

Importance of characteristics and modalities of physical activity and exercise in the management of cardiovascular health within the general population: Recommendations from the EACPR (Part I). Short title: Exercise and PA characteristics in primary prevention

AUTHOR(S)

L Vanhees, J De Sutter, N Geladas, Frank Doyle, E Prescott, V Cornelissen, E Kouidi, D Dugmore, D Vanuzzo, M Borjesson, P Doherty

CITATION

Vanhees, L; De Sutter, J; Geladas, N; Doyle, Frank; Prescott, E; Cornelissen, V; et al. (2012): Importance of characteristics and modalities of physical activity and exercise in the management of cardiovascular health within the general population: Recommendations from the EACPR (Part I). Short title: Exercise and PA characteristics in primary prevention. Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland. Journal contribution. <https://hdl.handle.net/10779/rcsi.10772327.v2>

HANDLE

[10779/rcsi.10772327.v2](https://hdl.handle.net/10779/rcsi.10772327.v2)

LICENCE

CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

This work is made available under the above open licence by RCSI and has been printed from <https://repository.rcsi.com>. For more information please contact repository@rcsi.com

URL

https://repository.rcsi.com/articles/journal_contribution/Importance_of_characteristics_and_modalities_of_physical_activity_and_exercise_in_the_management_of_cardiovascular_health_within_the_general_population_Recommendations_from_the_EACPR_Part_I_Short_title_Exercise_and_PA_characteristics_in_pri/10772327/2

Importance of characteristics and modalities of physical activity and exercise in the management of cardiovascular health within the general population: Recommendations from the EACPR (Part I)

Short title: Exercise and PA characteristics in primary prevention

L. Vanhees¹, J. De Sutter², N. Geladas³, F. Doyle⁴, E. Prescott⁵, V. Cornelissen¹, E. Koudi⁶, D. Dugmore⁷, D. Vanuzzo⁸, M. Börjesson⁹, P. Doherty¹⁰, Ø. Ellingsen¹¹, S. Mazic¹², S. Adamopoulos¹³, B. Bjarnason-Wehrens¹⁴, H.H. Björnstad¹⁵, A. Cohen-Solal¹⁶, V. Conraads¹⁷, D. Corrado¹⁸, R. Fagard¹⁹, F. Giada²⁰, S. Gielen²¹, A. Hager²², M. Halle²³, D. Hansen²⁴, H. Heidbüchel²⁵, A. Jegier²⁶, H. McGee²⁷, K.P. Mellwig²⁸, M. Mendes²⁹, A. Mezzani³⁰, J. Niebauer³¹, N. Pattyn¹, A. Pelliccia³², M. Piepoli³³, B. Rauch³⁴, Z. Reiner³⁵, A. Schmidt-Trucksäss³⁶, T. Takken³⁷, F. van Buuren²⁸

¹ Department Rehabilitation Sciences, K.U.Leuven, Leuven, Belgium

² Department of Cardiology, AZ Maria-Middelares Hospital, Gent, Belgium

³ Department of Sport Medicine and Biology of Exercise, University of Athens, Athens, Greece

⁴ Division of Population Health Sciences (Psychology), Royal College of Surgeons, Dublin, Ireland

⁵ Department of Cardiology, Bispebjerg University Hospital, Copenhagen, Denmark

⁶ Laboratory of Sports Medicine, Aristotle University, Thessaloniki, Greece

⁷ Wellness International Medical Centre, Stockport, UK

⁸ Cardiovascular Prevention Centre, Udine, Italy

⁹ Department of Acute and Cardiovascular Medicine, Sahlgrenska University Hospital/Ostra, Goteborg, Sweden

¹⁰ Department of Health, York St John University, York, UK

¹¹ Department of Circulation and Medical Imaging, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, Norway

¹² Institute of Physiology, School of Medicine, University of Belgrade, Belgrade, Serbia

¹³ Department of Cardiology, Onassis Cardiac Surgery Center, Athens, Greece

¹⁴ Department of Preventive and Rehabilitative Sports Medicine, Deutsche Sporthochschule Köln, Köln, Germany

¹⁵ Coronary Care Unit, Medical Department, Nordland Hospital, Bodø

¹⁶ Department of Cardiology, Lariboisière Hospital, Denis Diderot University, Paris, France

¹⁷ Department of Cardiology, Antwerp University Hospital, Edegem, Belgium

¹⁸ Division of Cardiology, Department of Cardiac, Thoracic and Vascular Sciences, University of Padova, Padua, Italy

¹⁹ Department Cardiovascular Diseases, K.U.Leuven, Leuven, Belgium

²⁰ Operative Unit of Sports Medicine, PF Calvi Hospital, Venice, Italy

²¹ Heart Center Leipzig, University Hospital, Leipzig, Germany

²² Department of Pediatric Cardiology and Congenital Heart Disease, Deutsches Herzzentrum München, Technische Universität München, Germany

²³ Department of Prevention and Sports Medicine, University Hospital 'Klinikum rechts der Isar', Technische Universität München, Munich, Germany

²⁴ Cardiovascular Medicine and Rehabilitation, Jessa Hospital, Hasselt, Belgium

²⁵ Department of Cardiology, University Hospital Gasthuisberg, Leuven, Belgium

²⁶ Department of Sports Medicine, Medical University of Lodz, Lodz, Poland

²⁷ Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland, Dublin, Ireland

- ²⁸ Department of Cardiology, Heart and Diabetes Center North Rhine-Westphalia, Ruhr University Bochum, Bad Oeynhausen, Germany
- ²⁹ Instituto Do Coracao, Hospital Santa Cruz, Portugal
- ³⁰ Cardiology Division-Laboratory for the Analysis of Cardiorespiratory Signals, S. Maugeri Foundation, Veruno Scientific Institute, Veruno, Italy
- ³¹ Department of Sports Medicine, Prevention and Rehabilitation, Paracelsus Medical University, Salzburg, Austria
- ³² Institute of Sports Medicine and Science, Italian National Olympic Committee, Rome, Italy
- ³³ Department of Cardiology, Guglielmo da Saliceto Hospital, Piacenza, Italy
- ³⁴ Centrum for Ambulatory Cardiac and Angiologic Rehabilitation, Ludwigshafen, Germany
- ³⁵ Department of Internal Medicine, University Hospital Center Zagreb, Zagreb, Croatia
- ³⁶ Department of Sports Medicine, University Basel, Basel, Switzerland
- ³⁷ Child Development and Exercise Center, University Medical Center Utrecht, Utrecht, The Netherlands

Address for correspondence

Prof. Luc Vanhees
Department Rehabilitation Sciences
Tervuursevest 101, B1501
B- 3001 Leuven
Belgium
Tel: +32-16-329158
E-mail address: Luc.Vanhees@faber.kuleuven.be

Abstract:

Over the last decades, more and more evidence is accumulated that physical activity (PA) and exercise interventions are essential components in primary and secondary prevention for cardiovascular disease. However, it is less clear whether and which type of PA and exercise intervention (aerobic exercise, dynamic resistive exercise or both) or characteristic of exercise (frequency, intensity, time or duration and volume) would yield more benefit in the management of cardiovascular health.

The present paper, as the first of a series of three, will deal with the importance of these characteristics for cardiovascular health in the population at large. The guidance offered in this series of papers is aimed at medical doctors, health practitioners, kinesiologists, physiotherapists and exercise physiologists, politicians, public health policy makers and the individual member of the public.

Based on previous and the current literature overviews, recommendations from the European Association on Cardiovascular Prevention and Rehabilitation are formulated regarding type, volume and intensity of PA and regarding appropriate risk evaluation during exercise.

Word count 12.441

Introduction

Heart and circulatory system diseases (cardiovascular disease, CVD) remain the single most common cause of death in Europe, accounting for over 4.3 million deaths each year [1]. The burden of CVD is progressively expanding with projected deaths currently at 23.6 million (34.8%) of the world population and to 4.7 million of the European population in 2030 [2]. The results of the WHO MONICA project showed that the incidence of coronary events increased by 5% over the period 1990 to 2000. This is likely to increase to 25% by 2030.

CVD cost the European Union (EU) just under 192 billion euro in 2006, almost 110 billion of which were for health care costs and 82 billion were from lost productivity and the cost of informal care. The direct health care costs alone per resident of the EU amount to 223 euro per annum [1,3].

Whereas patients with established CVD have declared themselves to be at high total risk of a further cardiovascular event, [4] several models have been developed to assess the risk for CVD in asymptomatic subjects. The SCORE (Systematic Coronary Risk Evaluation) system is developed and derived from a large data set of prospective European studies, and is currently recommended by the ESC (European Society of Cardiology) to assess cardiovascular risk. It is now widely accepted that a strategy for individuals at high risk must be complemented by public health measures to reduce population levels of cardiovascular risk factors and the new onset of CVD. In this regard, three strategies for the prevention of CVD can be distinguished: population (primary), high-risk (primary) and secondary prevention [5]. The population strategy in particular is critical for reducing the overall incidence of CVD. This is done through lifestyle and environmental changes that affect the whole population without necessarily requiring medical examination. Physical activity (PA) is an essential component of primary and secondary prevention [5]. The time has now come to promote PA and healthy lifestyle habits through aggressive and global health policies [6]. Scientific guidance expressed in a meaningful way is required to enable the public in Europe and those with responsibility for health policy and practice, in order to bring about measurable changes in lifestyle that will eventually contribute to a decreased health burden on European society.

