

1 **German Recommendations for Physical Activity and Physical Activity Promotion**
2 **in Adults with Noncommunicable Diseases**

3

4 Wolfgang Geidl^{1,3}, Karim Abu-Omar^{2,3}, Mayra Weege², Sven Messing^{2,3}, Klaus
5 Pfeifer^{1,3}

6

7 ¹Department of Sport Science and Sport, Division of Exercise and Health, Friedrich-
8 Alexander University Erlangen-Nürnberg, Germany

9 ²Department of Sport Science and Sport, Division of Physical Activity and Public
10 Health, Friedrich-Alexander University Erlangen-Nürnberg, Germany

11 ³Committee for the Development of the German Recommendations on Physical Activity
12 and Physical Activity Promotion

13

14 **Corresponding author:** Dr Wolfgang Geidl, Department of Sport Science and Sport,
15 Friedrich-Alexander University Erlangen-Nürnberg, Gebbertstraße 123b, 91058
16 Erlangen, Germany; Tel.: +49-9131-85-25457, Fax. +49-9131-85-28198, email:
17 wolfgang.geidl@fau.de

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25 Main text word count: 5,490 words

26

27 **ABSTRACT**

28 **Background**

29 The objective of this study was to develop evidence-based recommendations for
30 physical activity (PA) and PA promotion for German adults (18–65 years) with
31 noncommunicable diseases (NCDs).

32 **Methods**

33 The PA recommendations were developed based on existing PA recommendations and
34 using a three-phased process. In phase 1, systematic literature searches were conducted
35 for current PA recommendations for seven chronic conditions (osteoarthritis of the hip
36 and knee, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, stable ischemic heart disease, stroke,
37 clinical depression, and chronic non-specific back pain). In phase 2, the PA
38 recommendations were evaluated on the basis of 28 quality criteria. High-quality
39 recommendations were identified, and a content analysis was conducted on these
40 recommendations. In phase 3, the findings of the content analysis were summarised, and
41 PA recommendations for seven chronic conditions were deduced. The seven
42 recommendations were then synthesised to generate generic German PA
43 recommendations for adults with noncommunicable diseases (NCDs). In relation to the
44 recommendations for PA promotion, a systematic literature review was conducted on
45 papers that reviewed the efficacy/effectiveness of interventions for PA promotion in
46 adults with NCDs.

47 **Results**

48 The German Recommendations for Physical Activity state that adults with NCDs
49 should, over the course of a week, should do at least 150 minutes of moderate-intensity
50 aerobic PA, or 75 minutes of vigorous-intensity aerobic PA, or a combination of both.

51 Furthermore, muscle-strengthening activities should be performed at least twice a week.
52 The promotion of PA among adults with NCDs should be theory-based, specifically
53 target PA behaviour, and be tailored to the respective target group. In this context, and
54 as an intervention method, exercise referral schemes are one of the more promising
55 methods of promoting PA in adults with NCDs.

56 **Conclusion**

57 The development of evidence-based recommendations for PA and PA promotion is an
58 important step in terms of the initiation and implementation of actions for PA-related
59 health promotion in Germany. The German Recommendations for PA and PA
60 promotion inform adults affected by NCDs and health professionals on how much PA
61 would be optimal for adults with NCDs. Additionally, the recommendations provide
62 professionals entrusted in PA promotion the best strategies and interventions to raise low
63 PA levels in adults with NCDs. The formulation of specific PA recommendations for
64 adults with NCDs and their combination with recommendations on PA promotion is a
65 unique characteristic of the German recommendations.

66

67 **Keywords:** Guidelines, Recommendations, Physical Activity, Physical Activity
68 Promotion, Behaviour Change, Noncommunicable Disease, Chronic Condition

69

70

71

72

73 INTRODUCTION

74 The high prevalence of physical inactivity is a global problem [1, 2] that contributes to
75 increasing morbidity, higher rates of premature death [3], and increased economic costs
76 [4]. In this context, the development of strategies to promote physical activity (PA) is an
77 important challenge, both globally and nationally. A method of combatting high levels
78 of inactivity is the development of PA guidelines. PA guidelines define the amount of
79 health-enhancing activity through which significant health gains can be achieved [e.g.
80 5]. Both the World Health Organization (WHO) and the European Union have urged
81 their member states to develop their own recommendations on a national level [5–8].
82 Even though many nations have developed these recommendations in recent years,
83 including Canada, Great Britain, Australia, Switzerland, and Australia [e.g. 9, 10], the
84 resulting guidelines predominantly focus on age-stratified target groups of children and
85 adolescent, adults, and older adults. Thus far, the target group of individuals with
86 noncommunicable diseases (NCDs) has received scant consideration.

87

88 The fact that there are hardly any national PA recommendations for adults with NCDs is
89 surprising and problematic for several reasons. The ever-growing prevalence of NCDs
90 [11] has become a global health issue. For most countries, adults with NCDs comprise
91 one of the largest population groups. In Germany, for example, four out of every 10
92 adults report themselves as having at least one NCD [12]. PA has been proven to not
93 only aid in the prevention [13] but also in the treatment of NCDs [14]. For more than 25
94 NCDs – such as type 2 diabetes mellitus, osteoporosis, ischaemic heart disease, and
95 clinical depression – PA is viewed as a medicine [15]; a medicine that positively
96 influences symptoms and comorbidities, physical fitness and health-related quality of
97 life [15]. Therefore, WHO [16] states that regular PA is the 'best buy' in controlling
98 NCDs. Accordingly, WHO [5] specifies that their PA recommendations that are relevant

99 for all healthy adults ‘also apply to adults with chronic noncommunicable conditions not
100 related to mobility such as hypertension or diabetes.’ The PA recommendations of WHO
101 are based on a vast body of evidence, and they have an immensely positive influence on
102 global actions regarding PA promotion. However, a limitation of WHO’s
103 recommendations is that their underlying scientific evidence is mainly based on the
104 general population, meaning that specific scientific evidence regarding the health effects
105 of PA on adults with NCDs has not been systematically considered. This is problem if
106 adults with NCDs would need other PA and different levels of PA to optimally promote
107 their health. This lack of disease-specific evidence in PA recommendations also applies
108 to nations that base their PA recommendations for adults with NCDs on WHO
109 recommendations (e.g. Austria, Ireland, and Sweden). Other countries in Europe (e.g.
110 Netherlands) excluded studies in people with NCDs in developing their national PA
111 recommendations but state that the recommendations are useful for numerous specific
112 groups of people with a chronic condition [17]. And some countries (e.g. Belgium,
113 Greece, Spain, and Great Britain) do not make specific exercise recommendations for
114 adults with NCDs [11]. This means that for many countries, there exists no evidence-
115 based health-promoting PA recommendations for the large group of adults with NCDs.
116 Thus, neither the adults affected by NCDs nor the health professionals involved in PA
117 promotion know how much PA would be optimal.

