

1 ***activPAL-measured sitting levels and patterns in 9-10 year old children from a***
2 ***UK city***

3

4 Aron P. Sherry^{1,2}, Natalie Pearson¹, Nicola D. Ridgers³, Sally E. Barber⁴, Daniel D.
5 Bingham⁴, Liana C. Nagy^{4,5}, Stacy A. Clemes^{1,2}.

6

7 ¹National Centre for Sport and Exercise Medicine, School of Sport, Exercise and
8 Health Sciences, Loughborough University, Loughborough LE11 3TU, UK

9 ²NIHR Leicester Biomedical Research Centre –Lifestyle theme, Loughborough
10 University, Loughborough LE11 3TU, UK

11 ³Deakin University, Institute for Physical Activity and Nutrition (IPAN), School of
12 Exercise and Nutrition Sciences, Geelong, Australia, VIC 3125

13 ⁴Bradford Institute for Health Research, Bradford Teaching Hospitals Foundation
14 Trust, Bradford, BD9 6RJ

15 ⁵Bradford University, Faculty of Health Studies, Richmond Road, Bradford, BD7 1DP

16

17 **Corresponding author:**

18 Aron Sherry

19 National Centre for Sport and Exercise Medicine

20 School of Sport, Exercise and Health Sciences

21 Loughborough University

22 Loughborough

23 LE11 3TU

24 UK

25 a.p.sherry@lboro.ac.uk +44 (0)1509 228170

26

1 **Abstract**

2 **Background:** There is insufficient evidence of sitting time in UK children from
3 validated objective measures. This study explored sitting patterns in primary school
4 children from Bradford, UK, using the validated activPAL inclinometer.

5 **Methods:** Seventy-nine children (9.8 (SD 0.3) years old, 52% boys; 70% South
6 Asian) wore activPALs for 7-days. Total sitting time, sitting time accumulated in
7 different bout lengths, and the proportion of wear time spent in these variables were
8 explored and compared across different periods of the week.

9 **Results:** Children spent 614±112 (median±IQR) mins/day on school days and
10 690±150 mins/day on weekend days sitting. The proportion of time spent sitting was
11 significantly higher on weekend days compared to school days (mean±SD: 74±10%
12 vs 68±8%,*P*<0.001), as was the proportion of time accumulated in >30min sitting
13 bouts (mean±CI: 28±27-33% vs 20±20-22%,*P*<0.001). The proportion of time spent
14 sitting after school was significantly higher than during school time (mean±SD:
15 70±8.4% vs 63±8.3%,*P*<0.001), as was the proportion of time spent in prolonged
16 (>30min) sitting bouts (mean±CI: 19±16-22% vs 11±10-14%,*P*<0.001).

17 **Conclusions:** Children spent large proportions of their waking day sitting, often
18 accumulated in prolonged uninterrupted bouts and particularly after school and on
19 weekends. Interventions to reduce sitting time in children are urgently needed.

20

1 INTRODUCTION

2 Sedentary behaviour is defined as “any waking behaviour characterised by an
3 energy expenditure ≤ 1.5 METs while in a sitting, reclining or lying posture”(1). Early
4 sedentary behaviour research has predominantly explored screen-based pursuits
5 (TV viewing, computer use) using self-report measures. In children (ages 6-12yrs),
6 these types of sedentary behaviour are unfavourably associated with cardio-
7 metabolic health, pro-social behaviour, and academic achievement (2).

8

9 Recently, total waking sedentary time has been explored using accelerometry. This
10 international evidence has consistently reported that children spend most of their
11 time sedentary ($>60\%$ waking hours), both during (4) and outside school hours (5–7).
12 For example, in 1,862 English children (9-10yrs), 64% (7.5hours) of an average day
13 was spent sedentary (5). Unlike screen time, the relationship between total
14 sedentary time and health outcomes in children is unclear (2). However, high
15 sedentary time in children is a public health concern for several reasons. Firstly,
16 sedentary time not only tracks from childhood into adolescence and adulthood (8,9),
17 but also continually increases between these stages of life (9). There is a clear
18 adverse association between high levels of sedentary time (i.e. >8 h/day) and
19 mortality in adults (10). Additionally, an increased cardio-metabolic health risk in
20 some demographics is evident during childhood (11). For example, British South
21 Asian children have demonstrated higher glycated haemoglobin, fasting insulin and
22 triglyceride and lower HDL-cholesterol compared to white British children (11).
23 Therefore, these populations may be more vulnerable to the adverse affects of
24 excessive sedentary time. Consequently, it is important to develop strategies to
25 reduce sedentary time during childhood before these behaviours become more
26 established and difficult to change.