There is no doubt that health policy and practice has set out to inform the public on the benefits of PA. Questions remain about the primary and secondary requirements that are needed to reduce cardiovascular risk and about the differences between PA and exercise recommendations in the context of primary and secondary prevention. The contribution made by existing levels of fitness and the impact of increasing or decreasing these fitness levels has not, to date, been clarified in any European guideline.

Therefore, the aim of this paper is to review the evidence and present recommendations for PA in primary and secondary prevention of CVD focusing on PA characteristics: Frequency, Intensity, Time (duration), Type (mode) and Volume (dose: intensity x duration) of exercise.

We will split the topic to three parts. The present paper will deal with PA and exercise training in the management of cardiovascular health in healthy individuals within the general population. The second and third papers will focus on PA and exercise training in the management of cardiovascular health in individuals with cardiovascular risk factors (Part II) and in individuals with cardiac disease (Part III). The guidance offered in this series of papers is aimed at medical doctors, health practitioners, kinesiologists, physiotherapists and exercise physiologists, politicians, public health policy makers and the individual member of the public.

The physical activity-physical fitness dilemma

Beneficial effects of regular PA and its role in maintaining cardiovascular health are well established. In order to compare and contrast current studies and make exercise recommendations for the future, it is necessary to provide some basic definitions and descriptions related to PA and physical fitness (PF).

PA refers to any bodily movement produced by skeletal muscles that results in energy expenditure above the basal metabolic level [7,8]. Accordingly, energy expenditure reflects the energy cost or intensity for the given physical activity [9] and physical inactivity refers to a condition or behaviour in which bodily movement is minimal and energy expenditure approximates resting metabolic rate [10]. Knowing about the extent of sedentary behaviour and the need to avoid habitual sedentary behaviour is as important as the promotion of PA and exercise. Statistics from around the world suggest that about 60% of the adult population is sedentary [11].

There are many approaches used to express PA intensity or demand / to quantify energy expenditure. However, on a more pragmatic level, two traditional approaches are used worldwide. The first term or approach is the metabolic equivalent unit (MET), which expresses energy expenditure in multiples of resting energy cost. One MET is equivalent to an oxygen uptake (O_2) of 3.5 ml per kg body weight, which is the amount of energy expended during one minute of seated rest [12]. For comparison, 3 METs is equivalent to the cost of steady state walking at a normal speed, namely 2.5 mph or 4 km per hour. Compendiums have been developed that give considerable detail on MET costs for most physical activities [13,14]. The second approach, kilo calorie (kcal) utilisation, uses a more absolute approach whereby the energy cost is expressed as the total energy yield for the activity which is available in various compendia [15]. Both approaches are useful in clarifying total workload and should not be seen as mutually exclusive.

In contrast to PA, which is related to the movements that people perform, PF is a set of attributes that people have or can achieve that relates to the ability to perform PA [16]. It is also characterized by an ability to perform daily activities with vigour, and to exhibit traits and

capacities associated with a low risk of developing premature hypokinetic diseases [17,18]. A PF assessment is used to determine the extent of one or more of these attributes and includes measures of body composition, cardiorespiratory endurance, muscular strength/endurance, or musculoskeletal flexibility. Such an assessment is often performed to maximum, peak or sub-maximum levels and the results can be expressed in either absolute or relative terms. Fitness (or at least PF) refers to the extent to which an individual possesses these attributes. Research suggests that the higher the level of fitness in the field of aerobic endurance, the less likely an individual is to suffer premature cardiovascular death [19-23]. In this paper, the term PF mostly reflects aerobic endurance capacity as measured by peak oxygen uptake (VO_{2peak}).

Although exercise and PA have been used interchangeably, it is important to recognize that exercise is considered a subcategory of PA. Exercise or exercise training is, by definition, PA that is planned, structured, repetitive, and purposive in the sense that improvement or maintenance of one or more components of PF is the objective [7].

Aerobic exercise refers to activity performed at an intensity that allows the metabolism of stored energy to mainly occur through the use of oxygen. It involves large muscle groups in dynamic activities, resulting in substantial increases in heart rate and energy expenditure. Good examples are cycling, running and swimming performed at low to moderate intensity [24]. In contrast, anaerobic exercise refers to movements performed at an increasingly high intensity unsustainable by O_2 alone / that requires the metabolism of stored energy to be mainly processed without oxygen (i.e. energy is predominantly provided by anaerobic glycolysis and stored phosphocreatine) or the use of muscles in a sustained isometric muscle action which are not working maximally but nevertheless do not utilise oxygen during the muscle contraction. Intermittent high-intensity exercise includes such type of activity [7].

The precise measurement of PA is crucial in order to investigate population trends and explore relations with cardio-metabolic diseases. Physical activity recommendations issued by public authorities are based on measurements of PA. The method of doubly labelled water is the gold standard of quantifying PA but is time consuming and expensive. PA assessment methods that are particularly suited for use in population based studies include accelerometry, pedometry, heart rate monitoring, heart rate and accelerometry combined, direct observation, and self-report questionnaires. The accuracy, validity, reliability, and cost-effectiveness of each method has been extensively reviewed and found to vary considerably between approaches [9,25,26], being clear that the choice of method and anticipated outcomes are influenced by age, ethnicity and cognitive ability of the population.

PA is typically quantified in terms of its frequency, intensity, duration and time. These characteristics are used to describe the dose of PA or exercise needed to exhibit particular physiological responses and outcomes. Frequency refers to number of activity sessions per

day, week, or month. The number of activity minutes in each session is described as time, while total time of activity session or of PA programme is termed duration. Intensity describes energy expenditure associated with certain PA (light, moderate or vigorous). It can be expressed in many different ways, in relative or absolute terms (Table 1). Within the general population, however, moderate-intensity PA is usually defined as any PA level at which a person experiences some increase in breathing or heart rate and a rate of perceived exertion (RPE) of 11-14 on the Borg scale. The person should be able to carry on a conversation comfortably during the activity [27]. It is typically characterized as energy expenditure of 3-6 METs, for instance, brisk walking. Vigorous-intensity is any type of activity that is intense enough to represent a substantial challenge to an individual and results in a significant increase in heart rate, breathing frequency and sweating. In terms of energy expenditure, it is equivalent to any activity that corresponds to more than 6 METs, for instance, jogging. Activities corresponding to less than 3 METs are characterized as light activities, but can, if the duration is sufficiently long, contribute to health [28].

There are many ways to describe PA and the terms 'type and mode of PA' is often used to pull together related terms. For instance, walking as a type of activity could include walking outdoors, on the flat, up or down hill or treadmill walking. Typically exercise related types of PA include walking, cycling, swimming or running, because they have specific movement patterns and energy expenditure trends related to performing such activities. PA also includes a number of behaviours such as walking to the bus station, gardening, building a brick wall. Therefore, "total physical activity" includes all activities from different behaviour categories, such as active transportation, household activities, leisure time physical activities and occupational physical activities. Accordingly, depending on the purpose of study, PA can be related to the nature of the activity (e.g. leisure time physical activity (LTPA); occupational physical activity); time frame over which the activity takes place (e.g., 20–60 min for a fitness workout or 8 hours of daily physical work as done by manual labourers); or mode of exercise (walking-aerobic physical activity or resistance training, interval training) [22].

Insert table 1

Impact of physical activity and physical fitness on cardiovascular morbidity and mortality. Evidence from meta-analysis and large cohort studies

Criteria of studies included

A large number of studies and meta-analyses have been published the last 30 years on PF and PA. For this updated literature summary, a computerized systemic literature search was performed in EMBASE, PUBMED and MEDLINE databases (January 2008 - March 2011) to identify meta-analyses on the relationship between PF, PA and cardiovascular outcomes. A

total of 8 relevant meta-analyses, each including more than 100 000 individuals, were selected. Also, results from large cohort studies ($n > 1000$ individuals in each study) published in the same period were taken into account to provide complementary information.

Physical fitness

Over the past 20 years, it has become clear that measured aerobic capacity (for simplicity, we refer to it as PF) is strongly associated with all-cause mortality, coronary heart disease (CHD) and CVD events [19,20,21,23].

In a recent meta-analysis, Kodama et al. [23] evaluated in detail PF as a quantitative predictor (measured by maximum METs performed) of all cause mortality and cardiovascular events in healthy men and women. Based on an analysis of 33 studies including 102 980 participants, the authors concluded that a higher level of PF was associated with a lower risk of all-cause mortality and CHD/CVD events. Additional sensitivity analysis indicated that better PF was independently associated with longevity, while the inverse association between PF and risk of CHD/CVD was explained partly by the established coronary risk factors.

According to their subsequent dose-response analyses, a 1-MET higher level of maximal aerobic capacity (corresponding to approximately 1km/h higher running/jogging speed) was associated with 13% and 15% reductions, respectively, in risk of all-cause mortality and CHD/CVD events. Their analyses suggest that the minimum PF level that is associated with significantly lower event rates for men and women is approximately 9 and 7 METs (at 40 years old), 8 and 6 METs (at 50 years of age), and 7 and 5 METs (at 60 years of age) [23].

Physical activity

Already in the period 1990- 2001, three systematic reviews [19,20,29] indicated a clear positive impact of PA on all-cause mortality. Since then, a large number of prospective cohort studies have been published. In 2008, Nocon et al. provided a systematic review and an updated meta-analysis on the association of PA with all-cause and cardiovascular mortality [30]. The authors included 33 studies with 883 372 participants with a follow-up ranging from 4 years to over 20 years. Most studies included in this meta-analysis reported risk reductions of 30-50% for cardiovascular mortality and of 20-50% for all-cause mortality, with pooled risk reductions of 35% (95% CI 30-40%) for cardiovascular mortality and 33% (95% CI 28-37%) for all-cause mortality comparing high with low levels of PA, even after adjusting for other relevant risk factors . The most important reason for heterogeneity among risk reductions was the differing methods used to assess PA. Studies that used patient questionnaires to assess PA reported lower risk reductions than studies that used more objective measures/measurements of PA.

