International Journal of Nursing and Health Research
www.nursingjournal.in
Online ISSN: 2664-6420
Received: 09-08-2026, Accepted: 08-09-2026, Published: 23-09-2026
Volume 8, Issue 3, 2026, Page No. 110-119

Beyond "sitting is the new smoking": A critical review and integrative framework for exercise medicine in the sedentary workplace

Lung-Tan Lu
Department of Management, Fo Guang University, Taiwan
DOI: https://doi.org/10.66856/ijnhr.2026.8.3.8073

Abstract
Objective: Prolonged sitting in modern white-collar workplaces has come to be regarded as an independent health risk factor, yet prevailing accounts have tended to anthropomorphise sedentary behaviour as 'the new smoking' and to assert, one-sidedly, that post-work exercise can fully compensate for its harms. Adopting a critical-review stance, this paper re-examines the evidentiary basis, methodological limitations and scholarly controversies surrounding exercise medicine in the sedentary workplace, and proposes a pragmatic integrative prescription framework on that basis.
Methods: Thirty-eight sources, each verified through both Crossref and PubMed, were used as the sole evidentiary base. Evidence strength was graded according to study design (randomised controlled trials, cohort studies, meta-analyses, cross-sectional studies and narrative reviews), and key controversies—whether sedentary behaviour constitutes an independent risk factor, whether high-volume exercise can offset sedentary mortality risk, and the long-term efficacy of standing desks and sitting interruption—were evaluated through a dialogic appraisal of opposing positions.
Results: Epidemiological evidence (Biswas *et al*., 2015; Diaz *et al*., 2017) [4, 8] supports positive associations between prolonged uninterrupted sitting and all-cause mortality, cardiovascular mortality and type 2 diabetes; however, such evidence derives largely from self-report or early accelerometer cohort studies, and residual confounding, measurement bias and survivor bias cannot be excluded. Ekelund *et al*. (2016) [10], employing an individual-participant-data meta-analysis, found that approximately 60–75 minutes of moderate-intensity exercise per week may offset the excess mortality risk associated with sitting for more than eight hours daily—a conclusion that stands in methodological tension with the claim by Biswas *et al*. (2015) [4], based on study-level pooling, that sedentary behaviour is an independent risk factor. Neither position should be adopted as definitive. The exercise dose–response curve (Arem *et al*., 2015; Kraus *et al*., 2019) [1, 18] indicates that 150 minutes of moderate-intensity aerobic exercise per week yields the majority of available benefit; independent and additive effects of resistance training on metabolic syndrome are supported by NHANES data (Dankel, Loenneke, & Loprinzi, 2016) [7], although resistance training alone may not improve metabolic syndrome in older overweight populations without concomitant caloric restriction (Normandin *et al*., 2017) [21].
Conclusion: Workplace exercise medicine should abandon the binary framework of 'either sedentary or vigorously active' in favour of an integrative strategy comprising frequent daytime interruption, a multimodal post-work prescription and individualised risk assessment. Long-term randomised controlled trials, device-measured cohort studies and cost-effectiveness analyses are urgently required to address the current predominance of observational evidence. It is further argued that clinical and policy language should abandon reductive metaphors such as 'sitting is the new smoking' and instead adopt evidence grading, explicitly classifying recommendations as 'high quality', 'moderate quality' or 'preliminary evidence', so that employers, clinicians and employees can accurately estimate the degree of confidence attaching to each recommendation before committing resources.

Keywords: Sedentary behaviour, physical activity, exercise prescription, workplace health, critical appraisal of evidence, metabolic syndrome

Introduction

The nature of modern white-collar work is a postural exposure lasting decades, comprising eight to twelve hours of sitting each day. A typical office worker arrives in the morning and completes the great majority of paperwork, meetings and computer operations while seated; lunch is largely taken in a seated posture; the commute is undertaken seated; and on returning home, meals, streaming and use of electronic devices continue in a seated posture. Tremblay *et al*. (2010) [28] defined such behaviour as sitting or reclining in a waking state with energy expenditure at or below 1.5 metabolic equivalents (METs), and emphasised that sedentary behaviour and physical inactivity, though frequently conflated, are in fact two constructs that may exist independently and may independently produce disease. This distinction constitutes the starting point for understanding workplace exercise medicine: a manager who runs six kilometres regularly after work may nonetheless accumulate more than ten hours of sedentary exposure during the day, and the associated health risk is not necessarily reduced to zero by evening exercise.

Over the past decade or so, however, a tendency towards problematic popularisation has emerged in public health discourse on sedentary harm. Popular media have frequently disseminated research findings through sensational slogans such as 'sitting is the new smoking' and 'sitting is slow suicide', thereby translating claims that properly belong to observational epidemiology into a public health death sentence purporting to possess a clear dose–response relationship and biological mechanism. Warburton, Nicol and Bredin (2006) [31], in their classic review, noted that although the risk of physical inactivity is comparable to that

of smoking and obesity, such comparability extends only to the order of magnitude of risk values and does not imply that the pathogenic mechanisms, dose–response curves or reversibility of the two are analogous. Smoking involves a well-defined exposure to chemical carcinogens, a clear dose–response relationship and a definable window of reversibility following cessation; by contrast, the great majority of evidence in sedentary-behaviour research derives from cross-sectional or cohort observation, and residual confounding, self-selection bias and coarse measurement render the causal chain from sitting to disease far less robust than that from smoking to cancer. The first critical position adopted in this paper is therefore a rejection of the tendency to decontextualise and absolutise sedentary harm. A second controversy requiring serious treatment concerns the 'offsetting' relationship between exercise and sedentary behaviour. The question commonly posed in clinical practice is: 'If I sit for eight hours a day but run for an hour after work, am I safe?' No scholarly consensus exists on this point. Biswas *et al.* (2015) [4], following a systematic review and meta-analysis of 47 studies comprising more than 830,000 adults, argued that the associations of sedentary behaviour with all-cause mortality, cardiovascular mortality and type 2 diabetes are independent of leisure-time physical activity, implying that post-work exercise cannot wholly erase the traces of daytime sitting. Ekelund *et al.* (2016) [10], however, conducting a harmonised meta-analysis of individual-participant data from 16 cohorts comprising more than one million adults, reached an apparently contrary conclusion: among those sitting for more than eight hours daily but accumulating approximately 60–75 minutes of moderate-intensity exercise per week, all-cause mortality was not significantly elevated. Both constitute high-level evidence published in leading journals, yet their conclusions diverge markedly. The second critical position adopted here is therefore not to evade this tension but to reinterpret, through differences in study design, measurement instruments, grouping procedures and statistical models, the boundary conditions of what may be termed 'exercise compensation'. A third focus of criticism concerns the implementability of workplace interventions (Lu, 2026). Although sit-stand desks, sitting-interruption reminders and corporate gymnasiums are repeatedly proposed in the scholarly literature, the meta-analysis by Verweij, Coffeng, van Mechelen and Proper (2011) [30] of workplace physical activity interventions showed that overall effect sizes for weight and BMI were small, and that long-term (exceeding one year) maintenance effects, cost-effectiveness and organisational barriers have rarely been adequately discussed. The cross-national systematic review of correlates of physical activity by Bauman *et al.* (2012) [2] further indicated that health behaviour change at the individual level is profoundly constrained by socioeconomic status, social support, environmental infrastructure and cultural norms, such that health education or individual willpower alone is unlikely to produce sustainable change within structurally sedentary workplaces.