27

28 There is currently growing interest into how sedentary time is accumulated. Time
29 spent sedentary in bouts (a period of uninterrupted sitting (1)) that are prolonged
30 (>30 min) is associated with increased risk of the metabolic syndrome in adults (12).
31 Evidence using isotemporal substitution of prolonged bouts of sitting time with

1 shorter sitting bouts has demonstrated favourable cardio-metabolic outcomes in UK
2 adults (13). In European children, it would appear that sedentary time is rarely spent
3 in prolonged bouts (i.e.>30min) (14,15) which may partly explain the weaker
4 association between total sedentary time and health outcomes (16) compared to
5 adults. However, Australian data have demonstrated that children spend up to 20%
6 of waking hours in such bouts (17). While an association between sedentary bouts
7 and health indicators in children is inconsistent (2), evidence has shown that a higher
8 frequency (up to 3.1/day) of >30min bouts of sedentary time is associated with
9 reduced HDL cholesterol in children, independent of total sitting time, moderate-to-
10 vigorous physical activity (MVPA), saturated fat intake and body composition (18).
11 Consequently, the manner in which sedentary time is accumulated needs to be
12 further explored to better understand when and how to target interruptions in
13 sustained sedentary periods.

14

15 To date, most published studies describing objectively-measured sedentary time use
16 accelerometry. Accelerometers, which are typically worn on the waist, cannot
17 accurately distinguish between sitting and standing postures (19). This is important
18 because standing is not a sedentary behaviour (1). Consequently, there is a need to
19 differentiate between time spent sitting and standing using inclinometers (2). The
20 activPAL inclinometer has been implemented in a handful of studies in children (8-
21 12yrs) which confirm high proportions of time at school (70-71%) (20), on school
22 days (53-69%) and weekend days (60-73%) is spent sitting (20–23). More studies
23 need to build on these findings for a better understanding of sitting patterns. Such
24 studies should include the exploration of sitting time in demographics that are
25 typically more sedentary compared to other populations (from accelerometry). In the
26 UK, British Pakistani children have demonstrated higher total sedentary time than
27 white British children on school days and weekend days (6,24). This is particularly
28 important when considering the higher cardio-metabolic health risks that British
29 South Asian children have (11). In the present cross-sectional study, using activPAL
30 inclinometers, we explored total sitting time and sitting bouts of different lengths,
31 during and outside of school hours in a sample of children of mostly British South
32 Asian ethnicity.

1 **METHODS**

2 Sitting patterns during school days and weekend days were explored in Year 5
3 primary school children (aged 9-10yrs) during term time. Participating children were
4 from two schools within deprived neighbourhoods (top 10% and 30% of UK
5 neighbourhoods) (25), located within the city of Bradford, England. All children were
6 originally approached and recruited for two classroom-based intervention trials
7 conducted in 2014 and 2015; the complete intervention data for the 2014 study have
8 been reported elsewhere (20). These schools were selected due to their
9 engagement with the Born in Bradford Project (26) which has connections to local
10 schools. Five separate classes consisting of 30 children (150 children in total) were
11 approached. Baseline assessments from each study, which employed identical
12 measurement protocols and were conducted during the autumn (November) and
13 winter (December/January) seasons, were included in this study.

14 Parental written consent and child assent were required for study participation.
15 Children were not included in baseline assessments if they had any disability that
16 prevented them from standing or an illness or injury that prevented them from
17 performing normal daily tasks. Both studies were approved by Loughborough
18 University's Ethical Advisory Committee.

19 Participants self-reported their age and ethnicity (after ethnicity was explained and a
20 subsequent selection was made from a list of different options i.e. white British,
21 Murpuri Pakistani). Participants wore an activPAL inclinometer (PAL Technologies
22 Ltd, Glasgow, UK) on the anterior aspect of the right thigh, placed within a nitrile
23 sleeve and attached using hypoallergenic medical dressing, for 7 days. This made
24 the device waterproof and enabled a 24hr wear protocol. The activPAL has been
25 shown to be a valid measure of posture in children (27). activPAL data explored in
26 this study included minutes spent sitting accumulated at school, after school, and
27 during total waking hours on school days and weekend days.

28

29 **Data management**

30 activPAL data were downloaded using standard manufacturer software (activPAL
31 Professional v.7.2.29/v.7.2.32) and then processed with a customised Microsoft

1 Excel macro. The hours of 11pm-6am were set as sleep time and thus removed from
2 the data (21). A non-wear time of 20 minutes was applied using the accelerometer
3 function of the device to determine when the device was not being worn during
4 waking hours (21,28). Data were analysed in 15-s epochs (21,28). School hours
5 were based on each school timetable (school one-08:50-15:10; school two-08:40-
6 15:15) and included lunch and break times.

7 Wear time compliance was set at ≥ 10 h/day, ≥ 3 school days and ≥ 1 weekend day.
8 (17). A customised macro provided the frequency and accumulated minutes and
9 proportions of wear time spent sitting in bouts of 5-10min, 10-30min and >30 min (15).
10 Proportions of wear time spent sitting were also calculated. Sitting variables were
11 compared between sexes and ethnicities (white British compared to a British South
12 Asian category comprising Bangladeshi, Indian, Mirpuri Pakistani, other Pakistani or
13 'any other Asian background' ethnicities).

