Committee Discussion
Experts and Consultants

None.
Is the current target for physical activity for adults appropriate for young adults?

- Target should be informed by amount needed for healthy development and disease prevention.
- Hybrid of targets for youth and adults.
- Recognize physical activity likely to influence weight gain, metabolic health, brain health, & bone health during this period.
- Recognize multiple, unique contextual changes during this period including independent living, increased responsibility, access and expectations for PA.
• Work with existing subcommittees to identify studies where PA (exposure) is age stratified to include adults between 18 to 34 yr.
  • Tentative range.

• Decide if the amount and strength of this literature would warrant comment in the advisory report perhaps as an emerging topic.
Experts and Consultants

Phone calls with outside experts:
1. Kelly Evenson, PhD, Professor, University of North Carolina

2. James Pivarnik, PhD, Professor, Michigan State University

3. Lisa Chasan-Tabor, ScD, Professor, University of Massachusetts
Consultant:

Kelly Evenson, PhD, Research Professor, University of North Carolina

Specializes in physical activity epidemiology with a special interest in physical activity and pregnancy
No new literature search required.
Draw upon information from 3 documents:

1. 2008 PAGAC Report


Next Steps

• Fill in gaps
• Provide quantitative estimates of size of benefits
• Search for more information about dose
Meeting 3

Fitness

Lead: Bill Kraus

Members: Kirk Erickson, Kathy Janz, Russ Pate, Ken Powell

Fitness • March 23, 2017
Experts and Consultants

• Invited experts: None

• Consultants: William L. Haskell, Ph.D., FACSM
Stanford University
Fitness Working Group Mission

• To consider the role of physical fitness in PAGAC 2018 report and guidelines
  – What is fitness?
  – How do we measure it?
  – Its role as an exposure, mediator or outcome of the benefits of exercise on human health.
Next Steps

• Consultation with PAGAC on current conclusions and next steps.
Summary of recent discussions

1. Reviewed status and progress of current list of questions to be addressed
2. Reconsidered public health value of current list of questions and other potential questions
3. Considered available resources
   a) Committee members
   b) Contract with ICF
   c) (Federal staff – not discussed, indefatigable)
1. Content with questions determined to be most important in October
   a) Most important issues from a public health perspective
   b) Work load challenging but doable
Summary of recent discussions

1. Brain Health subcommittee to address PA and sleep if possible.

2. Weight gain during pregnancy and weight loss after pregnancy will be addressed by the pregnancy work group.
Additional Dose-Response Discussion

Ken Powell, MD, MPH
Dose-related Topics

1. Putting a point on the figure
2. Threshold or no
3. Straight or curved line
4. Incubation period
Interpreting dose-response curves

Data from PAGAC Report 2008
Figure published in Ann Rev Public Health 2011;32:349-365
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Relative risk of CVD mortality

\[ y = mx + b \]

\[ RR = 1 + b(MET\text{-hr/day})^{0.25} \]

Wahid et al, J Am Heart Assoc 2016
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