Changes in Cycling and Incidence of Overweight and Obesity among Danish Men and Women

Rasmussen, Martin G; Overvad, Kim; Tjønneland, Anne; Jensen, Majken K; Østergaard, Lars; Grøntved, Anders

. . . Published ahead of Print

Changes in Cycling and Incidence of Overweight and Obesity among Danish Men and Women

Martin G. Rasmussen[1], Kim Overvad[2,3], Anne Tjønneland[4], Majken K. Jensen[5,6], Lars Østergaard[1], and Anders Grøntved[1]

[1]Research unit for Exercise Epidemiology, Department of Sports Science and Clinical Biomechanics, University of Southern Denmark, Odense, Denmark; [2]Department of Cardiology, Aalborg University Hospital, Aalborg, Denmark; [3]Department of Public Health, Section for Epidemiology, Aarhus University, Aarhus, Denmark; [4]Danish Cancer Society Research Center, Copenhagen, Denmark; [5]Department of Nutrition, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Boston MA; [6]Department of Medicine, Channing Division of Network Medicine, Harvard Medical School, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Boston, MA

Changes in Cycling and Incidence of Overweight and Obesity among Danish Men and Women

Martin G. Rasmussen[1], Kim Overvad[2,3], Anne Tjønneland[4], Majken K. Jensen[5,6],

Lars Østergaard[1], and Anders Grøntved[1]

[1]Research unit for Exercise Epidemiology, Department of Sports Science and Clinical Biomechanics, University of Southern Denmark, Odense, Denmark; [2]Department of Cardiology, Aalborg University Hospital, Aalborg, Denmark; [3]Department of Public Health, Section for Epidemiology, Aarhus University, Aarhus, Denmark; [4]Danish Cancer Society Research Center, Copenhagen, Denmark; [5]Department of Nutrition, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Boston MA; [6]Department of Medicine, Channing Division of Network Medicine, Harvard Medical School, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Boston, MA

Correspondance. Martin Gillies Rasmussen, Research unit for Exercise Epidemiology, Department of Sports Science and Clinical Biomechanics, University of Southern Denmark, Campusvej 55, DK-5230 Odense M, Denmark, e-mail: mgrasmussen@health.sdu.dk, phone: +4565504816

Abstract

Purpose: Overweight and obesity is associated with increased risk of several non-communicable diseases and is a growing public health issue. The primary purpose of the current study was to investigate incidence of overweight and obesity according to five-year cycling habits. The secondary purpose was to investigate incidence of remission from overweight and obesity according to five-year cycling habits.

Methods: We analyzed 9014 men and 8661 women without chronic disease who between 1993 and 2003 completed two assessments approximately five years apart. At both assessments participants reported habitual cycling habits. Also, bodyweight and waist circumference was measured by a lab technician at baseline and self-assessed at second examination. We computed multivariable adjusted odds ratios (ORs) with 95% confidence intervals (CIs) for development of and remission from abdominal and general overweight and obesity, according to five-year cycling habits.

Results: Continued cycling was associated with lower odds for incidence of abdominal (men:>102 cm,women:>88 cm) and incidence of general (BMI$\geq$30 kg/m^2) obesity; compared to no cycling, ORs (95% CIs) were 0.82 (0.74,0.91) and 0.74 (0.60,0.92) for abdominal and general obesity, respectively. Also, those who initiated cycling had lower odds for incidence of abdominal obesity; OR (95% CI) was 0.85 (0.73,1.00) relative to no cycling. Although we found no evidence of remission from abdominal and general overweight and obesity according to five-

year cycling habits, those who continued cycling had significantly larger decreases in waist circumference relative to non-cyclists (β-coefficient (95% CI): -0,95 cm (-1,56 cm,-0,33 cm).

Conclusion: Continued cycling compared to no cycling was associated with lower odds for abdominal and general obesity. Also, late-in-life initiation of cycling was associated with lower odds for abdominal obesity, relative to no cycling.

Introduction

During previous decades the worldwide prevalence of overweight and obesity has increased. The global prevalence of BMI$\geq$25 kg/m^2 is estimated a staggering 36.9% and 38% among adult men and women, respectively (1). The global prevalence of obesity is estimated 12% (2). Obesity increases the risk of numerous non-communicable diseases including type 2 diabetes, ischemic heart disease, stroke and some types of cancer. However, an increased risk of these diseases is already present in overweight individuals (3).

Engagement in physical activity has been suggested as an approach to lower the prevalence of overweight and obesity (4). In trials of isolated aerobic exercise in subjects with overweight or obesity, modest decreases in bodyweight and waist circumference have been found (5). Results from observational studies show positive associations between physical activity, weight loss maintenance (6) and prevention of weight gain (7, 8). Although physical activity appears to contribute towards a healthy bodyweight, research investigating the role of cycling and weight control has received little attention.

Cycling for transportation and recreation may be important in maintaining or attaining a healthy bodyweight. It can be practically incorporated into daily life, e.g. in one's daily commute or when completing daily chores. Furthermore, cycling is non-weight bearing, which people who find discomfort in prolonged walking or jogging could find appealing. In cohort studies of adults recreational or commuter cycling has been associated with a lower incidence of type 2 diabetes (9), coronary heart disease (10) and all-cause mortality (11). However, few cohort studies in adults have investigated the relationship between cycling and bodyweight; one study found

favourable changes in weight with long-term cycling (12) and a recent study found lower odds for incidence of obesity with habitual cycling (13). Five cross-sectional studies found lower odds for overweight or obesity with cycling (14-18) whereas one did not (19). There is a need for more prospective cohort studies of cycling and changes in bodyweight to more clearly quantify the long-term relationship.

Using data from the Danish Diet, Cancer and Health cohort study, the primary purpose of this study was to compare the incidence of overweight and obesity between different five-year cycling habits. A secondary purpose was to investigate the relationship between five-year cycling habits and the incidence of remission from overweight and obesity. We hypothesized that any regular cycling would be associated with a lower incidence of overweight and obesity, and a higher incidence of remission to non-overweight or non-obese levels. Remission refers to change in status from overweight or obese to non-overweight or non-obese.

Methods

Ethics. The Diet, Cancer and Health study was conducted in accordance with the Helsinki Declaration. It was approved by the Scientific Ethical Committee of Copenhagen (no. H-KF-01-345/93) and the study protocol for the current study was approved by the Danish Data Protection Agency (no. 2015-57-0008). Informed written consent to collect data on health outcomes in medical registries in the years that followed was gathered from all study participants (20).

Participants. Between 1993 and 1997, 80996 men and 79729 women were invited to participate in the Diet, Cancer and Health study. Inhabitants of Aarhus and Copenhagen and surrounding

cities were invited if between 50 and 64 years of age, born in Denmark and without a cancer diagnosis registered in the Danish Cancer Registry. Eligible persons were identified through the Civil Registration System – a unique system in Denmark where Danish residents are assigned a 10-digit identification code (21) - and 27178 men and 29875 women agreed to participate (20).

