

Lubans et al. [34] studied 47 boys and 59 girls (all 14 years old) walking and running on a treadmill at 65-75% of maximum heart rate (confirmed by heart rate monitor). Twenty-seven participants repeated the test three times over the course of a month to determine reliability of results. The results were highly repeatable (ICC = .83-.87). Pedometer-determined cadence associated with the designated heart rate range was 147 steps/minute (range 125 to 149 steps/minute) for boys and 137 steps/minute (range 125 to 149 steps/minute) for girls. Cadence also differed by fitness level (assessed by the 3-min Queen's College Step Test): adolescents in the lowest quintile of cardiorespiratory fitness took 129 steps/min, those in the next two quintiles averaged 138 steps/min, and those in the top two quintiles averaged 152 steps/min. It is difficult to use these cadence values to extrapolate to MVPA. The authors did not report when running vs. walking occurred, but it seems likely that the boys and girls with the top fitness levels were running at this higher cadence. Extrapolating from the adult data where the floor value (in absolute terms) of moderate and vigorous intensity is 100 and 130 steps/minute respectively [30], we would expect that a child/adolescent-specific vigorous intensity cadence is likewise at least 30 steps/minute (and likely even higher in children) more than the child/adolescent-specific moderate intensity cadence, or approximately 141 to 157 steps/minute. The Lubans et al. [34] study is grounded by a relative (vs. absolute) indicator of intensity (i.e., heart rate). Further, the heart rate range tested in this study is somewhat narrower than previously included in physical activity recommendations (i.e., 55-90% of maximum heart rate) [46]. Public health guidelines issued by the American College of Sports Medicine and American Heart Association in 2007 do not provide explicit guidelines in terms of heart rate-determined intensity [47].

More recently, Graser et al. [32] conducted another study of pedometer-determined cadence and heart-rate determined intensity in 12-14 year old adolescents. Treadmill speeds were set at 4.0, 4.8, 5.64, and 6.42 km/hr after confirming that this age group could perform all speeds without breaking into a run. These researchers defined moderate intensity as 40-59% of maximum heart rate, which may be considered low compared with physical activity recommendations (i.e., 55-90% of maximum heart rate) [46]. The corresponding cadence averaged 122 (range 108-134) steps/minute in boys and 102 (range 80-123) steps/minute in girls, suggesting great individual variation in intensity-associated cadence, a phenomenon that may reflect underlying variation in development as well as fitness. Limitations include the use of heart rate to define moderate intensity and the use of a target heart rate formula originally produced for adults. Heart rate reflects relative intensity, unlike

direct measures of intensity such as MET values. As in each of the controlled studies in children and adolescents described above, steps were detected by a body-worn instrument instead of by direct observation, which is arguably the more appropriate criterion for these types of lab-based studies.

In summary, no controlled studies of cadence have used a direct measure of absolutely-defined intensity at this time and none have counted steps taken using direct observation. The limited evidence at this time suggests that, in 10-15 year olds, continuous MVPA walking produces 3,300-3,500 steps in 30 minutes or 6,600-7,000 steps in 60 minutes (assuming at least 3 METs). No studies were located that have attempted to intervene specifically on cadence. Hypothetically, however, such a practical approach might be useful for increasing time spent in MVPA.

#### **Translating existing physical activity guidelines**

As stated earlier, public health physical activity guidelines are typically expressed in terms of frequency, time, and intensity. For example, a recent PHAC-commissioned systematic review [48] of physical activity and health concluded that "Children and youth 5-17 years of age should accumulate an average of at least 60 minutes per day and up to several hours of at least moderate intensity physical activity. Some of the health benefits can be achieved through an average of 30 minutes per day." It remains logically implicit (although not expressly stated) that these recommended minutes of at least moderate intensity be accumulated *over and above* such functional activities of daily life. There are no data at this time to inform a quantity of steps suggestive of these 'background' activities in children or adolescents, necessary to compute an estimate of steps/day that will also include recommended amounts of time spent in MVPA. However, studies of free-living behaviour present an opportunity to identify what total volume of steps/day also includes recommended amounts of activity that is of at least moderate intensity. Seven free-living studies were located that have attempted to provide such information. These studies are presented in Table 2 by year of publication. Two have focused on preschool samples [49,50], three with elementary/primary school children [15,16,51], one with adolescents recruited through primary care providers [52], and one of children and adolescents spanning 9-16 years of age recruited as part of a national survey [53].

