

Effect of an office-based intervention on visceral adipose tissue: the WorkACTIVE-P randomized controlled trial

James L. Dorling, Christoph Höchsmann, Catrine Tudor-Locke, Robbie Beyl, and Corby K. Martin

Abstract: Office-based activity reduces sedentariness, yet no randomized controlled trials (RCTs) have assessed how such activity influences visceral adipose tissue (VAT). This study examined the effect of an office-based, multicomponent activity intervention on VAT. The WorkACTIVE-P RCT enrolled sedentary office workers (body mass index: 31.4 (standard deviation (SD) 4.4) kg/m²) to an intervention ($n = 20$) or control ($n = 20$) group. For 3 months, the intervention group received an office-based pedal desk, further to an intervention promoting its use and increased walking. The control group maintained habitual activity. At baseline and follow-up, VAT, cardiometabolic disease risk markers, physical activity, and food intake were measured. Steps/day were not altered relative to control ($P \geq 0.51$), but the pedal desk was utilized for 127 (SD 61) min/day. The intervention reduced VAT relative to control (-0.15 kg; 95% confidence interval (CI) = -0.29 to -0.01 ; $P = 0.04$). Moreover, the intervention decreased fasting glucose compared with control (-0.29 mmol/L; 95% CI = -0.51 to -0.06 ; $P = 0.01$), but no differences in other cardiometabolic disease markers or food intake were revealed ($P \geq 0.11$). A multicomponent intervention decreased VAT in office workers who were overweight or obese. Though longer-term studies are needed, office-based, multicomponent activity regimens may lower cardiometabolic disease risk. Trial registered at ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT02561611).

Novelty:

- In WorkACTIVE-P, a multicomponent activity intervention decreased visceral adipose tissue relative to control in office workers.
- The intervention also reduced glucose compared with control, though other metabolic risk markers and food intake were not altered.
- Such multicomponent interventions could help reduce cardiometabolic disease risk, but longer studies are needed.

Key words: sedentary behavior, physical activity, cardiometabolic health, pedal desk, walking, workplace.

Résumé : L'activité liée au travail de bureau réduit la sédentarité, mais aucun essai contrôlé randomisé n'a évalué comment une telle activité affecte le tissu adipeux viscéral (« VAT »). Cette étude examine dans le travail de bureau l'effet de l'activité à plusieurs composants sur le VAT. L'essai WorkACTIVE-P comprend des employés de bureau sédentaires (indice de masse corporelle: 31,4 (écart-type (ET) 4,4) kg/m²) assignés à un groupe d'intervention ($n = 20$) ou témoin ($n = 20$). Le groupe d'intervention reçoit pour trois mois un bureau à pédales à la suite d'une intervention favorisant son utilisation et l'augmentation de la marche à pied. Le groupe témoin maintient l'activité habituelle. Au début et au suivi, le VAT, les marqueurs de risque de maladie cardiométabolique, l'activité physique et la prise alimentaire sont mesurés. Le nombre de pas journalier n'est pas modifié par rapport au groupe témoin ($P \geq 0,51$), mais le bureau à pédales est utilisé pendant 127 (ET : 61) min/jour. L'intervention réduit le VAT par rapport au groupe témoin ($-0,15$ kg; intervalle de confiance (IC) à 95 % = $-0,29$ à $-0,01$; $P = 0,04$). De plus, l'intervention diminue la glycémie à jeun par rapport au groupe témoin ($-0,29$ mmol/L; IC à 95 % = $-0,51$ à $-0,06$; $P = 0,01$), mais aucune différence dans les autres marqueurs de la maladie cardiométabolique ou la prise alimentaire n'est révélée ($P \geq 0,11$). Une intervention à plusieurs composants réduit le VAT chez les employés de bureau en surpoids ou obèses. Bien que des études à plus long terme soient nécessaires, des régimes de travail de bureau à plusieurs composants peuvent réduire le risque de maladie cardiométabolique. Essai enregistré dans ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT02561611). [Traduit par la Rédaction]

Les nouveautés :

- Dans l'essai WorkACTIVE-P, une intervention d'activité à plusieurs composants diminue le tissu adipeux viscéral chez les employés de bureau par rapport au groupe témoin.
- L'intervention réduit la glycémie par rapport au groupe témoin, mais les autres marqueurs de risque métabolique et la prise alimentaire ne sont pas modifiés.
- De telles interventions à plusieurs composants pourraient aider à réduire le risque de maladie cardiométabolique, mais des études à plus long terme sont nécessaires.

Mots-clés : comportement sédentaire, activité physique, santé cardiométabolique, bureau à pédales, marche à pied, lieu de travail.

Received 13 March 2020. Accepted 27 July 2020.

J.L. Dorling, C. Höchsmann, C. Tudor-Locke, *R. Beyl, and C.K. Martin. Pennington Biomedical Research Center, Baton Rouge, LA 70808, USA.

Corresponding author: Corby K. Martin (email: Corby.Martin@pbr.edu).

*Present address: College of Health and Human Services, University of North Carolina Charlotte, Charlotte, NC 28223, USA.

Copyright remains with the author(s) or their institution(s). Permission for reuse (free in most cases) can be obtained from copyright.com.

Introduction

Sedentary behavior increases the risk of obesity, type 2 diabetes, cardiovascular disease (Wilmot et al. 2012), cancer (Biswas et al. 2015), and mortality (Diaz et al. 2017). Although the mechanisms have yet to be elucidated, sedentary behavior can lead to the development of excess visceral adipose tissue (VAT) (Slentz et al. 2005), which is linked to poor blood glucose regulation, insulin resistance, and cardiometabolic conditions (Blucher 2016). Decreasing sedentary time and increasing physical activity are consequently strategies that could attenuate VAT and deleterious metabolic issues.

Reducing sedentariness within the workplace is important since occupational sitting is the largest contributor to weekday sitting (Miller and Brown 2004). Researchers have attempted to decrease sedentary behavior within the workplace by integrating active workstations, principally through sit-stand desks and/or treadmills (Koepp et al. 2013; John et al. 2011; Bergman et al. 2018). These strategies appear to reduce sedentary time (Koepp et al. 2013; Bergman et al. 2018) but their influence on VAT is unclear. In a non-randomized single-arm trial, John et al. (2011) found that a treadmill workstation, which increased stepping time by 38 min/day after 9 months, reduced waist circumference, a surrogate measure of VAT. Conversely, another treadmill intervention that stimulated an 18-min/day increase in walking did not change waist circumference (Bergman et al. 2018). These discrepancies illustrate the need for randomized controlled trials (RCTs) that assess the impact of workstations on direct measures of VAT. Moreover, changes in other cardiometabolic disease markers and food intake in response to such workplace regimens need to be evaluated. Indeed, the effect of workplace interventions on cardiometabolic changes is equivocal (John et al. 2011; Healy et al. 2017; Bergman et al. 2018), whilst alterations in food intake may mitigate beneficial effects of increased physical activity (Martin et al. 2019).

