## Title:

Small steps: effectiveness and feasibility of an incremental goal-setting intervention to reduce sitting time in older adults

## Authors:

Lewis LK<sup>a,b</sup>, Rowlands AV<sup>b,c,d</sup>, Gardiner PA<sup>e,f</sup>, Standage M<sup>g</sup>, English C<sup>b</sup>, Olds T<sup>b</sup>

## Affiliations:

<sup>a</sup> School of Health Sciences, Faculty of Medicine, Nursing and Health Sciences, Flinders University, Adelaide, Australia.

<sup>b</sup> Alliance for Research in Exercise, Nutrition and Activity (ARENA), Sansom Institute for Health Research, University of South Australia, Adelaide, Australia.

<sup>c</sup> Diabetes Research Centre, University of Leicester, Leicester Diabetes Centre, Leicester General Hospital, Leicester, Leicestershire, LE5 4PW, United Kingdom.

<sup>d</sup> National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Leicester-Loughborough Diet, Lifestyle and Physical Activity Biomedical Research Unit (BRU), Leicester Diabetes Centre, Leicester General Hospital, Leicester, Leicestershire, LE5 4PW, United Kingdom.

<sup>e</sup> The University of Queensland, School of Public Health, Brisbane, Australia.

<sup>f</sup> Mater Research Institute – The University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia.

<sup>g</sup> Department for Health, University of Bath, Bath, United Kingdom.

## **Corresponding author:**

Dr Lucy Kate Lewis

Postal address: Flinders University, Health Sciences Building, Repatriation General Hospital, Daws Road, Daw Park, Adelaide, SA, 5041, Australia Email: lucy.lewis@flinders.edu.au

## **Co-authors**

Dr Alex Rowlands Dr Paul Gardiner Professor Martyn Standage Dr Coralie English Professor Tim Olds alex.rowlands@leicester.ac.uk p.gardiner@sph.uq.edu.au m.standage@bath.ac.uk Coralie.english@unisa.edu.au tim.olds@unisa.edu.au

## Abstract

*Objective*: This study aimed to evaluate the effectiveness and feasibility of a theory-informed program to reduce sitting time in older adults.

*Design*: Pre-experimental (pre-post) study. Thirty non-working adult (≥60 years) participants attended a one hour face-to-face intervention session and were guided through: a review of their sitting time; normative feedback on sitting time; and setting goals to reduce total sitting time and bouts of prolonged sitting. Participants chose six goals and integrated one per week incrementally for six weeks. Participants received weekly phone calls.

*Outcome measures:* Sitting time and bouts of prolonged sitting (≥30 min) were measured objectively for seven days (activPAL3c inclinometer) pre- and post-intervention. During these periods, a 24-hour time recall instrument was administered by computer-assisted telephone interview. Participants completed a post-intervention project evaluation questionnaire. Paired t tests with sequential Bonferroni corrections and Cohen's d effect sizes were calculated for all outcomes.

*Results*: Twenty-seven participants completed the assessments (71.7±6.5 years). Post-intervention, objectively-measured total sitting time was significantly reduced by 51.5 minutes (p=0.006; d=-0.58) and number of bouts of prolonged sitting by 0.8 per day (p=0.002; d=-0.70). Objectively-measured standing increased by 39 minutes per day (p=0.006; d=0.58). Participants self-reported spending 96 minutes less per day sitting (p<0.001; d=-0.77), 32 minutes less per day watching television (p=0.005; d=-0.59) and engaging in more light (p=0.01; d=0.53) and moderate-to-vigorous (p=0.02; d=0.46) physical activity. Participants were highly satisfied with the program.

*Conclusion*: The 'Small Steps' program is a feasible and promising avenue for behavioral modification to reduce sitting time in older adults.