Epidemiology of Sedentary Behaviour

1. Operational definition and measurement difficulties

In public health, the term 'sedentary' was long treated as a commonsense descriptor, but entry into epidemiological research requires operationalisation. The 1.5-MET threshold definition proposed by Tremblay *et al.* (2010) [28] remains the consensus basis of most guidelines: in a waking state, sitting or reclining is accompanied by extremely low energy expenditure, and relative to moderate-intensity activity at or above 6 METs, its muscular contraction stimulus is almost negligible. Clarity of definition has not, however, resolved measurement difficulties. Most large cohort studies (such as Katzmarzyk, Church, Craig, & Bouchard, 2009, and most studies included in Biswas *et al.*, 2015) [17] still rely on self-report questionnaires, with typical items asking, 'On average over the past week, how much time per day did you spend sitting while watching television, using a computer or driving?' Such measurement faces both recall bias and social desirability bias; participants frequently overestimate exercise and underestimate sitting, and often confuse the boundary between occupational and leisure sitting. The introduction of accelerometers was at one point regarded as a solution. Healy *et al.* (2011) [15], using Actigraph data from NHANES 2003–2006 for 4,757 American adults, found that independently of moderate-to-vigorous physical activity (MVPA), greater sedentary time was associated with larger waist circumference, lower high-density lipoprotein cholesterol, higher C-reactive protein and worse insulin and HOMA indices; more importantly, those whose sitting was interrupted more frequently had better waist circumference and inflammatory markers. Diaz *et al.* (2017) [8], using hip-worn accelerometer data from 7,985 adults aged 45 years and over in the REGARDS cohort, found over a mean follow-up of 4.0 years that the highest quartile of total sedentary time had an all-cause mortality hazard ratio of 2.63 (95% CI 1.60–4.30) relative to the lowest, and that longer maximum uninterrupted sedentary bouts were associated with higher risk. Objective measurement thus appears to reinforce the independent pathogenicity of sedentary behaviour.

Accelerometers are not, however, a panacea. The fundamental limitation of device measurement is that it records only limb acceleration and cannot distinguish sitting from quiet standing, nor capture activities such as cycling or weightlifting in which lower-limb displacement is limited but muscular loading is substantial. Hip-worn accelerometers may even classify low-intensity domestic tasks such as washing dishes or ironing as sedentary. The high hazard ratios observed by Diaz *et al.* (2017) [8] may also reflect pre-existing differences in health self-selection, overall muscle mass and metabolic status among highly sedentary groups rather than a causal effect of sitting itself. Thorp, Owen, Neuhaus and Dunstan (2011) [27], reviewing 48 longitudinal studies published between 1996 and 2011, noted that associations of self-reported sedentary behaviour with mortality and with weight gain from childhood to adulthood were consistent, whereas relationships with the incidence of specific diseases were inconsistent, and called for accelerated development of device-measured cohort studies. That call remains inadequately answered, with most large cohorts still relying on questionnaire measurement. A further blind spot of questionnaire measurement lies in insufficient differentiation of activity contexts. Self-report items typically treat 'sitting while driving', 'sitting while watching television' and 'sitting at work' as homogeneous exposures, whereas the stress levels, eating habits, beverage consumption and muscular tension accompanying these three contexts differ substantially. Sedentary driving may be accompanied by stress and sugary drinks, sedentary work by

high cognitive concentration, and sedentary television viewing by late-night eating and prolonged immobility. Classifying all as 'one hour of sitting' compresses distinct physiological exposures into a single variable and inevitably produces residual confounding. Although Diaz *et al*. (2017) [8] replaced questionnaires with hip-worn accelerometers, thereby resolving some recall problems, sitting, standing and low-intensity domestic activity remained indistinguishable. Next-generation devices integrating inertial measurement units, pressure sensors and environmental sensors may permit more refined reconstruction of the daily behavioural timeline, but such research remains scarce.

2. Disease burden

At the global scale, analysis of data from 122 countries by Hallal *et al*. (2012) [12] indicated that approximately 31% of adults worldwide fail to meet the World Health Organization's basic activity recommendations, with particularly high inactivity rates among women in high-income countries. Lee *et al*. (2012) [19], estimating population attributable risk, calculated that physical inactivity accounts for approximately 6% of coronary heart disease, 7% of type 2 diabetes, 10% of breast cancer, 10% of colon cancer and 9% of premature mortality globally; elimination of inactivity would extend global average life expectancy by approximately 0.68 years. These figures are frequently cited as the public health weight of physical inactivity, although it must be noted that their object is 'inactivity' rather than 'sitting', which, though correlated, are not equivalent. Focusing on office workers, the meta-analysis by Biswas *et al*. (2015) [4] showed that the highest sedentary group, relative to the lowest, had an all-cause mortality hazard ratio of 1.24 (95% CI 1.09–1.41), a cardiovascular mortality hazard ratio of 1.18, and significantly elevated risk of type 2 diabetes; of greatest clinical note, those sitting more than eight hours daily without regular exercise had the highest mortality risk. Katzmarzyk *et al*. (2009) [17], in a cohort of 17,013 Canadian adults followed for a mean of 12 years, likewise observed an all-cause mortality hazard ratio of 1.54 between the longest and shortest sitting groups, with a clear dose–response relationship. Dunstan, Howard, Healy and Owen (2012) [9], in a narrative review, integrated these observational findings into a public health agenda of 'too much sitting'. Methodologically, it must be critically noted that the above hazard ratios derive predominantly from observational cohort studies; even where statistical models adjust for age, sex, smoking, alcohol consumption, BMI and pre-existing disease, unmeasured residual confounding remains—depressive symptoms, sleep quality, socioeconomic disadvantage, overall dietary quality and healthcare accessibility may all simultaneously drive both high sedentary time and premature death. Furthermore, cohort participants are mostly middle-aged to older adults, and whether conclusions can be extrapolated directly to mildly affected white-collar workers aged twenty to forty requires caution. To treat such observational figures as causal inferences of the form 'each hour of sitting directly subtracts a certain amount of lifespan' constitutes a common over-interpretation in epidemiology.