14

15 **Statistical analysis**

16 Statistical analyses were conducted using SPSS v.23 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA).
17 Outcome variables were compared between school days and weekend days, and
18 between school time and after school time (end of school time to 11pm). activPAL
19 outcome variables were screened for outliers using box-plots. Box-plots did not
20 identify any extreme outliers (values more than three interquartile ranges from the
21 25th or 75th percentile) in any sitting variable and therefore all data were included in
22 the analysis. Outcome variables were tested for normality using the Kolmogorov-
23 Smirnov test. This test found both normally distributed and skewed data. Normally
24 distributed data sets were compared between school days and weekend days and
25 during school and after school time using paired sample t-tests. For skewed data, a
26 natural-log transformation was applied. Transformed data were then compared
27 between time periods using paired t-tests. Mean transformed values and confidence
28 intervals were then back transformed and reported in the results. Data that were still
29 skewed following transformations were compared across periods using the Wilcoxon
30 signed-rank test, and the median and inter-quartile range reported. Significant
31 differences were detected ($P < 0.05$) for wear time between school days and weekend
32 days and school time and after school; minute and frequency data are reported as

1 descriptives only. To account for differences in wear time, the proportion of wear
2 time spent sitting were compared between the different time periods. Cohens d was
3 used to calculate effect sizes using mean and standard deviation values (29) for
4 outcome variables for each time period that were compared. Effect sizes were
5 interpreted as small ($d=0.2-0.4$); intermediate ($d=0.5-0.7$); and large ($d \geq 0.8$)(29).
6 Sitting data were compared between boys and girls and between White British and
7 British South Asian ethnicities using Mann-Whitney U tests. Significance was set at
8 $P < 0.05$.

9

1 RESULTS

2 One hundred and thirty-seven children provided parental consent to participate in the
3 studies, of which, 79 (58%) provided valid activPAL data (mean age: 9.8 (SD 0.3)
4 years). The sample characteristics by ethnicity and sex are summarised in Table I.

5 There were no significant sex or ethnic differences between those who provided
6 valid activPAL data and those who did not ($P>0.05$). There were significant
7 differences in just one/32 sitting variables ($P<0.05$) between girls and boys (see
8 appendix Table A1) (school time sitting mins; boys -19.8mins, $P=0.028$). Just two/32
9 significant differences were observed between White British and British South Asian
10 children in sitting outcomes (frequency and accumulated mins of sitting bouts of 10-
11 30min after school; British South Asian +0.9, $P=0.018$ and +22.2min, $P=0.010$)
12 (appendix Table A2). Consequently, data hereafter are presented for the sample as
13 a whole.

14 Time spent sitting on school days and on weekend days totalled 614 ± 112
15 (median \pm IQR) mins/day and 690 ± 150 mins/day, respectively (Table II), with
16 participants spending a significantly greater proportion of time sitting on weekend
17 days compared to school days (+6.3%, $P=0.001$, intermediate effect size).

18 On a school day, 38% (227.8min) of total daily sitting time was accumulated at
19 school, 48% (290.2min) was accumulated after school, with the remainder (14%,
20 96min) accumulated before school. Participants spent a significantly lower proportion
21 of time sitting at school (-6.7%, $P=0.001$, intermediate effect size) compared to time
22 spent sitting after school (Table II).

23 The highest bout frequencies during all periods was of 5-10min and 10-30min (Table
24 III). Total accumulated bout minutes during all time periods were highest in 10-30min
25 and >30min bouts (Table III). In >30min bouts, over 180 minutes were accumulated
26 from just 3.8 bouts on school days and over 280 minutes from just 5.2 bouts on
27 weekend days.

28 A significantly greater proportion of wear time was spent in short bouts (5-10min) on
29 school days compared to weekend days (+1.4%, $P<0.001$, intermediate effect size),
30 with no difference in medium bouts (10-30min) and significantly more time spent in
31 long bouts (>30min) on weekend days compared to school days (+7.9%, $P<0.001$)

1 (Table IV). A significantly greater proportion of wear time was spent in short bouts (5-
2 10min) at school compared to after school (+2.0%, $P<0.001$,intermediate effect size).
3 Conversely, significantly more time was spent after school compared to school time
4 in medium (+2.2%, $P<0.05$,small effect size) and long bouts (+7.7%, $P<0.001$) (Table
5 IV).

6

7

1 **DISCUSSION**

2 **Main findings of this study**

3 This study explored activPAL-determined sitting patterns during and outside school
4 hours in 9-10 year old children from a deprived northern UK city. This study
5 observed large proportions of wear time spent sitting on school days and weekend
6 days, not only in total but also in prolonged bouts, which has not been observed
7 before in UK children. Sitting time was particularly high after school and on
8 weekends. These findings are concerning for a sample of mostly British South Asian
9 children who are more susceptible to cardio-metabolic risk factors (11).