118

119 Even more uncommon than missing PA recommendations, however, is to identify
120 guidelines which not only define the health-enhancing dose of PA, but also recommend
121 how PA promotion works for the specific target groups of adults with NCDs [18]. The
122 majority of countries fail to provide such recommendations on PA promotion for adults
123 with NCDs within a specific national scenario. Therefore, health professionals entrusted

124 in PA promotion often lack recommendations for the best strategies and interventions to
125 raise low PA levels in adults with NCDs.

126

127 With such limitations in mind, Germany developed its own national recommendations in
128 2016 [19]. The Committee for the Development of the German Recommendations on
129 Physical Activity and Physical Activity Promotion consisted of an interdisciplinary
130 working group made up of 16 scientists from six German universities. From an
131 international perspective, the German recommendations are characterised by two unique
132 features – namely, the formulation of specific recommendations for adults with NCDs
133 and the systematic integration of guidelines for PA and PA promotion for adults with
134 NCDs as well as for the other target groups (children and adolescents, adults, and older
135 adults).

136

137 Following on from this, the purpose of this paper is to describe the methodology we
138 used to develop the German National Recommendations for Physical Activity and
139 Physical Activity Promotion in Adults with NCDs and summarise the main results of
140 this development. By doing this, the paper hopes to help other nations develop their own
141 PA guidelines for the increasingly relevant target group of adults with NCDs. The paper
142 also hopes to promote debate in relation to the implications of addressing specific target
143 groups and the impact of this specific targeting on PA levels and public health policies.

144

145 **METHODS**

146 **Physical activity recommendations**

147 For the development of the German PA recommendations for all target groups (children
148 and adolescents, adults, older adults, and adults with NCDs), the same three-phase
149 process was used (see Table 1).

150 Table 1. Methodology used to prepare the German Recommendations for Physical
151 Activity.

Phase 1 January–June 2015	1A: Systematic literature review of existing PA recommendations 1B: Survey of experts to establish quality criteria
Phase 2 May–August 2015	2A: Assessment of the identified PA recommendations using quality criteria 2B: Selection of high-quality PA recommendations as source recommendations 2C: Content analysis of the source recommendations
Phase 3 September–December 2015	3A: Synthesis of content analyses and derivation of the recommendations for health-effective PA

152
153 For adults with NCDs, the three-phase process was initially applied to PA
154 recommendations that were specific to the seven NCDs. Considering years of life lost
155 due to premature death as well as years lived with disability, six of these NCDs are
156 among the most burdensome diseases in Germany for both men and women [20]. The
157 six NCDs are clinically stable ischemic heart disease, chronic non-specific back pain,
158 clinical depression, type 2 diabetes mellitus, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease

159 (COPD), and stroke (> 6 months after the acute event). Additionally, osteoarthritis was
160 added as seventh disease. Along with chronic non-specific back pain, osteoarthritis
161 accounts for the majority of diseases in the disease group of musculoskeletal diseases
162 which is among the three most relevant disease groups regarding burden of disease [20].
163 Osteoarthritis is characterised by high prevalence and high levels of stress among those
164 affected. Its negative effects include pain, functional restrictions in everyday life, and
165 loss of quality of life [21]. Finally, generic PA recommendations for adults with NCDs
166 were synthesised from an aggregation of the seven disease-specific PA
167 recommendations. We previously published a comprehensive description of the entire
168 methodology [22, 23]. The central aspects of the methodological approach are described
169 below.

170

171 *Phase 1: Systematic literature review and establishment of quality criteria*

172 Separate literature searches were carried out for the seven NCDs (1A). The searches
173 were comprised of PA recommendations, reviews of PA recommendations, and meta-
174 analyses of the effects of PA, all published between 2010 and 2015 on the Medline
175 database, either in German or English. Primary studies were not included.

176

177 As a first step in the selection of papers, titles and abstracts were checked for relevance.

178 At this point, primary studies, non-human articles, papers not available in German or
179 English, and papers that dealt with a different topic were excluded. Those papers
180 deemed relevant were then analysed in their entirety. The full texts were subjected to a
181 detailed relevance test that was conducted based on a standardised assessment sheet.

182

183 After checking the papers for the correct target population (adults with one of the seven
184 relevant NCDs), all papers containing original PA recommendations for those adults
185 were included. If a paper did not contain any original PA recommendations but
186 contained a meta-analysis of the effects of PA for the relevant target group or a review
187 of clinical guidelines or PA recommendations, then it was included.

188

189 For the standardised quality evaluation of the researched PA recommendations, an
190 evaluation instrument was developed (1B). The evaluation instrument was used to
191 ensure that methodically high-quality PA recommendations were selected. First, a list of
192 23 potential quality criteria was compiled based on the methodology of the *German*
193 *Instrument for Methodological Guideline Appraisal* [24] and the instrument for
194 *Advancing guideline development, reporting and evaluation in health care* (AGREE)
195 methodology [25]. Second, the list of quality criteria was submitted to national experts
196 for validation, based on the methodological approach of the Delphi surveys [26]. The
197 experts were asked to check the proposed quality criteria for completeness and
198 comprehensibility and to add any missing criteria (Delphi procedure stage 1). Finally,
199 the revised list of quality criteria was submitted to the experts once again to evaluate its
200 relevance with regard to the identification of high-quality PA recommendations (Delphi
201 procedure stage 2).

202

203 *Phase 2: Evaluation, selection, and content analysis of identified physical activity*
204 *recommendations*

205 The yielded PA recommendations were evaluated based on their content and
206 methodological quality using the evaluation instrument developed in phase 1 (2A). The
207 domains that were evaluated were the scope and purpose of the recommendations, the

208 methodological accuracy in their development, their clarity and differentiation of
209 content, and their structure (see Additional file 1).

210

211 The quality evaluation formed the basis for the selection of what is here referred to as
212 the source recommendations (2B). The source recommendations are those used as the
213 basis for the German PA recommendations. The cut-off value for the selection of high-
214 quality recommendations was > 60% in the domains of *scope and purpose* and
215 *methodological accuracy in the development of the recommendations*. Additionally,
216 reviews of recommendations and meta-analyses for the target group of adults with
217 NCDs were included as supplementary resources. We did this without explicit quality
218 ratings because even reviews with low quality could include statement on high quality
219 PA recommendations and meta-analysis normally include a quality rating leading to the
220 inclusion of studies with a high methodological quality. The identified source
221 recommendations were then subjected to a detailed content analysis using a standardised
222 analysis sheet that contained all 28 quality criteria (2C).