Approximately five years later (mean 5.4±0.3 years) between 1999 and 2003 men and women still alive and residing in Denmark were invited for a second examination. 45245 or 79.3% of the original cohort participated.

Participants were eligible for analyses if they were free of known chronic disease throughout the study. The following participants were excluded: 2217 registered with diabetes according to the National Patient Registry, the National Diabetes Registry or via self-report; 1043 with non-fatal acute myocardial infarction according to the National Patient Registry; 751 who according to the National Patient Registry prior had a stroke; and, lastly, 2588 diagnosed with cancer according to the Danish Cancer Registry. In total, 6092 with one or more chronic diseases were excluded. Please consult figure 1 for a detailed description of each step following invitation to each analytic sample size.

Cycling conditions in Copenhagen and Aarhus. In Copenhagen and Aarhus, as well as most other cities in Denmark, there are good conditions for cycling. One reason for this is the well-built infrastructure for cycling in both urban and rural areas. An example of this are bike lanes clearly separated from car lanes by a curb (22), which allows for safe active transportation. Therefore, in Denmark, it is possible for individuals of all ages, including seniors, to cycle in

everyday life, e.g. as part of one's daily commute or as a general mode of transportation in leisure.

Data collection. At baseline a validated semi-quantitative food frequency questionnaire, developed to be compatible with the Danish diet (23-26), was sent by mail and filled out before a visit at a study clinic. At the clinic an additional questionnaire was completed, addressing general lifestyle habits, e.g. physical activity, smoking and alcohol consumption. Furthermore, a lab technician measured anthropometrics (20).

At the second examination a similar dietary survey, additionally including foods that since baseline had been introduced to the Danish diet, was mailed to the participants. A lifestyle questionnaire was sent also, along with a tape measure to self-assess waist circumference (20).

Assessment of Physical activity. Assessment of physical activity has previously been described (9). Briefly, the following activities were reported at baseline: work-related physical activity, walking, total cycling, housework, do-it-yourself work, gardening, sport participation and stair climbing. The same activities except for stair climbing were reported at second examination, although cycling was reported separately for commuting and recreational purposes, and sports participation was reported according to intensity (light, moderate or vigorous).

Participants were grouped according to those who did no cycling, ceased to, initiated or continued cycling from baseline to second examination.

We also created composite leisure time physical activity variables, including physical activities reported in the questionnaire other than total cycling. These variables were converted into metabolic equivalent (MET) hours/week. 1 MET is considered equivalent to the resting metabolic rate and MET values express intensity levels as multiples of the resting metabolic rate (27). These variables were created to be included as covariates in regression models.

The physical activity questions at baseline have shown good validity for ranking participants according to overall physical activity levels (28-30) with fair reliability (weighed kappa statistic=0.6) (28, 30). The physical activity questions at second examination have shown moderate-to-high reliability, with an intra-class correlation coefficient of 0.76 for physical activity energy expenditure, and good validity for ranking individuals according to overall physical activity energy expenditure (31).

Assessment of overweight and obesity. Height (cm), bodyweight (kg) and waist circumference (cm) (the narrowest part between the lower rib and the iliac crest) was measured by a lab technician at baseline (20, 32). BMI was calculated by dividing bodyweight in kg with height in metres squared. At second examination participants were asked "What is your current weight?" in light clothing. Based on baseline height and self-reported bodyweight, we computed second examination BMI. Waist circumference was self-assessed at second examination; participants were instructed to measure waist circumference at the level of the umbilicus after exhalation, to the nearest whole cm (20). The difference between the method of measurement of waist circumference at baseline and at second examination was assessed in a separate study in a subsample of the cohort who participated in the second examination of Diet, Cancer and Health.

These individuals were invited into a clinic in Copenhagen, where they went through several anthropometric measurements. The mean difference (95% confidence intervals (CIs)) between waist circumference measured at the narrowest part between the lower rib and the iliac crest and waist circumference measured at the umbilicus was -0.8 cm (-1.6 cm,0.007 cm) and 2.1 cm (1.3 cm,2.9 cm) for men and women, respectively. Limits of agreement (95% CIs) were -11.3 cm (-11.1 cm,-11.5 cm) to 9.7 cm (9.5 cm,9.9 cm) and -10.5 cm (10.0 cm,11.0 cm) to 14.6 cm (14.2 cm,15.1 cm) for men and women, respectively (32).

We defined abdominal obesity according to National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute criteria; >102 cm for men and >88 cm for women (33). General overweight and general obesity was defined as ≥ 25 kg/m^2 and ≥ 30 kg/m^2, respectively (4).

Statistical analyses. Descriptive statistics for continuous data were computed as medians with 25th and 75th percentiles for asymmetric distributions, and means with standard deviations when approximately normal. Proportions were computed for categorical data.

We conducted six analyses, all combining baseline and second examination data; 1) odds for the incidence of abdominal obesity (men:>102 cm, women:>88 cm) (excluding those with abdominal obesity at baseline); 2) incidence of general overweight or obesity (BMI≥ 25 kg/m^2) (excluding those with general overweight or obesity at baseline); 3) incidence of general obesity (BMI≥ 30 kg/m^2) (excluding those with baseline general obesity); 4) incidence of remission from abdominal obesity (men:≤ 102 cm, women:≤ 88) (excluding those without abdominal obesity at baseline), 5) incidence of remission from general overweight and obesity (BMI<25 kg/m^2)

(excluding those with a BMI<25 kg/m^2 at baseline) and 6) incidence of remission from general obesity (BMI<30 kg/m^2) (excluding those with BMI<30 kg/m^2 at baseline). Multivariable adjusted odds ratios (ORs) with 95% CIs were computed using logistic regression. To compliment these analyses we computed multivariable adjusted β-coefficients (95% CIs) for each analytic sample to assess changes (second examination measure minus baseline measure) in waist circumference (cm) and bodyweight (kg), depending on the analysis. All analyses were conducted with five-year categories of total cycling (No cycling/Cessation/Initiation/Continuation) as exposure with No cycling as reference.

Assumptions of linear regression were tested. We created residual versus fitted plots to investigate assumptions of linearity and homoscedasticity. Furthermore, we investigated if residuals were normally distributed. Multicollinearity diagnostics of predictor variables were performed by computing variation inflation factors, using conventional cut-offs of >10 for individual variables, or mean of >4, as evidence of multicollinearity. There was no evidence for violations of any of the above-mentioned assumptions.

In all analyses we adjusted for age (quintiles of years), sex (male/female), analysis-dependent baseline measure (bodyweight, BMI or waist circumference), years of basic school (<7/8-10/>10), years of higher education (0/1-2/3-4/>4), dietary energy intake (quintiles of kJ/day), alcohol intake (quintiles of grams/day), smoking (never/former/<15 grams per day/15-25 grams per day/>25 grams per day), wholegrain cereal consumption (quintiles of grams/day), physical activity at work (No work/sedentary/standing/manual work/heavy manual work) and reported leisure-time physical activity other than total cycling (quintiles of MET hours/week). These

variables were all from baseline assessment. Data on dietary energy intake, alcohol intake and reported leisure-time physical activity other than cycling was also available from second examination and was included. We also adjusted for length of follow-up (years). The difference between self-reported umbilical waist circumference and lab-technician measured natural waist circumference was shown to be related to baseline BMI in a subsample of the cohort (32). Therefore, in multivariable analyses including waist circumference as outcome, we also adjusted for baseline BMI.