10

11 **What is already known on this topic**

12 Internationally, children spend the majority of waking hours sedentary, both during (4)
13 and outside of school hours (typically >60% of waking hours) (5–7). Sedentary
14 behaviour tracks into adulthood (8) where detrimental health effects are clear (10).
15 Time spent in prolonged sitting bouts is associated with attenuated metabolic health
16 (18), but there is limited available evidence of how children accumulate sitting time.
17 Furthermore, most objectively-measured sedentary data is from hip-worn
18 accelerometers, which cannot distinguish between sitting and standing postures (19).
19 Consequently, studies using inclinometers are urgently needed to better determine
20 sitting time, particularly in higher health risk groups such as South Asian children.

21

22 **What this study adds**

23 This study found that children sat in excess of 10hrs/day (68% of wear time) on
24 school days and 11hrs/day (74% of wear time) on weekend days which are high
25 volumes of sitting for this age group. These proportions are almost identical to
26 activPAL data reported in obese Malaysian children (aged 9-11yrs) on school days
27 (68%) and weekend days (73%) (23). Compared to accelerometer data, our results
28 are similar to the proportions of sedentary time observed in British Pakistani and
29 White British girls (65-70%) (aged 10yrs) (6) and higher than that reported in a
30 sample of White British children (64%) (5). These results are also higher than

1 accelerometer data in US children where 8.7 h/day (aged 9-11yrs) (7) and 41-43% of
2 wear time (aged 6-11yrs) (30) have been observed. The high volumes of sitting time
3 are likely to increase into adolescence, with a recent review showing that sedentary
4 time increases by approximately 10-20 mins/day across the primary-secondary
5 school transition (9). If this yearly change were to hold constant, the current sample
6 will be sitting 11-13 hrs/day (73-85% of current wear time) by the age of sixteen. This
7 could mean as little as 3hrs available for movement-based activities (assuming 8hrs
8 of sleep), which would have major implications for energy expenditure.

9

10 This is the first study to explore sitting time accumulated in prolonged bouts in a
11 sample of UK children. Wear time accumulated in sitting bouts of >30min on school
12 days (187mins/20% of wear time) and weekend days (282mins/28%) was
13 considerably higher than that observed in Belgian (school days: 34mins/4%;
14 weekend days: 29mins/4%) (15), European (all days \leq 80mins/ \leq 10%) (18), and
15 Australian children (school days: 132mins/16%; weekend days: 129mins/16%) (17).
16 The present results are comparable to those observed in adult office workers (10-
17 30%) (31) and demonstrate that some children do spend a considerable amount of
18 time a day sitting for prolonged periods, contrary to previous conclusions (15). The
19 frequency of prolonged bouts were low (school day 3.8, weekend day 5.2) compared
20 to bouts of 5-10min and >10min (11-17.5), however, the average duration of
21 prolonged bouts were 49 minutes and 54 minutes on school days and weekend days.
22 This demonstrates that children do not need to engage in a high frequency of such
23 bouts to result in a large proportion of waking hours being composed of prolonged
24 sitting. The frequency values we observed exceed those previously reported in
25 obese children demonstrating the highest number of >30min bouts (\leq 3.1), who
26 exhibiting lower levels of HDL cholesterol compared to children who did not
27 accumulate any sitting bouts of this duration (18). Future research should further
28 examine potential differences of health indicators between children who accumulate
29 high and low volumes of prolonged sitting bouts (frequencies and minutes),
30 particularly in groups of higher health risk (i.e. South Asians, obese), as this is
31 largely unexplored.

32

1 Children spent more time sitting on weekend days compared to school days in this
2 study. These findings add to previous inconsistent evidence that either supports this
3 finding (21–23), have found no difference (17,32), or have observed the opposite (6).
4 Children were also the least sedentary at school. This is in contrast to Abbott et al.
5 (17) who observed the highest proportion of wear time spent sedentary in total and in
6 prolonged bouts at school compared to other times of the week in Australian children.
7 In the present study, reduced daylight hours (33) during the autumn/winter as well as
8 less favourable weather associated with these seasons, may have influenced more
9 indoor sedentary pursuits away from school (7) compared to outdoor conditions in
10 the Abbott et al. study (set in western Australia). It is also likely that contrasting
11 school environments between study locations played a role in the differences
12 reported during school time. Despite this, we still observed almost 4 hours of sitting
13 at school, highlighting that the school environment is an important setting to reduce
14 this behaviour. Although in the early stages of evidence, standing desk interventions
15 implemented within the school classroom are emerging as a promising solution for
16 interrupting and reducing sitting time (34,35).

