

TITLE PAGE**Authors Names:**

James P Sanders PhD^{1,2}, Stuart JH Biddle PhD⁵, Kajal Gokal PhD^{1,2}, Lauren B Sherar PhD^{1,2}, Magdalena Skrybant PhD^{3,4}, Helen M Parretti PhD⁶, Natalie Ives PhD⁷, Thomas Yates PhD^{8,9}, Nanette Mutrie PhD¹⁰ & Amanda J Daley PhD^{1,2} on behalf of the Snacktivity Study Team*

Title

‘Snacktivity™’ to increase physical activity: Time to try something different?

Affiliations

¹ National Centre for Sport and Exercise Medicine, School of Sport, Exercise and Health Sciences, Loughborough University, Loughborough, Leicestershire, UK

² Centre for Lifestyle Medicine and Behaviour, School of Sport, Exercise and Health Sciences, Loughborough University, Loughborough, Leicestershire, UK

³ Institute of Applied Health Research, University of Birmingham, Edgbaston, Birmingham, UK

⁴ NIHR Applied Research Collaboration (ARC) West Midlands, University of Warwick, Coventry, UK

⁵ Physically Active Lifestyles Research Group (USQ-PALs), Centre for Health Research, University of Southern Queensland, Springfield, QLD 4300, Australia

⁶ Norwich Medical School, University of East Anglia, Norwich, UK

⁷ Birmingham Clinical Trials Unit, Institute of Applied Health Research, University of Birmingham, Edgbaston, Birmingham, UK

⁸ Diabetes Research Centre, University of Leicester, Leicester, UK

⁹ NIHR Leicester Biomedical Research Centre, Leicester, UK

¹⁰ Physical Activity for Health Research Centre, Institute for Sport, Physical Education and Health Sciences, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK

Corresponding Author

Professor Amanda Daley

The Centre for Lifestyle Medicine and Behaviour (CLiMB)

National Centre for Sport and Exercise Medicine

School of Sport, Exercise and Health Sciences,

Loughborough University

Loughborough

Leicestershire, LE11 3TU, UK

a.daley@lboro.ac.uk

Conflicts of interest/Competing interests (include appropriate disclosures)

AD is supported by a National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Research Professorship award. The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NHS, the NIHR or the Department of Health and Social Care.

Financial Disclosures

No financial disclosures were reported by the authors of this paper

Word Count: 1999. Number of pages: 16, Tables: 0, Figures: 1

1 **Introduction**

2 Despite unequivocal evidence that physical activity (PA) reduces the risk of morbidity and
3 mortality, a large proportion of the adult population do not meet the internationally accepted
4 PA guidelines to perform at least 150 minutes of moderate-intensity PA (or 75 minutes of
5 vigorous-intensity per week, or a combination of both)¹. This guidance has historically been
6 promoted as 30 minutes of moderate-to-vigorous intensity physical activity (MVPA) on at
7 least five days/week. Alongside this, World Health Organisation (WHO) now advocates that
8 150-300 minutes of moderate-intensity, or 75-150 minutes of vigorous-intensity PA per week
9 is required for optimal health. Furthermore, adults are also advised to undertake PA that
10 improves muscle strength on at least two days per week. However, despite PA guidance
11 having existed for many years, this has not led to an increase in population levels of PA.
12 Based on accelerometer-measured PA, only 6% of men and 4% of women in England
13 achieve 150 minutes per week², with similar results reported worldwide³. With the removal
14 from the PA guidelines of the necessity to accumulate PA in bouts lasting 10 mins or more, a
15 larger proportion (45-55%) of the population are now meeting PA guidelines;⁴ however, this
16 still means that approximately half of the population remains physically inactive. Of
17 particular concern are data suggesting only 1% of adults participate in strength-based PA
18 each week⁵. This suggests a need to consider more innovative, persuasive, and translational
19 guidance messaging to encourage the population to regularly engage in PA and spend less
20 time sedentary. Guidelines themselves do not change behaviour and improve health, it is
21 having the means and motivation to achieve them that matters.