Some research suggests that adjustment for baseline values in analyses of change may create spurious statistical associations (34). To address this we ran all multivariable analyses without adjusting for analysis-relevant baseline measure (bodyweight, BMI or waist circumference). The associations were almost unchanged, with no differences in direction of associations or statistical significance (data not shown).

In our analyses using logistic regression, we also computed models where we restricted the analyses to those reporting no sport at either baseline or second examination, in further attempt to eliminate residual confounding of sports participation. Among reported physical activities, we suspected that sports participation might impact bodyweight in particular.

Lastly, in the relationship between cycling and changes in bodyweight, dietary energy intake might confound, mediate or neither confound or mediate. Also, cycling may decrease engagement in other physical activities, which overall may be either beneficial or detrimental for changes in bodyweight. Holding these two variables constant in our analyses could thus create

spurious associations. To address these concerns, we conducted sensitivity analyses excluding one or both of these variables.

All analyses were conducted using STATA IC V.14 (STATA Corp, College Station, Texas, USA) with α=0.05.

Results

Sample characteristics. Consistent cyclists had the highest dietary energy intake; lowest baseline alcohol intake; largest proportion of 'Never' smokers and lowest proportion of heavy smokers; the highest intake of wholegrain cereals; the largest proportion of standing and manual workers and the lowest proportion of heavy manual workers; and, the highest engagement in reported leisure-time physical activity beyond cycling. For non-cyclists, the opposite was true for baseline dietary energy intake, wholegrain cereal intake and reported leisure-time physical activity beyond cycling. Also, non-cyclists had the lowest proportion of manual workers and the largest proportion of heavy smokers (table 1).

Consistent cyclist had the highest long-term cycling exposure, followed by those who ceased to cycle. Those who initiated cycling had the lowest long-term cycling, when disregarding the no cycling group (figure 2).

Primary analyses. We first analysed odds for incidence of abdominal obesity. In the multivariable model, both initiated (OR (95% CI): 0.85 (0.73,1.00)) and continued (OR (95% CI): 0.82 (0.74,0.91)) cycling was associated with lower odds for abdominal obesity, compared

to no cycling (figure 2). These results were supported by significantly larger decreases in waist circumference among those cycling consistently (β-coefficient (95% CI): -0.53 cm (-0.81 cm,-0.25 cm), compared to non-cyclists (figure 3A).

We then analysed odds for incidence of general overweight and obesity. No category was associated with lower odds, compared to no cycling (figure 2). This was consistent with no significant differences in bodyweight changes in any cycling category, relative to no cycling (figure 3B).

We then analysed odds for incidence of general obesity where continued cycling was associated with decreased odds for incidence of general obesity (OR (95% CI): 0.74 (0.60,0.92)) relative to no cycling (figure 2).

Secondary analyses. We then investigated odds for incidence of remission from abdominal obesity, incidence of remission from general overweight and obesity and incidence of remission from general obesity, according to five-year cycling. We found no differences of any category of cycling in any multivariable model, relative to no cycling (figure 2). However, in the analysis of remission from abdominal obesity, those who continued cycling had significantly larger decreases in waist circumference (β-coefficient (95% CI): -0,95 cm (-1,56 cm,-0,33 cm) relative to non-cyclists (figure 3A). In the two remaining remission analyses, surprisingly, those who ceased to cycle had significant increases in bodyweight (β-coefficients (95% CIs): 1.44 cm (0.55 cm,2.33 cm) and 0.36 cm (0.01 cm,0.71 cm)), when compared to non-cyclists (figure 3B).

Analyses restricted to participants reporting no sport. We then restricted the analysis of odds for incidence of abdominal obesity to those reporting no sport (n=5073); ORs (95% CIs) were 1, 0.87 (0.68,1.12), 0.69 (0.52,0.90) and 0.86 (0.72,1.02) for No cycling, Cessation, Initiation and Continuation, respectively, compared to no cycling. In all remaining analyses, when restricting to participants reporting no sport, no category of cycling was associated with lower odds, compared to no cycling.

Sensitivity analyses. We consistently found almost identical ORs (95% CIs) with no differences in direction or strength of the associations across the four levels of multivariable adjustments (see Table, Supplemental Digital Content 1, Sensitivity analyses of primary analyses, http://links.lww.com/MSS/B214; and Table, Supplemental Digital Content 2, Sensitivity analyses of secondary analyses, http://links.lww.com/MSS/B215). There was almost no difference in statistical significance; however, in the analysis of odds for incidence of general overweight and obesity, omission of reported leisure-time physical activity other than cycling as a covariate resulted in significantly lower odds for those cycling consistently, when compared to non-cyclist (see Table, Supplemental Digital Content 1, Sensitivity analyses of primary analyses, http://links.lww.com/MSS/B214).

Discussion

Summary of the results. In this large population-based cohort study of Danish men and women residing in cycling-friendly cities, about two hours per week of cycling was associated with approximately 20-30 percent lower odds of developing abdominal (OR (95% CI): 0.82 (0.74,0.91)) and general (OR (95% CI): 0.74 (0.60,0.92)) obesity, relative to no cycling. Also,

initiated cycling was associated with a lower incidence of abdominal obesity (OR (95% CI): 0.85 (0.73,1.00)) compared to no cycling. We found no relationship between cycling and any remission from overweight or obesity. According to proposed standard definitions applied in epidemiology, the strength of the associations in the current study would be considered weak (0.7-0.9) (35).

When restricting our analyses to those reporting no sport, initiated cycling was associated with lower odds for incidence of abdominal obesity, indicating benefits of cycling, independent of sports engagement. However, after restriction continued cycling was no longer associated with lower odds for incidence of abdominal obesity and incidence of general obesity. Although this would imply residual confounding of sports participant in the original estimates for these two analyses, lack of significance may reflect loss of statistical power. From restriction <30% of the original analytic samples remained, with considerable loss of cases.

In sensitivity analyses we essentially found no differences in the associations from the different types of adjustment. However, in the analysis of odds for incidence of general overweight and obesity, in a model without reported leisure-time physical activity other than cycling, consistent cycling was associated with significant decreased odds, when compared to no cycling. This might be indicative of either residual confounding or that consistent cycling contributes to a physical activity profile more favourable towards decreases in bodyweight.

Our analyses included partition models, where we assessed the impact of 'adding' (36) cycling in relation to changes in bodyweight and waist circumference, holding other reported physical

activities and other covariates constant. It would have been valuable to assess the impact on these measures when substituting one activity, e.g. sitting, with cycling. However, only general physical activity habits during summer and winter, and no sedentary activities in leisure, were reported, making substitution modelling impossible.