17

18 Sitting time in total and in prolonged bouts was particularly high during weekend
19 days and after school periods, suggesting these periods should be targeted for
20 intervention. A recent systematic review into the effectiveness of interventions
21 targeting sedentary time (36) identified just one study in children (7-12yrs), a six-
22 month intervention to reduce media use, that found a reduction in sedentary time
23 outside of school hours (-37min/day of TV viewing) (37). Although screen-based
24 pursuits will surely be common, we do not know which types of sedentary behaviours
25 were adopted in the present study. This highlights the need for the inclusion of self-
26 report measures (i.e. diary logs) to provide information on the mode, dose, and
27 setting of sedentary behaviour to better inform intervention design. An alternative to
28 reducing total sedentary time could be to break up prolonged sitting bouts with short
29 periods of activity, such as standing or stepping. Unfortunately, intervention studies
30 with this objective are limited to a six-week school-based educational program that
31 demonstrated inconsistent intervention effects during out of school hours (38).
32 Future intervention studies may benefit from including parents and children in the
33 intervention design process, which has not been undertaken to date (36), to

1 potentially increase child engagement (39) and the likelihood of tackling sedentary
2 behaviours effectively during leisure time.

3

4 **Limitations of this study**

5 The cross-sectional design of this study prevents any conclusions about causality.
6 The high non-compliance rate of the activPAL protocol resulted in a large proportion
7 of lost data which may have influenced the outcome of key variables. The small
8 sample spread across just two schools within close proximity to one another, limits
9 the generalisability of the findings. Furthermore, a sample size calculation was not
10 performed due to the exploratory nature of this study. Despite these limitations, this
11 study provides novel information on the composition of accumulated sitting time in a
12 sample of UK children.

13

14 In conclusion, this sample of mostly British South Asian children demonstrated very
15 high proportions of time spent sitting in total and in prolonged bouts during school
16 days and weekend days. These proportions are likely to increase into adolescence
17 which is concerning for an ethnic population at higher cardio-metabolic health risk.
18 To inform effective interventions, further longitudinal research is required, with larger
19 sample sizes spread across multiple UK areas, to better understand the levels and
20 patterns of sitting accumulated at and away from school.

21

1 **FUNDING**

2 APS is supported by the School of Sport Exercise and Health Sciences at
3 Loughborough University. NP is supported by a British Heart Foundation project
4 grant (PG/12/70/29777). The funding body had no role in the analysis or preparation
5 of the manuscript. SAC is supported by the National Institute for Health Research
6 (NIHR) Leicester Biomedical Research Centre – Lifestyle theme. SEB, DDB and
7 LCNs involvement in this publication was also funded by the NIHR. This study is part
8 of the Healthy Children, Healthy Families Theme of the NIHR CLAHRC Yorkshire
9 and Humber. The views expressed in this publication are those of the authors and
10 not necessarily those of the NHS, the NIHR or the Department of Health and Social
11 Care.

12

13

1 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

2 The authors gratefully appreciate and thank the teachers (Anita Selby, Martyn
3 Yeoman, Robert Nykolyszyn, and Allen Hey) and children at Grove House primary
4 school and Byron primary school for participating in this study. The authors also
5 acknowledge Eoin O'Connell for the development of the customised Excel macro.

6

7

1 REFERENCES

- 2 1. Tremblay MS, Aubert S, Barnes JD, Saunders TJ, Carson V, Latimer-cheung
3 AE, et al. Sedentary Behavior Research Network (SBRN) – Terminology
4 Consensus Project process and outcome. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act.*
5 *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity;*
6 2017;14(75):1–17.
- 7 2. Carson V, Hunter S, Kuzik N, Gray CE, Poitras VJ, Chaput J, et al. Systematic
8 review of sedentary behaviour and health indicators in school-aged children
9 and youth : an update 1. *Appl Physiol Nutr.* 2016;41:240–65.
- 10 3. Heidi J. Syvaioja, Tuija H. Tammelin, Timo Ahonen, Anna Kankaanpa MTK.
11 The Associations of Objectively Measured Physical Activity and Sedentary
12 Time with Cognitive Functions in School aged children. *PLoS One.*
13 2014;9(7):1–10.
- 14 4. Stralen MM Van, Yildirim M, Wulp A, Saskia J, Verloigne M, Doessegger A, et
15 al. Measured sedentary time and physical activity during the school day of
16 European 10- to 12-year-old children : The ENERGY project. *J Sci Med Sport*
17 [Internet]. *Sports Medicine Australia;* 2014;17(2):201–6. Available from:
18 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jsams.2013.04.019>
- 19 5. Steele RM, Van Sluijs EMF, Cassidy A, Griffin SJ, Ekelund U. Targeting
20 sedentary time or moderate- and vigorous-intensity activity: Independent
21 relations with adiposity in a population-based sample of 10-y-old British
22 children. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 2009;90(5):1185–92.
- 23 6. Hornby-turner YC, Hampshire KR, Pollard TM. A comparison of physical
24 activity and sedentary behaviour in 9 – 11 year old British Pakistani and White
25 British girls : a mixed methods study. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act.*
26 2014;74(11):1–11.
- 27 7. Leblanc AG, Katzmarzyk PT, Barreira T V, Broyles ST, Chaput J, Church TS,
28 et al. Correlates of Total Sedentary Time and Screen Time in 9 – 11 Year-Old
29 Children around the World : The International Study of Childhood Obesity ,
30 Lifestyle and the Environment. *PLoS One.* 2015;10(6):1–20.
- 31 8. Biddle SJH, Pearson N, Ross GM, Braithwaite R. Tracking of sedentary
32 behaviours of young people: A systematic review. *Prev Med (Baltim)* [Internet].
33 Elsevier Inc.; 2010;51(5):345–51. Available from:
34 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ypmed.2010.07.018>
- 35 9. Pearson N, Haycraft E, Johnston JP, Atkin AJ. Sedentary behaviour across the
36 primary-secondary school transition : A systematic review. *Prev Med (Baltim)*
37 [Internet]. The Authors; 2017;94:40–7. Available from:
38 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ypmed.2016.11.010>