223

224 *Phase 3: Synthesis of content analysis and derivation of the recommendations for*
225 *health-effective physical activity*

226 Based on the detailed content analysis of the source recommendations and
227 supplementary texts, seven disease-specific recommendations for health-relevant PA
228 were compiled. These recommendations were then critically reviewed in relation to the
229 reported health effects, dose-response relationships, and risk–benefit considerations of
230 PA. Finally, the identification of cross-disease commonalities across the seven diseases
231 (e.g., similar amounts of PA or similar types of PA recommended) was discussed
232 resulting in the derivation of generic PA recommendations for adults with NCD.

233

234 **Physical activity promotion recommendations**

235 A systematic review of reviews regarding the efficacy/effectiveness of interventions for
236 PA promotion in adults with NCDs was conducted. This review comprises one of the
237 main pillars that led to the development of the German PA promotion recommendations
238 for adults with NCDs.¹ The methodology used for the systematic review of reviews is
239 briefly described below. A more detailed characterisation has already been explicated
240 [29, 30].

241

242 *Systematic review of review papers that examined the efficacy/effectiveness of*
243 *interventions for physical activity promotion*

244 A systematic review of review papers that examined the efficacy and effectiveness of
245 interventions was conducted. Six electronic databases (PubMed, Scopus, SPORTDiscus,
246 PsycINFO, ERIC, and IBSS) were systematically searched for the terms ‘physical
247 activity,’ ‘intervention,’ ‘evidence,’ ‘effect,’ ‘health,’ and ‘review.’ Alternative terms
248 were also utilised for PA, including ‘bike,’ ‘biking,’ ‘cycling,’ ‘walking,’ ‘active
249 transport,’ ‘human-powered transport,’ ‘sedentary,’ ‘exercise,’ and ‘sport.’ Two
250 independent reviewers screened titles and abstracts for relevance based on the following
251 criteria: a) the paper contains empirical results from single studies; b) the paper includes
252 interventions focused on PA promotion or the reduction of physical inactivity; c) the
253 paper focuses on the efficacy of interventions; and d) the paper is written in English or
254 German. For the identified relevant papers, a secondary screening process of the entire

¹ Additionally, two reviews were carried out to analyse the cost-effectiveness of PA promotion interventions and develop generic quality criteria for the conception, implementation, and evaluation of interventions for the promotion of PA. The results of these reviews have been published [27, 28] and are beyond the scope of this article.

255 text was conducted by two independent reviewers based on the same criteria. Finally,
256 additional papers were identified via screening the reference lists of identified articles.

257

258 An independent researcher assessed the quality of the identified papers using two
259 separate tools – namely, the AGREE instrument (The AGREE Collaboration 2003),
260 which was used in the formulation of the Canadian Physical Activity Guidelines [31],
261 and our own quality criteria, which allowed for higher levels of differentiation regarding
262 the methodological quality criteria of each review (see Additional file 2). Based on both
263 instruments, percentage values were calculated for each paper. Such values indicated the
264 percentages of fulfilled criteria for each paper, both on the basis of the AGREE tool and
265 our newly developed instrument. These percentage values were calculated based on the
266 number of applicable criteria (e.g. some criteria were only applicable for meta-analyses).
267 The combined results defined the quality of each paper as high, medium, or low. A
268 paper was classified as being of high quality when at least 75% of the AGREE criteria
269 and 60% of our own criteria were fulfilled. Papers were defined as being of medium
270 quality if they satisfied just one of these thresholds, while low-quality papers reached
271 neither threshold.

272

273 *Expert consensus*

274 A group of scientific experts developed the German Recommendations for Physical
275 Activity Promotion in a process of consensus. Two individuals with expertise in PA
276 promotion were assigned the task of assessing the efficacy/effectiveness of the identified
277 papers. Following the methodology proposed by Smith et al. [32], both reviewers
278 applied a standardised process of analysis that consisted of six steps. First, an
279 independent review of the identified literature was conducted, and a draft summary

280 statement was compiled. Second, a meeting of both reviewers was held to discuss
281 statements and agree on a conjointly revised summary statement. Third, the summary
282 statement was presented and discussed with the reviewers who were assigned to other
283 target groups (e.g. older adults). Fourth, a workshop meeting was held to present each
284 summary statement to the entire project group (including scientists involved in drafting
285 the PA promotion recommendations as well as an International Scientific Advisory
286 Board). Each summary statement was revised on the basis of expert feedback. Fifth, the
287 recommendations for each target group were drafted using the finalised summary
288 statements. A template specifying how to draft the recommendations was developed and
289 provided by the project leaders. Sixth, the drafted recommendations were circulated for
290 review by the entire project group as well as the International Scientific Advisory Board.
291 Recommendations were made when both reviewers rated the available evidence as being
292 of strong or medium quality, based on the following criteria: (1) the number of available
293 reviews focusing on a given intervention type is sufficient to formulate
294 recommendations; and (2) the reviews show conclusive evidence for efficacy.
295 Recommendations were not made when the above criteria were not fulfilled (i.e. when
296 the available evidence was weak or inconclusive).

297

298 **RESULTS**

299 **Physical activity recommendations**

300 *Existing physical activity recommendations for adults with NCDs*

301 The PA recommendations for adults with NCDs were derived from a detailed content
302 analysis of 48 source recommendations and texts: arthrosis (hip and knee)(9 articles);
303 type 2 diabetes mellitus (4 articles); COPD (5 articles); clinically stable ischemic heart
304 disease(4 articles); stroke (10 articles); clinical depression (7 articles); and chronic non-

305 specific back pain (9 articles). The detailed references of all 48 articles and their quality
306 ratings can be found in Additional file 3.

307

308 For all seven analysed NCDs, PA and/or exercise is recommended as an effective
309 treatment option. The positive benefits of PA outweigh its costs and side effects. A
310 physically inactive lifestyle is associated with significantly greater health risks than a
311 lifestyle with high levels of PA. Details regarding the health effects, risks, and side
312 effects of PA within the individual disease-specific PA recommendations are reported by
313 Rütten et al. [19].