Keywords: sitting, sedentary behavior, aged, adults

## 1. Introduction

High levels of time spent in sedentary behavior (any waking behavior characterised by low rates of energy expenditure while in a sitting or reclining position) [1] have been shown to be associated with increased risk of developing cardiovascular disease, type 2 diabetes, obesity, breast and colon cancer, and premature mortality [2-4]. Accruing sedentary time in prolonged bouts may be particularly detrimental for cardio-metabolic health [5, 6]. The deleterious impacts of high levels of sedentary time are also observed in older adults [7], who are the most sedentary age group of the population [8], with an average sedentary time of 9.4 hours per day. Reducing sedentary time is an emerging target for health behavior change interventions [9].

A recent meta-analyses of interventions reporting sedentary time outcomes in adults concluded that interventions targeting physical activity (alone or in combination with sedentary time) were not effective in reducing sedentary time [10]. Limited evidence exists on interventions to specifically reduce sedentary time in older adults. Three pre-post studies have implemented goal setting interventions which included individual feedback on sedentary time [11-13]. These studies reported decreases in objectively-measured sedentary time ranging from 24 [13] to 31 minutes per day [11]. Two of these studies included very short-term interventions and follow up [11, 13], and the third study targeted overweight and obese older adults, therefore limiting the generalisability of the findings [12].

In order to increase reductions in sedentary time and assess changes beyond the short-term nature of previous interventions, a novel, incremental goal setting intervention ('Small Steps') was developed and evaluated for feasibility and effectiveness.

## 2. Materials and methods

### 2.1. Study design

The study employed a pre-experimental (pre-post) design and complies with the STROBE guidelines for the reporting of observational studies [14]. Data were collected in Adelaide, South Australia between April and December 2014. Ethical approval was gained from the University of South Australia Human Research Ethics Committee (protocol no. 0000032457). Participants provided written informed consent.

#### 2.2 Participants

Older adults (≥ 60 years) were recruited through community centres and groups and included if they: could communicate effectively in English, lived in the metropolitan area, and worked less than two days per week (paid or voluntary); and excluded if they were unable to walk independently or had a significant cognitive impairment. No formal cognitive screening was applied but potential subjects needed to understand the study aims, procedures and instruments.

We required a sample of 25 participants to detect a 90 min/day reduction in sitting time (80% power, alpha 0.05) which would result in an effect size of 0.53 – based on older adults' ( $\geq$  60 years) mean sedentary time of 618±171 minutes per day (unpublished self-report use of time data from 2163 older adults). We aimed to recruit 30 participants to allow for attrition.

### 2.3 The 'Small Steps' program

The intervention has been reported according to the Template for Intervention Description and Replication (TIDieR) [15]. The intervention was administered by either the principal investigator (LKL) or a trained research assistant (EL) and consisted of a one hour, one on one, face-to-face session in participant's homes where they were guided through three activities: 1) Review of assessed sedentary time. Participants were provided with a workbook adapted from a previous study [11] which contained general information about sitting time and health, and individualised data (min/d) on total sitting time, and the time spent sitting while completing certain types of activities, e.g. watching TV, reading or transport. These data were derived from a use of time interview.

2) Normative feedback on sedentary time. Participants were provided with a ranking (in quartiles) against the average older Australian (n=2163, unpublished data) for their total sitting time, and their sitting time according to 'types' of activities (e.g. TV, reading). This feedback informed the subsequent guided goal setting.

*3) Guided goal setting*. The goal setting involved a collaborative 'small steps' approach, whereby each participant chose six ways to decrease their sitting time and break up prolonged sitting from a list of pre-specified behavioral items combined with suggestions of their own. The aim was for one goal to be integrated each week for six weeks (e.g. Week 1: *"I am going to stand up during the TV ad breaks"*, Week 2: *"I am going to stand up while I talk on the phone"*). Each step was designed to be easily achievable and to reduce sitting time by about 15 min/day, leading to a cumulative reduction of 90 min/day at the end of the 6-week intervention. Individually tailored feedback and a summary of the goal setting plan were provided at the end of the session. Participants were required to self-monitor their goals with a simple daily checklist (e.g. *"Today, did you achieve your goal of standing up during two TV ad breaks? Yes/No. If not, why not?"*). Weekly phone calls provided support and resolved any issues. Intervention materials are available from the principal investigator.