To quantify the association between walking and the risk of CVD and all-cause mortality, Hamer et al. [33] performed a meta-analysis on 18 prospective studies which included 459 833

participants free from CVD at baseline with 19 249 cases at follow-up. The pooled hazard ratio of CVD in the highest walking category compared with the lowest was 0.69 (95% CI 0.61-0.77, $p<0.001$) and 0.68 (95% CI 0.59-0.78, $p<0.001$) for all-cause mortality.

Taken together, the results of large cohort studies and recent meta-analyses show a very clear positive effect of PA on reducing risk of CVD, cardiovascular and all-cause mortality.

Physical activity or physical fitness as a predictor of CVD risk?

Based on the present data, it is clear that poor PF and inadequate PA are predictors of cardiovascular morbidity and mortality. Although there is an inevitable interrelationship between PF and PA, several studies have shown that individual CVD risk factors are more strongly related to PF than PA [32,33,34]. More recently, in a cohort of 1298 police employees, Sassen et al. [35] showed that both PF and PA are inversely associated with the clustering of CVD risk factors. From the different PA characteristics, mainly intensity was inversely related CVD risk factors. However, compared with PA, PF exerted greater impact on each of these individual CVD risk factors and their combination. Also, Ekblom-Bak et al. [36] showed in a population of 781 men and 890 women, aged 20-65 years, an independent association of PF and PA with both individual and clustered CVD risk factors; the higher PA or PF, the lower the CVD risk factors. The association was most pronounced for PF.

Studies that have compared the effects of PF and PA on cardiovascular morbidity and mortality have also generally shown that PF is more strongly correlated with outcome than PA [19,20,37-39]. A large cohort study by Lee et al. [40] that evaluated 31 818 men and 10 555 women confirmed that PF was more strongly associated with all-cause mortality than PA. However, as already pointed out by Blair et al. [19], there are often quite different methodological approaches used when comparing different studies. Fitness can be measured more accurately by exercise testing and spiro-ergometry. PA however, especially when registered or observed over many years by questionnaires, may be less precise giving larger variations of estimated caloric expenditure [11]. Whether genetics may explain partly the better preventive effect of PF compared to PA remains to be elucidated.

Role of the physical activity characteristics

1. Type/mode of physical activity

Most studies examining the effects of PA on CVD prevention have focused primarily on aerobic modes of exercise. However, over the last decade resistance training has gained popularity and was recognised as beneficial, since it has the potential both to increase cardiorespiratory and muscular fitness and to decrease the risk for CVD [41]. Indeed, in healthy individuals with a low endurance exercise capacity, cardiorespiratory fitness may be improved effectively by

resistance training [42]. Additionally, resistance training was found to have favourable effects on body composition, glucose tolerance, insulin sensitivity and management of obesity [43,44].

Although there are clear differences between aerobic and resistance exercise and continuous and interval training, there are no data in the population at large that show independent contributions of resistance or interval exercise to mortality reduction.

Leisure time physical activity

The first meta-analyses focusing on the associations of PA on CHD incidence dealt with leisure time and occupational activity [29,45]. However, PA can nowadays be equated with leisure time physical activity (LTPA) in industrialized countries and only LTPA can really be influenced by the recommendations of guidelines. In a specific meta-analysis on LTPA by Sofi et al. [46], including 26 studies with an overall population of 513 472 individuals (20 666 CHD events), a moderate to high level of LTPA was associated with a reduced risk of CHD. Compared with individuals performing low or nil LTPA, highly and moderately active individuals had, respectively, a 27 and 12% lower risk of CHD incidence or mortality.

Commuting physical activity

Active commuting, such as cycling and walking to work, provides a feasible method of integrating PA into daily life activities. In 2000 Andersen et al. [47] demonstrated a protective effect of active commuting on reducing the severity of cardiovascular outcomes. More recently, Hamer et al. [48] performed a meta-analysis on the effects of active commuting on cardiovascular risk (defined as cardiovascular mortality, incident CHD, stroke, hypertension or diabetes) based on 8 studies (173146 participants). The overall meta-analysis demonstrated a protective effect of active commuting on cardiovascular outcomes (integrated RR=0.89, 95%CI 0.81-0.98, p=0.016). However, the studies included were mainly from one country (Finland) and used self-report data to assess commuting activity, which is imprecise and can be prone to recall bias. Also, some studies merely assessed the mode of transport used for commuting, while others assessed commuting time but not intensity.

Recent prospective research suggests that moderate intensity active commuting is associated with improved biomarker profiles [49].

2. Dose of physical activity

Vigorous intensity exercise has been shown to increase aerobic fitness more effectively than moderate intensity exercise, suggesting that the former may confer greater cardio protective benefits. In 2006 Swain et al. [50] summarized the epidemiological studies and evaluated the relationship between exercise intensity and incidence of CHD. The authors identified 6 studies that controlled for energy expenditure or that found a relationship between one intensity level and the incidence of CHD. All these studies reported greater benefits at higher intensities.

More recently, Löllgen et al. [51] performed a meta-analysis on 38 studies, involving more than 271 000 participants, to evaluate the effect of PA intensity on all-cause mortality. The focus was put on studies with three or four intensities of PA (e.g., none, light, moderate, or vigorous activity). A questionnaire was used to estimate the intensity of PA in the majority of these studies. The PA classification in the papers analyzed mostly refer to kcal or MET-hours with describing inactive (or sedentary) as less than 200 kcal/week (or less than 1 MET), lightly active as 200-599 kcal/week (or 1-3 METs), moderate activity as 600-1499 kcal/week (or 3-6 METs) or vigorous activities with more than 1500 kcal/week (or > 6 METs). This analysis showed that regular PA over longer periods of observation, ranging from 4 to 40 years, is strongly associated with lower all-cause mortality in active subjects compared to sedentary subjects. Importantly, the authors showed a dose-response curve especially from sedentary subjects to those with low and moderate exercise intensity, with only a minor additional risk reduction with further increase in activity level. Similarly, Sofi et al. [46] documented a dose-dependent protective role of LTPA that was independent of confounding variables, such as gender and methods to assess PA. Likewise, Zheng et al. [52] tried to quantify the dose-response of walking in reducing CHD risk. The authors performed a meta-analysis including 11 prospective cohort studies and one randomized controlled trial (RCT) with 295 177 participants free of CHD at baseline and 7094 cases at follow-up. They showed that an increment of approximately 30 min of normal walking a day for 5 days a week (or 8 MET-hours/week) was associated with 11% CHD risk reduction (95% CI: 4-18%). The dose-response relationship between walking and CHD risk in the 8 studies where walking was based on a uniform measure of MET-hours/week was even more pronounced: an increment of 8 MET-h/week was associated with 19% CHD risk reduction (95% CI: 14-23%). Regarding walking pace, an increment of 2 km/h was associated with 21% reduced risk of CHD (95% CI: 15-27%). Regarding walking duration, an increment of 3.5 hours/week of normal walking was significantly associated with 32% CHD risk reduction (95% CI: 11-48%). The results of this analysis indicate that walking conferred protection against CHD in a dose-response manner, irrespective of walking measures in walking velocity, time or energy expenditure. Also in the meta-analysis by Hamer et al. [31], a dose-response relationship across the highest, intermediate and lowest walking categories in relation to CVD and all-cause mortality was documented. However, in that analysis, walking velocity was a stronger independent predictor of overall risk compared with walking volume (48% versus 26% risk reductions, respectively). Accordingly, data from the Copenhagen City Heart Study [53] indicate that the relative intensity and not the duration of cycling, is of more importance in relation to all-cause and CHD mortality. In that study, the difference in expected lifetime in relation to intensity of cycling was also calculated. Men with fast intensity cycling survived 5.3 years longer and men with average intensity 2.9 years longer than men with slow cycling intensity. For women the perspectives were 3.9 and 2.2 years longer, respectively.

In a recent meta-analysis Woodcock et al. [54] further evaluated the dose-response relationship of non-vigorous PA and all-cause mortality. The authors included 22 studies containing almost a million people and found that 2.5 hours/week of moderate intensity PA was associated with a reduction in mortality risk of 19% (95%CI 15-24%), while 7 hours/week of moderate intensity PA compared with no activity reduced the mortality risk by 24% (95%CI 19-29%).

Finally, Chomistek et al. [55] reported results from the Health Professionals Follow-up Study where they evaluated whether vigorous activity, independent of the amount of time spent exercising, was associated with a lower risk of CVD, compared with moderate exercise. Baseline PA levels were first collected in 1986 in 43647 individuals and assessed every two years thereafter until 2004. Individuals were followed for the primary endpoint of combined fatal CHD, nonfatal myocardial infarction and fatal and nonfatal stroke. The total volume of PA (expressed as METs-h/week) at all intensity levels appeared to be associated with the largest reduction in risk. Among individuals who exercised the same number of MET-h/week, vigorous activity was associated with a trend toward lower risk of CVD compared with individuals who performed moderate activity.