- 1 10. Ekelund U, Steene-johannessen J, Brown WJ, Fagerland MW, Owen N,
2 Powell KE, et al. Does physical activity attenuate , or even eliminate , the
3 detrimental association of sitting time with mortality ? A harmonised meta-
4 analysis of data from more than 1 million men and women. *Lancet* [Internet].
5 Elsevier Ltd; 2016;6736(16):1–10. Available from:
6 [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(16\)30370-1](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(16)30370-1)
- 7 11. Whincup PH, Nightingale CM, Owen CG, Rudnicka AR, Gibb I, McKay CM,
8 Donin AS, Sattar N, Alberti KGMM CD. Early emergence of ethnic differences
9 in type 2 diabetes precursors in the UK: The Child Heart and Health Study in
10 England (CHASE Study). *PLoS Med*. 2010;7.
- 11 12. Honda T, Chen S, Yonemoto K, Kishimoto H, Chen T, Narazaki K. Sedentary
12 bout durations and metabolic syndrome among working adults : a prospective
13 cohort study. *BMC Public Health* [Internet]. BMC Public Health; 2016;16:1–9.
14 Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12889-016-3570-3>
- 15 13. Edwardson CL, Henson J, Bodicoat DH, Bakrania K, Khunti K, Davies MJ, et
16 al. Associations of reallocating sitting time into standing or stepping with
17 glucose , insulin and insulin sensitivity : a cross-sectional analysis of adults at
18 risk of type 2 diabetes. *BMJ Open*. 2017;7:1–10.
- 19 14. Altenburg TM, Niet M De, Verloigne M, Bourdeaudhuij I De, Androustos O,
20 Manios Y, et al. Occurrence and duration of various operational de fi nitions of
21 sedentary bouts and cross-sectional associations with cardiometabolic health
22 indicators : The ENERGY-project. *Prev Med (Baltim)* [Internet]. Elsevier B.V.;
23 2015;71:101–6. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ypmed.2014.12.015>
- 24 15. Verloigne M, Ridgers ND, Chinapaw M, Altenburg TM, Bere E, Lippevelde W
25 Van, et al. Patterns of objectively measured sedentary time in 10- to 12-year-
26 old Belgian children : an observational study within the ENERGY- project. *BMC*
27 *Pediatr*. *BMC Pediatrics*; 2017;17(147):1–10.
- 28 16. Altenburg TM, Chinapaw MJM. Bouts and breaks in children’s sedentary time:
29 currently used operational definitions and recommendations for future research.
30 *Prev Med (Baltim)* [Internet]. Elsevier Inc.; 2015;77:1–3. Available from:
31 <http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0091743515001462>
- 32 17. Abbott R a., Straker LM, Mathiassen SE. Patterning of children’s sedentary
33 time at and away from school. *Obesity*. 2013;21(1):2012–4.
- 34 18. Cliff DP, Jones RA, Burrows TL, Morgan PJ, Collins CE, Baur LA, et al.
35 Volumes and Bouts of Sedentary Behavior and Physical Activity : Associations
36 with Cardiometabolic Health in Obese Children. *Pediatr Obes*.
37 2014;22(5):112–8.
- 38 19. Ridgers ND, Salmon J, Ridley K, Connell EO, Arundell L, Timperio A.