The promise of treadmill workstations notwithstanding, administrative and human resource difficulties suggest the adoption of these stations may not be sustainable (Tudor-Locke et al. 2014a). As a response to these challenges, we have studied the influence of a pedal desk in office settings (Proença et al. 2018). This is a semi-recumbent, pedal-based workstation that contains an adaptable desktop, enabling users to sit and complete tasks on a computer monitor whilst pedaling at a desired intensity (Proença et al. 2018). Encouragingly, the pedal desk has been acceptable to users (Proença et al. 2018), elevates energy expenditure (Tudor-Locke et al. 2014b), and acutely enhances insulin sensitivity after a meal (Han et al. 2018). While these studies indicate that the pedal desk may improve metabolic function, the chronic effects of the pedal desk have not been studied, and many workplace interventions have induced no changes in adiposity and cardiometabolic risk markers (Bergman et al. 2018). It is thus possible that larger improvements in VAT and cardiometabolic risk markers could be obtained if the pedal desk was implemented together with a simple daily walking-based strategy, which would potentially lower sedentary time further in combination with the office-based intervention.

Our primary objective was to test the effect of a 3-month, multi-component pedal desk and daily walking intervention delivered in the workplace on VAT in office workers who were overweight or obese. We hypothesized that the intervention group would realize a decrease in VAT compared with a control group. Our secondary objectives were to examine changes in other cardiometabolic risk markers and food intake in response to the multicomponent intervention.

Materials and methods

Ethics

The WorkACTIVE-P study was a 3-month parallel RCT performed between June 2016 and May 2018 (ClinicalTrials.gov

identifier no.: NCT02561611) by Pennington Biomedical Research Center (Baton Rouge, La., USA). The center's institutional review board approved the procedures and protocol of the WorkACTIVE-P study, and all outcome measurements were collected by Pennington Biomedical Research Center staff. All participants provided written informed consent prior to enrollment, and a data and safety monitoring board oversaw the study. All outcome assessors and investigators were blind to participant allocation, whereas participants, the project manager, and interventionists prescribing and supervising the intervention were not blinded (single-blinded). Cessation of the trial occurred when the desired sample size had completed the study.

Study sample


We approached corporations in Louisiana that we have worked with previously for similar office interventions (Tudor-Locke et al. 2014a). The workplaces comprised a mixture of open- and closed-based spaces that had adequate room for our pedal desks. After meetings with the facilities' directors, human resources representatives, information technologists, department supervisors, and wellness coordinators, email and telephone communications were utilized within a site to recruit participants. No racial or gender biases occurred during the selection of corporations and participants.

We recruited office workers from 5 corporations whose job descriptions mainly required sitting-based administrative duties such as filing, scheduling, interacting via email and telephone, and attending meetings. To be eligible, participants had to be 18–64 years of age, be overweight or obese, have a waist circumference > 102 cm (men) or > 88 cm (women), and satisfy at least 1 of the 4 defining criteria for metabolic syndrome, namely triglycerides ≥ 1.7 mmol/L, high-density lipoprotein (HDL) cholesterol < 1.0 mmol/L (men) or < 1.3 mmol/L (women), resting blood pressure ≥ 130 mm Hg systolic, and/or fasting glucose ≥ 5.6 mmol/L. Participants also had to be sedentary; that is, they averaged < 7500 steps/day at baseline (as measured by step counters, described below) and indicated in response to direct query that they “mostly sit during the day at work and do not walk about very much”. Exclusion criteria included high resting blood pressure (systolic > 179 mm Hg and/or diastolic > 99 mm Hg), cardiometabolic disease — type 1 or type 2 diabetes, serious arrhythmias, cardiomyopathy, congestive heart failure, stroke, transient ischemic cerebral attacks, peripheral vascular disease with intermittent claudication, and uncontrolled angina — and other medical conditions that would significantly impede conduction of the intervention or collection of outcome measures.

Experimental design

Interested participants received orientation, run-in, and screening visits to determine eligibility and indicate whether they could cope with the rigors of the study (Fig. 1). The orientation was a 1-h visit that detailed the procedures of the trial. During the run-in visit, descriptive characteristics, blood pressure, and medical history were obtained. Participants deemed eligible at this stage completed a screening visit at which a fasting blood sample was taken. Participants were additionally provided an accelerometer (GT3X+, ActiGraph LLC, Pensacola, Fla., USA) and were instructed to wear this for 7 days. This served to examine the participants' ability to comply with the wearing requirements of objective physical activity monitoring devices. If participants failed to wear the accelerometer for at least 4 days with at least 10 h of wear time recorded on each day, their compliance was deemed inadequate and they were excluded. Participants who complied with this requirement were deemed eligible and the data obtained from the 7 days of monitoring was utilized to determine if participants were sedentary (< 7500 steps/day).

Approximately 16 days after the screening visit, eligible participants completed a baseline visit at which all baseline measures

Fig. 1. WorkACTIVE-P flow chart. BMI, body mass index; N/S, not significant.

(see below) were assessed. Participants were also randomized into a 3-month intervention or control arm. Randomization occurred via a computerized pseudo-random number generator by the study statistician, with equal numbers allocated to each group. Participants were notified of group allocation through sealed and numbered envelopes, which were provided by the project manager or interventionist.

Participants assigned to the control group were asked to maintain their typical work and lifestyle habits. By contrast, those assigned to the intervention arm received a combined behavior support program that aimed to promote use of a pedal desk and increase daily walking. The intervention focused on optimizing 2 components of the Social Cognitive Theory: self-efficacy and social support (Bandura 1986). Specifically, goals were set for both interventional components and these were scrutinized during weekly or biweekly phone contacts and scheduled group meetings with interventionists who had backgrounds in kinesiology or psychology and had experience delivering behavior change interventions. Individual meetings were also scheduled with interventionists in the participants' workplace when necessary and convenient. During contact time with participants, interventionists utilized methods that developed self-monitoring and goal fulfillment, including the provision of objective data detailing use and performance on intervention tools, as well as instructions on how to monitor these as part of the intervention. To further enhance feedback during contact sessions, data from intervention tools were transferred via the internet to interventionists, enabling remote programmatic oversight and tracking. Participant goals were highly specified and accounted for variations in work and personal schedules. For example, a participant may have been set a goal to use their pedal desk for 1 accrued hour/day but over time lift their goal up to 4 or more hours/day, depending on work schedules that may have required

attendance at events/meetings outside of their office on short notice.