Special groups

1. Elderly

The majority of meta-analyses reviewed found no evidence of heterogeneity between subgroups of studies defined by age when evaluating the effects of PF and PA on cardiovascular and all-cause mortality [23,30,31]. A study by Ueshima et al. [56] in 10 385 Japanese subjects aged 65-84, also showed that PA was associated with a clear reduced risk of all-cause and CVD mortality in this elderly population. Leisure-time PA was also associated with a 15-35% reduction in all-cause mortality risk in the Leisure World Cohort study (including over 13000 people with a median age at baseline of 74 years) [57]. Higher levels of duration and higher levels of intensity of PA were also associated with lower mortality in a study by Hrobonova et al. [58] that included 1449 participants aged 75-84 years.

There are very few studies on aged populations beyond 85 years and in this population there is little evidence on the effects of PA on mortality [59]. Easily achievable lifestyle habits should be further evaluated as useful preventive measures to reduce cardiovascular events in this population.

2. Gender

Most large cohort studies in women and the meta-analyses on the effects of PF or PA on cardiovascular and all-cause mortality have shown similar risk reductions in women compared with men [23,30,31,51,60].

Taken together, the effects of PF and PA intensity on cardiovascular outcome seem to be largely comparable in women and in men.

3. Race

Data on racial differences regarding the prognostic value of PF and PA are scarce and no systematic review or meta-analysis could be identified from the literature search. Some studies documented the prognostic value of PF in black populations [61] or PA in Japanese individuals [56], but clearly more studies are needed on this topic.

Lifestyle approaches to increase PA in the general population

There is substantial evidence that PA levels in the general population have been decreasing, with more than 60% of the world's population not engaging in enough PA [62], and a reduction in PA from lifestyles of bygone eras [63]. Reasons for this are numerous, but mainly point to the fact that our daily living environments in a number of areas are simply less conducive to PA. Areas influencing this are [64]: transport (e.g. the increased use of cars, and perceived or real danger from walking or cycling), urban planning (e.g. lack of public parks and athletic fields, work places and shopping centres becoming more distant), technical advances (e.g. elevators and escalators rather than stairs), occupational changes (e.g. increasing service sector instead of manual work seen in agricultural/industrial settings), institutionalisation of childhood (e.g. longer school hours with increasing academic demands), changing leisure-time activities (e.g. use of computer-related activities).

Thus, interventions to increase PA in the general population could potentially address all of the above and include incorporating multi-method or 'ecological' approaches, involving a broad range of sectors as follows: (i.e. aimed at individuals [both intrapersonal and interpersonal], institutions, communities, environments and policies) are likely to reap greater benefits than concentrating on individual areas alone [64]. Using this type of approach is likely to echo the success of other multi-method campaigns – such as smoking or the use of seat-belts (albeit the use of legislation seemed to be the most effective methods in these campaigns – an option that may not be available for PA campaigns).

Population interventions for increasing PA can be divided into two main strategies – targeting children and adolescents (e.g. at school, leisure-time), and targeting adults (e.g. at work and during leisure time).

Children and adolescents

Several systematic reviews have demonstrated the link between low PA levels and an increase in cardiovascular risk factors also in children (e.g. increased risk of obesity) [65-68]. In addition, children are an especially important group to target as evidence suggests that those who engage in PA at young age are likely to continue this habit [69,70] later in life.

Children spend a longer time in school than in previous years, and physical education classes have been reduced over time [64,71]. For example, both attendance at non-vocational schools

for adolescents, and school PA-related policies, were consistent predictors of childhood PA levels in a recent systematic review [65]. Furthermore, cycling or walking to school is on the decrease, due to real or perceived traffic danger [64,65,72] and lower PA levels can be attributed to these factors. However, given the captive audience, this could be a prime opportunity for intervention, being a “win-win” situation for a number of reasons:

- there is strong evidence that school-based physical education increases PA to recommended levels [65,73,74]
- test results in core academic subjects are not reduced by increasing physical education lessons [75], or may even be increased [76]
- increasing physical education increases children’s health [65,68]
- there is the possibility of superior cognitive functioning, including better concentration in class, in children and adolescents with higher PA levels [77,78].

Thus, schools should be a prime target for interventions to increase PA.

School interventions to increase PA in children and adolescents

A Cochrane review has demonstrated that, in 26 moderate-to-high quality studies, school-based PA interventions increased duration of PA, reduced television viewing, increased VO₂ max, and reduced blood cholesterol. Also, simply increasing the time spent on physical education or activity breaks is effective [66,74]. Furthermore, a later review showed that school interventions may decrease the prevalence of obesity [79]. After-school interventions increase PA levels and fitness, with reductions in blood lipids [80]. Further research is needed on interventions that increase LTPA – although the results suggest that such interventions may not be successful unless implemented outside of school.

Schools should therefore be mandated to provide recommended amounts of PA each day. Schools and parents should also be encouraged to promote walking or cycling as the main mode of transport when attending school. A variety of organised or unorganised physical activities need to be promoted throughout the school day [64]. There is also a need to promote a commuting infrastructure (see below)

Leisure-time interventions

Non-school based variables that have been associated with lower PA levels are as follows: low PA levels of the father, less time spent outdoors, less social support, lower education level of the mother, lower family income, and higher rates of crime [64,65]. Thus, taking such factors into account may provide promising opportunities for effective interventions. Indeed, multi-factorial interventions have provided the best approaches for increasing PA in adolescents [74].

However, findings from research on increasing LTPA in adolescents is mixed, and better quality studies are needed [81,82].

Screen-based activities may also be looked on as an opportunity for PA promotion. Recent reviews demonstrate that PA interventions delivered via the internet appear to provoke a similar response to more established interventions [83-85]. There is also a suggestion from the literature that exergaming (using video-console games that require PA, e.g. games for Nintendo Wii or Xbox360) may provide increased levels of moderate intensity PA – although not as much as doing the actual activity [85-91]. For example, Leatherdale showed that, when measuring 51 undergraduate students playing active and inactive videogames, estimated kcal energy expenditure was higher among those with active videogames than sedentary ones (97.4–192.4 kcal v 42.3–64.7 kcal) [87]. However, conclusive evidence is currently unavailable and large RCTs are required [83,91].

Adults

Interventions to increase PA need to be targeted at work and towards leisure time activities.

Interventions for increasing PA at work

There is substantial evidence that work-related PA is decreasing [71]. Given the increasing distances travelling to work and decreasing PA from active commuting, this highlights the need for work-related PA interventions [64]. Interventions for increasing PA at work have been successful. A recent meta-analysis of studies of PA interventions in the workplace (n=38 231 participants) showed significant increases (demonstrated by Cohen's d effect sizes) in the following: PA physical activity (0.21); fitness (0.57, corresponding to VO₂max of 3.5 mL/kg/min); lipids (0.13); anthropometric measures (0.08). Furthermore, these interventions demonstrated positive benefits for work attendance (0.19) and job stress (0.33) [92]. Modest weight reductions (-1.3 kg) can also be achieved, if dietary intervention is added [93]. Evidence based guidance on promoting physical activity in the workplace is widely available [94].

Exercise and corporate wellness

Many corporations have included exercise facilities and/or programmes as a part of their worksite health promotion, fitness, wellness and cardiac rehabilitation programmes. The Johnson and Johnson “Live for Life” programme has previously been made available to more than 25000 employees at 43 locations in the USA, Puerto Rico, Canada and Europe [95]. This proved to be one of the few programmes that attempted to compare the effectiveness of selected cardiovascular /lifestyle risk reduction interventions through a randomized controlled study. It showed statistically significant improvements in weight reduction, exercise tolerance and blood pressure control within the treatment population. Healthcare savings of \$225 per

employee were also found from the “Live for Life” health and wellness programme [94]. Burton et al. [96] examined the effect of participation on productivity in a worksite fitness programme. Non-participants in this study were twice as likely to report health related work limitations in the areas of time management and physical work. They also recorded more days absent from work when compared with their more active counterparts. This trial promoted the use of exercise (15-45 minutes every other day) and was a precursor to the Stanford HEAR2T PROGRAMME, a large part of which targeted cardiovascular risk reduction in the workplace [97]. Subsequently the ADIFIT FOR LIFE programme implemented some of the approaches used in the Stanford HEAR2T programme, showing lack of exercise training to be a significant cardiovascular factor among the 174 employees studied. The ADIFIT FOR LIFE programme has a key focus on the “test re-test” of key cardiovascular risk factors, with a concentration on healthy nutrition and regular exercise as main interventions for improving lifestyle, exercise tolerance and reducing cardiovascular risk [98]. This has resulted in reducing annual employee absenteeism rates from 6.8 days to 2.6 days per year. Corporate wellness with an emphasis on the promotion and implementation of PA or regular exercise was a key feature within this programme. Coupled with this, compliance to the programme amongst Adidas employees was 65%, compared with an average corporate engagement to fitness and wellness programmes within the UK of 25-30% [100].

Other programmes that have recently focused on exercise as a key intervention in the corporate setting include Unilevers’ “Fit Business programme”, did not have a significant impact on improving the attitude and behaviours of employees towards exercising. Interestingly, 84% of employees responding to the survey at the office site felt that their employer did encourage them to exercise, compared with only 23% at the factory site. The former interestingly had an onsite free of charge state of the art gym including space for exercise classes, while the factory location has a small gym not on site and not free of charge. Clearly this study suggests that location and cost can have a significant effect upon approaches and attitudes taken towards exercise by employees [100].

Active commuting to work

Walking has been shown to be protective of incident CVD, with those engaging in high levels of walking having a 31% reduced risk of developing CVD when compared to those in the lowest walking category [31]. A recent meta-analysis has also demonstrated the benefits of walking or cycling to work [48]. However, subgroup analysis showed that this result was only significant for women, who demonstrated a 13% reduction in cardiovascular risk, whereas the 9% reduction seen in men was non-significant [48]. Thus, structural interventions which promote active commuting would be of benefit, such as measures to increase/improve public transport access

[101], but more research is needed to determine appropriate interventions for both sexes (especially men).