22

23 One of the most critical obstacles to meeting current guidance for PA is it requires inactive
24 populations to make significant lifestyle changes to achieve at least 150 minutes of MVPA
25 each week. Previous PA interventions have only had modest effects, at best, on initiation of

26 PA behaviour, and we know very little about successful behavioural maintenance⁶. There is
27 also growing concern about the amount of time the public spend in sedentary behaviours
28 (SB), with adults spending approximately 60-70% of waking hours sedentary⁷. For inactive
29 adults, particularly those with low participation in MVPA, high levels of sedentary time have
30 been associated with Type 2 diabetes, cardiovascular disease, and all-cause mortality⁸.
31 Collectively, these data are of real concern and there is no reason to assume that this situation
32 will improve unless effective strategies are put in place to address the problem; this includes
33 the guidance and supporting implementation strategies given to the public to support
34 behaviour change.

35
36 It is clear that guidance setting large behavioural goals for PA has not been successful in
37 supporting those who are inactive, to become sufficiently physically active, and current
38 approaches to PA guidelines may therefore not be optimal. The approaches that have been
39 tried to date appear have been ineffective for people who are inactive and a shift in emphasis
40 in facilitating PA behaviour to prevent disease is now required. It is time to try something
41 different.

42 43 **Every minute counts: Snacktivity™ to promote physical activity**

44 Updated guidelines on the volume and intensity of PA from health agencies in 2019 and the
45 WHO in 2020, has removed the need to complete PA in bouts of 10 mins or more^{1,9,10}.
46 Although revised guidance now recognises the importance of making small changes to PA
47 behaviour and that any PA is better than none^{1,9,10}, guidance still focuses on the public
48 needing to achieve a considerable behavioural goal of at least 150 mins of MVPA per week,
49 which can be a daunting task for the most inactive populations^{1,10}. Additional or

50 complementary strategies are likely to be needed to assist the public in overcoming their
51 often, hypokinetic environment and become more physically active.

52

53 A complimentary ‘whole day’ approach to PA promotion that seeks to engage, support and
54 motivate individuals to be more physically active throughout the day, is a concept we refer to
55 as ‘Snacktivity™. Rather than broadly encouraging at least 150 minutes/week of MVPA,
56 Snacktivity™ focuses on promoting small (e.g., 2-5 minutes), but frequent, bouts of MVPA
57 throughout each day, to accumulate at least 150 minutes of MVPA per week. For example six
58 ‘activity snacks’ lasting five minutes each day would be required to meet the current PA
59 recommendations. Examples of Snacktivity™ include walk-talk conversations, using stairs
60 rather than the lift/elevator, pacing whilst using the telephone, squats while waiting for the
61 kettle to boil, and leg raises whilst watching television (see Figure 1 for examples of
62 Snacktivity™ in different contexts and settings).

63

64 **What is the evidence that Snacktivity™ might improve population health?**

65 Evidence demonstrates an inverse dose-response relationship exists between PA and all-cause
66 mortality. This means that for people who are inactive, any increase in PA is important for
67 health¹¹. The relationship is also characterised by a steep early slope meaning the greatest
68 gains in health are experienced inactive people doing a little more activity per week (e.g. 2-3
69 MET/hrs per/week), rather than by encouraging those who are already physically active to do
70 marginally more¹². Improved cardio-metabolic health and aerobic fitness have been reported
71 following brief bouts of PA¹³, such as stair climbing, which is a good example of
72 Snacktivity™. Most studies reported no difference in improvement in cardiovascular fitness
73 between accumulated and continuous bouts of exercise of the same total duration¹⁴. This
74 suggests that achieving short(er) bouts of Snacktivity™ throughout the day may achieve

75 similar health benefits to long(er) bouts. Moreover, whilst the idea that small bouts of
76 physical activity may improved health outcomes is not new, as is shown in laboratory and
77 experimental studies ^{14,15} it is not a message that has been prominent in public guidance, in
78 part, due to a lack of high quality, “real world” evidence to support the approach.