Small Steps was informed by constructs from self-determination theory [16] which argues that enduring behavior change arises from the satisfying of universal and innate human needs for competence (the need to feel capable and effective within activities), autonomy (the need to experience behaviors as self-endorsed, volitional, and valued), and psychological relatedness (the need to experience close and caring connections with others). The program captured each of these needs, for example, competence because the goals were modest and achievable, autonomy because participants suggested and chose their own goals, and relatedness with the integration of supportive phone calls.

### 2.4 Outcome measures

*Sitting, standing* and *stepping* time were measured with the activPAL3 device (PAL Technologies, Glasgow, UK) which was waterproofed, attached to the anterior mid-thigh, and worn for 24 hours/day for seven days at pre- and post-intervention. The activPAL is a valid and reliable measure of sitting time compared with direct observation in older adults (correlation of 0.99) [17]. Data were processed using activPAL3 software (version 7.2.28). Sitting time during waking hours was obtained from a custom-built SAS program which matched self-report non-wear and sleep time (from logs and entered into a database) to activPAL data (from events files) [18].

*Use of time* was measured with the Multimedia Activity Recall for Children and Adults (MARCA) which uses a structured phone interview with participants recalling their last weekday and weekend day to construct daily activity profiles [19, 20]. The MARCA has demonstrated test-retest reliability in adults for sleep, physical activity levels and screen time (ICC 0.92–0.99) [20] and has been shown to be a valid measure of total daily energy expenditure [21] and physical activity levels [20]. Data on daily total sitting time (all waking activities rated as  $\leq$  1.5 METS) as well as discrete activities such as watching TV, computer use, or reading (all while sitting or reclining) were obtained from the MARCA.

*Participant satisfaction* and *burden* were assessed with a questionnaire administered following the post-intervention assessment. The questionnaire contained a series of 5-point Likert scale and openended items. The *feasibility* of the participant recruitment and management processes were assessed by evaluating uptake of the program (% of eligible participants who enrolled in the study) and retention (% of enrolled participants completing the post-intervention assessment).

### 2.5 Procedure

Following recruitment, participants attended a face-to-face baseline session in their own home, completed a basic demographic and health questionnaire, were measured for height and weight, and fitted with an activPAL3 monitor. Participants were asked to wear the device for 7-days, 24 hours a day, including during water-based activities. During this monitoring period, participants were requested to record periods of non-wear and sleep in a log. At a pre-arranged time during the monitoring period, participants completed the MARCA. In the following week, participants underwent the intervention session. Following the intervention session, weekly phone calls were completed for the 6-week intervention period. At the end of this period, participants completed the post-intervention assessment, including activPAL and MARCA assessments. Participants also completed the project evaluation questionnaire at the end of this monitoring period.

## 2.6 Analysis

Participant characteristics, activity and use of time data, and feasibility measures were descriptively analysed. All data were checked for normality. Paired t-tests (2 tailed) with sequential Bonferroni corrections were completed to account for multiple comparisons. Effect sizes (Cohen's d) were calculated and interpreted as small 0.20 to <0.50, medium 0.50 to < 0.80, and large  $\geq$  0.80 [22]. One way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was completed to examine associations between self-reported goal achievement and changes in objectively-measured total sitting time. Significance was set at 0.05 and SPSS statistical software (version 22) was used for all analyses.

## 3. Results

Figure 1 shows the flow of participants through the study. Thirty participants enrolled in the study and completed the baseline assessment. Three women (who were older and had a lower BMI than completers) withdrew prior to the post-intervention assessment (Table 1). Completers had an average of 3.0±1.6 chronic conditions, including: arthritis (n=14), back pain (n=13), hypertension (n=10), high cholesterol (n=10), skin cancer (n=9), reflux / indigestion (n=7), depression (n=7), cardiovascular disease (n=5), diabetes (n=3), migraines (n=2), cancer (n=1) and chronic lung disease (n=1).