314

315 *Main recommendations for physical activity*

316 The following recommendations are for adults aged between 18 and 65 with an NCD
317 such as type 2 diabetes, COPD, arthritis in the hip or knee, clinically stable ischemic
318 heart disease, stroke (> 6 months after the acute event), clinical depression, or chronic
319 non-specific back pain.

320

321 In order to achieve significant health effects (e.g., improved symptoms, enhanced
322 physical functioning, improved psychological health and quality of life), adults with
323 NCDs should be physically active on a regular basis. However, health-enhancing results
324 can also occur when individuals who were entirely physically inactive become
325 somewhat more active. Every step away from physical inactivity is important, as each
326 step leads to increased health benefits.

327

328 The PA recommendations for adults with NCDs are presented in Table 2. They do not
329 differ from the PA recommendations for healthy adults and represent the minimum

330 levels of PA one should meet in order to maintain and promote one's health
331 comprehensiveley.

332

333

334 Table 2. German recommendations for physical activity for adults with
335 noncommunicable diseases.

Moderate-intensity aerobic PA for at least 150 minutes/week where possible (e.g. 5 x 30 minutes a week) OR

at least 75 minutes/week of vigorous-intensity aerobic PA OR

a corresponding combination of both intensities (e.g. 50 minutes moderate-intensity PA and 50 minutes vigorous-intensity PA).

The aerobic PA should be gathered in bouts lasting at least 10 minutes distributed over days and week (e.g. at least 3 x 10 minutes/day for 5 days a week).

Additionally, muscle-strengthening PA should be conducted at least twice a week.

336

337 During phases in which the recommendations cannot be met (e.g. due to severity of
338 illness or reduced physical capacity), adults with NCDs should be as active as their
339 current situation permits.

340

341 *Additional recommendations for safe (re-)entry into a physically active lifestyle*

342 PA is associated with a variety of positive health effects for adults with NCDs.

343 However, PA is not completely without risk for such individuals. The beginning of a

344 physical training programme or phases during which PA levels are increased can be

345 associated with a higher risk of side effects and adverse events. Therefore, the developed
346 recommendations also include information on safety enhancement. To increase the
347 safety and effectiveness of PA, adults with NCDs should:

348 (1) have a (sports) medical examination carried out when commencing a physically
349 active lifestyle or entering a PA programme;

350 (2) decide, along with a doctor, whether practicing PA independently is safe and
351 appropriate, or whether it is advisable to be under the professional care of PA
352 professionals at the outset;

353 (3) tailor the PA dose (type of PA, exercise intensity, duration, frequency) to
354 individual needs and functional levels with the assistance of a PA professional; and

355 (4) obtain professional advice from healthcare professionals during the phases of the
356 progression of the illness, when experiencing lack of control over the illness, or when
357 one's health status is deteriorating, as it may be necessary to adjust or change PA or
358 momentarily interrupt PA.

359

360 **Physical activity promotion recommendations**

361 *Efficacy/effectiveness for physical activity promotion*

362 The PA promotion recommendations for adults with NCDs were developed based on 18
363 systematic reviews. The detailed quality ratings of the papers are included in Additional
364 file 4. All the papers conducted their reviews in healthcare settings. Two analysed
365 general PA promotion interventions [33, 34], seven focused on indication-based PA
366 promotion [35–41], three assessed interventions in primary care [42–44], and six dealt
367 with the effects of different types of PA-promoting interventions [45–50].

368

369 The reviews analysing general interventions for PA promotion found that the effects of
370 interventions are stronger when PA behaviour is targeted specifically rather than in
371 combination with other health behaviours [33]. Furthermore, interventions are most
372 effective when they are theory-based and use techniques of behavioural change [34].

373

374 Six indication-based PA-promotion approaches provided medium-level evidence during
375 the assembling of the recommendations. Short et al. [35] evidenced that special
376 behaviour-based techniques can be useful for adults with breast cancer. Interventions for
377 adults with rheumatoid arthritis were investigated in two reviews [36, 37], and one
378 review indicated that PA promotion for this target group can be effective in the long
379 term [37]. The research findings identified only one study that showed positive effects of
380 a PA-promoting intervention for people with cystic fibrosis [38]. One review analysed
381 home-based exercise programmes for adults with chronic low back pain, and most of the
382 studies reviewed showed significant effects [39]. For adults after stroke, specific
383 behavioural interventions, such as targeted counselling or specially tailored exercise
384 programmes, are more effective than exercise programmes and general counselling [40].
385 The usual rehabilitation measures comprising PA therapy combined with psychosocial
386 or educational interventions can increase PA behaviour in the short term for individuals
387 with cardiovascular disease [41].

388

389 Concerning interventions in primary care and/or curative care, one review shows that
390 exercise referral schemes can lead to small positive effects in the short and medium term
391 [42]. Orrow et al. [44] conducted a review and meta-analysis based on a broad range of
392 interventions and showed that interventions in primary care can be effective. Another
393 review concluded that motivational interventions are effective for PA promotion [43].

394 The last group of reviews focused on the effectiveness of different types of
395 interventions. Based on these reviews, there is strong evidence for the effectiveness of
396 pedometer-based interventions for adults with musculoskeletal diseases [45],
397 inconclusive evidence for the effectiveness of internet-based interventions in cardiac
398 rehabilitation [46, 47], and conflicting evidence for the effectiveness of web-based
399 interventions for patients with NCDs [50]. Furthermore, the reviews showed evidence of
400 the effectiveness of the counseling method *motivational interviewing* for individuals
401 with NCDs [48] and of lifestyle interventions delivered by nurses in primary healthcare
402 [49].

403

404 *Recommendations for physical activity promotion: efficacy/effectiveness*

405 All papers in the systematic review refer to health care settings, e.g. general practitioners
406 practices or clinics. Accordingly, recommendations for PA promotion in adults with
407 NCDs were made for interventions in healthcare institutions (see Table 3).

408

409 Table 3. German recommendations for physical activity promotion in adults with
410 noncommunicable diseases.

	Healthcare institutions
Efficacy/effectiveness	Introduce exercise referral schemes
and quality criteria	Use theory-based approaches
	Tailor PA behaviour of adults with NCDs specifically
	Tailor interventions to the respective target group

411

412 **DISCUSSION**

413 The German guidelines for PA and PA promotion for adults with NCDs provide
414 recommendations for the amount of PA necessary to yield substantial health benefits and
415 strategies for PA promotion so that the recommended level of PA is successfully
416 reached. Thus far, and to the best of our knowledge, such a combination of
417 recommendations is the first of its kind. The concomitant implementation of both PA
418 and PA promotion recommendations produces considerable health gains in what is, to
419 date, one of the largest and most inactive adult subgroups.