- 1 Agreement between activPAL and ActiGraph for assessing children ' s
2 sedentary time. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act* [Internet]. BioMed Central Ltd;
3 2012;9(1):15. Available from: <http://www.ijbnpa.org/content/9/1/15>
- 4 20. Clemes S a., Barber SE, Bingham DD, Ridgers ND, Fletcher E, Pearson N, et
5 al. Reducing children's classroom sitting time using sit-to-stand desks: findings
6 from pilot studies in UK and Australian primary schools. *J Public Health*
7 (Bangkok) [Internet]. 2015;1–8. Available from:
8 <http://jpubhealth.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/doi/10.1093/pubmed/fdv084>
- 9 21. Ridgers ND, Timperio A, Cerin E, Salmon J. Within- and between-day
10 associations between children ' s sitting and physical activity time. *BMC Public*
11 *Health* [Internet]. *BMC Public Health*; 2015;15:1–7. Available from:
12 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12889-015-2291-3>
- 13 22. Adrienne R Hughes, David J Muggeridge, Ann-Marie Gibson, Avril Johnstone
14 AK. Objectively Measured Sedentary Time in Children and Their Parents
15 Adrienne. *AIMS public Heal*. 2016;3(4):823–36.
- 16 23. Wafa W, Aziz NN, Shahril MR, Halib H, Rahim M, Janssen X. Measuring the
17 Daily Activity of Lying Down , Sitting , Standing and Stepping of Obese
18 Children Using the ActivPAL TM Activity Monitor. *J Trop Pediatr*. 2017;63:98–
19 103.
- 20 24. Owen CG, Nightingale CM, Rudnicka AR, Cook DG. Ethnic and gender
21 differences in physical activity levels among 9 – 10-year-old children of white
22 European , South Asian and African – Caribbean origin : the Child Heart
23 Health Study in England (CHASE Study). 2009;1082–93.
- 24 25. Government M of housing communities and local. English indices of
25 deprivation [Internet]. 2015. Available from: [http://imd-by-](http://imd-by-postcode.opendatacommunities.org/)
26 [postcode.opendatacommunities.org/](http://imd-by-postcode.opendatacommunities.org/)
- 27 26. Wright J, Small N, Raynor P, Tuffnell D, Bhopal R, Cameron N, et al. Cohort
28 Profile : The Born in Bradford multi-ethnic family cohort study. 2013;(October
29 2012):978–91.
- 30 27. Ridley K, Ridgers ND, Salmon J. Criterion validity of the activPAL TM and
31 ActiGraph for assessing children ' s sitting and standing time in a school
32 classroom setting. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act* [Internet]. *International Journal of*
33 *Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*; 2016;1–5. Available from:
34 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12966-016-0402-x>
- 35 28. Janssen X, Basterfield L, Parkinson KN, Pearce MS, Reilly JK, Adamson AJ,
36 et al. Objective measurement of sedentary behavior : impact of non-wear time
37 rules on changes in sedentary time. *BMC Public Health*. ???; 2015;1–6.
- 38 29. Cohen J. *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. 2nd ed.

- 1 Erlbaum: Hillsdale, NJ; 1988.
- 2 30. Matthews CE, Chen KY, Freedson PS, Buchowski MS, Beech BM, Pate RR, et
3 al. Amount of time spent in sedentary behaviors in the United States, 2003-
4 2004. *Am J Epidemiol.* 2008;167(7):875–81.
- 5 31. Thorp AA, Healy GN, Winkler E, Clark BK, Gardiner PA, Owen N, et al.
6 Prolonged sedentary time and physical activity in workplace and non-work
7 contexts : a cross- sectional study of office , customer service and call centre
8 employees. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act.* 2012;1–9.
- 9 32. Riso E, Kull M, Mooses K, Hannus A, Jürimäe J. Objectively measured
10 physical activity levels and sedentary time in 7 – 9-year-old Estonian
11 schoolchildren : independent associations with body composition parameters.
12 *BMC Public Health [Internet]. BMC Public Health;* 2016;16:1–10. Available
13 from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12889-016-3000-6>
- 14 33. Harrison F, Goodman A, Sluijs EMF Van, Andersen LB, Cardon G, Davey R,
15 et al. Weather and children ’ s physical activity ; how and why do relationships
16 vary between countries ? *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act. International Journal of*
17 *Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity;* 2017;14(74):1–13.
- 18 34. Hinckson E, Salmon J, Benden M, Clemes SA, Sudholz B, Barber SE, et al.
19 Standing Classrooms : Research and Lessons Learned from Around the World.
20 *Sport Med [Internet]. Springer International Publishing;* 2016;46(7):977–87.
21 Available from: "<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s40279-015-0436-2>
- 22 35. Hegarty LM, Murphy MH, Mair JL, Kirby K, Murtagh E. School-based
23 Interventions to Reduce Sedentary Behaviour in Children : A Systematic
24 Review. *AIMS public Heal.* 2016;3(3):520–41.
- 25 36. Teatske M. Altenburg* JKH and MJMC. Effectiveness of intervention strategies
26 exclusively targeting reductions in children’s sedentary time: a systematic
27 review of the literature. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act.* 2016;13(65).
- 28 37. Robinson TN. Reducing Children’s Television Viewing to Prevent ObesityA
29 Randomized Controlled Trial. *JAMA.* 1999;282(16):1561–1567.
- 30 38. Verloigne M, Ridgers ND, Chinapaw M, Altenburg T, Bere E, Berntsen S,
31 Cardon G, Brug J, De Bourdeaudhuij I, Van Lippevelde W ML. The UP4FUN
32 intervention effect on breaking up sedentary time in 10- to 12-year-old Belgian
33 children : The ENERGY Project. *Pediatr Exerc Sci.* 2016;27(November
34 2014):234–42.
- 35 39. Vaughn, L.M., Wagner, E. and Jacquez F. A review of community-based
36 participatory research in child health. *MCN Am J Matern Nursing,.*
37 2013;38(1):48–53.