79

80 **How might Snacktivity™ work to improve population health?**

81 The most commonly reported barrier to PA is a perceived lack of time, even though, on
82 average, the population has more leisure time than in previous decades. For adults who are
83 inactive, long(er) bouts of MVPA may seem too daunting and difficult to achieve and it may
84 be that many people believe that achieving 150 mins of MVPA/week requires too much
85 cognitive effort, planning and physical exertion to be worthwhile. In contrast, Snacktivity™
86 may be perceived as more achievable because each ‘snack’ only requires a small-time
87 commitment, and it involves less planning and effort (physical and cognitive). Snacktivity™
88 does not require skills, equipment, or a change of clothing, thereby addressing both
89 convenience and health inequalities¹⁶. Snacktivity™ requires little or no preparation, can be
90 performed in several settings (home, work, indoors and outdoors), can be adapted for the
91 environment, as well as for physical, social and cultural contexts, and easily incorporated into
92 a day, allowing for greater population reach.

93

94 Simple actions may become more habitual than complex ones. This suggests that the
95 integration of Snacktivity™ into usual routines may be a more feasible and appealing
96 approach to sustaining PA behaviour than trying to achieve larger changes¹⁷. Moreover,
97 small changes are easier to initiate, and maintain, than large changes. Snacktivity™ is
98 consistent with the small change approach that argues behaviour change is best achieved
99 through celebrating small successes to make behaviours become habitual¹⁸.

100

101 How people feel about PA is an important predictor of whether they continue to engage and
102 adhere to the behaviour. Snacktivity™ may help to develop confidence among those who are
103 most physically inactive by encouraging them to ‘start small’ and try to be more physically
104 active regularly. Psychological theory acknowledges that achieving small changes is
105 important for individuals’ task and self-regulatory self-efficacy and habit formation¹⁹. If
106 individuals complete activity snacks, this should increase their self-efficacy for engagement,
107 making them more likely to continue. Snacktivity™ might then be the gateway for more
108 sustained participation in physical activity. Snacktivity™ may be particularly appropriate for
109 specific populations, such as the elderly, pregnant women, and people with chronic diseases
110 and disabilities, who may find it difficult or be reluctant to engage in PA because of lack of
111 confidence, fear of injury, or exacerbating health conditions (see Figure 1).

112

113 An important component of the PA guidance is that adults should undertake muscle-
114 strengthening activity on at least two days per week. It is particularly important that people
115 perform strength-based activities, especially older adults, given that strength is directly
116 related to the risk of falls, fractures and osteoporosis¹⁰. Snacktivity™ provides an opportunity
117 to promote this message since many muscle-strengthening activities lend themselves to
118 activity snacks as they are traditionally shorter and stationery (so do not need space) and do
119 not necessarily need special equipment or clothing. Examples of Snacktivity for muscle
120 strength include press-ups against furniture and squats whilst brushing your teeth (Figure 1)..

121

122 Whilst Snacktivity™ is primarily focused on promoting MVPA, we should not be
123 prescriptive over which activity snacks we wish the public to do, given all PA is important
124 for health^{1,10}. A further benefit of Snacktivity™ is that it encourages PA while

125 simultaneously breaking up time spent sedentary throughout the whole day. Snacktivity™
126 may therefore provide two health outcomes in a ‘buy one, get one free’ scenario, increasing
127 the probability of cost-effectiveness. Snacktivity™ may also increase time spent in light-
128 intensity PA because it may encourage a mindset of simply moving more and sitting less. To
129 support this hypothesis, experimental trials have shown that breaking up prolonged time
130 sedentary with periods of light activity provides favourable changes in individuals’ cardio-
131 metabolic risk profile²⁰. PA does not need to be ‘no pain, no gain’, or prolonged, for it to
132 benefit health and this is an important message to convey to the public through the
133 Snacktivity™ message.