420

421 The German recommendations for PA and PA promotion represent a fundamental
422 building block in terms of mobilising national efforts to fight against physical inactivity.
423 On the one hand, professional organisations in the fields of medicine, exercise therapy,
424 and/or rehabilitation can use these guidelines to promote increased PA levels among
425 individuals with NCDs. On the other hand, health professions and societies ought to
426 support the dissemination and implementation of these guidelines in order to maximise
427 their influence and ensure that the target population is reached.

428

429 The ideal dosage of PA for various target groups has been long discussed. Evidence
430 supporting the claim that PA promotes health among people with NCDs is plentiful [15].
431 When considering a wide scope of health outcomes, many adults with NCDs respond to
432 higher levels of PA by producing better health effects, and the understanding that ‘a lot
433 helps a lot’ still rings true. Nonetheless, there are other outcomes in this regard. For
434 example, a higher level of PA intensity might have negative effects on psychological
435 well-being [51]. For some outcomes, much of the maximal effect is achieved from a
436 relatively low dose of PA; for example, the greatest reduction in mortality rates occurs at
437 PA levels already well below the recommended minimum dose of 150 minutes/week

438 [52]. The German PA recommendations for adults with NCDs are based on a synthesis
439 of the available recommendations. Consequently, they also use the concept of the
440 minimum dose for substantial health gains. Nevertheless, it is a task for future
441 researchers to question the concept of minimum doses and determine the dose–response
442 relationships for certain health outcomes (e.g., mortality, morbidity, physical
443 functioning, psychological health and well-being).

444

445 The current German PA recommendations for individuals with NCDs are identical to
446 those suggested for healthy adults (i.e. 150 minutes of moderate PA plus two strength-
447 training sessions per week). This generic outcome was synthesised based on seven
448 carefully prepared, high-quality, indication-specific recommendations. The claim that
449 this dose leads to substantial health gains in most individuals with NCDs is evidence-
450 based. Notwithstanding, this dose might be physically and psychologically excessive for
451 some individuals with NCDs – this point cannot be ignored. The importance of patient-
452 centred tailoring plans and programmes that focus on adjusting the dosage to individual
453 needs and functionality levels is therefore emphasised. This supports and values adults
454 with NCDs being regularly active, according to their current health status and their
455 ability.

456 In addition to PA behaviour, other health-related behaviours, including smoking,
457 alcohol, diet, and medication, have a major influence on the health of individuals with
458 NCDs [53]. It is understood and anticipated that the recommendation to change only one
459 behaviour at a time might not be practical to implement in a real-world setting. For
460 example, in a typical rehabilitation context, it is often recommended to try and adjust
461 multiple behaviours at once. Even if this is medically recommended and meaningful, the
462 probability of successful behaviour change decreases as a result. Influencing multiple
463 behaviour patterns individually might be a better approach. Addressing the promotion of

464 PA first might be the best option, as regular PA can act as a catalyst to promote changes
465 in other health behaviours [54].

466

467 The basic premise of the Committee for the German Recommendations for Physical
468 Activity and Physical Activity Promotion was to develop recommendations for specific
469 target groups. Independent and separate working processes were implemented for
470 children and adolescents, adults, older adults, and adults with NCDs. Thus, the German
471 recommendations include more diverse population subgroups and fulfil a requirement of
472 the Advisory Committee of the United States [55]. Due to the rather low level of
473 evidence of PA promotion in individuals with NCDs, the recommendations for adults
474 with NCDs are less detailed compared to the other target groups [29]. Nevertheless,
475 additional to the development of the target-specific recommendations for PA promotion,
476 general quality criteria for the conceptualization, implementation, and evaluation of
477 interventions for PA promotion were developed [27]. For example, during the
478 conceptualisation phase, quality criteria, such as the multidimensionality of the
479 intervention, the involvement of different stakeholders, and the specification of goals
480 and target behaviour, need to be considered. Other criteria relate to, for example,
481 communication, sustainability, and resources during implementation as well as to
482 different aspects of the evaluation (see Additional file 5 for a list of all quality criteria).
483 Even though there is no specific evidence in relation to adults with NCDs for most of
484 these criteria, the criteria support the conceptualisation, implementation, and evaluation
485 of interventions for adults with NCDs.

486

487 It is important to highlight that nations should not only *develop* PA and PA promotion
488 recommendations. In order to maximise the reach of the recommendations, it is crucial
489 to attempt to *disseminate* said recommendations to the appropriate individuals,

490 communities, and organisations at the right time. In order to facilitate understanding of
491 the developmental process for PA recommendations, it has been proposed that the
492 German context should be analysed through the lens of the multiple streams approach
493 (MSA) [18]. In summary, the MSA was developed in 1984 to study policy processes and
494 to clarify why certain issues receive or attract attention and others do not (agenda
495 setting). It posits that the political process comprises three streams that flow
496 independently – namely, the problem stream (i.e. specific issues perceived as
497 problematic and in need of solution), the policy stream (i.e. the development of
498 strategies and possible policies to address the stated problem), and the politics stream
499 (i.e. operating actors such as political parties, institutions, and interest groups). The
500 interaction between the three streams might facilitate or hinder the effective
501 dissemination and adoption of national PA and PA promotion guidelines. As for the
502 German context, including PA promotion as a stand-alone topic in the political agenda
503 might have come as a result of said interaction. This propelled several different
504 strategies and actions that boosted the impact of PA and PA promotion
505 recommendations nationwide. A more detailed description and dissection of the
506 aforementioned strategies and actions was published by Rütten et al. [18].

507

508 **Limitations**

509 The methodological approach used to develop both guidelines is not without its
510 restrictions. A goal of the Committee for the Development of German Guidelines for
511 Physical Activity was to address the target group of adults with NCDs. However, only a
512 (very) limited amount of finances, time, and human resources was made available for the
513 overall development of the guidelines.

514

515 Due to said limitations, the committee opted to apply an overall methodological
516 approach based on the extraction and synthesis of high-quality reviews, meta-analyses,
517 and existing recommendations. Original scientific works, for instance, could
518 unfortunately not be taken into account during this development. The consideration of
519 these works would have allowed for additional and relevant topics to be explored in
520 more detail. As an example of this consequence, the current PA guidelines do not
521 incorporate the role of sedentary behaviour and its impact on adults with NCDs.

522

523 As for the PA promotion guidelines, general recommendations can be provided for
524 interventions in terms of their theoretical foundations. However, investigating the most
525 effective theory-based intervention or conducting comparative analyses of the effects of
526 different theories was beyond the scope of our methodological approach.