[Figure 1 approximately here]

[Table 1 approximately here]

## 3.1 Objectively-measured outcomes

There was no difference in the number of days the device was worn between the pre- ( $6.9\pm0.3$  days) and post-intervention ( $7.0\pm0.3$  days) assessments or in waking time between the pre- ( $15.4\pm0.8$ hr/d) and post-intervention ( $15.5\pm0.8$  hr/d) assessments. From pre- to post-intervention, participants significantly reduced their: total daily sitting time and sitting time accrued in prolonged bouts ( $\geq 30$  min), percentage of waking time spent sitting, the number of bouts of prolonged sitting, and significantly increased their daily standing time (Table 2). These outcomes remained significant following sequential Bonferroni corrections. The effect size for all of these outcomes was medium (Table 2).

[Table 2 approximately here]

### 3.2 Use of time outcomes

From pre- to post-intervention, there were significant reductions in total sitting time and in time spent watching TV; and increases in time spent in light, moderate-to-vigorous physical activity, and daily energy expenditure. However, following sequential Bonferroni correction, these differences were attenuated to non-significance (Table 3). Despite this, the physical activity and energy expenditure outcomes demonstrated a medium effect size from pre- to post-intervention (Table 3).

[Table 3 approximately here]

## 3.3 Satisfaction

Eighty-one per cent of participants (n=22) reported achieving all of their goals, seven per cent (n=3) some goals, and 11% (n=3) did not achieve any goals. A list of all participant goals is contained in Supplementary file 1. Goal achievement and changes in activPAL sitting time were not significantly associated (F=0.55, p=0.58). Overall program satisfaction was high, with an average rating of 8.2±1.8 out of 10 (range 5 to 10), and 8.2±2.2 (range 3 to 10) for the likelihood of recommending the program. Most participants (81%) rated the content and quality of the intervention materials as good, and that the individual components (workbook (77%), daily checklist (85%), feedback (88%), telephone calls (96%) and ability to choose own goals (89%)) were useful. The majority of participants (93%) liked the 'small steps' approach of adding one goal per week and all felt supported by the research team.

### 3.4 Burden

The overall burden to participants was rated as low, with a mean score of 8.8±1.2 out of 10 (with 10 representing 'not time consuming at all'). Nearly all of the participants (96%) reported that the activity monitor was easy to wear, and 85% reported they enjoyed completing the use of time interviews.

## 3.5 Feasibility

Thirty-one of the 32 eligible participants enrolled in the study, representing an uptake of 97% (Figure 1). Twenty-seven of the 30 participants who completed the baseline assessment also completed the post-intervention assessment, resulting in a retention rate of 90%.

## 4. Discussion

This study aimed to evaluate the feasibility and effectiveness of the 'Small Steps' program. After completing the program, participants reduced their total sitting time, time spent sitting in and number of prolonged bouts, and time spent sitting while watching TV, and also spent more time standing, and engaging in physical activity. There were high levels of uptake, retention, and program satisfaction. The observed decrease of 52 minutes a day in objectively-measured sitting represented a medium effect size (0.58) which is considerably greater than reductions reported in a recent meta-analyses [10], and in previous studies with older adults, which had small effect sizes [11-13]. Compared with previous studies, we found a larger effect size for increased standing time (current study: 0.58; [13]: 0.15; [12]: 0.34), and similar or smaller effect size for increased stepping time (current study: 0.35; [13]: 0.39; [12]: 0.16). This suggests that, similar to the study by Rosenberg et al. [12], participants in our study mostly replaced sitting time with standing rather than stepping.