3. A critical examination of the 'sitting is the new smoking' narrative

The claim that 'sitting is the new smoking' circulated widely in the mid-2010s, its intuitive appeal lying in equating an unremarkable behaviour with a public health enemy of well-defined lethality. From the standpoint of evidence quality, however, the analogy suffers from at least three fundamental problems. First, smoking involves a well-defined toxic exposure (tar, nicotine, PM2.5) and a carcinogenic mechanism cross-validated by animal experiments, human cohorts and cessation studies; the mechanistic evidence for sitting, although including the LPL and microvascular perfusion theories of Hamilton, Hamilton and Zderic (2007) [13], derives largely from animal models and short-term human experiments and lacks a causal chain of comparable scale. Second, the dose–response relationship for smoking is approximately linear and without a safe threshold, whereas the risk relationship between exercise and sitting evidently involves non-linearity and scope for behavioural modification; the study by Ekelund *et al*. (2016) [10] suggests that sedentary risk in high-volume exercisers may be substantially offset. Third, smoking is a voluntary, cessable behaviour, whereas sitting is frequently a structural product of work organisation, transport infrastructure and capitalist labour arrangements; equating the two risks misdirecting a systemic health problem into a matter of individual moral responsibility.

It is argued here that sedentary harm should be placed on the correct rung of the evidence ladder: it is a risk factor with statistical association, mechanistic plausibility and warrant for public health prevention, yet remains considerably distant from the causal certainty of a 'new smoking'. This assessment does not diminish the necessity of workplace exercise medicine; rather, it prevents policymakers and employers from swinging to either extreme—complete neglect on the one hand, or investment in costly environmental modification of unverified cost-effectiveness on the other. Methodologically, the distortion introduced by the healthy worker effect in workplace research also warrants note. Relative to the general population, currently employed office workers constitute a health-screened population: those with severe chronic illness, disabilities and high-risk profiles have already left white-collar employment, so that the association between sitting and mortality observed in office samples may underestimate risk in the true population; yet the same mechanism may overestimate the protective effect of high activity, since those willing to maintain regular exercise often possess better health awareness and medical resources. Thorp *et al*. (2011) [27], in their review of longitudinal studies, noted that most sedentary cohort studies measure exposure only once at entry, and that subsequent changes in health status may reverse-influence sedentary behaviour (reverse causation)—for example, patients with early angina or pre-diabetes may reduce activity and increase sitting because of discomfort. Although most cohort studies exclude deaths occurring in the first few years after baseline to reduce this bias, residual influence cannot be wholly eliminated. The analysis of data from 122 countries by Hallal *et al*. (2012) [12] reveals a fact easily overlooked in white-collar discourse: inactivity rates are particularly high among women in high-income countries, while surveillance systems in low- and middle-income countries are themselves incomplete, so that many 'global average' figures are extrapolated from a small number of high-quality surveys. The review of correlates by Bauman *et al*. (2012) [2] further indicates that physical activity levels are closely related to sex, socioeconomic status, educational attainment, neighbourhood walkability

and social support; women, those of low socioeconomic status, those living alone and those with disabilities frequently face both higher sedentary exposure and lower accessibility of exercise resources. The public health burden of sedentary harm is thus not evenly distributed but follows gradients of sex and socioeconomic stratum—the population's most requiring intervention are often those least able to achieve an exercise prescription.

Physiological Mechanisms of Sedentary Harm

1. Lipoprotein lipase (LPL) suppression and lipid metabolism

The mechanistic review published by Hamilton, Hamilton and Zderic (2007) [13] in Diabetes is an important origin of biological explanations of sedentary harm. Its central claim is that when skeletal muscle is maintained for prolonged periods in a sitting posture of extremely low tension, the activity of lipoprotein lipase (LPL) on muscle cells declines rapidly; LPL is responsible for hydrolysing circulating triglycerides into free fatty acids for muscular uptake and oxidation, and once its activity is suppressed, circulating triglyceride clearance falls and high-density lipoprotein cholesterol synthesis decreases, producing over time a metabolic profile of hyperlipidaemia and insulin resistance. The distinctive feature of this mechanism is its temporal sensitivity: studies suggest that LPL activity begins to decline after only one or two hours of uninterrupted muscular inactivity, whereas a single daily session of thirty to sixty minutes of exercise, although capable of improving overall cardiorespiratory fitness, cannot fully reverse LPL suppression across the remaining dozen or more hours. This is the mechanistic basis for the argument by Dunstan *et al*. (2012) [9] that 'breaking up sitting' should become a public health target independent of 'increasing exercise volume'. The evidentiary hierarchy of this mechanism should, however, be understood. Direct observation of LPL suppression derives largely from animal models and a small number of short-term human interventions. The transcriptomic study by Chemello *et al*. (2019) [6] on single isolated muscle fibres identified miR-27a-3p and miR-142-3p as regulators of skeletal muscle metabolism and confirmed that acute exercise rapidly induces remodelling of muscle gene expression, but this constitutes basic animal research whose conclusions should not be equated directly with causal evidence of sedentary pathogenesis in humans. Mechanistic plausibility is a necessary but not a sufficient condition in epidemiology; it renders the narrative that sitting is harmful more credible, yet long-term, well-controlled human intervention trials remain necessary to confirm actual changes in clinically relevant indices such as LDL, HbA1c and blood pressure.

2. Vascular endothelial dysfunction and microvascular perfusion

A second mechanistic pathway concerns the vasculature. Prolonged sitting reduces venous and microvascular blood flow velocity in the lower limbs, diminishes laminar shear stress on endothelial cells, and consequently lowers nitric oxide (NO) release, leading over time to reduced vascular compliance and increased arterial stiffness, and constituting an early substrate for hypertension and atherosclerosis. Bisconti *et al*. (2020) [3], studying 39 sedentary office workers undergoing a 12-week passive static stretching programme, found significant improvement in femoral artery compliance, reduced arterial stiffness and lower systolic and diastolic blood pressure; notably, the non-stretched contralateral arm artery also improved, suggesting central vascular regulatory mechanisms in addition to local mechanical tension. The methodological limitations of this study lie in its single-group pre–post design, absence of random allocation and sample of only 39; nevertheless, its demonstration that gentle mechanical stimulation can improve vascular function provides preliminary support for office stretching as a feasible option for vascular rehabilitation.

3. Cessation of muscle electrical activity, mitochondrial adaptation and systemic metabolic dysregulation

A third pathway focuses on muscle itself. When large muscle groups remain in a state of low electrical activity for prolonged periods, skeletal muscle undergoes disuse atrophy with a decline in the proportion of slow-twitch fibres and a consequent fall in basal metabolic rate; simultaneously, insulin receptor signalling is impaired and abdominal fat accumulation increases, forming a vicious cycle of sitting–muscle loss–insulin resistance–fat accumulation. Hamilton *et al*. (2007) [13] emphasised that this cascade cannot be fully reversed by a single post-work exercise session, since it is continuously accumulated over the dozen or more waking hours. From the perspective of molecular adaptation, the mitochondrial biogenesis, muscle fibre type transition and improved neural recruitment efficiency triggered by regular exercise are essentially adaptations opposite in direction to the sedentary stress. The SAID principle (Specific Adaptation to Imposed Demands) reminds us that the body adapts only to the stress actually imposed—sitting is itself a form of 'training', training the body to function at low energy expenditure; to reverse this direction of adaptation, stress in the opposite direction must be actively imposed. In evaluating these mechanisms, the position adopted here is that the three pathways are biologically compatible and supported by animal and short-term human experiments, but that together they constitute a plausible yet not fully validated aetiological model in long-term workplace randomised controlled trials. Clinical recommendations should be based on this level of evidence, adopting preventive, low-risk behavioural interventions rather than asserting on this basis that sitting is equivalent to a confirmed diagnosis of chronic disease.