RESULTS

Table I. Sample characteristics by ethnicity and sex

	British South Asian			White British			Mixed ethnicity			Total sample		
	Boys	Girls	Total	Boys	Girls	Total	Boys	Girls	Total	Boys	Girls	Total
N	29	26	55	8	10	18	3	3	6	40	39	79
Proportion of ethnic group, %	52.7	47.3		44.4	55.6		50.0	50.0				
Proportion of total sample, %	36.7	32.9	69.6	10.1	12.7	22.8	3.8	3.8	7.6	50.6	49.4	100.0

Table II. Time spent sitting in total and in different bout lengths and comparisons during different times of the week. Data presented as mean (SD) unless stated otherwise.

	School day		Weekend day		Difference, <i>P</i> (Effect size, <i>d</i>)	At school		After school		Difference, <i>P</i> (Effect size, <i>d</i>)
Number of valid days ^a ‡	5.2	(1.2)	1.9	(0.3)		5.2	(1.2)	5.2	(1.2)	
Wear time, mins/d †	910.7	(82.9)	956.2	(51.0)	0.001	372.3	(29.7)	419.7	(48.2)	<0.001
Time sitting, % of wear time	67.7	(7.9)	74.0	(9.9)	<0.001 (0.7 IE)	63.0	(11.6)	69.7	(8.4)	<0.001 (0.7 IE)
Sitting, mins	† 614.0	(112.0)	† 690.7	(150.4)		227.8	(46.4)	290.2	(38.6)	

^a In total, 410 valid school days and 151 valid weekend days of activPAL data were provided.

‡ Number of valid days (wear time ≥10 hrs/d) included in the analysis.

† Data represent the median and interquartile ranges due to skewed distributions. The Wilcoxon-signed rank test was used if values were compared (see 'Difference' column) and log transformation did not normalise the distributions.

IE, intermediate effect size; SE, small effect size.

Table III. Bout frequencies and accumulated minutes spent sitting during different times of the week. Data presented as mean (SD) unless stated otherwise.

	School day		Weekend day		At school		After school	
Frequency								
5-10 minutes	† 12.6	(4.5)	† 11.0	(5.5)	5.8	(2.0)	5.5	(1.7)
10-30 minutes	11.7	(2.3)	11.6	(4.0)	† 4.7	(1.9)	† 5.8	(1.7)
>30 minutes	3.8	(1.0)	5.2	(1.8)	† 1.0	(0.7)	† 1.7	(0.9)
Total accumulated minutes								
5-10 minutes	87.6	(23.5)	75.3	(28.8)	40.9	(14.3)	38.9	(11.8)
10-30 minutes	196.3	(40.4)	196.9	(70.5)	76.9	(26.4)	97.8	(25.6)
>30 minutes †	186.9	(79.6)	281.6	(138.2)	43.5	(33.7)	83.4	(51.6)

† Values represent the median and interquartile ranges due to skewed data.

Table IV. Proportion of wear time spent sitting in different bout lengths and comparisons between different times of the week. Data presented as mean (SD) unless stated otherwise.

	School day		Weekend day		Difference, <i>P</i>				Difference, <i>P</i>					
					(Effect size, d)		At school		After school		(Effect size, d)			
Wear time, mins	910.7		956.2		372.3				419.7					
5-10 minutes, %	9.6	(2.5)	8.2	(3.0)	<0.001 (0.5 IE)		11.3	(3.7)	9.3	(2.8)	<0.001 (0.6 IE)			
10-30 minutes, %	21.6	(5.0)	21.4	(7.3)	NS		21.3	(7.3)	23.5	(6.1)	<0.05 (0.3 SE)			
>30 minutes, % ^a	20.4	19.5 22.0	–	28.3	27.1 33.1	–	<0.001	11.3	10.0 13.5	–	19.0	16.4 22.2	–	<0.001

^aMean value and confidence intervals taken from log transformed data which were then back transformed. Data compared using paired t-tests.

^bEffect sizes not calculated due to median and interquartile range reported for minute data.

IE, intermediate effect size; NS, not significant.

