Veterinary Research* 8, 147.  
715

716 Tvarijonaviciute, A., Ceron, J.J., Holden, S.L., Biourge, V., Morris, P.J., German, A.J., 2013.  
717 Effect of weight loss in obese dogs on indicators of Renal function or disease. *Journal of  
718 Veterinary Internal Medicine* 27, 31-38.  
719

720 Vitger, A.D., Stallknecht, B.M., Nielsen, D.H., Bjornvad, C.R., 2016. Integration of a physical  
721 training program in a weight loss plan for overweight pet dogs. *Journal of the American  
722 Veterinary Medical Association* 248, 174-182.  
723

724 Wakshlag, J.J., Struble, A.M., Warren, B.S., Maley, M., Panasevich, M.R., Cummings, K.J.,  
725 Long, G.M., Laflamme, D.E., 2012. Evaluation of dietary energy intake and physical  
726 activity in dogs undergoing a controlled weight-loss program. *Journal of the American  
727 Veterinary Medical Association* 240, 413–419.  
728

729 Westgarth. C., Ladha, C., 2017. Evaluation of an open source method for calculating physical  
730 activity in dogs from harness and collar based sensors. *BMC Veterinary Research* 13, 322.  
731

732 Yam, P.S., Penpraze, V., Young, D., Todd, M.S., Cloney, A.D., Houston-Callaghan, K.A.,  
733 Reilly, J.J., 2011. Validity, practical utility and reliability of Actigraph accelerometry for  
734 the measurement of habitual physical activity in dogs. *Journal of Small Animal Practice*  
735 52, 86-91.  
736

737 **Table 1.** Average composition of the therapeutic diets used for weight loss in dogs on the dietary energy restriction intervention.

<i>Criterion</i>	<b>Dry food 1 <sup>a</sup></b>		<b>Dry food 2 <sup>b</sup></b>		<b>Wet food <sup>c</sup></b>	
	<u>g per 100g DM</u>	<u>g per 1000 kcal (ME)</u>	<u>g per 100g DM</u>	<u>g per 1000 kcal (ME)</u>	<u>g per 100g DM</u>	<u>g per 1000 kcal (ME)</u>
<i>ME content</i>	2595 kcal/kg		2670 kcal/kg		600 kcal/kg	
<i>Crude protein</i>	33.1	116	33.1	112	49.7	141
<i>Crude fat</i>	10.5	37	10.5	36	11.7	33
<i>Starch</i>	19.3	67	18.2	62	10.5	30
<i>NFE</i>	31.8	111	31.8	108	17.5	50
<i>Crude fibre</i>	18.2	64	17.1	58	11.7	33
<i>TDF</i>	30.7	107	30.7	104	18.7	53
<i>Ash</i>	6.3	22	7.4	25	8.8	25
<i>Fibre sources</i>	Cellulose, beet pulp, FOS, psyllium husk, diet cereals		Cellulose, chicory pulp, FOS, psyllium husk, diet cereals		Cellulose, beet pulp, carrageenan, xanthan, diet cereals	

738  
739 <sup>a</sup> High protein high fibre dry food (Satiety Weight Management, Royal Canin); <sup>b</sup> high protein high fibre dry food (Satiety Small Dog, Royal  
740 Canin); <sup>c</sup> high protein high fibre wet food (Satiety Wet, Royal Canin); ME = metabolisable energy content, calculated using a predictive equation  
741 based on total dietary fibre (TDF) (Kienzle et al., 1998); AF = as fed; DM = dry matter; FOS = fructo-oligo-saccharides; NFE = nitrogen-free  
742 extract.

743 **Table 2.** Cut points used to determine time spent in different states of physical activity in dogs,  
 744 measured by accelomertry (Yam et al, 2011).

Cut Point (VM3 <sup>a</sup> counts per minute)	Cut point recorded as	Interpreting the cut point	Example of behaviour eliciting this level of activity
<1352	Sedentary	Little movement of the trunk	Resting, sleeping
1352-5695	Light-Moderate	Slow movement of the trunk	Slow walk on lead or around the house
>5695	Vigorous	Rapid movement of the trunk	Running outdoors or vigorous play indoors

745  
 746 <sup>a</sup> VM3 count: triaxial vector magnitude count derived from the accelerometer.  
 747

748 **Table 3.** Baseline details of the dogs on the dietary caloric restriction and physical activity  
 749 interventions.

Variable	Dietary caloric restriction	Physical activity	<i>P</i> -value
Sex	3 male neuter 3 female neuter	3 male neuter 4 female neuter	1.000
Age (mo)	92 (20 to 96)	90 (25 to 117)	0.617
Breed	Border collie (1) Chihuahua (1) Golden retriever (1) Jack Russell terrier (1) Mixed breed (1) Shih Tzu (1)	Bichon Frise (1) Golden retriever (1) Mixed breed (4) Rottweiler (1)	---
Body Condition Score	8 (6 to 9)	8 (6 to 9)	0.823
Bodyweight (kg)	13.4 (7.4 to 35.0)	28.0 (11.0 to 60.0)	0.134
Diet before study	Therapeutic hydrolysed diet <sup>a</sup> , dry (1) Adult maintenance, wet (1) Adult maintenance, dry (1) Adult maintenance, wet & dry (3)	Therapeutic weight loss diet <sup>b</sup> , dry (1) Adult maintenance, wet (2) Adult maintenance, dry (4)	---
Physical activity before (min) <sup>c</sup>	40 (20 to 60)	35 (20 to 90)	0.497

750

751 <sup>a</sup> Hypoallergenic Diet, Royal Canin; <sup>b</sup> Satiety diet, Royal Canin; <sup>c</sup> Amount of physical activity  
 752 undertaken each day before study enrolment, as estimated by the owner.