Current and existing studies. This study expands upon findings from three cohort studies (12, 13, 37). One study including American women with a low prevalence of cycling found that cycling was associated with bodyweight decreases and less weight gain. They also found that initiating cycling was associated with less weight gain (12). A study of Swedish men and women found lower odds for incidence of general obesity among commuter cyclists. Also, switching from passive travel to cycling was associated with 36% lower odds for incidence of general obesity (13). In the current study, taking up cycling was associated with lower odds for incidence of abdominal obesity, even after restricting the analysis to those reporting no sport. The current study also expands on evidence from cross-sectional studies; one of which found no association (19), whereas five found significant negative associations between cycling and body mass index (14-18). To the best of our knowledge, this is the first cohort study to examine the relationship between cycling and abdominal obesity, as well as examine cycling and remission from overweight and obesity.

Mechanisms. Cycling may affect one's waist circumference and bodyweight by contributing to a negative energy balance and thereby maintaining one's bodyweight or facilitating weight loss. Results from the few experimental studies of free-living cycling in adults show conflicting findings; two studies in adult men and women found no significant change in bodyweight after a

commuter cycling intervention (38, 39), one study including young adult men found an increased fat percentage post-intervention (40), whereas a recent trial in adults with overweight or obesity (BMI: 25-35 kg/m^2) found a reduction in fat mass (41). Two of these studies were randomized controlled trials (38, 41) and except for one study (41) the study populations were generally healthy and without obesity (38-40), leaving less potential for decreases in body fat. More high-quality randomized controlled trials of adults, including different population groups, investigating the effect of free-living cycling on changes in bodyweight and waist circumference are needed.

Clinical relevance. The current findings may have clinical relevance as continued and initiated cycling may be protective against obesity. Our findings are especially interesting when considering that participants were of middle and old age, i.e. a group in high risk of chronic disease. We have previously shown in the same cohort that initiated and consistent cycling was associated with lower type 2 incidence, potentially mediated by baseline waist circumference or body mass index (9). Cycling-induced changes in these measures may thus contribute to prevention of chronic diseases such as type 2 diabetes for which overweight and obesity are well-established risk factors (3).

Strengths and limitations. Strengths of our study include use of unique data based on a population of both men and women with widespread engagement in cycling across sociodemographic groups. Also, the combined use of exposure and outcome data from two examinations is also a major strength. Limitations include use of self-reported physical activity and, therefore, potential systematic bias and random error. In relation to the outcome measures,

waist circumference and bodyweight were measured objectively at baseline, but subjectively at second examination. Although the two measures of waist circumference show systematic differences in measurement (32), we have no reason to suspect that this misclassification is related to cycling. We would argue similarly for misclassification of bodyweight. These methodological limitations may, most likely, null-bias the associations. However, future cohort studies should include objective measures throughout to avoid potential information biases. Another limitation is use of BMI to investigate changes in bodyfat status from habitual cycling, as cycling-induced increases in fat free mass may mask the impact of cycling on fat mass if bodyweight remains relatively unchanged. Another limitation of our findings relate to the temporality of measurements; cycling exposure and anthropometry were measured at the same time, making it impossible to truly claim that changes in the exposure preceded changes in the outcome. Generalizability of our results may be somewhat limited; the cohort was composed of Caucasian men and women 50–65 years of age at baseline, limiting the extent to which the findings can be generalized to other ethnicities and younger populations. Another limitation is that numerous hypothesis tests may increase the risk of making type one errors. Lastly, residual confounding or unknown confounding cannot be ruled out; however, many known or potential confounders were controlled for, which, when included in the models, consistently attenuated strengths of the associations.

Conclusion

Consistent cycling for commuting or recreational purposes in middle and old age was associated with small decreased odds for incidence of abdominal obesity and incidence of general obesity. Also, taking up cycling at this stage of life was associated with lower odds for incidence of

abdominal obesity. We found no associations between cycling and remission from overweight and obesity. Future research should include high-quality randomized controlled trials investigating the effect of free-living cycling on changes in bodyweight and waist circumference, in a variety of populations groups. It should also include cohort studies employing only objective measures of bodyweight and waist circumference.

Acknowledgements

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

1.   Ng M, Fleming T, Robinson M, et al. Global, regional, and national prevalence of overweight and obesity in children and adults during 1980-2013: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2013. Lancet (London, England). 2014;384(9945):766-81. Epub 2014/06/02. doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(14)60460-8. PubMed PMID: 24880830; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC4624264.

2.   G. B. D. Obesity Collaborators. Health Effects of Overweight and Obesity in 195 Countries over 25 Years. N Engl J Med. 2017. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1614362. PubMed PMID: 28604169.

3.   Guh DP, Zhang W, Bansback N, Amarsi Z, Birmingham CL, Anis AH. The incidence of co-morbidities related to obesity and overweight: a systematic review and meta-analysis. BMC Public Health. 2009;9:88. doi: 10.1186/1471-2458-9-88. PubMed PMID: 19320986; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC2667420.

4.   World Health Organization. GLOBAL STATUS REPORT on noncommunicable diseases 2014 - Attaining the nine global noncommunicable diseases targets; a shared responsibility   Switzerland2014.   Available   from: http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/148114/1/9789241564854_eng.pdf.

5.   Thorogood A, Mottillo S, Shimony A, et al. Isolated aerobic exercise and weight loss: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. Am J Med. 2011;124(8):747-55. doi: 10.1016/j.amjmed.2011.02.037. PubMed PMID: 21787904.

6.   Catenacci VA, Wyatt HR. The role of physical activity in producing and maintaining weight loss. Nat Clin Pract Endocrinol Metab. 2007;3(7):518-29. doi: 10.1038/ncpendmet0554. PubMed PMID: 17581621; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC4578965.

7.   Fogelholm M, Kukkonen-Harjula K. Does physical activity prevent weight gain--a systematic review. Obes Rev. 2000;1(2):95-111. Epub 2002/07/18. PubMed PMID: 12119991.

8.   Ekelund U, Besson H, Luan J, et al. Physical activity and gain in abdominal adiposity and body weight: prospective cohort study in 288,498 men and women. Am J Clin Nutr. 2011;93(4):826-35. doi: 10.3945/ajcn.110.006593. PubMed PMID: 21346093.

9.   Rasmussen MG, Grontved A, Blond K, et al. Associations between Recreational and Commuter Cycling, Changes in Cycling, and Type 2 Diabetes Risk: A Cohort Study of Danish Men and Women. PLoS Med. 2016;13(7):e1002076. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1002076. PubMed PMID: 27403867.

10.   Blond K, Jensen MK, Rasmussen MG, et al. Prospective Study of Bicycling and Risk of Coronary Heart Disease in Danish Men and Women. Circulation. 2016;134(18):1409-11. doi: 10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.116.024651. PubMed PMID: 27799259.