Leisure-time physical activity (LTPA)

Levels of LTPA seems to be increasing for adults, whereas work-related PA is decreasing, and these reductions actually outweigh the increases seen for LTPA [71]. A recent systematic review has quantified the association between LTPA and incidence of first coronary heart disease (CHD) in initially health individuals [46]. Meta-analysis from 26 studies (n=513472, 20666 CHD events) showed that, in comparison to those reporting low or no levels of PA, those who reported high levels of PA were 27% less likely to develop CHD, and those who reported moderate levels were 12% less likely to develop CHD. One methodological issue with this review was the inability to define levels of PA more precisely – the authors had to rely on the original classifications from the primary studies in several cases. A strength of these findings is that the majority of the data reported in primary studies was adjusted for traditional or emerging risk factors. Thus, the overall effects can be considered to be relatively robust and there is the possibility of over-adjustment.

Various systematic reviews have demonstrated the effectiveness of several population-based strategies for increasing LTPA [46,73,102-106]. These have been broadly classified recently by The Community Guide as informational approaches, enhanced access to locations for LTPA and social/behavioral interventions [73].

A systematic review of 10 studies showed that an approximate 4% increase in PA levels, with a corresponding increase in energy expenditure of 16%, are seen in communities exposed to multi-component, broad-based campaigns which also addressed diet and smoking [73]. There is evidence that interventions delivered without face-to-face contact do provide increases in PA, at least in the short-term [104]. Thus, such interventions do not always require direct, one-to-one intervention, and effective results may be achieved relatively inexpensively.

Point-of-decision prompts (e.g. signs encouraging use of stairs instead of lifts/elevators) also have strong evidence to suggest effectiveness for increasing PA [107]. A median 54% increase in the use of stairs was demonstrated in one review [73].

Mass-media campaigns run as single-component interventions do not seem to increase PA levels [73]. However, it is possible that single component interventions such as media advertising or point-of-decision prompts may even be enhanced when combined with other interventions, although further work is needed to evaluate this.

Enhancing access to PA locations (e.g. providing walking routes, access to exercise facilities) was reported to be especially effective in one systematic review of 12 studies [73]. This review demonstrated that PA frequency increased by 48%, energy expenditure by 8% and aerobic capacity increased by 5%.

Social/behavioural approaches aimed at population level are also effective in increasing PA levels [73,101]. Some examples of effective interventions are as follows: contract system with peer, or buddy system (i.e. partner to engage in PA with – 44% increase in time spent on PA, 20% increase in PA frequency, 5% increase in aerobic capacity); individually-tailored interventions (35% increase in time spent on PA, 6.3% increase in VO2 max, 64% increase in energy expenditure, and other increases such as number of PA sessions conducted, proportions of participants commencing PA, frequency of PA). Thus, non-family social support is effective. Interestingly, there was insufficient evidence that family-based social support interventions (often as adjunct to school interventions) were effective [73]. Intervention approaches to promote LTPA may also include strategies that develop self-efficacy, increase enjoyment and intentions, enhance behavioral skills and provide childcare options [108]. Moreover, the use of pedometers was found to be a useful tool for providing motivation and visual feedback in a workplace PA programme [109].

Unfortunately, there is a lack of data evaluating interventions to increase participation in sport when delivered by sporting organisations [110], and this requires more research.

Cost-benefit analysis has shown that active transport, comprehensive worksite approaches, individually-adapted behaviour change, creation of locations for PA along with information services, have shown these interventions to be cost-effective, [73,105], but more cost-effectiveness data is required [111].

Active environments

The significance of our physical environment for promoting or reducing PA should not be underestimated. For example, vigorous PA has been associated with availability of (vigorous) PA equipment [101]. Furthermore, trail connectivity is associated with the use of active commuting [101]. Such results have implications for both commuting PA and LTPA. However, there are inconsistent findings in this area [101,112]. Thus, further research is needed as structural interventions may be required to support multi-component interventions.

Minority groups

Much of the research outlined above may have differential effects across minority groups and socioeconomic classes. For example, multi-component interventions for increasing PA in children/adolescents seems to be more effective among the middle classes than among lower classes, and commuting activity may be protective for women only [48,113,114]. Also, there is a lack of data on the effects of interventions among minority groups [114-116]. In general, more research is needed on the effectiveness of the above interventions in minority groups.

Overall conclusions of literature

Low levels of PF and PA are clearly associated with increased CVD risk and all-cause and cardiovascular mortality. From comparative studies, it appears that these associations seem to be stronger for PF as compared to PA. For PA intensity, a dose-response curve on cardiovascular outcome has been demonstrated in most studies, but the additional risk reduction from moderate to vigorous intensity seems to be small. These results seem to be applicable in men and women as well in the elderly. However, data on racial differences are scarce.

PA interventions can be targeted at children and adults in two spheres: during or commuting to work/school and during leisure time. Effective measures aimed at children/adolescents are increasing physical education and active breaks in school. Evidence for effective LTPA interventions specifically for children/adolescents is more limited. However, it is possible that effective LTPA interventions for adults will also increase family LTPA.

Work-place interventions to increase PA are effective. Improving the health of employees by promoting exercise and healthy eating should be clear corporate and government priorities within the European Union. Furthermore, structural interventions to increase PA during commuting could be considered. There is strong evidence for the following to increase LTPA in adults: multi-component interventions based in community-wide campaigns, non-family social support, individually adapted health behaviour change, enhanced access to locations for PA (public parks, athletic fields, fitness facilities etc.) when combined with information activities and point-of-decision prompts. Other interventions (e.g. mass media campaigns delivered as a single component) do not have enough evidence for current recommendations. However, it is possible that these other interventions may enhance the effectiveness of the above recommendations in a synergistic way when used in combination [64,73], but further research is needed to elucidate this.

Cost-benefit analyses have shown that such approaches are cost-effective.

Recommendations (Insert table 2 and table 3)

In 2007 the European Guidelines on cardiovascular disease prevention in clinical practice recommended that healthy people, in all age groups, should choose enjoyable physical activities, which fit into their daily routine, preferable for 30-45 minutes, 4-5 times weekly in order to prevent or delay the onset of cardiovascular disease [5]. Accordingly the 2007 ACSM/AHA recommendations state that all healthy adults aged 18 to 65 years will benefit from

moderate intensity aerobic (endurance) physical activity (such as walking briskly with a noticeable acceleration of heart rate) for a minimum of 30 minutes on five days each week or vigorous intensity aerobic physical activity (such as jogging with rapid breathing and a substantial increase in heart rate) for a minimum of 20 minutes on three days each week. Combinations of moderate and vigorous intensity activity can be performed to meet this recommendation. In addition, every adult should perform activities that maintain or increase muscular strength and endurance a minimum of two days each week. Therefore, 8-10 exercises should be performed on two or more non-consecutive days each week using the major muscle groups. To maximize strength development, a resistance (weight) should be used that allows 8-12 repetitions of each exercise resulting in volitional fatigue. Muscle-strengthening activities include a progressive weight-training program, weight bearing calisthenics, stair climbing and similar resistance exercises that use the major muscle groups [22].

Based on previous [30,46] and the current literature overviews, it is clear that PA at a moderate intensity such as walking and cycling have a considerable impact on CHD events. Therefore such activities a few hours per week should be recommended to all adults. The additional benefit of vigorous intensity aerobic physical activity can be deducted from the dose-response curve for physical activity and addition of two hours per week high intensity activities can be recommended. More research is needed to elucidate this.

Before engaging in regular physical activity, an appropriate evaluation of middle-aged and older individuals should take place as moderate and vigorous physical exertion is associated with a small but significant increased risk for cardiac events. Such evaluation should vary according to the individual's cardiac risk profile and the intended level of physical activity. For practical recommendations regarding risk assessment we refer to a recent EACPR position paper [117].

Table 2 summarizes the general recommendations for physical activity and risk evaluation of PA at the population level. In **table 3** more specific recommendations, derived from several previous recommendations are given according to age, mode of activity, PA intensity and volume and exercise test results [22,118-126].

Table 1.Relative intensities for aerobic physical activity

Intensity	METs	%VO₂max	%HRR	%HRmax	RPE scale	Examples
Low intensity Light effort	2-4	28-39	30-39	45-54	10-11	light gardening, light walking
Moderate intensity- moderate effort	4-6	40-59	40-59	55-69	12-13	brisk walking
High intensity - vigorous effort	6-8	60-79	60-84	70-89	14-16	jogging
Very hard effort	8-10	>80	> 84	> 89	17-19	running fast
Maximal effort	>10	100	100	100	20	maximum sprinting

METs = metabolic equivalents (1 MET = individual metabolic resting demand, when sitting quiet, about 3.5 mL oxygen per kilogram per minute, or 1 kcal [4.2 kJ] per kilogram per hour in the general population)

HRR = heart rate reserve, HRmax = maximum heart rate, RPE = Borg rating of perceived exertion (6-20 scale)

Table 2: General recommendations for physical activity at the population level [22,118-120]

- A. It is recommended to perform enjoyable physical activities which fit into daily routine on most days of the week, that consist of the following:
1. Aerobic training:
 - a. Moderate-intensity aerobic PA for a minimum of 30 minutes on 5 days/week. Moderate-intensity PA is equivalent to a brisk walk with a noticeably acceleration of heart rate.
or
 - b. Vigorous –intensity aerobic PA for a minimum of 20 minutes on 3 days/week. Vigorous-intensity PA is equivalent to jogging and causes rapid breathing and a substantial increase in heart rate.
or
 - c. A combination of the above, to meet the global weekly PA volume
 2. Muscular strength training: should be carried out twice weekly on major muscle groups
- B. Evaluation of the risk for performing PA varies according to the intended level of physical activity and of the individual's cardiac risk profile
- a. Self assessment of the habitual PA level and of the risk factors are recommended for large populations screening.
 - b. Individuals deemed to be at risk require further evaluation by a qualified physician
 - c. In senior/adult individuals with an increased risk for coronary events, maximal exercise testing (and possibly further evaluations) is advocated.

