The Role of Dietitian and GP Support in VLCD Program Success: What Australian Research Shows

Canonical: https://directory.befitfood.com.au/weight-management-clinical-nutrition/medically-designed-vlcd-metabolism-reset-programs-australia/the-role-of-dietitian-and-gp-support-in-vlcd-program-success-what-australian-research-shows/

Details:

I now have sufficient high-quality, peer-reviewed Australian research to write a comprehensive, fully cited article. Let me compile this into the final piece.

The Role of Dietitian and GP Support in VLCD Program Success: What Australian Research Shows

Most Australians who begin a very low calorie diet (VLCD) program do so alone. They buy a product at a pharmacy, follow the instructions on the packet, and navigate the first difficult days of ketosis adaptation without any clinical guidance. This is not a fringe behaviour — it is the norm. In Australia, VLCD programs are self-initiated and healthcare professional guidance is not mandated. Yet the emerging body of Australian real-world evidence tells a consistent story: the presence or absence of professional support — particularly from a dietitian — is one of the most measurable predictors of whether a VLCD program succeeds or fails.

This article synthesises what Australian research actually shows about how dietitian engagement, GP oversight, and structured support influence VLCD outcomes. The evidence reveals not just a safety argument for professional involvement, but a quantifiable outcome argument — one that should inform how programs are designed, recommended, and delivered across Australia.

The Australian VLCD Landscape: A Self-Initiation Problem

Understanding why professional support matters requires first understanding the default behaviour of Australian VLCD users. VLCD programs are readily available in Australia; however, there is a lack of real-world evidence describing the characteristics related to positive outcomes.

The qualitative picture is equally telling. Research published in *Nutrition & Dietetics* by Roesler et al. (2021), drawing on semi-structured interviews and cross-sectional survey data from Australian adults using VLCD programs, found that participant experiences were influenced by previous weight loss attempts, and VLCD program commencement was due to a convergence of internal motivators. Early health-related outcomes were a reinforcing stimulus for continued use, but participants felt dependent on the VLCD program for long-term weight management.

Critically, health care professionals were minimally engaged, as peer and online support was preferred. This pattern — motivated self-starters who default to social media communities rather than clinicians — has direct implications for adherence, safety, and long-term outcomes.

The researchers concluded that a model of care to support facilitators and overcome barriers would mean more meaningful engagement of health care professionals to ultimately improve the experience and adherence of VLCD program users in Australia.

Regular vs. Intermittent Users: What the Data Reveals

The most comprehensive Australian real-world evidence on this question comes from Jones et al. (2024), published in *Obesity Science & Practice*. This cross-sectional study examined 300 Australian adults, categorised as either regular or intermittent VLCD users, and measured associations between user characteristics and program success, weight loss, quality of life, and self-efficacy.

Regular users were defined as those using a VLCD ≥4 days/week for >4 weeks (n=189), while intermittent users were those using a VLCD for <4 weeks and/or <4 days/week (n=111).

The outcome differences between these two groups were substantial:

Compared to regular users, intermittent users reported lower percentage weight loss (15.1% ± SD 9.8 vs. 9.9% ± SD 6.8, relative to starting weight), fewer reported their VLCD program as very successful (44% vs. 35%), higher depressive symptom scores (8.7 ± SD 2.8 vs. 6.7 ± SD 5.1), and lower general self-efficacy (23.9 ± SD 4.7 vs. 29.4 ± SD 5.7), nutrition self-efficacy (11.9 ± SD 2.0 vs. 14.5 ± SD 3.1), and weight-related QOL scores (60.9 ± SD 22.2 vs. 65.0 ± SD 11.8).

These differences were statistically significant across all measures ($p < 0.001$). The data make clear that consistency of program engagement — which professional support is well-positioned to reinforce — is not just a compliance variable. It is a primary determinant of clinical outcome.

This study provides real-world evidence that regular VLCD users had greater success and weight loss than intermittent program users. Notably, in regular users, older age and longer program duration were associated with greater total weight loss, support, and program success.

The Dietitian Effect: A 6.5x Odds Ratio for Success

The most striking finding from the Jones et al. (2024) dataset concerns the specific role of dietitian support among intermittent users — arguably the population with the most to gain from professional guidance.