11.   Andersen LB, Schnohr P, Schroll M, Hein HO. All-cause mortality associated with physical activity during leisure time, work, sports, and cycling to work. Arch Intern Med. 2000;160(11):1621-8. PubMed PMID: 10847255.

12.   Lusk AC, Mekary RA, Feskanich D, Willett WC. Bicycle riding, walking, and weight gain in premenopausal women. Arch Intern Med. 2010;170(12):1050-6. doi: 10.1001/archinternmed.2010.171. PubMed PMID: 20585071; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC3119355.

13.   Grontved A, Koivula RW, Johansson I, et al. Bicycling to Work and Primordial Prevention of Cardiovascular Risk: A Cohort Study Among Swedish Men and Women. Journal of the American Heart Association. 2016;5(11). Epub 2016/11/02. doi:

10.1161/jaha.116.004413. PubMed PMID: 27799235; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC5210355.

14.   Becker S, Zimmermann-Stenzel M. [No sports = no exercise?--sports, overweight and physical activity in the 50-70 age group in Baden-Wurttemberg]. Z Gerontol Geriatr. 2009;42(1):20-7. doi: 10.1007/s00391-008-0568-1. PubMed PMID: 18787874.

15.   Hollingworth M, Harper A, Hamer M. Dose-response associations between cycling activity and risk of hypertension in regular cyclists: The UK Cycling for Health Study. J Hum Hypertens. 2015;29(4):219-23. doi: 10.1038/jhh.2014.89. PubMed PMID: 25273856; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC4357858.

16.   Laverty AA, Mindell JS, Webb EA, Millett C. Active travel to work and cardiovascular risk factors in the United Kingdom. Am J Prev Med. 2013;45(3):282-8. Epub 2013/08/21. doi: 10.1016/j.amepre.2013.04.012. PubMed PMID: 23953354.

17.   Millett C, Agrawal S, Sullivan R, et al. Associations between active travel to work and overweight, hypertension, and diabetes in India: a cross-sectional study. PLoS Med. 2013;10(6):e1001459. Epub 2013/06/19. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1001459. PubMed PMID: 23776412; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC3679004.

18.   Wen LM, Rissel C. Inverse associations between cycling to work, public transport, and overweight and obesity: findings from a population based study in Australia. Preventive medicine. 2008;46(1):29-32. Epub 2007/10/02. doi: 10.1016/j.ypmed.2007.08.009. PubMed PMID: 17904210.

19.   Becker S, Zimmermann-Stenzel M. Physical activity, obesity, and educational attainment in 50- to 70-year-old adults. Journal of Public Health. 2008;17(2):145-53. doi: 10.1007/s10389-008-0222-9.

20.   Tjonneland A, Olsen A, Boll K, et al. Study design, exposure variables, and socioeconomic determinants of participation in Diet, Cancer and Health: a population-based prospective cohort study of 57,053 men and women in Denmark. Scand J Public Health. 2007;35(4):432-41. doi: 10.1080/14034940601047986. PubMed PMID: 17786808.

21.   Schmidt M, Pedersen L, Sorensen HT. The Danish Civil Registration System as a tool in epidemiology. Eur J Epidemiol. 2014;29(8):541-9. doi: 10.1007/s10654-014-9930-3. PubMed PMID: 24965263.

22.   Cycling Embassy of Denmark. DANISH CYCLING KNOW-HOW 2017. Available from: http://www.cycling-embassy.dk/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/821-019-Messeavis-266x365-mm-enkeltsidet.pdf.

23.   Haraldsdottir J, Tjonneland A, Overvad K. Validity of individual portion size estimates in a food frequency questionnaire. Int J Epidemiol. 1994;23(4):786-96. PubMed PMID: 8002194.

24.   Overvad K, Tjonneland A, Haraldsdottir J, Ewertz M, Jensen OM. Development of a semiquantitative food frequency questionnaire to assess food, energy and nutrient intake in Denmark. Int J Epidemiol. 1991;20(4):900-5. PubMed PMID: 1800428.

25.   Tjonneland A, Haraldsdottir J, Overvad K, Stripp C, Ewertz M, Jensen OM. Influence of individually estimated portion size data on the validity of a semiquantitative food frequency questionnaire. Int J Epidemiol. 1992;21(4):770-7. PubMed PMID: 1521982.

26.   Tjonneland A, Overvad K, Haraldsdottir J, Bang S, Ewertz M, Jensen OM. Validation of a semiquantitative food frequency questionnaire developed in Denmark. Int J Epidemiol. 1991;20(4):906-12. PubMed PMID: 1800429.

27.   Ainsworth BE, Haskell WL, Whitt MC, et al. Compendium of physical activities: an update of activity codes and MET intensities. Medicine and science in sports and exercise. 2000;32(9 Suppl):S498-504. PubMed PMID: 10993420.

28.   Cust AE, Smith BJ, Chau J, et al. Validity and repeatability of the EPIC physical activity questionnaire: a validation study using accelerometers as an objective measure. Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act. 2008;5:33. doi: 10.1186/1479-5868-5-33. PubMed PMID: 18513450; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC2424075.

29.   InterAct Consortium, Peters T, Brage S, et al. Validity of a short questionnaire to assess physical activity in 10 European countries. Eur J Epidemiol. 2012;27(1):15-25. doi: 10.1007/s10654-011-9625-y. PubMed PMID: 22089423; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC3292724.

30.   Wareham NJ, Jakes RW, Rennie KL, et al. Validity and repeatability of a simple index derived from the short physical activity questionnaire used in the European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition (EPIC) study. Public Health Nutr. 2003;6(4):407-13. doi: 10.1079/PHN2002439. PubMed PMID: 12795830.

31.   Besson H, Brage S, Jakes RW, Ekelund U, Wareham NJ. Estimating physical activity energy expenditure, sedentary time, and physical activity intensity by self-report in adults. Am J Clin Nutr. 2010;91(1):106-14. doi: 10.3945/ajcn.2009.28432. PubMed PMID: 19889820.

32.   Bigaard J, Spanggaard I, Thomsen BL, Overvad K, Tjonneland A. Self-reported and technician-measured waist circumferences differ in middle-aged men and women. J Nutr. 2005;135(9):2263-70. PubMed PMID: 16140909.

33.   Alberti KGMM, Zimmet P, Shaw J. Metabolic syndrome—a new world- wide definition. A consensus statement from the international diabetes federation. Diabetic medicine. 2006;23(5):469-80.

34.   Glymour MM, Weuve J, Berkman LF, Kawachi I, Robins JM. When is baseline adjustment useful in analyses of change? An example with education and cognitive change. Am J Epidemiol. 2005;162(3):267-78. doi: 10.1093/aje/kwi187. PubMed PMID: 15987729.

35.   Monson RR. Occupational Epidemiology, Second Edition: Taylor & Francis; 1990.

36.   Mekary RA, Willett WC, Hu FB, Ding EL. Isotemporal substitution paradigm for physical activity epidemiology and weight change. Am J Epidemiol. 2009;170(4):519-27. doi: 10.1093/aje/kwp163. PubMed PMID: 19584129; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC2733862.