134

135 **Issues to consider in promoting Snacktivity™**

136 While there may be advantages to Snacktivity™, there are also some potential constraints to
137 consider. Snacktivity™ may be disruptive to the day and easily forgotten. It might be
138 difficult for the public to achieve MVPA in ‘bite sizes’, or too difficult to think of ways in
139 which to implement Snacktivity™ into daily life whether at home or work. Indeed,
140 incorporating activity snacks into the home or work life, may require a change in social
141 norms (e.g. making it socially acceptable to leave one’s desk to perform an activity snack).

142

143 Simply giving people information does not lead to sustained health behaviour change.

144 Additional strategies to encourage the public to engage in Snacktivity™ will be required, and
145 a wide range of technologies available are now available facilitate this process (e.g.,
146 mHealth) Consideration needs to be given to whether an accumulated Snacktivity™
147 approach requires the public to consider PA too many times in a day/week, and whether this
148 then requires too much cognitive energy to continually enact and implement. Given this,
149 Snacktivity™ may not be flexible enough and/or convenient to the public. Whilst all PA is

150 important for health, greater intensity PA provides more benefit for the same amount of time,
151 particularly for non-communicable diseases¹. However, Snacktivity™ may encourage
152 participation in predominately light-intensity PA, without progressing towards sufficient PA
153 within the MVPA range leading to Snacktivity™ having a smaller impact on health.
154 Research needs to explore these issues and how potential barriers to Snacktivity™ might be
155 resolved. Whilst evidence suggests that short bouts might be useful in increasing population
156 levels of PA, no randomised controlled trials has directly tested if Snacktivity™ derives the
157 same health benefits as current guidelines for PA; we are currently gathering such evidence
158 (<https://fundingawards.nihr.ac.uk/award/RP-PG-0618-20008>).

159

160 **Conclusion – time to add to the menu**

161 Given the lack of success in encouraging people who are inactive to achieve large(r) bouts of
162 PA. Snacktivity™ may be a complementary public health message that offers a method of
163 implementing this guidance. It is not suggested that current PA guidance should be
164 abandoned, but current approaches may not be ideal. Snacktivity™ should be achievable by
165 most of the population and therefore addresses health inequalities making it accessible to all of
166 those who might benefit. Snacking is a common behaviour and for the first time, the public
167 could be encouraged to snack as much as they can every day, just not with unhealthy foods,
168 but with Snacktivity™.

169 **Author contributions**

170 AD developed the original Snacktivity idea and JS conceived the idea for this report. AD and

171 JS wrote the initial draft for this report and SJHB, LS, KJ, MS, HMP, NI, TY, NM and

172 Snacktivity Investigators contributed at a later stage.

173

174 *Snacktivity study team includes Stuart Biddle, Amanda J Daley, Dale Esliger, Charlotte