Intervention tools

The Pennington Pedal Desk, which has been described before (Schuna et al. 2016), has been rated positively during computer-based tasks in office-based workers (Proença et al. 2018). Briefly, the pedal desk provides a maneuverable, fully automated tracking and intervention system that encompasses the user, the desk, and specialized pedal desk tracker software (Schuna et al. 2016). Participants randomized to the intervention group had a pedal desk placed in their usual workspace. To promote prolonged pedaling, a nonadjustable magnetic braking system provided a flywheel resistance of ≈ 0.30 kilogram-force, which aimed to yield power outputs of 12–36 W when pedal rates were 30–90 revolutions per minute (Schuna et al. 2016). Furthermore, in accord with the intervention's goal to allow participants to monitor their usage, the pedal desk was designed to provide a real-time display of revolutions per minute and the time of pedal desk use via a pop-up box that appeared on the computer monitor (Schuna et al. 2016). Such tracking measures are important, as other measures of physical activity do not effectively monitor seated activity (Nelson et al. 2016). To facilitate attainment of pedal-based goals and address low usage, participants were trained to independently use aspects of the pedal desk tracking software, including how to interpret graphical displays in the pop-up box. Such displays illustrated time of use and distance, which was estimated from a product of wheel revolutions and wheel diameter (Schuna et al. 2016). These illustrations could present daily, weekly, and monthly accrued data, and were readily available to pedal desk users. We intended to transfer and retain this data within the system so interventionists could direct participants and we could accurately characterize pedal desk use. However, our software experienced

technical faults when capturing the revolutions per minute data, and 15 participants in the intervention group (75%) reported problems with the tracking software. We consequently were unable to obtain estimates of power and energy expenditure as we had intended. Instead, we have used time of use as our determinant of pedal desk use, as this feature worked more consistently.

The walking component of the intervention was based on the success of previous studies (Chan et al. 2004) and aimed to increase physical activity by ≥ 3000 steps/day. Participants in the intervention group were provided with Fitbit devices (Fitbit Zip; Fitbit Inc., San Francisco, Calif., USA) and were instructed to wear these for the whole intervention, except for water-based activities (such as showering) and during sleep. Fitbits were connected to Internet-monitoring software, which transferred data to an on-board visual display to track average steps/day. Participants were taught to monitor these data during the trial to facilitate the attainment of individualized stepping goals. Additionally, interventionists obtained steps/day data each week from the Fitbit through internet connectivity and used these data to track compliance and assist participants in meeting specific goals.

Outcomes

Body weight, body composition, and adipose tissue

At baseline and month 3, body weight and waist circumference were determined using a Tanita Scale (Arlington Heights, Ill., USA) and a nonextensible tape measurer (Gulick II; Sammons Preston, Chicago, Ill., USA), respectively.

Measurement of VAT was conducted using a magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) scanner (3.0 T Scanner; Excite HD System, General Electric, Milwaukee, Wis., USA), since this provides greater precision than anthropometric and dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry measurements (Shuster et al. 2012). Participants were assessed in a supine position with their arms placed above their heads. A localizer and coronal images were used to locate measurement boundaries defined by the liver and the pubic synthesis. Specifically, images were obtained for the entire anatomy from the highest point of the liver through the pubic synthesis. A total of 240–340 images were acquired per participant. Images were analyzed by a blinded, trained analyst using Analyze software (AnalyzeDirect, Overland Park, Kans., USA). Total adipose tissue (TAT), VAT, and subcutaneous adipose tissue (SAT) were anatomically defined and quantified.

Following a 12-h fast, a blood draw was taken to measure glucose, hemoglobin A1c (HbA1c), total cholesterol, and triglycerides (DXC600; Beckman Coulter, Brea, Calif., USA). HDL levels were also assessed with a DXC600 analyzer (Wako Chemicals, Richmond, Va., USA) and low-density lipoprotein (LDL) levels were calculated using the Friedewald equation (Friedewald et al. 1972). Fasting insulin was measured (Immulin 2000; Siemens, Los Angeles, Calif., USA) and utilized with fasting glucose to calculate homeostatic model assessment of insulin resistance (HOMA-IR) (Matthews et al. 1985). In addition, blood pressure was measured manually twice using a standard sphygmomanometer and an appropriately sized cuff and the average was recorded. Participants were asked to refrain from consuming alcohol or engaging in physical activity 24 h prior to these measurements.

Physical activity and sedentary time at baseline and follow-up

For 7 days at baseline and 7 days prior to trial cessation, sedentary time, physical activity, and steps/day were measured using validated GT3X+ accelerometers (ActiGraph LLC). This accelerometer has been validated and is able to detect minute-by-minute physical activity using established activity cut points (Freedson et al. 1998; Matthews et al. 2008). These cut points utilize accelerometer counts per minute (cpm), with <100 cpm, 100–1951 cpm and ≥ 1952 cpm classified as sedentary time, light physical activity,

and moderate-to-vigorous physical activity (MVPA), respectively (Freedson et al. 1998). Participants were instructed to wear accelerometers for approximately 24 h/day, removing devices for activities involving water. Steps and time-based physical activity endpoints were divided by individual wear times and extrapolated to a 24-h day to account for variations in wear time.

Food intake

Food intake data were captured for 7 days at baseline and during the follow-up period with the Remote Food Photography Method (RFPM) and SmartIntake app as described elsewhere (Martin et al. 2009). The first 1–2 days represented a run-in period to habituate participants to the procedure; hence, approximately 4–5 complete days of data were obtained. Briefly, the RFPM relies on trained raters to estimate the proportion of food items in images captured by participants and compare them with a standard photo with a known portion size of the food being rated. Energy, carbohydrate, fat, and protein intake are then determined from the USDA Food and Nutrient Database for Dietary Studies (Ahuja et al. 2012) and manufacturer information (Martin et al. 2009).