37.   Mytton OT, Panter J, Ogilvie D. Longitudinal associations of active commuting with body mass index. Preventive medicine. 2016;90:1-7. doi: 10.1016/j.ypmed.2016.06.014. PubMed PMID: 27311338; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC5023394.

38.   Hendriksen IJ, Zuiderveld B, Kemper HC, Bezemer PD. Effect of commuter cycling on physical performance of male and female employees. Medicine and science in sports and exercise. 2000;32(2):504-10. PubMed PMID: 10694139.

39.   de Geus B, Van Hoof E, Aerts I, Meeusen R. Cycling to work: influence on indexes of health in untrained men and women in Flanders. Coronary heart disease and quality of life. Scand J Med Sci Sports. 2008;18(4):498-510. doi: 10.1111/j.1600-0838.2007.00729.x. PubMed PMID: 18067515.

40.   Madsen C, Mogensen P, Thomas N, et al. Effects of an outdoor bicycle-based intervention in healthy rural Indian men with normal and low birth weight. J Dev Orig Health

Dis. 2015;6(1):27-37. Epub 2014/12/18. doi: 10.1017/s2040174414000609. PubMed PMID: 25514893.

41.	Quist JS, Rosenkilde M, Petersen MB, Gram AS, Sjodin A, Stallknecht B. Effects of active commuting and leisure-time exercise on fat loss in women and men with overweight and obesity: A randomized controlled trial. Int J Obes (Lond). 2017. doi: 10.1038/ijo.2017.253. PubMed PMID: 28993707.

Figure captions

Figure 1. Flow chart of participants from invitation to analyses

The following known chronic diseases were excluded up until second examination: diabetes (any diabetes diagnosis), acute myocardial infarction, stroke, and cancer. Participants had to participate in both examinations to be included in the analyses. WC=waist circumference; BMI=body mass index.

Figure 2. Odds for and remission from overweight and obesity according to five-year cycling habits

The three upper sections illustrate the analysis of incidence of abdominal obesity (men:>102 cm, women:>88 cm), incidence of general overweight or obesity (BMI≥25 kg/m^2) and incidence of general obesity (BMI≥30 kg/m^2). The three lower sections illustrate incidence of remission from abdominal obesity (men:≤102 cm, women:≤88 cm), incidence of remission from general overweight and obesity (BMI≤25 kg*m^2) and incidence of remission from general obesity (BMI≤30 kg*m^2). All associations are relative to no cycling. Odds ratios include multivariable adjustment for the following; age (quintiles), sex (male/female), years of basic school (<7/8-10/>10), years of higher education (0/1-2/3-4/>4), dietary energy intake (quintiles), alcohol intake (quintiles), smoking (Never/former/<15 grams per day/>15-25 grams per day/>25 grams per day), wholegrain cereal consumption (quintiles), physical activity at work (No work/sedentary/standing/manual work/heavy manual work), reported leisure-time physical

activity other than cycling (quintiles), follow-up time (years) and either baseline waist circumference or baseline BMI (analysis-dependent). We adjusted for dietary energy intake, alcohol intake and reported leisure-time physical activity other than cycling from both baseline and second examination. The information in parenthesis includes: amount of participants (n), amount of cases (n) and long-term cycling exposure (cumulative average minutes per week of total cycling from the two examinations) in each category. BMI=body mass index; OR=odds ratio, CI=confidence interval.

Figure 3. Five-year changes in A) waist circumference (cm) and B) bodyweight (kg) according to five-year cycling habits

The figure illustrates A) changes (β-coefficients with 95% CIs) in waist circumference (cm) and B) changes (β-coefficients with 95% CIs) in bodyweight (kg) for the six analytic samples. The changes are presented according to five-year cycling status relative to no cycling. β-coefficients include multivariable adjustment for the following; age (quintiles), sex (male/female), years of basic school (<7/8-10/>10), years of higher education (0/1-2/3-4/>4), dietary energy intake (quintiles), alcohol intake (quintiles), smoking (Never/former/<15 grams per day/>15-25 grams per day/>25 grams per day), wholegrain cereal consumption (quintiles), physical activity at work (No work/sedentary/standing/manual work/heavy manual work), reported leisure-time physical activity other than cycling (quintiles), follow-up time (years) and either baseline waist circumference or baseline bodyweight (analysis-dependent). We adjusted for dietary energy intake, alcohol intake and reported leisure-time physical activity other than cycling from both baseline and second examination. The information in parenthesis includes: amount of

participants (n), amount of cases (n) and long-term cycling exposure (cumulative average minutes per week of total cycling from the two examinations) in each category. CI=confidence interval. † Analytic sample 1; ‡ analytic sample 4; ± analytic sample 2; § analytic sample 3; ¶ analytic sample 5; * analytic sample 6. Consult figure 1 for an overview of the analytic samples.

Supplemental digital content

Supplementary table 1.docx

Supplementary table 2.docx

Figure 1

Figure 2

Incidence of abdominal obesity
No cycling (n = 3383 / n = 908 / 0 min/week)
Cessation (n = 1694 / n = 460 / 30 min/week)
Initiation (n = 1793 / n = 402 / 18.8 min/week)
Continuation (n = 10805 / n = 2403 / 135 min/week)

Incidence of overweight and obesity
No cycling (n = 1983 / n = 260 / 0 min/week)
Cessation (n = 924 / n = 135 / 30 min/week)
Initiation (n = 992 / n = 129 / 18.8 min/week)
Continuation (n = 6420 / n = 742 / 137.2 min/week)

Incidence of obesity
No cycling (n = 3918 / n = 181 / 0 min/week)
Cessation (n = 1896 / n = 78 / 30 min/week)
Initiation (n = 2009 / n = 67 / 18.8 min/week)
Continuation (n = 11913 / n = 336 / 135 min/week)

Incidence of remission from abdominal obesity
No cycling (n = 1263 / n = 180 / 0 min/week)
Cessation (n = 529 / n = 76 / 30 min/week)
Initiation (n = 486 / n = 86 / 22.5 min/week)
Continuation (n = 2378 / n = 408 / 139.4 min/week)

Incidence of remission from overweight and obesity
No cycling (n = 2691 / n = 276 / 0 min/week)
Cessation (n = 1326 / n = 145 / 30 min/week)
Initiation (n = 1301 / n = 158 / 18.8 min/week)
Continuation (n = 6852 / n = 854 / 135 min/week)

Incidence of remission from obesity
No cycling (n = 756 / n = 156 / 0 min/week)
Cessation (n = 354 / n = 72 / 45 min/week)
Initiation (n = 284 / n = 64 / 22.5 min/week)
Continuation (n = 1359 / n = 341 / 148.1 min/week)

.75   1   1.25
Multivariable adjusted ORs with 95% CIs

Figure 3

A

Among those with a normal waist at baseline †
No cycling (n = 3 918 / 0 min/week)
Cessation (n = 1 896 / 30 min/week)
Initiation (n = 2 009 / 18.8 min/week)
Continuation (n = 11 913 / 135 min/week)