Table 3: Recommended components of physical activity for health benefits

	Mode of activity	Frequency	Duration	Intensity	Volume
		<i>d/wk</i>	<i>min/d</i>		
Adults [22,118-120]	Aerobic	≥ 5	≥ 30	40-60% VO ₂ max or 50-75 % HRR	Energy expenditure ≥ 1000 Kcal/wk
	Resistance	≥ 2 nonconsecutive	≥ 30	40-60% 1 RM	1-3 sets; 8-12 reps; 8-10 exercises
Elderly [118,121,122]	Aerobic	≥ 5	≥ 30	40-60% VO ₂ max or 50-75 % HRR	Energy expenditure ≥ 1000 Kcal/wk
	Resistance	≥ 2 nonconsecutive	≥ 30	40 % 1 RM	1-2 sets; 10-15 reps; 8-10 exercises
	Flexibility & balance exercises	≥ 5	≥ 10	20-40 % HRR	10-30 s for a static stretch; 3-4 reps
Young [123-126]	Aerobic	≥ 5	≥ 60	> 60-75% VO ₂ max or 50-85 % HRR	Energy expenditure ≥ 1500 Kcal/wk
	Resistance	2 or 3 nonconsecutive	≥ 30	40-60% 1 RM	Isotonic machines or free weights; 1-3 sets; 6-8 reps; 5-8 exercises

References

1. Allender S, Scarborough P, Peto V, Rayner M. *European Cardiovascular Disease Statistics 2008*. <http://www.ehnheart.org/cdv-statistics.html>.
2. World Health Organization. *Projections of mortality and burden of disease, 2002-2030*. http://www.who.int/healthinfo/global_burden_disease/projections/en/index.html.
3. Atella V, Brady A, Catapano AL, Critchley J, Graham IM, Hobbs FDR, et al. Bridging science and health policy in cardiovascular disease: focus on lipid management: A report from a session held during the 7th international symposium on multiple risk factors in cardiovascular diseases: prevention and intervention – health policy. *Atherosclerosis Supplements* 2009; 10: 3-21.
4. De Backer G, Ambrosioni E, Borch-Johnsen K, Brotons C, Cifkova R, Dallongeville J, et al. European guidelines on cardiovascular disease prevention in clinical practice. Third joint task force of European and other societies on cardiovascular disease prevention in clinical practice. *Eur Heart J* 2003; 24: 1601-1610.
5. ESC. European guidelines on cardiovascular disease prevention in clinical practice: executive summary. Fourth Joint Task Force of the European Society of Cardiology and other Societies. *Eur Heart J* 2007; 28: 2375-2414.
6. Arsenault BJ, Pibarot P, Després JP. The quest for the optimal assessment of global cardiovascular risk: Are traditional risk factors and metabolic syndrome partners in crime. *Cardiology* 2009; 113: 35-49.
7. Caspersen CJ, Powell KE, Christensen GM. Physical activity, exercise, and physical fitness: Definitions and distinctions for health-related research. *Public Health Reports* 1985; 100: 126-131.
8. Bouchard C and Shephard RJ. Physical activity, fitness, and health: The model and key concepts. In: Bouchard R, Shephard RJ, Stephens T (eds) *Physical activity, fitness, and health: International proceedings and consensus statement*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics Publishers, 1994, pp.77–88.
9. LaMonte MJ, Ainsworth BE. Quantifying energy expenditure and physical activity in the context of dose response. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2001; 33 Suppl: S370–S378.
10. Dietz WH. The role of lifestyle in health: The epidemiology and consequences of inactivity. *Proc Nutr Soc* 1996; 55: 829-840.
11. Health and Safety Executive (HSE). *Euro data statistics*. <http://www.hse.gov.uk/statistics/index.htm>
12. American College of Sports Medicine. *Resource manual for guidelines for exercise testing and prescription*. 6th ed. Philadelphia, USA: Wolter Kluwer and Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, 2010, pp.53-54.
13. Ainsworth BE, Haskell WL, Leon AS, Jacobs DR, Montoye HJ, Sallis JF, et al. Compendium of Physical Activities: Classification of energy costs of human physical activities. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 1993; 25: 71–80.
14. Ainsworth BE, Haskell WL, Whitt MC, Irwin ML, Swartz AM, Strath SJ, et al. Compendium of physical activities: An update of activity codes and MET intensities. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2000; 32 Suppl: S498–S504.
15. McArdle WD, Katch FI, Katch VL. *Exercise physiology*. 7th ed. Philadelphia, USA: Wolter Kluwer and Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, 2009.
16. American College of Sports Medicine. *Resource manual for guidelines for exercise testing and prescription*. 6th ed. Philadelphia, USA: Wolter Kluwer and Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, 2010, pp. 167.
17. Pate RR. The evolving definition of fitness. *Quest* 1988; 40: 174-179.
18. Knudson DV. Correcting the use of the term "power" in the strength and conditioning literature. *J Strength Cond Res* 2009; 23: 1902-1908.
19. Blair SN, Cheng Y, Holder JS. Is physical activity or physical fitness more important in defining health benefits? *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2001; 33 Suppl: S379-S399; Discussion Suppl: S419-420.

20. Williams PT. Physical fitness and activity as a separate heart disease risk factor: A meta-analysis. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2001; 33: 754-761.
21. Myers J, Prakash M, Froelicher V, Do D, Partington S, Atwood JE. Exercise capacity and mortality among men referred for exercise testing. *N Engl J Med* 2002; 346: 793-801.
22. Haskell WL, Lee IM, Pate RR, Powell KE, Blair SN, Franklin BA, et al. Physical activity and public health: Updated recommendation for adults from the American College of Sports Medicine and the American Heart Association. *Circulation* 2007; 116: 1081-1093.
23. Kodama S, Saito K, Tanaka S, Maki M, Yachi Y, Asumi M, et al. Cardiorespiratory fitness as a quantitative predictor of all-cause mortality and cardiovascular events in healthy men and women. *JAMA* 2009; 301: 2024-2035.
24. Howley ET. Type of activity: resistance, aerobic and leisure versus occupational physical activity. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2001; 33 Suppl: S364-S369.
25. Vanhees L, Lefevre J, Philippaerts R, Martens M, Huygens W, Troosters T, et al. How to assess physical activity? How to assess physical fitness? *Eur J Cardiovasc Prev Rehabil* 2005; 12: 102-114.
26. Warren JM, Ekelund U, Besson H, Mezzani A, Geladas N, Vanhees L; Experts Panel. Assessment of physical activity - a review of methodologies with reference to epidemiological research: A report of the exercise physiology section of the European Association of Cardiovascular Prevention and Rehabilitation. *Eur J Cardiovasc Prev Rehabil* 2010; 17: 127-139.
27. Persinger R, Foster C, Gobson M, Fater DC, Porcari JP. Consistency of the talk test for exercise prescription. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2004; 36: 1632-1636.
28. American College of Sports Medicine. Position stand: The recommended quantity and quality of exercise for developing and maintaining cardiorespiratory and muscular fitness, and flexibility in healthy adults. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 1988; 30: 975-991.
29. Berlin JA, Colditz GA. A meta-analysis of physical activity in the prevention of coronary heart disease. *Am J Epidemiol* 1990; 132: 612-628.
30. Nocon M, Hiemann T, Muller-Riemenschneider F, Thalauf F, Roll S, Willich SN. Association of physical activity with all-cause and cardiovascular mortality: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur J Cardiovasc Prev Rehabil* 2008; 15: 239-246.
31. Hamer M, Chida Y. Walking and primary prevention: A meta-analysis of prospective cohort studies. *Br J Sports Med* 2008; 42: 238-243.
32. Lochen ML, Rasmussen K. The Tromso study; Physical fitness, self reported physical activity, and their relationship to other coronary risk factors. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 1992; 46: 103-107.
33. Young DR, Steinhardt MA. The importance of physical fitness versus physical activity for coronary artery disease risk factors: A cross sectional analysis. *Res Q Exerc Sport* 1993; 64: 377-384.
34. McMurray RG, Ainsworth BE, Harrell JS, Griggs TR, Williams OD. Is physical activity or aerobic power more influential on reducing cardiovascular risk factors? *Med Sci Sport Exerc* 1998; 30: 1521-1529.
35. Sassen B, Cornelissen VA, Kiers H, Wittink H, Kok G, Vanhees L. Physical fitness matters more than physical activity in controlling cardiovascular risk factors. *Eur J Cardiovasc Prev Rehabil* 2009; 16: 677-683.
36. Ekblom-Bak E, Hellenius ML, Ekblom O, Engstrom LM, Ekblom B. Independent associations of physical activity and cardiovascular fitness with cardiovascular risk in adults. *Eur J Cardiovasc Prev Rehabil* 2010; 17: 175-180.
37. Lakka TA, Venalainen JM, Rauramaa R, Salonen R, Tuomilehto J, et al. Relation of leisure-time physical activity and cardiorespiratory fitness to the risk of acute myocardial infarction. *N Engl J Med* 1994; 330: 1549-1554.
38. Talbot LA, Morrell CH, Metter EJ, Fleg JL. Comparison of cardiorespiratory fitness vs leisure time physical activity as predictors of coronary events in men aged <or=65 years and >65 years. *Am J Cardiol* 2002; 89: 1187-1192.