Statistical analysis

The study had 80% power to detect a 21% difference in VAT between groups at the nominal 0.05 whilst accounting for a 10% attrition rate (De Souza et al. 2012). Linear mixed models examined the influence of the intervention on change in outcome measures, with group used as a fixed effect and between-group differences the primary hypotheses of interest. Age, sex, and race were included in preliminary change from baseline models as covariates. Without clear-cut data for clinically meaningful differences in the primary endpoint, absolute Cohen effect sizes (ESs) were performed on change scores to supplement findings. Calculations were made by dividing the difference between the mean values by the pooled standard deviation (SD) from the model (Cohen 1988). Cohen ESs were considered small, moderate, and large if they spanned from 0.20–0.49, 0.50–0.79, and 0.80 or greater, respectively (Cohen 1988). Analyses were performed using SAS software version 9.3 of the SAS System for Windows (SAS Institute, Cary, N.C., USA). Significance level for all analyses was set at the nominal 0.05, and unless otherwise stated, data are presented as least square means (95% confidence interval (CI)).

Results

Study sample

In total, after exclusions, 20 participants were randomized, and all participants completed the intervention and were analyzed for the primary outcome (Fig. 1). Trial cessation occurred when the targeted sample size completed the outcomes of the trial. The majority of participants recruited were female (31 (77.5%)) and white (28 (70.0%)), with a mean age of 46.4 (SD 10.5) years and a mean body mass index (BMI) of 31.4 (SD 4.4) kg/m². The control and intervention groups were not significantly different with respect to baseline demographic, anthropometric, and adipose tissue measures ($P \geq 0.07$; Table 1). Sedentary time, light physical activity, MVPA, and steps/day (as measured by the ActiGraph) were also similar between groups at baseline ($P \geq 0.39$), as were energy and macronutrient intake ($P \geq 0.27$) and cardiometabolic disease risk markers ($P \geq 0.19$; Table 1).

Physical activity and sedentary time

Participants in the intervention group used the pedal desk for a mean time of 127 (SD 61) min/day (Fig. 2A). However, mean steps/day, as assessed with the Fitbit throughout the intervention period, were 6313 (SD 2371), indicating that the intervention did not successfully increase daily walking by the targeted

Table 1. Baseline characteristics of WorkACTIVE-P participants.

	Control, <i>n</i> = 20	Intervention, <i>n</i> = 20	<i>P</i>
Age, y	46.7 (9.8)	46.2 (11.4)	0.88
Sex			
Male	6 (30.0%)	3 (15.0%)	0.26
Female	14 (70.0%)	17 (85.0%)	
Race			
White	15 (75.0%)	13 (65.0%)	0.49
African American	5 (25.0%)	7 (35.0%)	
Physical activity and sedentary time			
Sedentary time, min/d	1265 (56)	1249 (63)	0.42
Light, min/d	165 (52)	181 (61)	0.39
MVPA, min/d	10 (8)	9 (6)	0.87
Steps/d	3400 (1239)	3722 (1289)	0.42
Adipose tissue and anthropometry			
VAT, kg	1.93 (1.12)	1.97 (0.92)	0.90
SAT, kg	7.82 (2.24)	9.78 (4.07)	0.07
TAT, kg	9.75 (2.80)	11.76 (4.05)	0.08
Height, cm	166.8 (7.8)	167.8 (8.9)	0.71
Weight, kg	86.1 (14.0)	89.6 (16.6)	0.48
BMI, kg/m ²	30.8 (3.4)	32.0 (5.3)	0.43
Waist circumference, cm	98.9 (11.9)	99.1 (10.2)	0.97
Cardiometabolic disease risk factors			
Glucose, mmol/L	5.15 (0.29)	5.30 (0.61)	0.32
Insulin, μ U/mL	16.6 (18.2)	17.4 (25.0)	0.90
HOMA-IR	3.8 (4.1)	4.2 (5.8)	0.83
HDL, mmol/L	1.40 (0.33)	1.48 (0.36)	0.47
LDL, mmol/L	2.84 (0.82)	2.97 (0.71)	0.62
Total cholesterol, mmol/L	4.89 (0.92)	5.00 (0.96)	0.72
Triglycerides, mmol/L	1.41 (0.77)	1.20 (0.66)	0.35
HbA1c	5.3 (0.3)	5.4 (0.4)	0.19
SBP, mm Hg	114.0 (12.0)	116.8 (10.9)	0.44
DBP, mm Hg	74.1 (6.4)	76.8 (10.4)	0.32
Food intake			
Energy intake, kcal	1587 (439)	1474 (431)	0.43
Carbohydrate, g	170 (61)	148 (56)	0.27
Fat, g	68 (20)	67 (21)	0.83
Protein, g	70 (15)	65 (20)	0.38

Note: No significant difference between groups ($P > 0.05$). Values are means (SD), except for sex and race, which are *n* (%). BMI, body mass index; DBP, diastolic blood pressure; HbA1c, hemoglobin 1c; HDL, high-density lipoprotein; HOMA-IR, homeostatic model assessment of insulin resistance; LDL, low-density lipoprotein; MVPA, moderate-to-vigorous physical activity; SAT, subcutaneous adipose tissue; SBP, systolic blood pressure; TAT, total adipose tissue; VAT, visceral adipose tissue.

3000 steps/day (Fig. 2B). Similarly, ActiGraph data showed participants in the intervention group did not increase steps/day (-83 steps/day; 95% CI = $-946, 780$; $P = 0.85$), and no between-group differences were observed ($P = 0.51$; ES = 0.19; Table 2; Supplementary Fig. S1¹). The ActiGraph also revealed no differences in sedentary time, light physical activity, and MVPA between the control and intervention groups ($P \geq 0.27$; ES ≤ 0.31 ; Table 2; Supplementary Fig. S1¹).

Adipose tissue and anthropometry

Similar changes in SAT and TAT were seen between groups ($P \geq 0.58$; ES ≤ 0.15), yet there was a tendency for a within-group effect for VAT in the intervention group (-0.10 kg; 95% CI = -0.22 to 0.01 ; $P = 0.08$) and the between-group comparison showed VAT was reduced in the intervention group versus control (-0.15 kg; 95% CI = -0.29 to -0.01 ; $P = 0.04$; ES = 0.59; Table 3; Supplementary Fig. S2¹). Change in weight, BMI, and waist circumference from baseline to month 3 did not, however, differ between the intervention and control groups ($P \geq 0.30$; ES ≤ 0.29 ; Table 3; Supplementary Fig. S2¹).

Cardiometabolic disease risk factors

The intervention induced a 0.29-mmol/L (95% CI = -0.51 to -0.06) reduction in fasting blood glucose relative to control ($P = 0.01$; ES = 0.70), but changes in fasting insulin and HOMA-IR were comparable between groups ($P \geq 0.29$; ES ≤ 0.30 ; Table 3; Supplementary Fig. S3¹). Changes in HDL, LDL, total cholesterol, triglycerides, HbA1c, systolic blood pressure, and diastolic blood pressure were likewise not different between the control and intervention groups ($P \geq 0.11$; ES ≤ 0.45 ; Table 3; Supplementary Fig. S3¹).