Cardon et al. [49] reported that 13,874 pedometer-determined steps/day equated to a total volume of physical activity that included at least 60 minutes of accelerometer-determined time in MVPA in Belgian preschool children; only 8% of their sample actually achieved this level of steps/day. Tanaka and Tanaka [50] used a

**Table 2 Studies of steps/day associated with time in MVPA in young people**

| Reference                       | Sample Characteristics   | Instruments  | Monitoring Frame                | Analytical Strategy   | Summary Findings   |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---------------------------------|---|--|
| Cardon [15] 2004 Belgium        | 51 boys, 41 girls; elementary school children; 6.5-12.7 years                                      | Steps/day: Yamax Digiwalker SW-200, Yamax Corp, Japan<br>MVPA: self-report questionnaire   | 7 days                          | Linear regression equation to predict steps/day from self-reported 60 minutes in MVPA   | Total: 13,130 steps/day = 60 minutes MVPA<br>Boys: 15,340 steps/day = 60 minutes MVPA<br>Girls: 11,317 steps/day = 60 minutes MVPA   |
| Rowlands [16] 2005 UK           | 13 boys, 13 girls; primary school children; 8.3 to 10.8 years                                      | Steps/day: Yamax Digi-Walker DW-200, Yamasa, Tokyo, Japan<br>MVPA: Tritrac-R3D, models T303 and T303A, Professional Products, Reining International, Madison, WI | 5 weekdays and 1 weekend day    | Sensitivity/specificity analysis of various thresholds to ascertain likelihood of attaining 60 minutes of accelerometer-determined MVPA | Boys: 18,000 steps/day = 60 minutes MVPA<br>Girls: 15,000 steps/day = 60 minutes MVPA  |
| Beighle [51] 2006 USA           | 256 boys, 334 girls; elementary school children; 9.2 ± 1.8 years                                   | Steps/day and Activity Time*: MLS 2505, Walk4Life, Inc., Plainfield, IL  | 4 weekdays                      | Linear regression to predict pedometer-determined daily activity time from daily step count   | 5,000 steps/day = 64.5 minutes of activity<br>10,000 steps/day = 114.5 minutes of activity<br>12,000 steps/day = 134.5 minutes of activity<br>15,000 steps/day = 164.5 minutes of activity |
| Cardon [49] 2007 Belgium        | 37 boys, 39 girls; preschool children; 4 to 5.9 years  | Steps/Day: Yamax Digiwalker SW-200, Yamax Corp., Japan<br>MVPA: MTI Actigraph, 7164 (Fort Walton Beach, FL)  | 2 weekdays and 2 weekend days   | Regression equation to predict steps/day from accelerometer-determined time (60 minutes) in MVPA  | 13,874 steps/day = 60 minutes MVPA   |
| Adams [52] 2009 USA             | 12 boys, 28 girls; Overweight adolescents recruited through primary care providers; 11 to 16 years | Steps and MVPA: Actigraph 7164   | 7 days                          | ROC to determine steps/day related to achieving 60 minutes accelerometer-determined MVPA; two definitions of moderate intensity used    | MVPA defined at least 3 METs:<br>9,930 steps/day = 60 minutes MVPA<br>MVPA defined at least 4 METs:<br>11,714 steps/day = 60 minutes MVPA  |
| Tanaka [50] 2009 Japan          | 127 boys, 85 girls; kindergarten/nursery school children; 4.5 to 6.8 years                         | Steps/day: Lifecorder EX, Suzuken, Nagoya<br>MVPA: ActivTracer, GMS, Tokyo   | 4 weekdays and 2 weekend days   | Linear regression to predict steps/day from triaxial accelerometer-determined time (60, 100, and 120 minutes) in MVPA                   | 9,934 steps/day = 60 minutes MVPA<br>12,893 steps/day = 100 minutes MVPA<br>14,373 steps/day = 120 minutes MVPA  |
| Olds et al. [53] 2010 Australia | 129 boys, 168 girls; 9 to 16 years   | New Lifestyles 1000  | randomly chosen day of six days | Linear regression equation to predict self-reported MVPA from steps/day   | 1 minute MVPA = 103 steps; by extrapolation 60 minutes would approximately equal 6180 steps (taken over and above lifestyle activities)  |

\*Activity Time is not necessarily time in MVPA. Activity Time detected by this instrument is accumulated seconds of movement while the step counting lever arm is in motion.

similar analytical approach, but collected accelerometer data using a triaxial accelerometer to conclude that 60, 100, and 120 minutes of MVPA corresponded to 9,934, 12,893, and 14,373 steps/day, respectively, in Japanese preschool children. Furthermore, 92.4%, 51.6%, and 27.4% of the sample achieved these levels. Although a direct comparison between the Belgian and Japanese studies must be tempered by the fact that different instruments were used to collect step and MVPA data, the latter sample appears to have been much more active than the former; approximately 52% of the

Japanese children achieved almost 13,000 steps/day and 100 minutes in MVPA while only 8% of the Belgian sample achieved a similar value of steps/day and only 60 minutes in MVPA.