39. Myers J, Kaykha A, George S, Abella J, Zaheer N, Lear S, et al. Fitness versus physical activity patterns in predicting mortality in men. *Am J Med* 2004; 117: 912-918.
40. Lee DC, Sui X, Ortega FB, Kim YS, Church TS, Winett RA, et al. Comparisons of leisure-time physical activity and cardiorespiratory fitness as predictors of all-cause mortality in men and women. *Br J Sports Med* 2010. Epub 2010 Apr 23.
41. Kelley GA, Kelley KS. Progressive resistance exercise and resting blood pressure: A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Hypertension* 2000; 35 :838-843.
42. Hautala AJ, Kiviniemi AM, Mäkipallio TH, Kinnunen H, Nissilä S, Huikuri HV, et al. Individual differences in the responses to endurance and resistance training. *Eur J Appl Physiol* 2006; 96: 535-542.
43. Shaw I, Shaw BS. Consequence of resistance training on body composition and coronary artery disease risk. *Cardiovasc J S Afr* 2006; 17: 111-116.
44. Pollock ML, Franklin BA, Balady GJ, Chaitman BL, Fleg JL, Fletcher B, et al.; AHA Science Advisory. Resistance exercise in individuals with and without cardiovascular disease: Benefits, rationale, safety, and prescription: An advisory from the Committee on Exercise, Rehabilitation, and Prevention, Council on Clinical Cardiology, American Heart Association; Position paper endorsed by the American College of Sports Medicine. *Circulation* 2000; 101: 828-833.
45. Powell KE, Thompson PD, Caspersen CJ, Kendrick JS. Physical activity and the incidence of coronary heart disease. *Ann Rev Public Health* 1987; 8: 253-287.
46. Sofi F, Capalbo A, Cesari F, Abbate R, Gensini GF. Physical activity during leisure time and primary prevention of coronary heart disease: An updated meta-analysis of cohort studies. *Eur J Cardiovasc Prev Rehabil* 2008; 15: 247-257.
47. Andersen LB, Schnohr P, Schroll M, Hein HO. All-cause mortality associated with physical activity during leisure time, work, sports and cycling to work. *Arch Intern Med* 2000; 160: 1621-1628.
48. Hamer M, Chida Y. Active commuting and cardiovascular risk: A meta-analytic review. *Prev Med* 2008; 46: 9-13.
49. Wennberg P, Wensley F, Johansson L, Boman K, Di Angelantonio E, Rumley A, et al. Reduced risk of myocardial infarction related to active commuting: inflammatory and haemostatic effects are potential major mediating mechanisms. *Eur J Cardiovasc Prev Rehabil* 2010; 17: 56-62.
50. Swain DP, Franklin BA. Comparison of cardioprotective benefits of vigorous versus moderate intensity aerobic exercise. *Am J Cardiol* 2006; 97: 141-147.
51. Lollgen H, Bockenhoff A, Knapp G. Physical activity and all-cause mortality: An updated meta-analysis with different intensity categories. *Int J Sports Med* 2009; 30: 213-224.
52. Zheng H, Orsini N, Amin J, Wolk A, Nguyen VT, Ehrlich F. Quantifying the dose-response of walking in reducing coronary heart disease risk: Meta-analysis. *Eur J Epidemiol* 2009; 24: 181-192.
53. Schnohr P, Marott JL, Jensen JS, Jensen GB. Intensity versus duration of cycling, impact on all-cause and coronary heart disease mortality: the Copenhagen City Heart Study. *Eur J Cardiovasc Prev Rehabil* 2011; feb 21 (epub ahead of print)
54. Woodcock J, Franco OH, Orsini N, Roberts I. Non-vigorous physical activity and all-cause mortality: Systematic review and meta-analysis of cohort studies. *In J Epidemiol* 2011; 40: 121-138.
55. Chomistek AK, Rimm EB. Physical activity and incident cardiovascular disease: Investigation of the effect of high amounts of vigorous-intensity activity. Cardiovascular disease epidemiology and prevention, and Nutrition, physical activity and metabolism EPI/PNAM 2010 March 3; San Francisco, CA. Abstract 2.
56. Ueashima K, Ishikawa-Takata K, Yorifuji T, Suzuki E, Kashima S, Takao S, et al. Physical activity and mortality risk in the Japanese elderly: A cohort study. *Am J Prev Med* 2010; 38: 410-418.
57. Paganini-Hill A, Kawas CH, Corrada MM. Activities and mortality in the elderly: The leisure world cohort study. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2011; 66: 559-567.

58. Hrobonova E, Breeze E, Fletcher AE. Higher levels and intensity of physical activity are associated with reduced mortality among community dwelling older people. *J Aging Res* 2011; 7: ID 651931.
59. Takata Y, Ansai T, Akifusa S, Soh I, Yoshitake Y, Kimura Y, et al. Physical fitness and 4-years mortality in an 80-year-old population. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2007; 62: 851-858.
60. Manson JE, Greenland P, LaCroix AZ, Stefanick ML, Mouton CP, Oberman A, et al. Walking compared with vigorous exercise for the prevention of cardiovascular events in women. *New Engl J Med* 2002; 347: 716-725.
61. Kokkinos P, Myers J, Kokkinos JP, Pittaras A, Narayan P, Manolis A, et al. Exercise capacity and mortality in black and white men. *Circulation* 2008; 117: 614-622.
62. WHO Regional Office for Europe. Which are the known causes of and consequences of obesity, and how can it be prevented? In Copenhagen; 2004.
63. Bassett DR, Tremblay MS, Esliger DW, Copeland JL, Barnes JD, Huntington GE. Physical activity and body mass index of children in an old order Amish community. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2007; 39: 410-415.
64. WHO Regional Office for Europe. Steps to health: A European framework to promote physical activity for health. In Copenhagen; 2007.
65. Ferreira I, van der Horst K, Wendel-Vos W, Kremers S, van Lenthe FJ, Brug J. Environmental correlates of physical activity in youth - A review and update. *Obes Rev* 2007; 8: 129-154.
66. Salmon J, Booth ML, Phongsavan P, Murphy N, Timperio A. Promoting physical activity participation among children and adolescents. *Epidemiol Rev* 2007; 29: 144-159.
67. Katz DL, O'Connell M, Njike VY, Yeh MC, Nawaz H. Strategies for the prevention and control of obesity in the school setting: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int J Obes (Lond)* 2008; 32: 1780-1789.
68. Dobbins M, De Corby K, Robeson P, Husson H, Tirilis D. School-based physical activity programs for promoting physical activity and fitness in children and adolescents aged 6-18. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2009 (1): CD007651.
69. Telama R, Yang X, Viikari J, Valimaki I, Wanne O, Raitakari O. Physical activity from childhood to adulthood: A 21-year tracking study. *Am J Prev Med* 2005; 28: 267-273.
70. Telama R. Tracking of Physical Activity from Childhood to Adulthood: A Review. *Obes Facts* 2009; 2: 187-195.
71. Knuth AG, Hallal PC. Temporal trends in physical activity: A systematic review. *J Phys Act Health* 2009; 6: 548-559.
72. Lorenc T, Brunton G, Oliver S, Oliver K, Oakley A. Attitudes to walking and cycling among children, young people and parents: A systematic review. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2008; 62: 852-857.
73. Centres for Disease Control and Prevention. *The community guide - Promoting physical activity*. In. Atlanta, GA: 2006; pp. 80-113.
74. van Sluijs EM, McMinn AM, Griffin SJ. Effectiveness of interventions to promote physical activity in children and adolescents: Systematic review of controlled trials. *BMJ* 2007; 335: 703.
75. Murray NG, Low BJ, Hollis C, Cross AW, Davis SM. Coordinated school health programs and academic achievement: A systematic review of the literature. *J Sch Health* 2007; 77: 589-600.
76. Ericsson I. Motor skills, attention and academic achievements – an intervention study in school year 1-3. *Br Educ Res J* 2008; 34: 301-313.
77. Mahar MT, Murphy SK, Rowe DA, Golden J, Shields AT, Raedeke TD. Effects of a classroom-based program on physical activity and on-task behavior. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2006; 38: 2086-2094.
78. Caterino MC, Polak ED. Effects of two types of activity on the performance of second-, third-, and fourth-grade students on a test of concentration. *Percept Mot Skills* 1999; 89: 245-248.