Food intake


The changes in total energy, carbohydrate, fat, and protein intake during the trial were similar between the intervention and control groups ($P \geq 0.11$; ES ≤ 0.47 ; Table 4; Supplementary Fig. S4¹).

Discussion

Our results show that sedentary office workers who received a 3-month multicomponent intervention, which aimed to increase energy expenditure via a workstation pedal desk and daily walking

¹Supplementary data are available with the article at <https://doi.org/10.1139/apnm-2020-0175>.

Fig. 2. Average time of pedal desk use (A) and steps/day measured with the Fitbit (B) in the intervention group during the WorkACTIVE-P trial. Closed circles represent the mean; open circles represent the median; error bars represent the standard deviation; dashed lines represent the maximum and minimum; and the triangle represents the mean value at baseline derived from the ActiGraph.



regimen, reduced VAT by 0.15 kg compared with a control group (0.10 kg within the intervention group alone). Though anthropometry, cardiometabolic disease risk markers, and food (specifically, energy and macronutrient) intake were unaffected, the intervention group also displayed a moderate 0.29-mmol/L decrease in fasting blood glucose relative to the control group.

Previous studies assessing the impact of workplace activity interventions on abdominal obesity have produced mixed results (John et al. 2011; Koepp et al. 2013; Bergman et al. 2018), possibly because of differences in research design and the sensitivity of outcome measures. Using a gold-standard VAT measurement tool, which allowed us to detect changes in adipose tissue distribution that are not revealed with traditional measures (Shuster et al. 2012), we showed that sedentary office workers receiving a pedal desk and walking intervention displayed a 0.10-kg reduction in VAT (0.15 kg (8%) decrease in VAT compared with a control group). Most studies have used waist circumference as a proxy of VAT (Healy et al. 2017; Bergman et al. 2018), though as we demonstrated, moderate reductions in VAT occurred in the intervention group compared with the control group without observable differences in waist circumference. It is possible that the MRI allowed us to detect changes in adipose tissue distribution that were not revealed with traditional anthropometric measures (Shuster et al. 2012). The change in VAT could translate to health benefits, since increased VAT — through decreased adiponectin, greater inflammatory cytokine release, and a greater enrichment

of regulatory proteins involved in the lipid cascade and increased lipolysis (Laurencikiene et al. 2011) — leads to greater activation of pro-inflammatory pathways, which are associated with cardiometabolic disease (Blucher 2016). Although we cannot fully infer the mechanisms mediating the VAT changes in our study, the multicomponent regimen may have led to greater oxidation of VAT in the intervention group compared with the control group.

We also observed a 0.36-mmol/L reduction in fasting blood glucose in the intervention group (0.29-mmol/L reduction relative to the control group). Healy et al. (2017) found a 12-month standing intervention in desk-based workers reduced fasting blood glucose by 0.34 mmol/L compared with a control group, although our results suggest that a combined pedal desk and daily walking intervention can induce similar improvements in metabolic function over a shorter period. It is possible the decrease in VAT in the intervention group relative to the control group suppressed adipocyte inflammation, stimulating the increase in adipocyte glucose uptake and the reduction in glucose concentrations in the plasma (Karpe and Pinnick 2015; Blucher 2016). Such deductions are nonetheless speculative, and further mechanistic studies, including those with measures of inflammation, are needed to understand the interconnections between reduced sedentary time, increased physical activity, VAT, and blood glucose.

Our multicomponent intervention did not improve body weight or other cardiometabolic disease risk markers, including HOMA-IR and HbA1C, in spite of the improvements in VAT and blood glucose. Although some researchers have shown workplace activity programs can improve these outcomes (John et al. 2011), our findings are in line with RCTs showing no changes in body weight, insulin, HbA1c, cholesterol, triglycerides, and blood pressure in response to regimens aimed to decrease sedentary time (Healy et al. 2017; Bergman et al. 2018). Our findings are particularly consistent with Healy et al. (2017) who, despite finding improvements in blood glucose, found their workplace activity program did not induce improvements in fasting insulin or HOMA measures. Further studies incorporating larger sample sizes are likely required to detect small improvements in body weight and cardiometabolic disease risk factors seen with these interventions (Healy et al. 2017). Simultaneous dietary strategies alongside our multicomponent intervention may also be necessary to induce larger energy deficits and greater improvements in weight and cardiometabolic disease risk markers.

Increased energy expenditure can lead to an elevation in food intake (Dorling et al. 2018), but changes during and after workplace interventions are not well characterized. Bergman et al. (2018) reported that participants provided with a workplace treadmill desk for 13 months appeared to decrease their energy intake, whereas another study documented no change in energy intake after a 9-month treadmill intervention (John et al. 2011). Similar to John and colleagues, we found that energy and macronutrient intake were unchanged when comparing the intervention and control groups over the trial, though daily energy intake in our trial seemed low and this qualifies our conclusions. Our findings are at odds with studies suggesting that compensatory rises in food intake occur in response to exercise training (Turner et al. 2010; Martin et al. 2019). The reasons for these between-study differences are not known, though it is possible that our low-intensity regimen was not sufficient in triggering participants to perceive food as a reward for their raised activity (Dalton et al. 2013), meaning they were less likely to increase food consumption. Likewise, it is possible our measure of energy intake was not sufficiently sensitive in this relatively small study.

To our surprise, although we implemented similar strategies that have successfully elevated steps/day in a previous study (Tudor-Locke et al. 2004), our intervention did not elevate step count by our target, and no changes in sedentary time, steps/day, or time-based measures of physical activity intensity were apparent. Work-related conflicts and the pressure to produce

Table 2. Changes in ActiGraph physical activity and sedentary time in the WorkACTIVE-P trial.

	LS mean (95% CI)		Difference		
	Control, n = 20	Intervention, n = 20	LS mean (95% CI)	P	ES
Sedentary time, min/d	36 (2 to 70)*	48 (12 to 85)*	12 (-31 to 56)	0.57	0.16
Light, min/d	-35 (-67 to -2)*	-50 (-85 to -16)*	-15 (-57 to 26)	0.46	0.21
MVPA, min/d	-1 (-5 to 3)	2 (-3 to 7)	3 (-3 to 9)	0.27	0.31
Steps/d	-422 (-1236 to 391)	-83 (-946 to 780)	339 (-702 to 1380)	0.51	0.19

Note: CI, confidence interval; ES, effect size; LS, least square; MVPA, moderate-to-vigorous physical activity.