Among those with abdominal obesity at baseline ‡
No cycling (n = 756 / 0 min/week)
Cessation (n = 354 / 45 min/week)
Initiation (n = 284 / 22.5 min/week)
Continuation (n = 1 359 / 148.1 min/week)

-2   -1   0   1   2

Cm changes in waist circumference (multivariable adjusted β-coefficients with 95% CIs)

B

Among baseline non-overweight and non-obese participants ±
No cycling (n = 3383 / 0 min/week)
Cessation (n = 1694 / 30 min/week)
Initiation (n = 1793 / 18.8 min/week)
Continuation (n = 10806 / 135 min/week)

Among baseline non-obese participants §
No cycling (n = 1983 / 0 min/week)
Cessation (n = 924 / 30 min/week)
Initiation (n = 992 / 18.8 min/week)
Continuation (n = 6420 / 137.2 min/week)

Among baseline overweight and obese participants ¶
No cycling (n = 1264 / 0 min/week)
Cessation (n = 529 / 30 min/week)
Initiation (n = 486 / 22.5 min/week)
Continuation (n = 2378 / 139.4 min/week)

Among baseline obese participants *
No cycling (n = 2691 / 0 min/week)
Cessation (n = 1326 / 30 min/week)
Initiation (n = 1301 / 18.8 min/week)
Continuation (n = 6852 / 135 min/week)

-2   -1   0   1   2

Kg changes in bodyweight (multivariable adjusted β-coefficients with 95% CIs)

Table 1. Characteristics of analytic sample in primary analysis (odds for incidence of abdominal obesity)

	No cycling	Cessation	Initiation	Continuation	Total
Participants, n	3 383	1 694	1 793	10 805	17 675
Age, yrs	55 (52-60)	55 (52-59)	55 (52-59)	55 (52-59)	55 (52-59)
Sex, % women	49.4	48.1	42.5	50.1	49
Basic school, % yrs (<7/8-10/>10)	28.6/47.5/23.9	27.8/48.5/23.7	29.1/45.8/25.1	25.4/48.5/26.1	26.6/48/25.4
Higher education, % yrs (0/1–2/3–4/>4)	12.9/21.8/40.9/ 24.3	12.8/20.4/42.7/ 24.1	10.3/20.5/42.2/ 26.9	9.5/21.3/43.3/ 25.9	10.5/21.2/42.7/ 25.5
Waist circumference baseline/second examination, cm	84.5 (10.1)/ 90.8 (11)	85 (9.7)/ 91.3 (10.5)	85.6 (9.9)/ 91.1 (9.9)	84 (9.6)/ 89.7 (10.3)	84.4 (9.8)/ 90.2 (10.4)
BMI at baseline/second examination, kg/m^2	24.4 (2.8)/ 24.5 (3.1)	24.7 (2.7)/ 24.9 (3.1)	24.6 (2.6)/ 24.7 (2.8)	24.5 (2.6)/ 24.5 (2.8)	24.5 (2.6)/ 24.6 (2.9)
Alcohol intake at baseline/second examination, grams/day	14.4 (6.2-32.6) / 13.6 (4.8-32.9)	14.2 (6.8-31.9) / 13.7 (4.9-32.9)	14.7 (7.3-32.1) / 14.5 (6.4-33.2)	13.6 (6.8-28.8) / 13.7 (5.9-31.8)	13.9 (6.8-31) / 13.8 (5.6-32.2)
Dietary energy intake at baseline/second examination, kJ/day	9495.9 (2602.1)/ 9230 (3038.1)	9704.1 (2620.6)/ 9203.9 (2703.4)	9696.1 (2498.7)/ 9396.5 (2619.4)	10008.9 (2651.8)/ 9596.6 (2767.8)	9849.8 (2632.3)/ 9468.5 (2805.9)
Smoking status/amount (Never/former/<15 grams/15-25 grams/>25 grams)†	33.3/24.4/13.1/ 19.4/9.8	33.2/28.2/11.9/ 19.8/6.9	37.4/30.7/10.3/ 15.7/6	40.7/30.5/12.9/ 11.8/4.1	38.2/29.1/12.6/ 14.4/5.6
Wholegrain cereals, grams/day	131 (66.6)	137.2 (68)	140.7 (66.6)	152.9 (70.1)	145.9 (69.5)
Physical activity at work (no work/sedentary/standing/manual work/heavy manual work)	21/40.3/16.9/ 16.7/5.1	22.2/39.4/16.2/ 18/4.3	12.1/45.1/18/ 19.9/5	16.5/39.8/18.6/ 21.6/3.5	17.4/40.4/18/ 20.2/4.1
Reported LTPA other than total cycling at baseline/second examination, MET*hrs/week	42.8 (27.8-66)/ 60.8 (38.4-94.3)	46.1 (31-68)/ 64.2 (38.8-94.9)	44 (28.5-65.5)/ 67.5 (43.8-99.7)	46 (31.3-68.5)/ 68.8 (45.1-101.8)	45.3 (30-67.5)/ 66.6 (43-99.5)

The table presents characteristics of participants in the primary analysis stratified by five-year status of total cycling and for the whole sample. Unless otherwise specified the characteristics are based on data from baseline examination. Descriptive statistics for continuous data were computed as medians with 25th and 75th percentiles when data were asymmetrically distributed, and means with standard deviations when data were approximately normal. Categorized data is presented as proportions. Waist circumference was measured at the natural waist by a lab technician at baseline and at the level of the umbilicus by self-assessment at second examination. Also, waist circumference and bodyweight (used to compute BMI) was measured by a lab technician at baseline but self-reported at second examination. yrs = years; LTPA=leisure time physical activity; MET=metabolic equivalents; hrs = hours. † Grams refer to daily amounts for current smokers.

Supplementary table 1. Sensitivity analyses: Odds for incidence of abdominal obesity (men:>102 cm, women:>88 cm), incidence of general overweight and obesity (BMI≥25 kg/m^2) and incidence of general obesity (BMI≥30 kg/m^2) according to five-year cycling habits