79. Gonzalez-Suarez C, Worley A, Grimmer-Somers K, Dones V. School-based interventions on childhood obesity: A meta-analysis. *Am J Prev Med* 2009; 37: 418-427.
80. Beets MW, Beighle A, Erwin HE, Huberty JL. After-school program impact on physical activity and fitness: A meta-analysis. *Am J Prev Med* 2009; 36: 527-537.
81. Pate RR, O'Neill JR. After-school interventions to increase physical activity among youth. *Br J Sports Med* 2009; 43: 14-18.
82. O'Connor TM, Jago R, Baranowski T. Engaging parents to increase youth physical activity a systematic review. *Am J Prev Med* 2009; 37: 141-149.
83. Marcus BH, Ciccolo JT, Sciamanna CN. Using electronic/computer interventions to promote physical activity. *Br J Sports Med* 2009; 43: 102-105.
84. van den Berg MH, Schoones JW, Vliet Vlieland TP. Internet-based physical activity interventions: A systematic review of the literature. *J Med Internet Res* 2007; 9: e26.
85. Vandelandotte C, Spathonis KM, Eakin EG, Owen N. Website-delivered physical activity interventions a review of the literature. *Am J Prev Med* 2007; 33: 54-64.
86. Lanningham-Foster L, Foster RC, McCrady SK, Jensen TB, Mitre N, Levine JA. Activity-promoting video games and increased energy expenditure. *J Pediatr* 2009; 154: 819-823.
87. Leatherdale ST, Woodruff SJ, Manske SR. Energy expenditure while playing active and inactive video games. *Am J Health Behav* 2010; 34: 31-35.
88. Miyachi M, Yamamoto K, Ohkawara K, Tanaka S. METs in adults while playing active video games: A metabolic chamber study. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2010; 42: 1149-1153.
89. Daley AJ. Can exergaming contribute to improving physical activity levels and health outcomes in children? *Pediatrics* 2009; 124: 763-771.
90. Fawkner SG, Niven A, Thin AG, Macdonald MJ, Oakes JR. Adolescent girls' energy expenditure during dance simulation active computer gaming. *J Sports Sci* 2010; 28: 61-65.
91. Foley L, Maddison R: Use of active video games to increase physical activity in children: a (virtual) reality? *Pediatr Exerc Sci* 2010; 22: 7-20.
92. Conn VS, Hafdahl AR, Cooper PS, Brown LM, Lusk SL. Meta-analysis of workplace physical activity interventions. *Am J Prev Med* 2009; 37: 330-339.
93. Anderson LM, Quinn TA, Glanz K, Ramirez G, Kahwati LC, Johnson DB, et al. The effectiveness of worksite nutrition and physical activity interventions for controlling employee overweight and obesity: A systematic review. *Am J Prev Med* 2009; 37: 340-357.
94. National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE). *Promoting physical activity in the workplace: full guidance 2008*.
<http://guidance.nice.org.uk/PH13/Guidance/pdf/English>
95. Goetzel RZ, Ozminkowski RJ, Ling D, Rutter KB, Isacacs F, Wang S. The long term impact of Johnson and Johnsons health and wellbeing programme on employee health risks. *J Occup Envir Med* 2002; 44: 417-424.
96. Burton WN, McCalister KT, Chen CY, Edington DW. The association of health status, worksite fitness participation and two measures of productivity. *J Environ Med* 2005; 47: 343-351.
97. Haskell WL, Alderman, EL, Fair JM, Maron DJ, Mackey SF, Superko HR, et al. Effects of intensive multi factor risk reduction on coronary atherosclerosis and clinical cardiac events in men and women with coronary artery disease. The Stanford Coronary Risk Intervention Project. *Circulation* 1994; 89: 975-990.
98. Dugmore LD, Wark KJ, Walton KT, Watson DA, Bancroft G, Flint EJ, et al. The "Adifit for L.I.F.E" study: Two year results from a cardiovascular risk reduction programme in the corporate setting. *J Cardiopulm Rehabil* 2000; 20: 287.
99. British Safety Council (BSC). *Sword of Honour Award* 2009.
<http://www.britsafe.org/soh.aspx>
100. Cherti M, Platt R. Final report to Unilever on their "Fit To Business Programme". *Inst for Public Policy Research*, March 2010.

101. Wendel-Vos W, Droomers M, Kremers S, Brug J, van Lenthe F. Potential environmental determinants of physical activity in adults: A systematic review. *Obes Rev* 2007; 8: 425-440.
102. Hillsdon M, Foster C, Thorogood M. Interventions for promoting physical activity. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2005(1): CD003180.
103. Ogilvie D, Foster CE, Rothnie H, Cavill N, Hamilton V, Fitzsimons CF, et al. Interventions to promote walking: Systematic review. *BMJ* 2007; 334: 1204.
104. Jenkins A, Christensen H, Walker JG, Dear K. The effectiveness of distance interventions for increasing physical activity: A review. *Am J Health Promot* 2009; 24: 102-117.
105. Muller-Riemenschneider F, Reinhold T, Willich SN. Cost-effectiveness of interventions promoting physical activity. *Br J Sports Med* 2009; 43: 70-76.
106. Mowen AJ, Baker BL. Park, recreation, fitness, and sport sector recommendations for a more physically active America: A white paper for the United States national physical activity plan. *J Phys Act Health* 2009; 6 Suppl 2: S236-244.
107. Soler RE, Leeks KD, Buchanan LR, Brownson RC, Heath GW, Hopkins DH. Point-of-decision prompts to increase stair use: A systematic review update. *Am J Prev Med* 2010; 38 Suppl 2: S292-300.
108. Cleland V, Ball K, Hume C, Timperio A, King AC, Crawford D. Individual, social and environmental correlates of physical activity among women living in socioeconomically disadvantaged neighbourhoods. *Soc Sci Med* 2010; 70: 2011-2018.
109. Lauzon N, Chan CB, Myers AM, Tudor-Locke C. Participant experiences in a workplace pedometer-based physical activity program. *J Phys Act Health* 2008; 5: 675-687.
110. Priest N, Armstrong R, Doyle J, Waters E. Interventions implemented through sporting organisations for increasing participation in sport. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2008 (3): CD004812.
111. Oldridge NB. Economic burden of physical inactivity: healthcare costs associated with cardiovascular disease. *Eur J Cardiovasc Prev Rehabil* 2008; 15: 130-139.
112. Franzini L, Elliott MN, Cuccaro P, Schuster M, Gilliland MJ, Grunbaum JA, et al. Influences of physical and social neighborhood environments on children's physical activity and obesity. *Am J Public Health* 2009; 99: 271-278.
113. Romon M, Lommez A, Tafflet M, Basdevant A, Oppert JM, Bresson JL, et al. Downward trends in the prevalence of childhood overweight in the setting of 12-year school- and community-based programmes. *Public Health Nutr* 2009; 12: 1735-1742.
114. Whitt-Glover MC, Kumanyika SK. Systematic review of interventions to increase physical activity and physical fitness in African-Americans. *Am J Health Promot* 2009; 23 Suppl: S33-56.
115. Keeton VF, Kennedy C. Update on physical activity including special needs populations. *Curr Opin Pediatr* 2009; 21: 262-268.
116. Caperchione CM, Kolt GS, Mummery WK. Physical activity in culturally and linguistically diverse migrant groups to Western society: A review of barriers, enablers and experiences. *Sports Med* 2009; 39: 167-177.
117. Borjesson M, Urhausen A, Kouidi E, Dugmore D, Sharma S, Halle M, et al. Cardiovascular evaluation of middle-aged/senior individuals engaged in leisure-time sport activities: position stand from the sections of exercise physiology and sports cardiology of the European Association of Cardiovascular Prevention and Rehabilitation. *Eur J Cardiovasc Prev Rehabil* 2011. (Epub ahead of print)
118. Warburton D, Nicol CW, Bredin S. Prescribing exercise as preventive therapy. *CMAJ* 2006; 174: 961-974.
119. AHA/ACCF. Performance measures for primary prevention of cardiovascular disease in adults: A report of the American College of Cardiology Foundation/American Heart Association task force on performance measures (writing committee to develop performance measures for primary prevention of cardiovascular disease): developed in collaboration with the American Academy of Family Physicians; American Association of

- Cardiovascular and Pulmonary Rehabilitation; and Preventive Cardiovascular Nurses Association: endorsed by the American College of Preventive Medicine, American College of Sports Medicine, and Society for Women's Health Research. *Circulation* 2009; 120: 1296-1336.
120. O'Donovan G, Blazeovich AJ, Boreham C, Cooper AR, Crank H, Ekelund U, et al. The ABC of physical activity for health: A consensus statement from the British Association of Sport and Exercise Sciences. *J Sports Sci* 2010; 28: 573-591.
 121. Nelson ME, Rejeski WJ, Blair SN, Duncan PW, Judge JO, King AC, et al.; American College of Sports Medicine; American Heart Association. Physical activity and public health in older adults: Recommendation from the American College of Sports Medicine and the American Heart Association. *Circulation* 2007; 116: 1094-1105.
 122. Williams MA, Haskell WL, Ades PA, Amsterdam EA, Bittner V, Franklin BA, et al. American Heart Association Council on Clinical Cardiology; American Heart Association Council on Nutrition, Physical Activity, and Metabolism. Resistance exercise in individuals with and without cardiovascular disease: 2007 update: A scientific statement from the American Heart Association Council on Clinical Cardiology and Council on Nutrition, Physical Activity, and Metabolism. *Circulation* 2007; 116: 572-584.
 123. Andersen LB, Harro M, Sardinha LB, Froberg K, Ekelund U, Brage S, et al. Physical activity and clustered cardiovascular risk in children: A cross-sectional study (The European Youth Heart Study). *Lancet* 2006; 368: 299-304.
 124. Malina RM. Weight training in youth-growth, maturation, and safety: An evidence-based review. *Clin J Sport Med* 2006; 16: 478-487.
 125. Steele RM, Brage S, Corder K, Wareham NJ, Ekelund U. Physical activity, cardiorespiratory fitness, and the metabolic syndrome in youth. *J Appl Physiol* 2008; 105: 342-351.
 126. Faigenbaum AD, Kraemer WJ, Blimkie CJ, Jeffreys I, Micheli LJ, Nitka M, et al. Youth resistance training: updated position statement paper from the national strength and conditioning association. *J Strength Cond Res* 2009; 23 Suppl 5: S60-79.