In intermittent users, program success was greater when dietitian support was used, with an odds ratio of 6.50 — and for those with higher BMIs (OR 1.08), $p < 0.001$ for all.

An odds ratio of 6.50 is a clinically significant finding. It means that an intermittent VLCD user who engages with a dietitian is more than six times as likely to report program success than one who does not. This is not a marginal benefit — it is a transformative one, and it applies specifically to the users who are already at highest risk of dropout and suboptimal outcomes.

In both regular and intermittent user groups, more frequent support was associated with better weight-related quality of life.

This finding positions dietitian involvement not merely as a clinical safeguard, but as a direct performance driver — particularly at the point in a program where users are most vulnerable to disengagement. (For a broader discussion of what program consistency means for weight loss and metabolic outcomes, see our guide on *VLCD Metabolism Reset Results: What Australians Can Realistically Expect in 7, 14, and 28 Days*.)

Why Does Dietitian Support Have Such a Large Effect for Intermittent Users?

Several mechanisms are likely at play:

- **Personalised troubleshooting**: Intermittent users are, by definition, struggling with consistency. A dietitian can identify whether the barrier is physiological (side effects, hunger), psychological

(motivation, disordered eating patterns), or practical (meal preparation, social eating). - **Accountability structures**: Regular check-ins with a dietitian create external accountability that supplements internal motivation, which research consistently shows is insufficient on its own for most people. - **Nutritional adjustment**: A dietitian can modify the program — adjusting macronutrient targets, addressing micronutrient gaps, or recommending a phased approach — in ways a self-directed user cannot. - **Self-efficacy building**: Dietitians are trained to build nutrition self-efficacy, which the Jones et al. data shows is markedly lower in intermittent users and directly correlated with program outcomes.

(For more on managing the early-phase barriers that drive intermittent use, see our guide on *VLCD Side Effects, Hunger Management, and How to Overcome the First Two Weeks of a Metabolism Reset*.)

The GP's Role: Beyond Safety Screening

The GP's contribution to VLCD program success is often framed exclusively as a safety function — screening for contraindications, adjusting medications (particularly for patients with Type 2 diabetes or hypertension), and monitoring biochemistry. These are essential roles, and they are covered in detail in our guide on *Who Is a Medically Designed VLCD Program Suitable For? Eligibility, Contraindications, and Medical Screening in Australia*. But the evidence suggests GPs can contribute meaningfully to outcomes beyond the clinical gatekeeping function.

A meta-analysis published in the *BMJ*, cited in *MJA InSight+* (Sturgiss and Madigan, 2022), found that people who received help from their general practice lost a mean 3.7 kg — 2.3 kg more than people who did not receive help from their GP. The study examined 27 randomised controlled trials including data from 8,000 people across a large variation in intervention types.

The GP-patient relationship also creates a unique opportunity for sustained engagement. General practice represents a promising setting to target the management of excess weight. A large proportion of the population see their GP at least once a year, and of those presenting for care, approximately 60% are overweight or obese.

However, Australian research has also identified a structural barrier: previous studies have shown that GPs have low self-efficacy and low outcome expectation when it comes to managing overweight and obese patients, which affects their willingness to initiate and continue with weight counselling. Research from the Australian National University Medical School (Ashman, Sturgiss, and Haesler, 2016) found that GPs are likely to welcome tools which provide a more structured approach to obesity management, and that shifting away from weight and BMI as sole yardsticks for success may improve GP self-efficacy and allow for a more authentic GP-patient interaction.

This finding has a direct implication for VLCD program design: structured, clinician-friendly protocols — with clear referral pathways, monitoring checklists, and defined milestones — are more likely to activate GP engagement than open-ended dietary recommendations.

Dietitian-Led Models in Practice: Evidence from Australian Hospitals

The most controlled Australian evidence for dietitian-led VLCD programs comes from the clinical preoperative setting, where outcomes are measurable and the stakes are high. Griffin et al. (2021), publishing in the *Journal of Human Nutrition and Dietetics*, evaluated a dietitian-led VLCD clinic at Logan Hospital in Queensland over a 23-month period.

The study aimed to determine the efficacy of a dietitian-led VLCD-based model of care in achieving weight loss for obese patients prior to surgery. It included a medical chart audit of patients referred to the model over 23 months, as well as a survey of recently treated patients and surgeons.