It is not clear what sort of reductions in sedentary time are needed to confer positive health benefits. A recent randomised controlled trial [23] reported a significant intervention effect for increased standing and significant improvements in fasting insulin and waist circumference in favour of the intervention group despite a null intervention effect for sitting (16.2 min/day decrease in the intervention group and a 3.6 min/day increase in the control group). Furthermore, recent isotemporal substitution studies have reported significantly decreased cardio-metabolic risk biomarkers and all-cause mortality by replacing 30 to 60 minutes of daily sedentary time with light physical activity or 'non-exercise' chores such as housework [24-26]. It is plausible that interventions targeting sedentary time may have the most potential health benefit in older adults, or people with chronic conditions, e.g. people with cardiovascular disease who find it difficult to engage in moderate intensity physical activity. There is a clear need for future sedentary time reduction trials to assess health outcomes.

This study has several strengths: the use of self-report and objectively-measured sedentary time has allowed exploration of the context and types of activities; the exclusion of sleep and non-wear time ensures accurate sitting, standing and stepping time; and the sample was representative of older Australians (aged  $\geq$  60 years) in terms of income, education, and marital status [27].

Small Steps was designed for participants to incrementally make small changes to their daily routines and behaviors, and for this to build slowly over time. While the six-week program duration is a strength, we did not include a control condition or assess whether changes were maintained after the program. There is a clear need for larger scale randomised controlled trials with longer term follow up to examine the effectiveness of sedentary time interventions in older adults, and whether behavior change can be maintained. Based on the results of this study (d=-0.58, 95%Cl -0.02 to -1.14 objectively-measured total daily sitting time), we can recommend that a subsequent randomised controlled trial should recruit a total sample of 103 (2 tailed, alpha 0.05, 80% power).

## 5. Conclusions

In conclusion, we found that Small Steps was feasible and highly acceptable to older Australians. In addition, our intervention demonstrated preliminary evidence of a high level of effectiveness in decreasing both total sitting time, and bouts of prolonged sitting when compared with previous interventions. Given our ageing population, and documented high levels of sedentary time, this intervention shows promise for behavioral modification and possible health benefits in older adults.

# Acknowledgements

The study authors would like to acknowledge our Research Assistant, Ms Elizabeth Lowe (EL), for all of her hard work and persistence in collecting data for this study. Thank you also to our research participants, for giving up their time and supporting the study.

### References

Sedentary Behavior Research Network. What is Sedentary Behavior? 2015 [cited 20<sup>th</sup> September 2015]. Available from: http://www.sedentarybehaviour.org/what-is-sedentary-behaviour/.
 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;41:207-15.

[3] 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;162:123-32.

[4] Chau JY, Grunseit AC, Chey T, Stamatakis E, Brown WJ, Matthews CE, et al. Daily sitting time and all-cause mortality: a meta-analysis. 2013.

[5] Healy GN, Matthews CE, Dunstan DW, Winkler EA, Owen N. Sedentary time and cardio-metabolic biomarkers in US adults: NHANES 2003–06. European heart journal. 2011:ehq451.

[6] Henson J, Yates T, Biddle SJ, Edwardson CL, Khunti K, Wilmot EG, et al. Associations of objectively measured sedentary behavior and physical activity with markers of cardiometabolic health. Diabetologia. 2013;56:1012-20.

[7] Rezende LFM, Rey-López JP, Matsudo VKR, Luiz OC. Sedentary behavior and health outcomes among older adults: a systematic review. BMC Public Health. 2014;14:333.

[8] Harvey JA, Chastin SF, Skelton DA. Prevalence of sedentary behavior in older adults: a systematic review. International journal of environmental research and public health. 2013;10:6645-61.

[9] Owen N, Sugiyama T, Eakin EE, Gardiner PA, Tremblay MS, Sallis JF. Adults' sedentary behavior: determinants and interventions. American journal of preventive medicine. 2011;41:189-96.

[10] Martin A, Fitzsimons C, Jepson R, Saunders DH, van der Ploeg HP, Teixeira PJ, et al. Interventions with potential to reduce sedentary time in adults: systematic review and meta-analysis. British journal of sports medicine. 2015:bjsports-2014-094524.