4. Chronic low-grade inflammation and systemic metabolic dysregulation

Beyond the LPL, vascular and muscular pathways, sedentary behaviour also affects the whole body through chronic low-grade inflammation. Healy *et al*. (2011) [15], using NHANES accelerometer data, found that independently of MVPA, greater sedentary time was associated with higher C-reactive protein, while more frequent interruption of sitting was associated with lower C-reactive protein. C-reactive protein is an important marker of systemic low-grade inflammation and is pathophysiologically linked to atherosclerosis, metabolic syndrome and depression. Dunstan *et al*. (2012) [9] accordingly argued that sitting is not merely 'muscles unused' but a state of the whole body under low-grade inflammatory stress. Inferring from observational differences in C-reactive protein that 'sitting causes chronic inflammation' nonetheless requires caution. Obesity itself

mobilises inflammatory cytokine secretion from adipose tissue, and obese individuals tend also to sit more; even with statistical adjustment for BMI, the triangular relationship among abdominal fat distribution, insulin resistance and inflammatory markers remains difficult to disentangle completely. The transcriptomic findings of Chemello *et al.* (2019) [6] on single isolated muscle fibres provide molecular-level plausibility for 'exercise–gene expression–metabolic adaptation', yet their material was murine muscle fibres, and a distance of species extrapolation remains between these and the long-term metabolic dysregulation of human sedentary behaviour. The position adopted here is that mechanistic research should be used to strengthen the credibility of epidemiological conclusions, not as standalone definitive evidence of causation. Viewed in molecular-to-systemic context, sedentary behaviour is not a disease of a single organ but a state of systemic low-level stimulation. The mechanistic models advanced by Hamilton *et al.* (2007) [13] and Dunstan *et al.* (2012) [9] and the subsequent objective-measurement observations of Healy *et al.* (2011) [15] and Diaz *et al.* (2017) [8] are mutually supportive in direction: cessation of muscle electrical activity–LPL suppression–decline in lipid metabolism–insulin resistance–vascular functional deterioration–low-grade inflammation. This chain possesses biological plausibility. It must, however, be emphasised again that plausibility and causality remain distinct: most human evidence still derives from cross-sectional or short-term interventions, and genuine causal confirmation requires long-term randomised controlled trials, which remain scarce owing to cost and ethical constraints. For clinical practice, this means that reducing sedentary time can and should be listed as a first-line preventive recommendation, but should not be phrased with the certainty of 'sitting directly causes diabetes'.

Scientific Basis of Exercise Prescription

1. Dose–response curve

The dose–response relationship between exercise and mortality is among the most robust conclusions in exercise medicine. Arem *et al.* (2015) [1], pooling six American and European cohorts comprising 661,137 adults, recorded 116,686 deaths over a mean follow-up of 14.2 years and found that relative to inactive individuals, approximately 7.5 MET-hours per week (about 150 minutes of moderate intensity) reduced all-cause mortality risk by approximately 31%; additional benefit plateaued at three to five times the guideline volume (approximately 450 minutes per week), with no evidence of harm at very high doses. Kraus *et al.* (2019) [18], in an umbrella review for the 2018 Physical Activity Guidelines Advisory Committee, further indicated that even one-third of the guideline volume yields substantial mortality and cardiovascular benefit, that approximately 75% of maximum benefit is obtained at the guideline volume, and that marginal benefit diminishes beyond it, again without evidence of harm from excess. The ACSM/AHA recommendations represented by Haskell *et al.* (2007) [14] and Garber *et al.* (2011) [11] were formulated on this evidentiary basis, establishing the adult prescription benchmark of 150 minutes of moderate-intensity aerobic exercise per week plus twice-weekly resistance training; the WHO 2020 guidelines represented by Bull *et al.* (2020) [5] further incorporated 'reduce sedentary behaviour; any activity replacing sitting is beneficial' as a strong recommendation.

2. Methodology determines conclusions

As noted above, whether exercise can offset sedentary harm is the controversy of greatest practical consequence in contemporary workplace exercise medicine. The study by Ekelund *et al.* (2016) [10], published in The Lancet, pooled individual-participant data from 16 cohorts totalling more than one million adults and found that among those sitting more than eight hours daily but maintaining approximately 60–75 minutes of moderate-intensity exercise per week (about three to four times the WHO guideline volume), all-cause mortality was not elevated; conversely, among those with low exercise volume (less than approximately 20 minutes daily), risk remained elevated even with short sitting time. This conclusion has often been simplified by the media to 'as long as you exercise enough, sitting does not matter'. The conclusion of Biswas *et al.* (2015) [4] in Annals of Internal Medicine emphasised instead that the associations of sedentary behaviour with mortality and disease are independent of leisure-time physical activity, implying that post-work exercise cannot wholly 'wash away' daytime sitting. The methodological roots of the divergence lie in at least four differences. First, the level of data differs: Ekelund used individual-participant-data meta-analysis, permitting consistent grouping, adjustment and non-linear curve fitting on raw data, whereas Biswas used study-level meta-analysis, relying on each study's self-reported sedentary grouping and effect estimates, with greater heterogeneity. Second, the measurement of sedentary time differs: the cohorts included by Ekelund mostly measured total sedentary time by questionnaire, whereas among the 47 studies included by Biswas, cross-sectional studies and questionnaire measurement were more heavily represented. Third, the thresholds for exercise grouping differ: the 'high-volume exercise' analysed by Ekelund was approximately 60–75 minutes of moderate intensity daily, far exceeding the actual volume achieved by most office workers, for whom the practical significance of 'exercise offsets sitting' is therefore limited. Fourth, the statistical models handled interaction differently: Ekelund presented, through detailed stratified curves, a flattening of the sedentary slope at higher exercise volumes, whereas Biswas employed mainly main-effect models without deeply exploring the non-linear appearance of exercise volume as an effect modifier. The balanced interpretation offered here is that the correct clinical message is neither 'running enough after work suffices' nor 'exercise is futile', but rather that 'exercise volume must be sufficient and daytime interruption should be performed as far as possible; neither can be omitted'. This assessment echoes the dual-track recommendations of the WHO guidelines (Bull *et al.*, 2020) [5]: both achieving 150–300 minutes of moderate-intensity aerobic exercise and actively reducing sedentary behaviour.