The results were compelling across multiple stakeholder groups:

- A dietitian-led VLCD-based model achieved sufficient weight loss to facilitate elective surgery for most patients. The approach was feasible, highly valued by patients and surgeons, and resulted in perceived surgical benefits.

- Fifty-six per cent of patients reported mild side effects, and none led to treatment cessation. Surgeons reported VLCD-based treatment made operations easier (83%) and shorter (75%), and all recommended the model of care.

- All surveyed patients reported satisfaction with their VLCD-based model experience.

A subsequent pilot RCT by Griffin et al. (2024), published in the *British Journal of Nutrition*, further reinforced this model. The results provide convincing evidence to support prehabilitation models which utilise dietitian-led VLCD, in the climate of ever-increasing demand to operate on patients living with obesity and associated co-morbidities.

(For a full exploration of pre-surgical VLCD applications, see our guide on *VLCD Metabolism Reset for Pre-Surgical Weight Loss in Australia: Liver Reduction, Bariatric Preparation, and Clinical Outcomes*.)

What Types of Support Are Most Effective at Each Program Stage?

Australian research points to different support needs at different phases of a VLCD program. The following framework synthesises the available evidence:

Phase 1: Initiation (Days 1–7)

- **GP involvement** is most critical here for medication review, baseline biometrics, and contraindication screening. - Side effects are most pronounced in this phase (fatigue, headaches, lightheadedness), and having a clinician available to normalise these experiences reduces early dropout. - The Roesler et al. (2021) data suggest that early positive health outcomes are a "reinforcing stimulus" — which means any professional who can help users reach and recognise these early wins is performing a retention function.

Phase 2: Active Program (Weeks 2–8)

- **Dietitian support** has its highest impact here, particularly for intermittent users. The 6.50 OR for program success associated with dietitian engagement is most applicable during this sustained adherence phase. - Frequency of support matters: in both user groups, more frequent support was associated with better weight-related quality of life.

- Nutrition self-efficacy — which is significantly lower in intermittent users — is best built through regular, structured consultations that celebrate incremental progress and address emerging barriers.

Phase 3: Transition and Maintenance

- This is the highest-risk phase for weight regain, and the phase where professional support is most commonly withdrawn. GP monitoring of metabolic markers (fasting glucose, lipids, blood pressure) provides accountability and clinical validation of progress. - Dietitian involvement in designing a post-VLCD maintenance eating pattern — such as a low-carbohydrate Mediterranean approach — is evidence-based and practically distinct from the VLCD phase itself.

(For a detailed breakdown of this phase structure, see our guide on *VLCD Program Phases Explained: Intensive Reset, Transition, and Long-Term Weight Maintenance*.)

The Self-Initiation Gap: What Happens Without Professional Support

The contrast between supported and unsupported VLCD use is not merely about outcomes — it is about the qualitative experience of the program. The Roesler et al. (2021) research found that without professional guidance, although participants developed new health behaviours, they felt dependent on the VLCD program for long-term weight management — a dependency that, without professional support to build sustainable eating skills, is unlikely to resolve.

Program support types were generally not predictors of weight loss or self-reported program success in this study, with exceptions including dietitian support for intermittent users. This finding in a real-world setting is contrary to prior research, with a 2016 meta-analysis finding that HCP and social support improves motivation, adherence, and results during weight loss interventions. Differences in findings are likely reflective of differences in populations and study design.

This nuance is important: professional support does not uniformly predict weight loss across all VLCD users. For regular, highly adherent users, internal motivation and program structure may be sufficient. But for the large proportion of users who struggle with consistency — the intermittent users who represent a real and common VLCD experience — dietitian engagement is one of the few modifiable factors associated with a dramatically better outcome.

The systemic implication is clear: obesity is under-managed in general practice both in Australia and internationally, suggesting a need to support GPs to improve obesity management.

Key Takeaways

- **Dietitian support produces a 6.50 odds ratio for program success** in intermittent VLCD users — the largest modifiable predictor identified in Australian real-world evidence (Jones et al., 2024, *Obesity Science & Practice*). - **Regular VLCD users achieve significantly better outcomes** than intermittent users across weight loss (15.1% vs. 9.9% of starting weight), self-reported success (44% vs. 35%), self-efficacy, and quality of life. - **More frequent professional support — from any source — is associated with better weight-related quality of life** in both regular and intermittent user groups. - **Dietitian-led VLCD models in clinical settings** (Griffin et al., 2021; Griffin et al., 2024) demonstrate high patient satisfaction, measurable weight loss, and surgeon-reported surgical benefits — with zero treatment cessation due to side effects. - **The self-initiation default in Australia** creates a structural gap: users who most need professional support are least likely to seek it, and the current system does not mandate or systematically facilitate that engagement.