527

528 The underlying evidence comes exclusively from interventions carried out in the
529 healthcare system. Studies carried out in other settings (e.g., educational system, work
530 place) are lacking. It is likely that the consideration of original scientific papers would
531 have identified further studies conducted in other settings. It is likely that this would
532 have led to more multi-faceted recommendations for the promotion of PA in adults with
533 NCDs.

534

535 The robustness of the selected methodology as well as its economic limitations represent
536 a compromise that aims to include individuals with different NCDs, as they represent a
537 crucial target group from a public health perspective. When compared to Canada, for
538 example, Germany used a low-cost approach, which resulted in numerous
539 methodological limitations. Such an approach, however, seems to be feasible for other
540 nations, as it helps to curtail restraints imposed by a scarcity of available resources.

541

542 **CONCLUSION**

543 The development of PA recommendations for adults with NCDs provides an evidence-
544 based target dose of PA that adults with different NCDs can use to achieve significant
545 health outcomes; the development of PA promotion recommendations for adults with
546 NCDs helps to achieve that dose. Thus, the development of evidence-based PA and PA
547 promotion guidelines is an important building block in relation to the initiation and
548 implementation of actions for PA-related health promotion in Germany. The formulation
549 of specific PA recommendations for adults with NCDs and their combination with
550 specific PA promotion recommendations renders the German recommendations quite
551 unique. The German Recommendations for PA and PA promotion for adults with NCDs
552 help other nations develop their own PA guidelines for the increasingly relevant target
553 group of adults with NCDs.

554

555 **List of abbreviations**

556 COPD: chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; MSA: multiple streams approach; NCD:
557 noncommunicable disease; PA: physical activity; WHO: World Health Organization

558

559 **DECLARATIONS**

560 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

561 Not applicable

562

563 **Consent for publication**

564 Not applicable

565

566 **Availability of data and material**

567 Not applicable

568

569 **Competing interests**

570 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

571

572 **Funding**

573 The development of the National Recommendations for Physical Activity and Physical
574 Activity Promotion has been funded by the German Federal Ministry of Health (ZMVI 5
575 2514FSB-200). The ministry was not involved in the writing of this manuscript or in the
576 decision to submit the article for publication.

577

578 **Authors' contributions**

579 This work summarises aspects of the development of the National Recommendations for
580 Physical Activity and Physical Activity Promotion. WG, KA, SM, and KP are members
581 of the Committee for the Development of the German Recommendations on Physical
582 Activity and Physical Activity Promotion. WG and KA conceptualised this paper. WG
583 and KP are responsible for the methods and results related to the German
584 Recommendations for Physical Activity; KA, MW, SM, and KP are responsible for the
585 methods and results related to the German Recommendations for Physical Activity

586 Promotion; MW, KA, and WG wrote the draft of this manuscript; all authors revised the
587 draft of the manuscript and approved the submitted version.

588

589 **Acknowledgements**

590 We would like to thank all members of the Bewegungsförderung im Alltag (Physical
591 Activity Promotion in Daily Living) working group who made a valuable contribution to
592 the recommendations through their constructive suggestions and feedback.

593 **References**

- 594 1. Kohl HW, Craig CL, Lambert EV, Inoue S, Alkandari JR, Leetongin G, Kahlmeier
595 S. The pandemic of physical inactivity: global action for public health. *Lancet*.
596 2012;380:294–305. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(12)60898-8.
- 597 2. Guthold R, Stevens GA, Riley LM, Bull FC. Worldwide trends in insufficient
598 physical activity from 2001 to 2016. A pooled analysis of 358 population-based
599 surveys with 1.9 million participants. *Lancet Glob Health* 2018. doi:10.1016/S2214-
600 109X(18)30357-7.
- 601 3. Lee I-M, Shiroma EJ, Lobelo F, Puska P, Blair SN, Katzmarzyk PT. Effect of
602 physical inactivity on major non-communicable diseases worldwide: an analysis of
603 burden of disease and life expectancy. *Lancet*. 2012;380:219–29.
604 doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(12)61031-9.
- 605 4. Ding D, Lawson KD, Kolbe-Alexander TL, Finkelstein EA, Katzmarzyk PT, van
606 Mechelen W, Pratt M. The economic burden of physical inactivity: a global analysis
607 of major non-communicable diseases. *Lancet*. 2016;388:1311–24.
608 doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(16)30383-X.

- 609 5. WHO. Global recommendations on physical activity for health. Geneva: World
610 Health Organization; 2010.
- 611 6. WHO. Global strategy on diet, physical activity, and health. Geneva, Switzerland:
612 World Health Organization; 2004.
- 613 7. European Union Council. Council recommendation on promoting health-enhancing
614 physical activity across sectors. 2013.
615 http://ec.europa.eu/sport/library/documents/hepa_en.pdf. Accessed 7 Mar 2018.
- 616 8. European Union. EU physical activity guidelines: Recommended policy actions on
617 support of health-enhancing physical activity. 2008.
618 [http://ec.europa.eu/sport/library/policy_documents/eu-physical-activityguidelines-](http://ec.europa.eu/sport/library/policy_documents/eu-physical-activityguidelines-2008_en.pdf)
619 [2008_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/sport/library/policy_documents/eu-physical-activityguidelines-2008_en.pdf). Accessed 7 Mar 2018.
- 620 9. Kahlmeier S, Wijnhoven TMA, Alpiger P, Schweizer C, Breda J, Martin BW.
621 National physical activity recommendations: systematic overview and analysis of
622 the situation in European countries. *BMC Public Health*. 2015;15:133.
623 doi:10.1186/s12889-015-1412-3.
- 624 10. Stamatakis E, Ding D, Hamer M, Bauman AE, Lee I-M, Ekelund U. Any public
625 health guidelines should always be developed from a consistent, clear evidence base.
626 *Br J Sports Med* 2019. doi:10.1136/bjsports-2018-100394.
- 627 11. Murray CJL, Vos T, Lozano R, Naghavi M, Flaxman AD, Michaud C, et al.
628 Disability-adjusted life years (DALYs) for 291 diseases and injuries in 21 regions,
629 1990-2010: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2010.
630 *Lancet*. 2012;380:2197–223. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(12)61689-4.
- 631 12. Lange C. Daten und Fakten. Ergebnisse der Studie "Gesundheit in Deutschland
632 aktuell 2012" [Facts and figures. Results of the study "Health in Germany 2012"].
633 Berlin: Robert-Koch-Institut; 2014. German