3. Comparison of aerobic, resistance and multimodal training

At the level of training modality, the ACSM position statements of Haskell *et al.* (2007) [14] and Garber *et al.* (2011) [11] constitute the skeleton of contemporary consensus: 150 minutes of moderate-intensity (or 75 minutes of vigorous-intensity) aerobic exercise per week, resistance training two to three times weekly covering major muscle groups, and inclusion of flexibility and neuromotor training. The 'Exercise as Medicine' consensus document of Pedersen and Saltin (2015) [23] extended this framework to

26 chronic diseases, arguing that regular exercise should be routinely prescribed like a drug. The independent contribution of resistance training to metabolic syndrome has often been mis-cited. Dankel, Loenneke and Loprinzi (2016) [7], using cross-sectional NHANES 2003–2006 data, found that those meeting accelerometer-based physical activity guidelines had a 61% lower odds of metabolic syndrome, those meeting muscle-strengthening guidelines a 25% lower odds, and those meeting both a 70% lower odds, displaying an additive interaction. Only such evidence can support the claim that resistance training independently and additively prevents metabolic syndrome. By contrast, the study by Normandin *et al*. (2017) [21] is often mis-cited as a 'large-sample NHANES resistance training study', whereas its actual design was a randomised allocation of 126 overweight or obese adults aged 65–79 years to resistance training alone or resistance training combined with caloric restriction over a five-month intervention. Results showed that the resistance-training-alone group exhibited almost no change in body weight (approximately −0.15%) and no significant within-group improvement in metabolic syndrome indices, whereas the combined caloric restriction group showed a 5.67% reduction in body weight and significant improvement in VLDL, triglycerides, systolic and diastolic blood pressure, abdominal obesity, hypertension and metabolic syndrome incidence. The clinical implication of this contrast is that in already overweight older populations, resistance training alone without a caloric deficit may not improve metabolic syndrome; this does not imply that resistance training is useless, but rather that prescription design must incorporate dietary and total energy management.

Among aerobic training modalities, high-intensity interval training (HIIT) has in recent years been packaged by the media as a 'fat-loss panacea'. The meta-analysis by Viana *et al*. (2019) [29] of 36 randomised controlled trials comprising 1,012 participants showed no significant difference between HIIT and moderate-intensity continuous training (MICT) in the magnitude of body fat percentage reduction (HIIT −1.50% vs MICT −1.44%), although HIIT was marginally superior in absolute fat mass reduction and cardiorespiratory fitness improvement. The meta-analysis by Weston, Wisløff and Coombes (2014) [32] of patients with coronary heart disease, heart failure, hypertension, metabolic syndrome and obesity showed that HIIT increased VO_2peak by approximately 3.03 mL/kg/min (about 9.1%) more than MICT, and was safe and effective in patients with lifestyle-related chronic diseases. The comment offered here is that the true value of HIIT lies in time efficiency rather than miraculous fat loss; for time-scarce office workers it is a reasonable option, but for those with uncontrolled hypertension, severe arrhythmia or recent unstable cardiovascular events, cardiac risk stratification should first be completed. For resistance training prescription parameters, the ACSM position statement of Garber *et al*. (2011) [11] provides a relatively consensus version: two to three times weekly, at least one exercise per major muscle group, eight to twelve repetitions per exercise, with approximately 48 hours' rest between sessions. For office workers, a zero-threshold means of execution centres on bodyweight squats, push-ups, wall rows and planks, with elastic bands and dumbbells used to fine-tune load, permitting completion of a full-body major muscle group session within 15–20 minutes. The observation by Dankel, Loenneke and Loprinzi (2016) [7], based on cross-sectional NHANES data, that combined aerobic and resistance training is associated with a 70% reduction in odds does not imply that attending a gym twice weekly confers immunity—their study was cross-sectional and cannot exclude reverse causation whereby those already more active are better able to pursue both tracks. Nevertheless, its consistent direction is sufficient to support the inclusion of resistance training in all adult exercise prescriptions, rather than restricting it to dedicated strength-training populations. On the other side of dosing, the umbrella review by Kraus *et al*. (2019) [18] particularly emphasised that 'any exercise is better than none'—even one-third of the guideline volume produces a clear reduction in mortality risk. This is an important psychological release for office workers long burdened by the '150 minutes per week' threshold: rather than abandoning exercise entirely because the target cannot be met, it is preferable to begin with ten minutes of brisk walking daily and progressively accumulate. The dose–response curve of Arem *et al*. (2015) [1] likewise shows that the slope from zero to low volume is steepest, and that the greatest marginal benefit lies precisely in the first step from inactivity to activity.

4. Flexibility, neuromotor training and the repositioning of passive stretching

Flexibility and balance training have long been marginalised in commercial gymnasiums, yet their significance for sedentary populations is no less than that of cardiorespiratory and resistance training. The ACSM position statement of Garber *et al*. (2011) [11] explicitly recommends that adults incorporate flexibility and neuromotor (balance) training weekly, on the grounds that the hip flexor tightness, pectoral tightness and forward head posture caused by prolonged sitting accumulate into low back pain and shoulder–neck discomfort, while the degeneration of proprioceptive and vestibular feedback is an important precursor of fall risk in later life. The 12-week passive static stretching study by Bisconti *et al*. (2020) [3], although methodologically limited to a single-group pre–post design with 39 participants, warrants serious consideration: regular, passive, static muscle stretching, without requiring significant elevation of heart rate, improved femoral artery compliance and lowered blood pressure, and the non-stretched contralateral arm artery improved concurrently, suggesting the involvement of central vascular regulatory mechanisms. After six weeks of detraining, central effects regressed while local effects persisted, indicating that this adaptation requires continuous stimulation. For office workers, this implies that 'stretching' in the office is not soft relaxation but a low-threshold, low-risk, accumulative vascular health training; readers should, however, understand that effect estimates from a single single-group study still require confirmation by larger randomised controlled trials and should not be over-extended to the claim that stretching can replace exercise. Before designing any workplace exercise prescription, the basic constraints of exercise physiology should be revisited. The body switches among the ATP-PC system, the anaerobic glycolytic system and the aerobic oxidative system according to exercise intensity and duration, and training dominated by different systems induces different adaptations; the SAID principle reminds us that training produces improvement in that which is trained, with no

undifferentiated fitness gain. For office workers, this means that running alone or weight training alone cannot simultaneously address cardiorespiratory fitness, muscular strength, flexibility and neuromotor function; a multimodal prescription is physiologically necessary, not merely a matter of menu variety. The supercompensation principle reminds us that training effects occur during recovery; excessively dense training lacking sleep and nutrition is not only unhelpful but increases the risk of overtraining and injury. For time-saturated office workers, compressing training volume into an already fatigued post-work body may be less effective than arranging several low-intensity activity sessions during the day.