*Significant within-group difference pre- versus post-intervention ($P < 0.05$).

Table 3. Changes in adipose tissue, anthropometry, and cardiometabolic disease risk factors in the WorkACTIVE-P trial.

	LS mean (95% CI)		Difference		
	Control, n = 20	Intervention, n = 20	LS mean (95% CI)	P	ES
Adipose tissue and anthropometry					
VAT, kg	0.04 (-0.07 to 0.15)	-0.10 (-0.22 to 0.01)	-0.15 (-0.29 to -0.01) [†]	0.04	0.59
SAT, kg	-0.11 (-0.39 to 0.18)	-0.08 (-0.38 to 0.22)	0.02 (-0.34 to 0.38)	0.89	0.04
TAT, kg	-0.06 (-0.41 to 0.29)	-0.18 (-0.56 to 0.19)	-0.12 (-0.56 to 0.32)	0.58	0.15
Weight, kg	-0.3 (-1.3 to 0.6)	-0.9 (-1.8 to 0.1)	-0.5 (-1.7 to 0.7)	0.37	0.25
BMI, kg/m ²	-0.1 (-0.4 to 0.3)	-0.3 (-0.6 to 0.1)	-0.2 (-0.6 to 0.2)	0.30	0.29
Waist circumference, cm	0.4 (-1.7 to 2.5)	0.3 (-1.9 to 2.6)	-0.0 (-2.7 to 2.7)	0.98	0.01
Cardiometabolic disease risk factors					
Glucose, mmol/L	-0.08 (-0.26 to 0.10)	-0.36 (-0.55 to -0.17)*	-0.29 (-0.51 to -0.06) [†]	0.01	0.70
Insulin, μ U/mL	-1.1 (-7.8 to 5.6)	-4.6 (-11.7 to 2.5)	-3.5 (-12.0 to 5.0)	0.41	0.23
HOMA-IR	-0.3 (-1.8 to 1.3)	-1.3 (-3.0 to 0.3)	-1.1 (-3.1 to 0.9)	0.29	0.30
HDL, mmol/L	0.01 (-0.09 to 0.10)	-0.03 (-0.12 to 0.07)	-0.03 (-0.15 to 0.08)	0.58	0.15
LDL, mmol/L	-0.14 (-0.36 to 0.08)	0.09 (-0.14 to 0.33)	0.23 (-0.05 to 0.51)	0.11	0.45
Total cholesterol, mmol/L	-0.20 (-0.49 to 0.09)	-0.04 (-0.35 to 0.28)	0.16 (-0.21 to 0.53)	0.38	0.24
Triglycerides, mmol/L	-0.15 (-0.49 to 0.19)	-0.22 (-0.58 to 0.14)	-0.07 (-0.50 to 0.36)	0.73	0.10
HbA1c, %	0.00 (-0.07 to 0.08)	-0.04 (-0.12 to 0.04)	-0.04 (-0.14 to 0.06)	0.38	0.25
SBP, mm Hg	0.8 (-3.7 to 5.3)	-0.8 (-5.6 to 4.0)	-1.7 (-7.4 to 4.1)	0.56	0.16
DBP, mm Hg	-0.7 (-3.9 to 2.4)	-2.3 (-5.7 to 1.0)	-1.6 (-5.6 to 2.4)	0.43	0.22

Note: BMI, body mass index; CI, confidence interval; DBP, diastolic blood pressure; ES, effect size; HbA1c, hemoglobin 1c; HDL, high-density lipoprotein; HOMA-IR, homeostatic model assessment of insulin resistance; LDL, low-density lipoprotein; LS, least square; SAT, subcutaneous adipose tissue; SBP, systolic blood pressure; TAT, total adipose tissue; VAT, visceral adipose tissue.

*Significant within-group difference pre- versus post-intervention ($P < 0.05$).

[†]Significant difference between the control group and the intervention group ($P < 0.05$).

Table 4. Changes in food intake in the WorkACTIVE-P trial.

	LS mean (95% CI)		Difference		
	Control, n = 20	Intervention, n = 20	LS mean (95% CI)	P	ES
Energy intake, kcal	-64 (-227 to 100)	-161 (-339 to 17)	-97 (-306 to 112)	0.35	0.27
Carbohydrate, g	-11 (-33 to 11)	-6 (-30 to 17)	5 (-23 to 33)	0.73	0.10
Fat, g	-1 (-10 to 8)	-9 (-19 to 1)	-8 (-20 to 3)	0.15	0.43
Protein, g	-4 (-13 to 4)	-13 (-22 to -4)*	-9 (-20 to 2)	0.11	0.47

Note: CI, confidence interval; ES, effect size; LS, least square.

*Significant within-group difference pre- versus post-intervention ($P < 0.05$).

outputs in the workplace may have been too great for (some of) our participants to find time to augment their daily walking (Tudor-Locke et al. 2014a). Moreover, participants may have preferred the pedal desk to daily walking in this multicomponent intervention, as demonstrated by the relatively high engagement in that former aspect (127 min/day, on average). Activity on the pedal desk was unlikely to be tracked by the accelerometer or Fitbit and was thus possibly misclassified as sedentary time (Nelson et al. 2016), despite the time-based data from the pedal desk showing work-related activity was enhanced. Taken together, these findings could suggest that the pedal desk was the pivotal driver of VAT reductions (Proença et al. 2018). This could have implications for adults in office settings because these individuals spend most working days confined to accrued bouts of sedentary behavior (Neuhaus et al. 2014). However, the intervention

had 2 components (pedal desk and walking) and further work is needed to test the relative impact of different office-based activities — pedal desks, walking regimens, and treadmill desks — on reducing sedentary time and improving cardiometabolic risk markers. Such studies would ascertain the best office-based practices for metabolic health (Thompson and Levine 2011).

Limitations of our study include the relatively short duration, small sample size, and the potential individual level randomization, which may have led to treatment contamination between groups. Substantially larger controlled studies with durations beyond 3 months and cluster randomization are consequently needed. We also did not control for seasonal variations in weather, which could have affected step count outside of the office (Tucker and Gilliland 2007). Furthermore, our in-house pedal desk software was ultimately unable to consistently record

reliable revolutions per minute data, making it difficult for participants and researchers to precisely characterize pedal desk use other than by duration of use. Though problems like this are liable to occur in settings akin to those in our trial, and our experiences are likely to inform longer-term studies in real-world environments where confounding factors are manifold (Tudor-Locke et al. 2014a), refinements in technical software are needed.