[11] Gardiner PA, Eakin EG, Healy GN, Owen N. Feasibility of reducing older adults' sedentary time. American journal of preventive medicine. 2011;41:174-7.

[12] Rosenberg DE, Gell NM, Jones SM, Renz A, Kerr J, Gardiner PA, et al. The Feasibility of Reducing Sitting Time in Overweight and Obese Older Adults. Health Education & Behavior.

2015:1090198115577378.

[13] Fitzsimons CF, Kirk A, Baker G, Michie F, Kane C, Mutrie N. Using an individualised consultation and activPAL<sup>™</sup> feedback to reduce sedentary time in older Scottish adults: results of a feasibility and pilot study. Preventive medicine. 2013;57:718-20.

[14] Von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gøtzsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP, et al. The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies. Preventive medicine. 2007;45:247-51.

[15] Hoffmann TC, Glasziou PP, Boutron I, Milne R, Perera R, Moher D, et al. Better reporting of interventions: template for intervention description and replication (TIDieR) checklist and guide. Bmj. 2014;348:g1687.

[16] Ryan RM, Deci EL. Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. American psychologist. 2000;55:68.

[17] Healy G. Comparison of the GT3X+ and activPAL3 monitors in controlled and free-living environments: accuracy and responsiveness to change. International Society for Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity Annual Meeting. Melbourne, Australia2011.

[18] Edwardson C, Bakrania K, Bodicoat D, Yates T, Healy G, Winkler E. Validation of an automated STATA algorithm developed for isolating waking wear data in activPAL data. International Conference on Ambulatory Monitoring of Physical Activity and Movement (ICAMPAM). Limerick, Ireland2015.

[19] Ridley K, Olds TS, Hill A. The multimedia activity recall for children and adolescents (MARCA):development and evaluation. International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity.2006;3:10.

[20] Gomersall SR, Olds TS, Ridley K. Development and evaluation of an adult use-of-time instrument with an energy expenditure focus. Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport. 2011;14:143-8.
[21] Foley LS, Maddison R, Rush E, Olds TS, Ridley K, Jiang Y. Doubly labeled water validation of a computerized use-of-time recall in active young people. Metabolism. 2013;62:163-9.

[22] Cohen J. Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences: Academic press; 2013.
[23] Aadahl M, Linneberg A, Møller TC, Rosenørn S, Dunstan DW, Witte DR, et al. Motivational counseling to reduce sitting time: a community-based randomized controlled trial in adults.
American journal of preventive medicine. 2014;47:576-86.

[24] Maddison R, Jiang Y, Foley L, Scragg R, Direito A, Olds T. The association between the activity profile and cardiovascular risk. Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport. 2015.

[25] Matthews CE, Moore SC, Sampson J, Blair A, Xiao Q, Keadle SK, et al. Mortality Benefits forReplacing Sitting Time with Different Physical Activities. Medicine and science in sports and exercise.2015.

[26] Buman MP, Winkler EA, Kurka JM, Hekler EB, Baldwin CM, Owen N, et al. Reallocating time to sleep, sedentary behaviors, or active behaviors: associations with cardiovascular disease risk biomarkers, NHANES 2005–2006. American journal of epidemiology. 2013:kwt292.

[27] Australian Bureau of Statistics. 4102.0 - Australian Social Trends, 2014 [cited 20<sup>th</sup> September
2015]. Available from: http://www.abs.gov.au/socialtrends.

## **Author declarations**

*Dr Lucy Lewis* - "I declare that I participated in the conception of this study, interpretation of the results, and drafting and reviewing of the manuscript, and that I have seen and approved the final version. I declare no conflict of interest."

*Dr Alex Rowlands* - "I declare that I participated in the conception of this study, interpretation of the results, and drafting and reviewing of the manuscript, and that I have seen and approved the final version. I declare no conflict of interest."