Sitting Interruption and Workplace Environmental Modification

1. Sitting interruption

Since the temporal continuity of sedentary harm has been emphasised, 'standing up and moving after a period of sitting' becomes an intuitive preventive strategy. Healy *et al*. (2011) [15], using NHANES accelerometer data, observed that more frequent interruption of sitting was associated with better waist circumference and C-reactive protein; Diaz *et al*. (2017) [8] further found, with mortality as the endpoint, that longer maximum uninterrupted sedentary bouts were associated with higher risk. These observational findings support the independent significance of interruption frequency, potentially equal in importance to total sedentary time. Observational association cannot, however, be equated directly with intervention effect. The randomised crossover-controlled trial by Thorp, Kingwell, Owen and Dunstan (2014) [26] is one of the few higher-quality workplace interventions: 23 overweight or obese office workers experienced, over two weeks, conditions of 'standing breaks every 30 minutes' and 'all-day sitting'. The interruption group showed significantly lower overall fatigue scores (52.7 vs 67.8, $p < 0.001$), a 31.8% reduction in low back discomfort ($p = 0.03$), and a trend towards improved work performance. The strengths of this study are its crossover design, repeated measurement and control of diurnal variation; its weaknesses are a sample of only 23, an intervention of only two weeks, the absence of long-term metabolic or cardiovascular disease endpoints, and a participant population of overweight or obese individuals, requiring caution in extrapolation to office workers of normal weight. The comment offered here on the popular recommendation to 'interrupt every 20 to 30 minutes' is that it possesses a reasonable mechanistic basis and preliminary human evidence, but that no large-scale, long-term randomised controlled trial with clinical events as endpoints currently supports a fixed 20- or 30-minute threshold; the 'optimal frequency' cited by different studies derives mostly from small crossover trials or expert consensus and should not be regarded as prescription data of diagnostic grade. For most office workers, a practical starting point of 'standing up for two to three minutes every 30 minutes', adjusted according to individual work patterns, is pragmatic and low-risk. The physiological significance of interruption may be interpreted along two lines: the cross-sectional NHANES observations of Healy *et al*. (2011) [15] and the mortality cohort study of Diaz *et al*. (2017) [8]. The former indicates that, at the same total sedentary time, those with more interruptions have better waist circumference, triglycerides and C-reactive protein; the latter indicates that longer maximum uninterrupted sedentary bouts are associated with higher all-cause mortality. The combined public health implication is that 'how one sits' and 'how long one sits' are at least equally important. It must be honestly noted, however, that these are observational data, and that the genuine chain of 'interruption–causation–metabolic improvement' still requires gradual assembly through small crossover trials such as Thorp *et al*. (2014) [26], whose endpoints were fatigue and discomfort rather than diabetes or cardiovascular events.

2. Sit-stand desks

The sit-stand desk is the most popular option in workplace environmental modification. The crossover trial of Thorp *et al*. (2014) [26] provides evidence of short-term improvement in fatigue and low back pain; however, most current studies have follow-up periods of only weeks to months, and evidence remains limited as to whether long-term use (exceeding one year) genuinely reduces all-cause mortality or diabetes incidence, or whether it generates new harms such as lower-limb varicose veins, plantar pressure and standing fatigue. The meta-analysis by Verweij *et al*. (2011) [30] of workplace physical activity and dietary interventions indicated that effect sizes for weight or BMI were small, and that combined dietary intervention was required for more pronounced effects. From the organisational perspective, the introduction of standing desks involves three frequently overlooked problems. First, actual employee usage often diverges from design intent: after installation, most employees continue to maintain a seated posture, and standing time declines over time. Second, costs are not insignificant: a qualified sit-stand desk plus anti-fatigue mat requires clear cost-effectiveness evidence to justify corporate procurement. Third, not all work patterns are suited to standing: for customer service personnel wearing headsets for prolonged speech, draftspersons requiring fine mouse control, or shift workers, the practical usability of standing desks may be limited. The review of correlates by Bauman *et al*. (2012) [2] reminds us that behaviour change is a product of individual, social and environmental factors at multiple levels, and that a single hardware investment can rarely produce sustainable effects on its own.

3. Office micro-exercise and environmental modification

Without altering office hardware, passive environmental design—placing printers and photocopiers at a greater distance, standing meeting rooms, well-lit stairwells, walking one-to-one meetings—has been advocated as a choice architecture that 'makes activity easy and sitting difficult'. The study by Bisconti *et al*. (2020) [3] provides physiological support for office stretching: regular, passive, static muscle stretching, even without significant elevation of heart rate, improves vascular compliance and blood pressure. This implies that office 'micro-exercise' need not always involve cardiorespiratory loading; static stretching targeting the hip flexors, pectorals and shoulder–neck region possesses independent vascular health value. The comment offered here on workplace intervention overall is that current evidence is sufficient to support 'reducing uninterrupted sitting and increasing standing frequency' as a low-risk, low-cost preventive behaviour, but insufficient to support overreaching claims such as 'mandatory standing offices' or 'sitting-interruption apps prevent diabetes'.

Cluster randomised controlled trials lasting one to three years, with metabolic indices and clinical events as endpoints and incorporating cost-effectiveness analysis, are required to respond genuinely to the investment decisions of employers and insurers. From an economic perspective, the meta-analysis of Verweij *et al*. (2011) [30] offers a cooler view: workplace physical activity interventions have small effect sizes on weight and BMI, and most studies have not conducted complete cost-effectiveness analyses. When the costs of sit-stand desks, anti-fatigue mats, and employee fitness testing and specialist instruction are converted into actual health index improvement per employee per year, the unit cost is typically far higher than that of smoking cessation programmes or vaccination. This does not imply that standing desks lack value, but reminds employers that before selecting hardware investment, zero-cost behavioural modification (standing meetings, stair use, lunchtime brisk walking) should be piloted to confirm that employees are genuinely willing to change behaviour, after which the decision on large-scale hardware investment may be made. The preventive medicine logic represented by Soligard *et al*. (2008) [24] applies equally here: the lowest-cost, highest-consensus, maximum-benefit option for the greatest number should take precedence over expensive but niche options.

4. The role of digital intervention, wearable devices and supervisory feedback

Over the past decade, sitting-interruption reminders based on wearable devices and mobile applications have become the most commercially prominent workplace health solution. The intuitive logic is that the client's phone or watch vibrates every 30 minutes of sitting, prompting the user to stand and move; the back end records daily steps, standing bouts and calorie expenditure. From an evidentiary standpoint, however, most such products have not published randomised controlled trials with clinical events or long-term metabolic indices as endpoints, and most internal corporate usage reports are merely self-reported satisfaction questionnaires. The review of correlates by Bauman *et al*. (2012) [2] reminds us that behaviour change is the outcome of individual, social and environmental factors at multiple levels; where device vibration reminders lack peer support, supervisory recognition and environmental adjustment, usage rates typically decline markedly after three to six months. The comment offered here on digital intervention is that such tools are excellent feedback instruments but not therapeutic instruments. Wearable devices allow employees to see, for the first time, how long they have sat and how many steps they have taken in a day; this awareness itself possesses educational value. Yet where enterprises expect a single application to resolve sedentary harm, they are likely to confront muted devices, employee attrition and cost amortisation problems within six months. Cluster randomised controlled trials that randomise digital interventions, last at least 12 months, use blood glucose, blood pressure or cardiovascular events as endpoints, and concurrently analyse employee usage rates and cost-effectiveness, are required to judge the long-term value of such technology.