753

754 **Table 4.** Changes in bodyweight and zoometric measurements in the dogs on the dietary caloric  
 755 restriction and physical activity interventions.

Measurement	Dietary caloric restriction	Physical activity	Intervention comparison
<b>Weight (kg)</b>			
Before	13.4 (7.4 to 35.0)	28.0 (11.0 to 60.0)	
After	12.4 (7.0 to 31.3)	28.8 (10.6 to 59.0)	
Change	-9.6 (-4.6 to -11.7)	-1.9 (2.9 to -6.4)	
<i>P</i> -value	0.031	0.109	0.014
<b>Body condition score</b>			
Before	8 (6 to 9)	8 (6 to 9)	
After	7 (5 to 8)	7 (6 to 9)	
Change	---	---	
<i>P</i> -value	0.043	0.798	0.003
<b>Neck circumference (cm)</b>			
Before	30 (25 to 67)	37 (29 to 53)	
After	30 (26 to 64)	36 (26 to 53)	
Change	-4.5 (4.0 to -6.9)	-4.1 (0.0 to -13.3)	
<i>P</i> -value	0.125	0.062	1.000
<b>Abdominal circumference (cm)</b>			
Before	48 (40 to 69)	60 (44 to 90)	
After	42 (38 to 60)	56 (40 to 83)	
Change	-12.0 (-5.0 to -17.4)	-7.8 (-6.2 to -13.0)	
<i>P</i> -value	0.031	0.016	0.430
<b>Thoracic circumference (cm)</b>			
Before	60 (49 to 73)	70 (50 to 96)	
After	52 (46 to 69)	67 (44 to 91)	
Change	-7.5 (-5.5 to -18.2)	-3.6 (0.0 to -12.0)	

<i>P</i> -value	0.031	0.031	0.027
756	Before and after values represent median with range shown in brackets. The change values		
757	represent the percentage change from baseline within each group. The <i>P</i> -values shown below		
758	each intervention (dietary caloric restriction and physical activity) are within-group comparisons		
759	for the respective measurement, whilst the <i>P</i> -value the ‘intervention comparison’ column are		
760	comparisons between treatment groups.		
761			

762 **Table 5.** Percentage of time spent in different intensities of physical activity at the start and end  
 763 of the study, as determined by triaxial accelerometry.

Type of activity	Dietary caloric restriction	Physical activity	Intervention comparison
<b>Wear time (min)</b>			
Before	9916 (9246 to 10080)	9571 (9421 to 10080)	
After	9725 (8640 to 10080)	9991 (9480 to 10080)	
Change	-0.1 (-14.3 to 3.1)	0.0 (-0.9 to 7.0)	
<i>P</i> -value	1.000	0.562	0.391
<b>Sedentary activity</b>			
Before	77.4 (64.7 to 83.0)	79.5 (69.2 to 84.3)	
After	79.1 (66.8 to 82.4)	76.3 (71.2 to 83.1)	
Change	0.0 (-6.0 to 6.1)	-0.7(-5.6 to 5.0)	
<i>P</i> -value	1.000	0.469	0.617
<b>Light-moderate activity</b>			
Before	18.8 (15.4 to 31.4)	18.2 (14.7 to 24.6)	
After	19.1 (16.6 to 30.2)	20.0 (16.4 to 23.1)	
Change	6.7 (-14.7 to 16.4)	4.0 (-18.8 to 20.5)	
<i>P</i> -value	0.562	1.000	0.721
<b>Vigorous activity</b>			
Before	3.0 (1.6 to 4.2)	2.4 (0.4 to 6.2)	
After	2.8 (0.3 to 3.8)	3.4 (0.5 to 7.4)	
Change	-14.1 (-83.8 to 40.8)	16.7 (1.8 to 42.6)	
<i>P</i> -value	0.312	0.016	0.054

764  
 765 Wear time refers to the median (range) time in min that the accelerometers were worn during  
 766 each monitoring period. The change values represent the percentage change from baseline within  
 767 each group. All other data represent median percentage daily average with the range shown in  
 768 brackets. The *P*-values shown below each intervention (dietary caloric restriction and physical  
 769 activity) are within-group comparisons for the respective measurement, whilst the *P*-value the  
 770 ‘intervention comparison’ column are comparisons between treatment groups.

771 **Figure legend**

772

773 **Figure 1.** Example of physical activity monitoring using triaxial accelerometry in a dog in the  
774 physical activity group. The figures show the VetSens® heat map before (a) and at the end of (b)  
775 the trial. Non-wear is shown in grey, sedentary activity is shown in green, light-moderate activity  
776 is shown in yellow and vigorous activity is shown in red. Subjectively, the time spent in vigorous  
777 activity appears to be greater at the end of the trial compared with before the trial.

778

779 **Supplementary material**

780

781 **S1 checklist.** Checklist for the CONSORT statement. The table lists the items of the respective checklist,  
782 and the location within the manuscript where they can be found.

783

784 **S1 dataset.** Complete study dataset. Electronic spreadsheet containing study data for all dogs in the study.

785

786

787