Conclusions

In summary, we showed that sedentary office workers who received a 3-month combined pedal desk and walking intervention reduced VAT and blood glucose compared with a control group. Longer-term, well-powered studies in the workplace are now needed to ascertain the effectiveness of this multicomponent intervention and workstation alternatives in reducing sedentary behavior and ameliorating cardiometabolic issues.

Conflict of interest statement

Dr. Tudor-Locke and her husband, Gerald Locke, co-invented and own intellectual property for the Pennington Pedal Desk, which was built with support from the Pennington Medical Foundation. Dr. Corby Martin served as the Principal Investigator and Dr. Tudor-Locke had no contact with study participants or study data. The intellectual property surrounding the Remote Food Photography Method and SmartIntake application are owned by Louisiana State University/Pennington Biomedical Research Center and Dr. Martin is an inventor. All other authors declare no conflicts of interest, and the study sponsor and funders had no role in the study design, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation, writing the report, and the decision to submit the report for publication. No other financial disclosures were reported by the authors of this paper.

Acknowledgements

Chelsea Hendrick and Tanya Shaw assisted the intervention. This work was funded by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the National Institutes for Occupational Safety and Health (grants no. R21 OH010785), the Louisiana Clinical & Translational Science Center (grant no. U54 GM104940), and the Nutrition Obesity Research Center (grant no. P30 DK072476). The work was also supported by American Heart Association (grant no. 20POST35210907) (James L. Dorling). Christoph Höchsmann is supported by a National Institutes of Health/National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases (NIH/NIDDK) National Research Service Award (T32 DK064584).

References

Ahuja, J.K.C., Montville, J.B., Omolewa-Tomobi, G., Heendeniya, K.Y., Martin, C.L., Steinfeldt, L.C., et al. 2012. The USDA food and nutrient database for dietary studies, 5.0. Available from https://www.ars.usda.gov/ARSUserFiles/80400530/pdf/fndds/fndds5_doc.pdf [accessed 20 August 2012].

Bandura, A. 1986. Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory. In PrenticeHall Series in Social Learning Theory. Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., USA.

Bergman, F., Wahlström, V., Stomby, A., Otten, J., Lanthén, E., Renklint, R., et al. 2018. Treadmill workstations in office workers who are overweight or obese: a randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Public Health*. 3(11): E523–535. doi:10.1016/S2468-2667(18)30163-4. PMID:30322782.

Biswas, A., Oh, P.I., Faulkner, G.E., Bajaj, R.R., Silver, M.A., Mitchell, M.S., and Alter, D.A. 2015. Sedentary time and its association with risk for disease incidence, mortality, and hospitalization in adults: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Ann. Intern. Med.* 162(2): 123–132. doi:10.7326/M14-1651. PMID:25599350.

Blucher, M. 2016. Adipose tissue inflammation: a cause or consequence of obesity-related insulin resistance? *Clin. Sci.* 130: 1603–1614. doi:10.1042/CS20160005. PMID:27503945.

Chan, C.B., Ryan, D.A.J., and Tudor-Locke, C. 2004. Health benefits of a pedometer-based physical activity intervention in sedentary workers. *Prev. Med.* 39(6): 1215–1222. doi:10.1016/j.ypmed.2004.04.053. PMID:15539058.

Cohen, J. 1988. Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences. In *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Hillsdale, N.J., USA.

Dalton, M., Finlayson, G., Esdaile, E., and King, N. 2013. Appetite, satiety, and food reward in obese individuals: a behavioral phenotype Approach. *Curr. Nutr. Rep.* 2(4): 207–215. doi:10.1007/s13668-013-0060-4.

De Souza, R.J., Bray, G.A., Carey, V.J., Hall, K.D., LeBoff, M.S., Loria, C.M., et al. 2012. Effects of 4 weight-loss diets differing in fat, protein, and carbohydrate on fat mass, lean mass, visceral adipose tissue, and hepatic fat: results from the POUNDS LOST trial. *Am. J. Clin. Nutr.* 95(3): 614–625. doi:10.3945/ajcn.111.026328. PMID:22258266.

Diaz, K.M., Howard, V.J., Hutto, B., Colabianchi, N., Vena, J.E., Safford, M.M., et al. 2017. Patterns of sedentary behavior and mortality in U.S. middle-aged and older adults a national cohort study. *Ann. Intern. Med.* 167(7): 465–475. doi:10.7326/M17-0212. PMID:28892811.

Dorling, J., Broom, D.R., Burns, S.F., Clayton, D.J., Deighton, K., James, L.J., et al. 2018. Acute and chronic effects of exercise on appetite, energy intake, and appetite-related hormones: The modulating effect of adiposity, sex, and habitual physical activity. *Nutrients*, 10(9): 1140. doi:10.3390/nu10091140. PMID:30131457.

Freedson, P.S., Melanson, E., and Sirard, J. 1998. Calibration of the Computer Science and Applications, Inc. accelerometer. *Med. Sci. Sports Exerc.* 30(5): 777–781. doi:10.1097/00005768-199805000-00021. PMID:9588623.

Friedewald, W.T., Levy, R.I., and Fredrickson, D.S. 1972. Estimation of the concentration of low-density lipoprotein cholesterol in plasma, without use of the preparative ultracentrifuge. *Clin. Chem.* 18(6): 499–502. doi:10.1093/clinchem/18.6.499. PMID:4337382.

Han, H., Lim, J., Viskochil, R., Aguiar, E.J., Tudor-Locke, C., and Chipkin, S.R. 2018. Pilot study of impact of a pedal desk on postprandial responses in sedentary workers. *Med. Sci. Sports Exerc.* 50(10): 2156–2163. doi:10.1249/MSS.0000000000001679. PMID:29864080.

Healy, G.N., Winkler, E.A.H., Eakin, E.G., Owen, N., Lamontagne, A.D., Moodie, M., and Dunstan, D.W. 2017. A cluster RCT to reduce workers' sitting time: Impact on cardiometabolic biomarkers. *Med. Sci. Sports Exerc.* 49(10): 2032–2039. doi:10.1249/MSS.0000000000001328. PMID:28538025.

John, D., Thompson, D.L., Raynor, H., Bielak, K., Rider, B., and Bassett, D.R. 2011. Treadmill workstations: A worksite physical activity intervention in overweight and obese office workers. *J. Phy. Act. Health.* 8(8): 1034–1043. doi:10.1123/jpah.8.8.1034. PMID:22039122.

Karpe, F., and Pinnick, K.E. 2015. Biology of upper-body and lower-body adipose tissue - Link to whole-body phenotypes. *Nat. Rev. Endocrinol.* 11(2): 90–100. doi:10.1038/nrendo.2014.185. PMID:25365922.