175 Edwardson, Emma Frew, Kajal Gokal, Colin Greaves Sheila M Greenfield Natalie Ives, Kate

176 Jolly, Ralph Maddison, Nanette Mutrie, Helen M Parretti, James Sanders, Lauren Sherar,

177 Magdalena Skrybant, and Tom Yates.

178

REFERENCES

1. UK Chief Medical Officer. UK Chief Medical Officers' Physical Activity Guidelines. Department of Health and Social Care.
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/physical-activity-guidelines-uk-chief-medical-officers-report>. Published 2019. Accessed December 4, 2020.
2. Chaudhury M, Esliger DW. *Accelerometry in Adults.*; 2009.
doi:10.1016/j.ridd.2011.01.017
3. Troiano R, Berrigan D, Dodd K, Masse L, Tilert T, McDowell M. Physical activity in the United States measured by accelerometer. *Med Sci Sport Exerc.* 2008;40(1):181-188.
4. Rowlands A V., Sherar LB, Fairclough SJ, et al. A data-driven, meaningful, easy to interpret, standardised accelerometer outcome variable for global surveillance. *J Sci Med Sport.* 2019;22(10):1132-1138. doi:10.1016/j.jsams.2019.06.016
5. NHS. Health Survey for England 2016 Physical activity in adults. NHS Digital.
<https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/publications/statistical/health-survey-for-england/health-survey-for-england-2016>. Published 2017. Accessed November 21, 2020.
6. King AC, Whitt-Glover MC, Marquez DX, et al. Physical Activity Promotion: Highlights from the 2018 Physical Activity Guidelines Advisory Committee Systematic Review. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 2019;51(6):1340-1353.
doi:10.1249/MSS.0000000000001945
7. Biswas A, Oh PI, Faulkner GE, et al. Sedentary time and its association with risk for disease incidence, mortality, and hospitalization in adults. *Ann Intern Med.* 2015;162(2):123. doi:10.7326/M14-1651
8. Ekelund U, Brown WJ, Steene-Johannessen J, et al. Do the associations of sedentary

- behaviour with cardiovascular disease mortality and cancer mortality differ by physical activity level? A systematic review and harmonised meta-analysis of data from 850 060 participants. *Br J Sports Med.* 2019;53(14):886-894. doi:10.1136/bjsports-2017-098963
9. Bull FC, Al-Ansari SS, Biddle S, et al. World Health Organization 2020 guidelines on physical activity and sedentary behaviour. *Br J Sports Med.* 2020;54(24):1451-1462.
 10. 2018 Physical Activity Guidelines Advisory Committee. *2018 Physical Activity Guidelines Advisory Committee Scientific Report.*; 2018. doi:10.1115/1.802878.ch1
 11. Arem H, Moore SC, Patel A, et al. Leisure time physical activity and mortality: a detailed pooled analysis of the dose-response relationship. *JAMA Intern Med.* 2015;175(6):959-967. doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2015.0533
 12. Ekelund U, Tarp J, Steene-Johannessen J, et al. Dose-response associations between accelerometry measured physical activity and sedentary time and all cause mortality: Systematic review and harmonised meta-analysis. *BMJ.* 2019;366. doi:10.1136/bmj.l4570
 13. Hupin D, Roche F, Gremeaux V, et al. Even a low-dose of moderate-to-vigorous physical activity reduces mortality by 22% in adults aged ≥ 60 years: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Br J Sports Med.* 2015;49(19):1262-1267. doi:10.1136/bjsports-2014-094306
 14. Murphy MH, Lahart I, Carlin A, Murtagh E. The effects of continuous compared to accumulated exercise on health: A meta-analytic review. *Sport Med.* 2019;49:1585-1607. doi:10.1007/s40279-019-01145-2
 15. Boreham CAG, Kennedy RA, Murphy MH, Tully M, Wallace WFM, Young I. Training effects of short bouts of stair climbing on cardiorespiratory fitness, blood lipids, and homocysteine in sedentary young women. *Br J Sports Med.*

- 2005;39(9):590-593. doi:10.1136/bjism.2002.001131
16. Reichert FF, Barros AJD, Domingues MR, Hallal PC. The role of perceived personal barriers to engagement in leisure-time physical activity. *Am J Public Health*. 2007;97(3):515-519. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2005.070144
 17. Hill JO. Can a small-changes approach help address the obesity epidemic? a report of the joint task force of the american society for nutrition, institute of food technologists, and international food information council. *Am J Clin Nutr*. 2009;89(2):477-484. doi:10.3945/ajcn.2008.26566
 18. Fogg B. *Tiny Habits: The Small Changes That Change Everything*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt; 2019.
 19. Gardner B, Rebar A., Lally P. Habit Interventions. In: *The Handbook of Behavior Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2020:599-616.
 20. Frith E, Loprinzi PD. Accelerometer-assessed light-intensity physical activity and mortality among those with mobility limitations. *Disabil Health J*. 2018;11(2):298-300. doi:10.1016/j.dhjo.2017.08.007



Figure 1 - Snacktivity ideas