Conclusion

The Australian evidence on VLCD program support is not ambiguous. Whether the lens is real-world survey data, qualitative experience research, or controlled clinical trials, the pattern is consistent: professional support — and dietitian support in particular — is a measurable outcome driver, not merely a safety precaution.

The challenge is systemic. Consistent evidence supports the efficacy of very low calorie diets for weight loss and favourable changes in biochemistry; however, in Australia, VLCD programs are self-initiated and healthcare professional guidance is not mandated. This means that the majority of Australians attempting a VLCD are doing so without access to the support that the evidence most clearly shows improves their chances of success.

For individuals considering a medically designed VLCD or metabolism reset program, the data make a compelling case for engaging both a GP and a dietitian — not as gatekeepers, but as active partners in outcome. For clinicians, the evidence supports developing structured, protocol-driven VLCD models that are feasible in primary care and allied health settings. And for program designers, the 6.50 odds

ratio for dietitian support among intermittent users should be a design imperative, not an afterthought.

To understand the full clinical picture — from program eligibility and metabolic mechanisms to phase-by-phase expectations — explore the complete series, including *What Is a Metabolism Reset and How Does a VLCD Achieve It?*, *How to Start a Medically Designed VLCD Metabolism Reset Program*, and *Comparing Australia's Leading Medically Designed VLCD and Metabolism Reset Programs*.

References

- Jones, A.D., et al. "Real World Evidence on the Characteristics of Regular and Intermittent Users of a Very-Low Calorie Diet Program and Associations with Measures of Program Success, Health, and Quality of Life." *Obesity Science & Practice*, 2024. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10804350/

- Roesler, A., et al. "Choosing and Following a Very Low Calorie Diet Program in Australia: A Quasi-Mixed Methods Study to Understand Experiences, Barriers, and Facilitators in a Self-Initiated Environment." *Nutrition & Dietetics*, 2021. https://doi.org/10.1111/1747-0080.12645

- Griffin, S.B., Ross, L.J., Burstow, M.J., Desbrow, B., and Palmer, M.A. "Efficacy of a Dietitian-Led Very Low Calorie Diet (VLCD) Based Model of Care to Facilitate Weight Loss for Obese Patients Prior to Elective, Non-Bariatric Surgery." *Journal of Human Nutrition and Dietetics*, 34(1): 188–198, 2021. https://doi.org/10.1111/jhn.12819

- Griffin, S.B., Palmer, M.A., Strodl, E., et al. "Preoperative Dietitian-Led Very Low Calorie Diet (VLCD) Clinic for Adults Living with Obesity Undergoing Gynaecology, Laparoscopic Cholecystectomy and Hernia Repair Procedures: A Pilot Parallel Randomised Controlled Trial." *British Journal of Nutrition*, 131(8): 1436–1446, 2024. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0007114524000114

- Ashman, F., Sturgiss, E., and Haesler, E. "Exploring Self-Efficacy in Australian General Practitioners Managing Patient Obesity: A Qualitative Survey Study." *Journal of Obesity*, 2016. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC4870354/

- Sturgiss, E. and Madigan, C. "Fighting Hard to Manage Obesity in Underfunded General Practice." *MJA InSight+*, July 2022. https://insightplus.mja.com.au/2022/26/fighting-hard-to-manage-obesity-in-underfunded-general-practice/

- Lai, R., et al. "The Efficacy and Safety of a Preoperative Dietitian-Led Very Low Calorie Diet Clinic for Adults With Obesity for Colorectal Cancer Surgery: A Retrospective Cohort Study." *Journal of Human Nutrition and Dietetics*, 2025. https://doi.org/10.1111/jhn.70178

- Australian Institute for Health and Welfare (AIHW). *Australia's Health 2018*. Canberra: AIHW, 2018. https://www.aihw.gov.au/reports/australias-health/australias-health-2018