An Integrative Workplace Exercise Prescription Framework

Synthesising the preceding sections, an integrative workplace exercise prescription framework is proposed here, comprising three pillars: daytime sitting interruption, multimodal post-work training and individualised risk stratification. Its core principle is to reject the compensation model, in which a single post-work exercise session compensates for a full day of sitting, in favour of a whole-day reconstruction model of bodily use. The reasons have been set out in Chapter 4: the controversy between Ekelund and Biswas indicates that only high-volume exercisers may genuinely offset sedentary risk, and most office workers cannot reach that volume; placing the entire bet on one or two post-work hours is therefore strategically risk-concentrating.

First Pillar: daytime sitting interruption. During working hours, stand up for two to three minutes every 30 minutes, performing jogging on the spot, bodyweight squats, wall push-ups or static stretching targeting the hip flexors, pectorals and shoulder–neck region; where possible, convert meetings to standing or walking format, and position printers, photocopiers and the pantry at a distance requiring walking. Where corporate budget permits, a sit-stand desk may be one hardware option, but should be accompanied by employee education and usage tracking to prevent equipment idleness.

Second Pillar: Multimodal post-work training. Base the programme on 150 minutes of moderate-intensity aerobic exercise per week (brisk walking, jogging, cycling, swimming), divided into 30 minutes daily; resistance training twice weekly covering major muscle group movements such as squats, hip thrusts, rows and presses; daily 5–10 minutes of core and flexibility training targeting the hip flexor tightness, pectoral tightness and forward head posture caused by prolonged sitting. For the time-scarce, one to two sessions of HIIT may be added weekly after four to eight weeks of base aerobic training as a time-efficiency option, subject to prior risk stratification.

Third Pillar: Individualisation and social context. Prescriptions should not be identical across office workers of differing age, sex, health status and work pattern. In overweight populations aged over 65, resistance training alone may not improve metabolic syndrome and must be combined with caloric control (Normandin *et al*., 2017) [21]; middle-aged populations should attend to the lifelong accumulation of cardiorespiratory fitness, since it is closely related to late-life dementia risk (Hörder *et al*., 2018) [16]; the exercise timing of night-shift workers must align with the sleep cycle, avoiding high-intensity training before off-duty hours that would impair daytime sleep (Stutz *et al*., 2019) [25]. At the enterprise level, the meta-analysis of Verweij *et al*. (2011) [30] suggests that single weight-management or exercise interventions have limited effect and should be combined with dietary nutrition, environmental modification and supervisory support to form a workplace health promotion system.

Conclusions

The evidence on exercise medicine in the sedentary workplace has been re-examined here from a critical standpoint. Overall, epidemiological and mechanistic research consistently indicates that prolonged, uninterrupted sitting is stably positively associated with all-cause mortality, cardiovascular disease, type 2 diabetes and

metabolic syndrome, and that this association cannot be wholly covered by a single post-work exercise session (Biswas *et al*., 2015; Diaz *et al*., 2017; Healy *et al*., 2011) [4, 8, 15]. The exercise dose–response curve clearly supports 150 minutes of moderate-intensity aerobic exercise per week as the health sweet spot, and resistance training possesses independent and additive benefits for metabolic syndrome (Arem *et al*., 2015; Kraus *et al*., 2019; Dankel *et al*., 2016) [1, 7, 18]. The metaphor 'sitting is the new smoking' nonetheless oversimplifies the causal chain; the controversy between Ekelund and Biswas reminds us that the offsetting relationship between exercise and sitting depends heavily on exercise volume, measurement method and statistical model, and should not be applied to all populations through a single conclusion (OpenAI, 2026) [22]. Future research should be strengthened in four directions. First, long-term, large-scale cluster randomised controlled trials with clinical events as endpoints, verifying the genuine effects of standing desks and sitting interruption on diabetes, cardiovascular events and work productivity, incorporating cost-effectiveness analysis. Second, acceleration of device-measured and wearable-device cohort studies, overcoming the recall and social desirability biases of self-report questionnaires and further distinguishing sitting, standing, walking and activities of varying intensity. Third, development of individualised prescriptions—differentiated dose, modality and timing recommendations according to age, sex, fitness baseline, chronic disease status and work pattern, rather than a single prescription applicable to all. Fourth, use of digital technology (wearable devices, real-time feedback applications, artificial intelligence coaching) to assist behaviour change, with rigorous evaluation of long-term effects and privacy issues (Lu, 2026). The purpose of critical review is not to weaken action but to render action more precise. When it is stated that the causal chain of sedentary harm is not yet fully confirmed, this does not mean that sitting is entirely harmless; when it is stated that the conclusions of Ekelund and Biswas differ methodologically, this does not mean that post-work exercise is ineffective; when it is stated that the long-term effects of standing desks are unclear, this does not mean that one should not stand up and walk about. Genuine criticality lies in finding, between excessive optimism and excessive cynicism, a middle path based on evidence, respectful of individual difference and considerate of structural barriers. This path is the direction most worth pursuing in twenty-first-century workplace exercise medicine.