	Cycling (median)	Participants (n) / cases (n)	A: Multivariable adjusted ORs (95% CIs)	B: Multivariable adjusted ORs (95% CIs) - Dietary energy intake	C: Multivariable adjusted ORs (95% CIs) - Reported leisure physical activity other than cycling	D: Multivariable adjusted ORs (95% CIs) - Dietary energy intake - Reported leisure physical activity other than cycling
		Incidence of abdominal obesity (n=17675)				
No cycling	0	3383 / 908	1	1	1	1
Cessation	30	1694 / 460	0.96 (0.82,1.12)	0.96 (0.82,1.12)	0.96 (0.82,1.12)	0.96 (0.82,1.12)
Initiation	18.8	1793 / 402	0.85 (0.73,1.00)	0.85 (0.73,1.00)	0.83 (0.71,0.97)	0.83 (0.71,0.97)
Continuation	135	10805 / 2 403	0.82 (0.74,0.91)	0.82 (0.74,0.92)	0.81 (0.72,0.89)	0.81 (0.73,0.90)
		Incidence of general overweight and obesity (n=10319)				
No cycling	0	1983 / 260	1	1	1	1
Cessation	30	924 / 135	0.95 (0.74,1.23)	0.96 (0.74,1.23)	0.95 (0.74,1.22)	0.95 (0.74,1.23)
Initiation	18.8	992 / 129	0.92 (0.71,1.19)	0.91 (0.71,1.18)	0.90 (0.69,1.16)	0.89 (0.69,1.15)
Continuation	137.2	6420 / 742	0.85 (0.71,1.01)	0.84 (0.71,1.01)	0.83 (0.70,0.99)	0.83 (0.69,0.98)
		Incidence of general obesity (n=19736)				
No cycling	0	3918 / 181	1	1	1	1
Cessation	30	1896 / 78	0.91 (0.67,1.23)	0.91 (0.67,1.23)	0.89 (0.66,1.21)	0.89 (0.66,1.21)
Initiation	18.8	2009 / 67	0.84 (0.61,1.15)	0.84 (0.61,1.15)	0.82 (0.60,1.13)	0.82 (0.60,1.13)
Continuation	135	11913 / 336	0.74 (0.60,0.92)	0.74 (0.60,0.92)	0.73 (0.59,0.90)	0.73 (0.59,0.89)

The table presents sensitivity analyses of three investigations: Odds for incidence of abdominal obesity (men:>102 cm, women:>88 cm), incidence of general overweight and obesity (BMI≥25 kg/m^2) and incidence of general obesity (BMI≥30 kg/m^2), according to five-year cycling status. The first columns from the left includes long-term cycling exposure (cumulative average minutes per week of total cycling from the two examinations), and the second column includes the amount of participants (n) and amount of cases (n) in each category. Multivariable adjusted odds ratios from four models is presented; first from the main analysis (model A) with multivariable adjustment for the following; age (quintiles), sex (male/female), years of basic school (<7/8-10/>10), years of higher education (0/1-2/3-4/>4), dietary energy intake (quintiles), alcohol intake (quintiles), smoking (Never/former/<15 grams per day/>15-25 grams per day/>25 grams per day), wholegrain cereal consumption (quintiles), physical activity at work (No work/sedentary/standing/manual work/heavy manual work), leisure-time physical activity other than total cycling (quintiles), follow-up time (years) and analysis relevant baseline measure (waist circumference or BMI). We adjusted for dietary energy intake, alcohol intake and reported leisure-time physical activity other than total cycling reported at both baseline and second examination. The remaining columns include the same adjustment, but with the omission of dietary energy intake (model B), reported leisure-time physical activity other than cycling (model C) or both (model D). All data is presented for each category of five-year cycling habits. BMI=body mass index; OR=odds ratio, CI=confidence interval.

Supplementary table 2. Sensitivity analyses: Odds for incidence of remission from abdominal obesity (men: ≤102 cm, women: ≤88 cm), incidence of remission from general overweight and obesity (BMI<25 kg/m^2) and incidence of remission from general obesity (BMI<30 kg/m^2) according to five-year cycling habits

	Cycling (median)	Participants (n) / cases (n)	A: Multivariable adjusted ORs (95% CIs)	B: Multivariable adjusted ORs (95% CIs) - Dietary energy intake	C: Multivariable adjusted ORs (95% CIs) - Reported leisure physical activity other than cycling	D: Multivariable adjusted ORs (95% CIs) - Dietary energy intake - Reported leisure physical activity other than cycling
			Incidence of remission from abdominal obesity (n=4656)			
No cycling	0	1263 / 180	1	1	1	1
Cessation	30	529 / 76	1.05 (0.77,1.44)	1.05 (0.77,1.43)	1.07 (0.78,1.45)	1.06 (0.78,1.45)
Initiation	22.5	486 / 86	1.03 (0.75,1.39)	1.03 (0.76,1.40)	1.05 (0.78,1.43)	1.06 (0.78,1.43)
Continuation	139.4	2378 / 408	1.13 (0.92,1.40)	1.14 (0.92,1.40)	1.16 (0.95,1.43)	1.17 (0.95,1.44)
			Incidence of remission from general overweight and obesity (n=12170)			
No cycling	0	2691 / 276	1	1	1	1
Cessation	30	1326 / 145	1.02 (0.80,1.29)	1.03 (0.81,1.30)	1.02 (0.80,1.29)	1.03 (0.81,1.31)
Initiation	18.8	301 / 158	1.04 (0.83,1.32)	1.05 (0.83,1.32)	1.07 (0.85,1.36)	1.08 (0.86,1.36)
Continuation	135	6852 / 854	0.99 (0.84,1.17)	1.00 (0.85,1.17)	1.02 (0.86,1.20)	1.02 (0.87,1.20)
			Incidence of remission from general obesity (n=2753)			
No cycling	0	756 / 156	1	1	1	1
Cessation	45	354 / 72	0.88 (0.62,1.24)	0.88 (0.62,1.24)	0.87 (0.62,1.23)	0.87 (0.62,1.23)
Initiation	22.5	284 / 64	0.96 (0.67,1.39)	0.96 (0.67,1.39)	0.97 (0.67,1.39)	0.97 (0.67,1.40)
Continuation	148.1	1359 / 341	1.06 (0.83,1.36)	1.07 (0.84,1.36)	1.08 (0.85,1.37)	1.08 (0.85,1.38)

The table presents sensitivity analyses of three investigations: Odds for incidence of remission from abdominal obesity (men:≤102 cm, women:≤88 cm), incidence of remission from general overweight and obesity (BMI<25 kg/m^2) and incidence of remission from general obesity (BMI<30 kg/m^2) according to five-year cycling habits. The first columns from the left includes long-term cycling exposure (cumulative average minutes per week of total cycling from the two examinations), and the second column includes the amount of participants (n) and amount of cases (n) in each category. Multivariable adjusted odds ratios from four models is presented; first from the main analysis (model A) with multivariable adjustment for the following; age (quintiles), sex (male/female), years of basic school (<7/8-10/>10),

years of higher education (0/1-2/3-4/>4), dietary energy intake (quintiles), alcohol intake (quintiles), smoking (Never/former/<15 grams per day/>15-25 grams per day/>25 grams per day), wholegrain cereal consumption (quintiles), physical activity at work (No work/sedentary/standing/manual work/heavy manual work), leisure-time physical activity other than total cycling (quintiles), follow-up time (years) and analysis relevant baseline measure (waist circumference or BMI). We adjusted for dietary energy intake, alcohol intake and reported leisure-time physical activity other than total cycling reported at both baseline and second examination. The remaining columns include the same adjustment, but with the omission of dietary energy intake (model B), reported leisure-time physical activity other than cycling (model C) or both (model D). All data is presented for each category of five-year cycling status. BMI=body mass index; OR=odds ratio, CI=confidence interval.