- 634 13. Booth FW, Roberts CK, Laye MJ. Lack of exercise is a major cause of chronic
635 diseases. *Compr Physiol*. 2012;2:1143–211. doi:10.1002/cphy.c110025.
- 636 14. WHO. Global action plan on physical activity 2018-2013. More active people for a
637 healthier world. 2018.
638 <http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/272722/9789241514187-eng.pdf>.
639 Accessed 3 Aug 2018.
- 640 15. Pedersen BK, Saltin B. Exercise as medicine - evidence for prescribing exercise as
641 therapy in 26 different chronic diseases. *Scand J Med Sci Sports*. 2015;25 Suppl
642 3:1–72. doi:10.1111/sms.12581.
- 643 16. WHO. Global action plan for the prevention and control of noncommunicable
644 diseases: 2013-2020. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization; 2013.
- 645 17. Weggemans RM, Backx FJG, Borghouts L, Chinapaw M, Hopman MTE, Koster A,
646 et al. The 2017 Dutch Physical Activity Guidelines. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act*.
647 2018;15:58. doi:10.1186/s12966-018-0661-9.
- 648 18. Rütten A, Abu-Omar K, Messing S, Weege M, Pfeifer K, Geidl W, Hartung V. How
649 can the impact of national recommendations for physical activity be increased?
650 Experiences from Germany. *Health Res Policy Syst*. 2018;16:121.
651 doi:10.1186/s12961-018-0396-8.
- 652 19. Rütten A, Pfeifer K, editors. National recommendations for physical activity and
653 physical activity promotion. Erlangen: FAU University Press; 2016.
- 654 20. Plass D, Vos T, Hornberg C, Scheidt-Nave C, Zeeb H, Krämer A. Trends in disease
655 burden in Germany: results, implications and limitations of the Global Burden of
656 Disease study. *Dtsch Arztebl Int*. 2014;111:629–38. doi:10.3238/arztebl.2014.0629.
- 657 21. Rabenberg M (editor). *Arthrose [Osteoarthritis]*. Berlin: Robert Koch-Institut;
658 2013. German

- 659 22. Geidl W, Pfeifer K. Hintergrund und methodisches Vorgehen bei der Entwicklung
660 von nationalen Empfehlungen für Bewegung [Background and methodology of the
661 development of German physical activity guidelines]. Gesundheitswesen.
662 2017;79:S4-S10. doi:10.1055/s-0042-123703. German
- 663 23. Pfeifer K, Geidl W. Bewegungsempfehlungen für Erwachsene mit einer chronischen
664 Erkrankung – Methodisches Vorgehen, Datenbasis und Begründung [Physical
665 activity recommendations for adults with a chronic disease: methods. database and
666 rationale]. Gesundheitswesen. 2017;79:S29-S35. doi:10.1055/s-0042-123699.
667 German
- 668 24. Kopp IB. Perspectives in guideline development and implementation in germany. Z
669 Rheumatol. 2010;69:298–304. doi:10.1007/s00393-009-0526-3.
- 670 25. Brouwers MC, Kho ME, Browman GP, Burgers JS, Cluzeau F, Feder G, et al.
671 AGREE II: Advancing guideline development, reporting and evaluation in health
672 care. CMAJ. 2010;182:E839-E842. doi:10.1503/cmaj.090449.
- 673 26. Okoli C, Pawlowski SD. The Delphi method as a research tool: an example, design
674 considerations and applications. Inform Managment. 2004;42:15–29.
675 doi:10.1016/j.im.2003.11.002.
- 676 27. Messing S, Rütten A. Qualitätskriterien für die Konzipierung, Implementierung und
677 Evaluation von Interventionen zur Bewegungsförderung. Ergebnisse eines State-of-
678 the-Art Reviews [Quality criteria for the conception, implementation and evaluation
679 of interventions for physical activity promotion: a state-of-the-art review].
680 Gesundheitswesen. 2017;79:S60-S65. doi:10.1055/s-0042-123378. German
- 681 28. Abu-Omar K, Rütten A, Burlacu I, Schätzlein V, Messing S, Suhrcke M. The cost-
682 effectiveness of physical activity interventions: a systematic review of reviews. Prev
683 Med Rep. 2017;8:72–8. doi:10.1016/j.pmedr.2017.08.006.

- 684 29. Abu-Omar K, Rütten A, Messing S, Pfeifer K, Ungerer-Röhrich U, Goodwin L, et
685 al. The German recommendations for physical activity promotion. *J Public Health*.
686 2018;71:1. doi:10.1007/s10389-018-0986-5.
- 687 30. Abu-Omar K, Rütten A, Burlacu I, Messing S, Pfeifer K, Ungerer-Röhrich U.
688 Systematischer Review von Übersichtsarbeiten zu Interventionen der
689 Bewegungsförderung. Methodologie und erste Ergebnisse [A systematic review of
690 reviews of interventions for the promotion of physical activity: methodology and
691 first results]. *Gesundheitswesen*. 2017;79:S45-S50. doi:10.1055/s-0042-123502.
692 German
- 693 31. Tremblay MS, Warburton DER, Janssen I, Paterson DH, Latimer AE, Rhodes RE, et
694 al. New Canadian physical activity guidelines. *Appl Physiol Nutr Metab*.
695 2011;36:36-46; 47-58. doi:10.1139/H11-009.
- 696 32. Smith V, Devane D, Begley CM, Clarke M. Methodology in conducting a
697 systematic review of systematic reviews of healthcare interventions. *BMC Med Res*
698 *Methodol*. 2011;11:15. doi:10.1186/1471-2288-11-15.
- 699 33. Conn VS, Hafdahl AR, Cooper PS, Brown LM, Lusk SL. Meta-analysis of
700 workplace physical activity interventions. *Am J Prev Med*. 2009;37:330–9.
701 doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2009.06.008.
- 702 34. Leidy NK, Kimel M, Ajagbe L, Kim K, Hamilton A, Becker K. Designing trials of
703 behavioral interventions to increase physical activity in patients with COPD:
704 insights from the chronic disease literature. *Respir Med*. 2014;108:472–81.
705 doi:10.1016/j.rmed.2013.11.011.
- 706 35. Short CE, James EL, Stacey F, Plotnikoff RC. A qualitative synthesis of trials
707 promoting physical activity behaviour change among post-treatment breast cancer
708 survivors. *J Cancer Surviv*. 2013;7:570–81. doi:10.1007/s11764-013-0296-4.