Koeppe, G.A., Manohar, C.U., McCrady-Spitzer, S.K., Ben-Ner, A., Hamann, D.J., Runge, C.F., and Levine, J.A. 2013. Treadmill desks: a 1-year prospective trial. *Obesity*, 21(4): 705–711. doi:10.1002/oby.20121. PMID:23417995.

Laurencikiene, J., Skurk, T., Kulyté, A., Hedén, P., Åström, G., Sjölin, E., et al. 2011. Regulation of lipolysis in small and large fat cells of the same subject. *J. Clin. Endocrinol. Metabol.* 96(12): E2045–E2049. doi:10.1210/jc.2011-1702. PMID:21994963.

Martin, C.K., Han, H., Coulon, S.M., Allen, H.R., Champagne, C.M., and Anton, S.D. 2009. A novel method to remotely measure food intake of free-living individuals in real time: The remote food photography method. *Br. J. Nutr.* 101(3): 446–456. doi:10.1017/S0007114508027438. PMID:18616837.

Martin, C.K., Johnson, W.D., Myers, C.A., Apolzan, J.W., Earnest, C.P., Thomas, D.M., et al. 2019. Effect of different doses of supervised exercise on food intake, metabolism, and non-exercise physical activity: The E-MECHANIC randomized controlled trial. *Am. J. Clin. Nutr.* 110(3): 583–592. doi:10.1093/ajcn/nqz054. PMID:31172175.

Matthews, C.E., Chen, K.Y., Freedson, P.S., Buchowski, M.S., Beech, B.M., Pate, R.R., and Troiano, R.P. 2008. Amount of time spent in sedentary behaviors in the United States, 2003–2004. *Am. J. Epidemiol.* 167(7): 875–881. doi:10.1093/aje/kwm390. PMID:18303006.

Matthews, D.R., Hosker, J.P., Rudenski, A.S., Naylor, B.A., Treacher, D.F., and Turner, R.C. 1985. Homeostasis model assessment: insulin resistance and β -cell function from fasting plasma glucose and insulin concentrations in man. *Diabetologia*, 28(7): 412–419. doi:10.1007/BF00280883. PMID:3899825.

Miller, R., and Brown, W. 2004. Steps and sitting in a working population. *Int. J. Behav. Med.* 11(4): 219–224. doi:10.1207/s15327581jbm1104_5. PMID:15657022.

Nelson, M.B., Kaminsky, L.A., Dickin, D.C., and Montoye, A.H.K. 2016. Validity of consumer-based physical activity monitors for specific activity types. *Med. Sci. Sports and Exerc.* 48(8): 1619–1628. doi:10.1249/MSS.0000000000000933. PMID:27015387.

Neuhaus, M., Healy, G.N., Dunstan, D.W., Owen, N., and Eakin, E.G. 2014. Workplace sitting and height-adjustable workstations: A randomized controlled trial. *Am. J. Preventive Med.* 46(1): 30–40. doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2013.09.009. PMID:24355669.

Proença, M., Schuna, J.M., Barreira, T.V., Hsia, D.S., Pitta, F., Tudor-Locke, C., et al. 2018. Worker acceptability of the Pennington Pedal Desk™ occupational workstation alternative. *Work*, 60(3): 499–506. doi:10.3233/WOR-182753. PMID:30040784.

Schuna, J.M., Tudor-Locke, C., Proença, M., Barreira, T.V., Hsia, D.S., Pitta, F., et al. 2016. Validation of an integrated pedal desk and electronic behavior tracking platform. *BMC Res. Notes.* 9(1): 74. doi:10.1186/s13104-016-1882-0. PMID:26857115.

- Shuster, A., Patlas, M., Pinthus, J.H., and Mourtzakis, M. 2012. The clinical importance of visceral adiposity: A critical review of methods for visceral adipose tissue analysis. *British Journal of Radiology*. **85**(1009): 1–10. doi:10.1259/bjr/38447238. PMID:21937614.
- Slentz, C.A., Aiken, L.B., Houmard, J.A., Bales, C.W., Johnson, J.L., Tanner, C.J., et al. 2005. Inactivity, exercise, and visceral fat. STRRIDE: a randomized, controlled study of exercise intensity and amount. *J. Appl. Physiol.* **99**(4): 1613–1618. doi:10.1152/jappphysiol.00124.2005. PMID:16002776.
- Thompson, W.G., and Levine, J.A. 2011. Productivity of transcriptionists using a treadmill desk. *Work*. **40**(4): 473–477. doi:10.3233/WOR-2011-1258. PMID:22130064.
- Tucker, P., and Gilliland, J. 2007. The effect of season and weather on physical activity: A systematic review. *Public Health*. **121**(12): 909–922. doi:10.1016/j.puhe.2007.04.009. PMID:17920646.
- Tudor-Locke, C., Bell, R.C., Myers, A.M., Harris, S.B., Ecclestone, N.A., Lauzon, N., and Rodger, N.W. 2004. Controlled outcome evaluation of the First Step Program: a daily physical activity intervention for individuals with type II diabetes. *Int. J. Obes. Relat. Metab. Disord.* **28**(1): 113–119. doi:10.1038/sj.ijo.0802485. PMID:14569279.
- Tudor-Locke, C., Hendrick, C.A., Duet, M.T., Swift, D.L., Schuna, J.M., Martin, C.K., et al. 2014a. Implementation and adherence issues in a workplace treadmill desk intervention. *Appl. Physiol. Nutr. Metab.* **39**(10): 1104–1111. doi:10.1139/apnm-2013-0435. PMID:24993352.
- Tudor-Locke, C., Schuna, J.M., Frensham, L.J., and Proenca, M. 2014b. Changing the way we work: Elevating energy expenditure with workstation alternatives. *Int. J. Obes.* **38**(6): 755–765. doi:10.1038/ijo.2013.223. PMID:24285335.
- Turner, J.E., Markovitch, D., Betts, J.A., and Thompson, D. 2010. Nonprescribed physical activity energy expenditure is maintained with structured exercise and implicates a compensatory increase in energy intake. *Am. J. Clin. Nutr.* **92**(5): 1009–1016. doi:10.3945/ajcn.2010.29471.
- Wilmot, E.G., Edwardson, C.L., Achana, F.A., Davies, M.J., Gorely, T., Gray, L.J., et al. 2012. Sedentary time in adults and the association with diabetes, cardiovascular disease and death: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *Diabetologia*, **55**(11): 2895–2905. doi:10.1007/s00125-012-2677-z.