*Dr Paul Gardiner* - "I declare that I participated in the conception of this study, interpretation of the results, and drafting and reviewing of the manuscript, and that I have seen and approved the final version. I declare no conflict of interest."

*Professor Martyn Standage* - "I declare that I participated in the conception of this study, interpretation of the results, and drafting and reviewing of the manuscript, and that I have seen and approved the final version. I declare no conflict of interest."

*Dr Coralie English* - "I declare that I participated in the conception of this study, interpretation of the results, and drafting and reviewing of the manuscript, and that I have seen and approved the final version. I declare no conflict of interest."

*Professor Tim Olds* - "I declare that I participated in the conception of this study, interpretation of the results, and drafting and reviewing of the manuscript, and that I have seen and approved the final version. I declare no conflict of interest."

## Author conflict of interest declarations

Dr Lucy Lewis - "I declare no conflict of interest." Dr Alex Rowlands - "I declare no conflict of interest." Dr Paul Gardiner - "I declare no conflict of interest." Professor Martyn Standage - "I declare no conflict of interest." Dr Coralie English - "I declare no conflict of interest." Professor Tim Olds - "I declare no conflict of interest."

## Declaration of sources of funding

This work was supported by a University of South Australia Sansom Institute for Health Research Small Grant (\$9940). The funder played no role in the study design; in the collection, analysis and interpretation of data; in the writing of the report; or in the decision to submit the article for publication.

## **Dear Applicant**

Re: Ethics protocol "Small steps: a pilot study of an intervention to reduce sitting time in older adults" (Application ID: 0000032457)

Thank you for submitting your ethics protocol for consideration. Your protocol has been considered by the E2 Committee Review Group.

I am pleased to advise that your protocol has been granted ethics approval and meets the requirements of the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research.

Please note that the E2 Committee Review Group's decision will be reported to the next meeting of the Human Research Ethics Committee for endorsement.

Please regard this email as formal notification of approval.

Ethics approval is always made on the basis of a number of conditions detailed at <u>http://www.unisa.edu.au/res/forms/docs/humanresearchethics\_conditions.doc</u>; it is important that you are familiar with, and abide by, these conditions. It is also essential that you conduct all research according to UniSA guidelines, which can be found at <u>http://www.unisa.edu.au/res/ethics/default.asp</u>

Please note, if your project is a clinical trial you are required to register it in a publicly accessible trials registry prior to enrolment of the first participant (e.g. Australian New Zealand Clinical Trials Registry <u>http://www.anzctr.org.au/</u>) as a condition of ethics approval.

Best wishes for your research.

Executive Officer UniSA's Human Research Ethics Committee CRICOS provider number 00121B

This is an automated email and cannot be replied to. Please direct your query to <u>ethics@unisa.edu.au</u>.

Table 1 Participant demographic characteristics (completers n=27, non-completers n=3)

Characteristic		Non-completers			
	Males	Females	All	(all female)	
n	10	17	27	3	
Age (years) mean (SD)	69.4 (5.7)	72.4 (6.0)	71.7 (6.5)	75.8 (11.3)	
BMI mean (SD)	29 1 (3 2)	27 3 (4 4)	279(41)	26.9 (2.3)	
bivii mean (55)	23.1 (3.2)	27.3 (4.4)	27.5 (4.1)	20.5 (2.5)	
Marital status (%)					
married / de facto	80	41 56		0	
single / widowed / divorced or	20	59	44	100	
separated					
Education (%)					
High school (partial or completed)	30	53 44		33	
Post-secondary (e.g. Diploma)	40	35	38	66	
Bachelor degree	20	6	11	0	
Post-graduate	10	6 7		0	
Income (AUD*) (%)					
up to 20,799	10	12 11		0	
20,800 to 31,199	10	24	19	33	
31,200 to 41,599	10	6	7	0	
41,600 to 72,799	30	6	15	33	
72,800 to 129,999	30	6	15	0	
Preferred not to answer	10	47	33	33	
Paid employment					
% working in paid employment	20	12 15		0	
Hours / week mean (SD)	15.5	7 11.3		0	
Volunteer work					
% working as volunteers	60	53	56	33	
Hours /week mean (SD)	6.3 (5.6)	4.6 (1.6)	5.3 (1.7)	0.7 (1.2)	

