

Supplementary Table 1. Descriptive, recruitment and retention statistics of student participants in feasibility and pilot studies.

	Feasibility Study	Pilot Study – Control	Pilot Study – Intervention
N schools	1	1	1
N students invited	360	200	230
N parent opt out	25	13	19
N students randomly selected	120*	130*	130*
N student non assent	7	5	0
N student non attendance	11	17	14
N students assented	99	107	115
N two time points	91	98	107
N accepted monitor at two time points	91	93	104
N with sufficient PA at two time points	76	74	96
Age (years)	13.0 (1.1)	13.1 (0.6)	12.7 (1.0)
Sex: N (% male)	51 (52)	53 (50)	58 (50)
Height (cm)	158.6 (8.7)	159.6 (8.9)	156.2 (9.8)
Weight (kg)	51.9 (14.9)	54.1 (13.7)	48.1 (10.4)
BMI percentile	56.8 (30.8)	63.2 (29.4)	57.6 (28.2)
% overweight/obese	26.6	29.0	19.1

PA: physical activity

*After random selection, a small number of parent opt-out replies were received for students that had been randomly selected for evaluation measures (feasibility study = 3, pilot control school = 1, pilot intervention school = 1), as such, the number of students randomly selected who were eligible to assent were: feasibility study = 117, pilot control school = 129, pilot intervention school = 129.

Supplementary Table 2. Descriptive statistics of schools and teacher participants in feasibility and pilot studies.

	Feasibility Study	Pilot Study – Control	Pilot Study – Intervention
School information			
Students per year group (for years 7, 8, 9)	180	100	115
Ofsted rating	2 (Good)	2 (Good)	2 (Good)
% pupils eligible for free school meals	20.5%	36.2%	21.4%
% pupils with special education needs	3.6%	0.9%	1.9%
Teacher information			
N teachers invited	15	32	36
N teachers assented	13	32	36 ^a
Age Category: N (%)			
18-24 years	1 (17)	6 (19)	1 (3)
25-34 years	2 (33)	7 (22)	5 (14)
35-44 years	2 (33)	9 (28)	7 (19)
44-45 years	1 (17)	9 (28)	11 (31)
55-64 years	0	1 (3)	3 (8)
65 years +	0	0	0
N (%) male	2 (33)	10 (31)	10 (28)
Teaching Experience: N (%)			
< 1 year	1 (17)	8 (25)	0
2-5 years	2 (33)	7 (22)	6 (17)
6-10 years	2 (33)	5 (16)	7 (19)
>10 years	0	10 (31)	13 (36)
Current active lesson delivery N (%)			
Never/rarely	3 (50)	5 (16)	5 (14)
1-2 times / month	2 (33)	6 (19)	7 (19)
1-2 times / week	1 (17)	8 (25)	5 (14)
3-4 times / week	0	6 (19)	3 (8)
> once per day	0	6 (19)	6 (17)

^a27 teachers attended the research team's study introduction and completed baseline questionnaires. A further 9 teachers consented at training session 1 or 2 and did not provide baseline data.

Supplementary Table 3. Teacher feedback on the PAL training programme; mean (SD).

	Pilot Study – Intervention School			
	Feasibility Study (n=9)	Whole Group (n=33)	Baseline PAL delivery < once per week (n=11)	Baseline PAL delivery ≥ once per week (n=14)
Usefulness of training in preparing you to deliver PAL (1=not useful, 7=very useful)	5.3 (0.5)	3.1 (1.4)	3.9 (1.6)	2.5 (1.1)
Appropriateness of depth and scope of training (1=not appropriate, 7=very appropriate)	5.2 (0.7)	3.1 (1.4)	3.6 (1.6)	2.7 (1.2)
Appropriateness of programme materials and resources (1=not appropriate, 7=very appropriate)	5.6 (1.3)	2.8 (1.4)	3.5 (1.6)	2.4 (1.2)
Clarity of program materials and resources (1=not clear, 7=very clear)	6.0 (0.7)	3.7 (1.2)	4.4 (1.3)	3.4 (1.1)
Relevance of training for your lessons (1=not relevant, 7=very relevant)	5.3 (1.1)	2.9 (1.4)	3.6 (1.4)	2.4 (1.4)
Would you recommend the training to other teachers? N (%) yes	9 (100)	15 (45)	7 (64%)	4 (29%)