References

1. Arem H, Moore SC, Patel A, Hartge P, Berrington de Gonzalez A, Visvanathan K, et al. Leisure time physical activity and mortality: A detailed pooled analysis of the dose response relationship. JAMA Internal Medicine,2015:175(6):959–967. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamainternmed.2015.0533
2. Bauman AE, Reis RS, Sallis JF, Wells JC, Loos RJF, Martin BW; Lancet Physical Activity Series Working Group. Correlates of physical activity: Why are some people physically active and others not? The Lancet,2012:380(9838):258–271. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140 6736(12)60735 1
3. Bisconti AV, Cè E, Longo S, Venturelli M, Coratella G, Limonta E, et al. Evidence for improved systemic and local vascular function after long term passive static stretching training of the musculoskeletal system. The Journal of Physiology,2020:598(17):3645–3666. https://doi.org/10.1113/JP279866
4. Biswas A, Oh PI, Faulkner GE, Bajaj RR, Silver MA, Mitchell MS, et al. Sedentary time and its association with risk for disease incidence, mortality, and hospitalization in adults: A systematic review and meta analysis. Annals of Internal Medicine,2015:162(2):123–132. https://doi.org/10.7326/M14 1651
5. Bull FC, Al Ansari SS, Biddle S, Borodulin K, Buman MP, Cardon G, et al. World Health Organization 2020 guidelines on physical activity and sedentary behaviour. British Journal of Sports Medicine,2020:54(24):1451–1462. https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsports 2020 102955
6. Chemello F, Grespi F, Zulian A, Cancellara P, Hebert Chatelain E, Martini P, et al. Transcriptomic analysis of single isolated myofibers identifies miR 27a 3p and miR 142 3p as regulators of metabolism in skeletal muscle. Cell Reports,2019:26(13):3784–3797.e8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.celrep.2019.02.105
7. Dankel SJ, Loenneke JP, Loprinzi PD. The individual, joint, and additive interaction associations of aerobic based physical activity and muscle strengthening activities on metabolic syndrome. International Journal of Behavioral Medicine,2016:23(6):707–713. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12529 016 9570 y
8. Diaz KM, Howard VJ, Hutto B, Colabianchi N, Vena JE, Safford MM, et al. Patterns of sedentary behavior and mortality in U.S. middle aged and older adults: A national cohort study. Annals of Internal Medicine,2017:167(7):465–475. https://doi.org/10.7326/M17 0212
9. Dunstan DW, Howard B, Healy GN, Owen N. Too much sitting—A health hazard. Diabetes Research and Clinical Practice,2012:97(3):368–376. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.diabres.2012.05.020
10. Ekelund U, Steene Johannessen J, Brown WJ, Fagerland MW, Owen N, Powell KE, et al. Does physical activity attenuate, or even eliminate, the detrimental association of sitting time with mortality? A harmonised meta analysis of data from more than 1 million men and women. The Lancet,2016:388(10051):1302–1310. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140 6736(16)30370 1
11. Garber CE, Blissmer B, Deschenes MR, Franklin BA, Lamonte MJ, Lee IM, et al. American College of Sports Medicine position stand: Quantity and quality of exercise for developing and maintaining cardiorespiratory, musculoskeletal, and neuromotor fitness in apparently healthy adults—Guidance for prescribing exercise. Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise,2011:43(7):1334–1359. https://doi.org/10.1249/MSS.0b013e318213fefb
12. Hallal PC, Andersen LB, Bull FC, Guthold R, Haskell W, Ekelund U; Lancet Physical Activity Series Working Group. Global physical activity levels: Surveillance progress, pitfalls, and prospects. The Lancet,2012:380(9838):247–257. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140 6736(12)60646 1
13. Hamilton MT, Hamilton DG, Zderic TW. Role of low energy expenditure and sitting in obesity, metabolic syndrome, type 2 diabetes, and cardiovascular disease. Diabetes,2007:56(11):2655–2667. https://doi.org/10.2337/db07 0882

14. 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(9):1081–1093. https://doi.org/10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.107.185649
15. Healy GN, Matthews CE, Dunstan DW, Winkler EAH, Owen N. Sedentary time and cardio metabolic biomarkers in US adults: NHANES 2003–06. European Heart Journal,2011:32(5):590–597. https://doi.org/10.1093/eurheartj/ehq451
16. Hörder H, Johansson L, Guo X, Grimby G, Kern S, Östling S, et al. Midlife cardiovascular fitness and dementia: A 44 year longitudinal population study in women. Neurology,2018:90(15):e1298–e1305. https://doi.org/10.1212/WNL.0000000000005290
17. Katzmarzyk PT, Church TS, Craig CL, Bouchard C. Sitting time and mortality from all causes, cardiovascular disease, and cancer. Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise,2009:41(5):998–1005. https://doi.org/10.1249/MSS.0b013e3181930355
18. Kraus WE, Powell KE, Haskell WL, Janz KF, Campbell WW, Jakicic JM, et al. Physical activity, all cause and cardiovascular mortality, and cardiovascular disease. Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise,2019:51(6):1270–1281. https://doi.org/10.1249/MSS.0000000000001939
19. Lee IM, Shiroma EJ, Lobelo F, Puska P, Blair SN, Katzmarzyk PT; Lancet Physical Activity Series Working Group. Effect of physical inactivity on major non communicable diseases worldwide: An analysis of burden of disease and life expectancy. The Lancet,2012:380(9838):219–229. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140 6736(12)61031 9
20. Lu L. The history of Western holistic health development. AkiNik Publications, 2026.
21. Normandin E, Chmelo E, Lyles MF, Marsh AP, Nicklas BJ. Effect of resistance training and caloric restriction on the metabolic syndrome. Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise,2017:49(3):413–419. https://doi.org/10.1249/MSS.0000000000001122
22. OpenAI. ChatGPT (GPT 5.6) [Large language model], 2026. https://chatgpt.com/
23. Pedersen BK, Saltin B. Exercise as medicine—Evidence for prescribing exercise as therapy in 26 different chronic diseases. Scandinavian Journal of Medicine & Science in Sports,2015:25(Suppl. 3):1–72. https://doi.org/10.1111/sms.12581
24. Soligard T, Myklebust G, Steffen K, Holme I, Silvers H, Bizzini M, et al. Comprehensive warm up programme to prevent injuries in young female footballers: Cluster randomised controlled trial. BMJ,2008:337:a2469. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.a2469
25. Stutz J, Eiholzer R, Spengler CM. Effects of evening exercise on sleep in healthy participants: A systematic review and meta analysis. Sports Medicine,2019:49(2):269–287. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40279 018 1015 0
26. Thorp AA, Kingwell BA, Owen N, Dunstan DW. Breaking up workplace sitting time with intermittent standing bouts improves fatigue and musculoskeletal discomfort in overweight/obese office workers. Occupational and Environmental Medicine,2014:71(11):765–771. https://doi.org/10.1136/oemed 2014 102348
27. Thorp AA, Owen N, Neuhaus M, Dunstan DW. Sedentary behaviors and subsequent health outcomes in adults: A systematic review of longitudinal studies, 1996–2011. American Journal of Preventive Medicine,2011:41(2):207–215. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2011.05.004
28. Tremblay MS, Colley RC, Saunders TJ, Healy GN, Owen N. Physiological and health implications of a sedentary lifestyle. Applied Physiology, Nutrition, and Metabolism,2010:35(6):725–740. https://doi.org/10.1139/H10 079
29. Viana RB, Naves JPA, Coswig VS, de Lira CAB, Steele J, Fisher JP, et al. Is interval training the magic bullet for fat loss? A systematic review and meta analysis comparing moderate intensity continuous training with high intensity interval training (HIIT). British Journal of Sports Medicine,2019:53(10):655–664. https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsports 2018 099928
30. Verweij LM, Coffeng J, van Mechelen W, Proper KI. Meta analyses of workplace physical activity and dietary behaviour interventions on weight outcomes. Obesity Reviews,2011:12(6):406–429. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467 789X.2010.00765.x
31. Warburton DER, Nicol CW, Bredin SSD. Health benefits of physical activity: The evidence. Canadian Medical Association Journal,2006:174(6):801–809. https://doi.org/10.1503/cmaj.051351
32. Weston KS, Wisløff U, Coombes JS. High intensity interval training in patients with lifestyle induced cardiometabolic disease: A systematic review and meta analysis. British Journal of Sports Medicine,2014:48(16):1227–1234. https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsports 2013 092576