\* AUD = Australian Dollar (at the time of data collection, 1AUD was equal to approximately 0.84USD)

Outcome	Pre-	Post-	Mean difference	p*	Bonferroni-	Effect size	95% confidence intervals	
	mean (SD)	mean (SD)			corrected alpha	(d)	Lower	Upper
Total sitting time	534.1 (114.1)	482.6 (112.0)	-51.5	0.006	0.013	-0.58	-0.02	-1.14
(min/d)								
Sitting < 30 (min/d)	234.1 (60.7)	236.6 (63.0)	+2.5	0.801	0.050	0.05	-0.49	0.59
Sitting ≥ 30 (min/d)	299.9 (118.3)	246.0 (105.1)	-53.9	0.003	0.008	-0.62	-1.18	-0.06
% of waking time	57.4 (12.7)	52.1 (12.1)	-5.3	0.004	0.010	-0.60	-1.16	-0.04
sitting								
No. of bouts sitting ≥	5.0 (1.9)	4.2 (1.7)	-0.8	0.002	0.007	-0.70	-1.26	-0.14
30 min (n)								
Standing (min/d)	291.7 (97.3)	330.2 (99.4)	+38.5	0.006	0.017	0.58	0.02	1.14
Stepping (min/d)	106.7 (48.2)	114.2 (43.3)	+9.3	0.148	0.025	0.35	-0.20	0.9

Table 2 Paired t-tests with sequential Bonferroni correction, and effect sizes (with 95% confidence intervals) for the inclinometer outcomes (n=27)

\* p values < 0.05 were considered statistically significant (shown in bold type)

Table 3 Paired t-tests with sequential Bonferroni correction, and effect sizes (with 95% confidence intervals) for the self-reported use of time recall data

(n=27)

Outcomes	Pre	Post	Mean difference	<i>p</i> *	Bonferroni-	Effect size	95% confidence intervals	
	mean (SD)	mean (SD)			corrected alpha	(d)	Lower	Upper
					value			
TST1.5 <sup>#</sup> (min/d)	559.2 (137.4)	463.3 (127.3)	-95.9	<0.001	0.006	-0.77	-1.33	-0.21
TV (min/d)	192.3 (94.3)	160.1 (89.5)	-32.2	0.005	0.007	-0.59	-1.15	-0.03
Computer (min/d)	45.4 (65.6)	29.8 (37.3)	-15.6	0.25	0.017	-0.23	-0.78	0.32
Reading (min/d)	88.3 (74.3)	91.5 (73.2)	+3.1	0.818	0.050	0.04	-0.5	0.58
Passive transport (min/d)	43.1 (35.5)	39.5 (20.0)	-3.5	0.553	0.025	-0.11	-0.65	0.43
Light physical activity <sup>+</sup> (min/d)	214.8 (57.2)	256.6 (62.8)	+41.8	0.011	0.008	0.53	-0.02	1.08
Moderate-to- vigorous-physical activity <sup>+</sup>	138.3 (75.0)	173.7 (83.8)	+35.4	0.024	0.010	0.46	-0.09	1.01
TDEE (MET.min)	2197 (264)	2288 (251)	+91	0.037	0.013	0.42	-0.13	0.97

\* p values < 0.05 were considered statistically significant (shown in bold type)

# TST1.5 Total sitting time accrued with activities rated as less than or equal to 1.5 METS

<sup>+</sup> Light physical activity included activities eliciting 2.0-2.9 METs, and moderate-to-vigorous-physical-activity included moderate (3.0-5.9 METs) and vigorous (>6.0 METS) activities



Figure 1: Flow of participants through the study

Supplementary File Click here to download Supplementary File: Supplementary file 1.docx