- 709 36. Cramp F, Berry J, Gardiner M, Smith F, Stephens D. Health behaviour change
710 interventions for the promotion of physical activity in rheumatoid arthritis: a
711 systematic review. *Musculoskeletal Care*. 2013;11:238–47. doi:10.1002/msc.1049.
- 712 37. Iversen MD, Brawerman M, Iversen CN. Recommendations and the state of the
713 evidence for physical activity interventions for adults with rheumatoid arthritis:
714 2007 to present. *Int J Clin Rheumatol*. 2012;7:489–503. doi:10.2217/ijr.12.53.
- 715 38. Cox NS, Alison JA, Holland AE. Interventions for promoting physical activity in
716 people with cystic fibrosis. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2013;12.
- 717 39. Beinart NA, Goodchild CE, Weinman JA, Ayis S, Godfrey EL. Individual and
718 intervention-related factors associated with adherence to home exercise in chronic
719 low back pain: a systematic review. *Spine J*. 2013;13:1940–50.
720 doi:10.1016/j.spinee.2013.08.027.
- 721 40. Morris JH, Macgillivray S, McFarlane S. Interventions to promote long-term
722 participation in physical activity after stroke: a systematic review of the literature.
723 *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 2014;95:956–67. doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2013.12.016.
- 724 41. ter Hoeve N, Huisstede BMA, Stan HJ, van Domburg RT, Sunamura M, van den
725 Berg-Emons RJG. Does cardiac rehabilitation after an acute cardiac syndrome lead
726 to changes in physical activity habits? Systematic review. *Phys Ther*. 2015;95:167–
727 79.
- 728 42. Pavey TG, Anokye N, Taylor AH, Trueman P, Moxham T, Fox KR, et al. The
729 clinical effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of exercise referral schemes: a
730 systematic review and economic evaluation. *Health Technol Assess* 2011.
731 doi:10.3310/hta15440.
- 732 43. McGrane N, Galvin R, Cusack T, Stokes E. Addition of motivational interventions
733 to exercise and traditional physiotherapy: a review and meta-analysis.
734 *Physiotherapy*. 2015;101:1–12. doi:10.1016/j.physio.2014.04.009.

- 735 44. Orrow G, Kinmonth AL, Sanderson S, Sutton S. Effectiveness of physical activity
736 promotion based in primary care: systematic review and meta-analysis of
737 randomised controlled trials. *BMJ*. 2012;344:16. doi:10.1136/bmj.e1389.
- 738 45. Mansi S, Milosavljevic S, Baxter GD, Tumilty S, Hendrick P. A systematic review
739 of studies using pedometers as an intervention for musculoskeletal diseases. *BMC*
740 *Musculoskel Disord* 2014. doi:10.1186/1471-2474-15-231.
- 741 46. Mastellos N, Gunn LH, Felix LM, Car J, Majeed A. Transtheoretical model stages
742 of change for dietary and physical exercise modification in weight loss management
743 for overweight and obese adults. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2014;2.
- 744 47. Munro J, Angus N, Leslie SJ. Patient focused internet-based approaches to
745 cardiovascular rehabilitation - a systematic review. *J Telemed Telecare*.
746 2013;19:347–53. doi:10.1177/1357633X13501763.
- 747 48. O'Halloran PD, Blackstock F, Shields N, Holland A, Iles R, Kingsley M, et al.
748 Motivational interviewing to increase physical activity in people with chronic health
749 conditions: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Clin Rehabil*. 2014;28:1159–71.
750 doi:10.1177/0269215514536210.
- 751 49. Sargent GM, Forrest LE, Parker RM. Nurse delivered lifestyle interventions in
752 primary health care to treat chronic disease risk factors associated with obesity: a
753 systematic review. *Obes Rev*. 2012;13:1148–71. doi:10.1111/j.1467-
754 789X.2012.01029.x.
- 755 50. Bossen D, Veenhof C, Dekker J, Bakker D de. The effectiveness of self-guided web-
756 based physical activity interventions among patients with a chronic disease: a
757 systematic review. *J Phys Act Health*. 2014;11:665–77. doi:10.1123/jpah.2012-
758 0152.

- 759 51. Zenko Z, Ekkekakis P, Ariely D. Can you have your vigorous exercise and enjoy it
760 too? Ramping intensity down increases postexercise, remembered, and forecasted
761 pleasure. *J Sport Exerc Psychol.* 2016;38:149–59. doi:10.1123/jsep.2015-0286.
- 762 52. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Physical activity guidelines for
763 americans, 2nd edition. Washington, DC: U.S.: Department of Health and Human
764 Services; 2018.
- 765 53. WHO. Global Status Report on Noncommunicable Diseases 2014. Geneva: World
766 Health Organization; 2014.
- 767 54. Loprinzi PD. Physical activity is the best buy in medicine, but perhaps for less
768 obvious reasons. *Prev Med.* 2015;75:23–4. doi:10.1016/j.ypmed.2015.01.033.
- 769 55. King AC, Whitt-Glover MC, Marquez DX, Buman MP, Napolitano MA, Jakicic J,
770 et al. Physical activity promotion: highlights from the 2018 Physical Activity
771 Guidelines Advisory Committee Systematic Review. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.*
772 2019;51:1340–53. doi:10.1249/MSS.0000000000001945.

773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795

796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816

Additional files

817 Additional file 1.pdf; Criteria for Quality Assessment and Content Analysis of Physical
818 Activity Recommendations. This file lists the 28 criteria used to assess methodological
819 quality and analyse motion-related content.

820 Additional file 2.pdf; Quality checklist for the systematic reviews of reviews regarding
821 the effectiveness/efficacy of PA promoting interventions. This file lists the criteria used
822 to evaluate the papers reporting PA promotion interventions with regard to their
823 effectiveness/efficacy.

824 Additional file 3.pdf; Quality ratings of the physical activity recommendations and
825 additional resources (meta-analysis and reviews on physical activity recommendations)
826 that were additional included without explicit quality ratings for seven
827 noncommunicable diseases. This file lists the retrieved articles and their quality ratings
828 leading to the decision on which articles the German Recommendations for Physical
829 Activity for Adults with NCD were developed.

- 830 Additional file 4.pdf; Quality rating of the reviews for developing the German
831 Recommendations for PA Promotion. This table contains the quality rating of the
832 reviews used to develop the German Recommendations for PA promotion.
- 833 Additional file 5.pdf; Quality criteria for the conceptualization, implementation and
834 evaluation of PA promoting interventions. This table lists the general quality criteria for
835 PA promotion interventions.