In a separate study, Cardon et al. [15] examined the relationship between 60 minutes of self-reported time in MVPA and pedometer-determined steps/day in Belgian elementary school children. Overall, 13,130 steps/day was equivalent to a total volume of daily physical activity that included 60 minutes of self-reported time in MVPA. Sex-specific values were 15,340 steps/day (boys)

and 11,317 steps/day (girls). These results must be interpreted with caution; the correlation between pedometer-determined steps/day and self-reported time in MVPA was  $r=.39$ . In another study comparing pedometer data with self-reported time in MVPA conducted with 9-16 year olds, the correlations ranged from .44 to .50 [53]. Linear regression was used to determine that approximately 100 steps equated to about 1 minute of MVPA. By extrapolation, the authors suggested that at least 6,000 steps would be required to accumulate 60 min of MVPA (assumedly taken over and above lifestyle activities).

Rowlands and Eston [16] conducted a sensitivity/specificity analysis of various thresholds to ascertain likelihood of attaining 60 minutes of triaxial accelerometer-determined MVPA in Welsh primary school children. They concluded that 13,000 steps/day (boys) and 12,000 steps/day (girls) provided the most reasonable estimation of attainment of 60 minutes of MVPA by way of accumulating a total volume of daily steps. Beighle and Pangrazi [51] used a pedometer that had both a step counting function and an internal stopwatch that accumulates seconds of movement while the step counting lever arm is in motion. The resulting output is labeled "activity time" but also logically includes movement that is likely performed at less than MVPA. Although the outputs were dependent (obtained from the same counting mechanism), the researchers used regression to predict daily activity time from steps/day. They reported that 5,000 steps/day was equivalent to 64.5 minutes of activity, 10,000 steps/day equals 114.5 minutes, 12,000 steps/day equals 134.5 minutes, and 15,000 steps/day equals 164.5 minutes. This study must be interpreted with due caution (and cannot be reasonably considered together with the other two studies of primary/elementary school children) since the activity time output from this instrument does not necessarily reflect time spent specifically in MVPA, but rather accumulated time associated with all detected movement.

Only a single study has attempted to translate time- and intensity-based physical activity guidelines into a steps/day value specific to adolescents [52], and this was specifically done in overweight 11-16 year olds recruited through their primary care providers. The authors used receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curves to determine a total volume of steps/day most likely related to also achieving 60 minutes of accelerometer-determined MVPA. Two definitions of moderate intensity were used (3 and 4 METs). Depending on the definition, between 10,000 (3 METs) and 11,700 (4 METs) steps/day produced the best sensitivity and specificity values for achieving at least 60 minutes of MVPA accumulated within the course of daily living.

In summary, the use of different approaches to measure steps and also time in MVPA hamper the ability to combine results and inform "how many steps are enough" in terms of attainment of recommended amounts of MVPA. Overall, limited evidence suggests that a total daily physical activity volume of 10,000-14,000 steps/day is associated with 60-100 minutes in MVPA for preschool children ( $\approx$ 4-6 years of age) [49,50]. Sixty minutes of MVPA in primary/elementary school children appears to be achieved, on average, within a total volume of 13,000 to 15,000 steps/day in boys and 11,000 to 12,000 steps/day in girls, although these ranges reflect findings based on both self-report [15] and triaxial-determined time in MVPA [16]. For adolescents, 10,000 to 11,700 steps/day may be associated with 60 minutes of MVPA, however there is only a single study, and it is based primarily on overweight adolescent girls [52].

#### Health outcome-related analyses

Besides a translation of time in intensity, steps/day recommendations could also be informed by studies that relate step-defined physical activity to desired health outcomes. Four studies (Table 3) were located that examined steps/day related to indicators of healthy vs. unhealthy body composition in young people. Tudor-Locke et al. [23] combined pedometer data collected in 6-12 year olds from three countries (Australia, Sweden, USA) and used a contrasting groups method to identify criterion-referenced steps/day cut points related to BMI-defined normal weight vs. overweight/obese. The median value for 6-12 year olds was 15,000 steps/day for boys and 12,000 steps/day for girls. Duncan et al. [54] performed a similar analysis but using percent body fat obtained through bioelectric impedance in 5-12 year old New Zealanders. Overweight was defined as  $> 85^{\text{th}}$  percentile and compared with nonoverweight ( $< 85^{\text{th}}$  percentile). The authors reported that 16,000 steps/day (boys) and 13,000 steps/day (girls) were the best predictors of body fat percent-defined weight status. Laurson et al. [55] used ROC analysis to match sensitivity and specificity of various cut points and to identify the optimized cut point (which minimized misclassification error for normal weight vs overweight/obese children) in a sample of U.S. children. The optimized cut points approximated 13,500 steps/day (boys) and 10,000 steps/day (girls). Dollman et al. [56] also used ROC analysis in a sample of 2,071 5-16 year old Australian children. The optimized cut points for discriminating between normal weight and overweight/obese children were 12,000 steps/day for 5-12 year old boys, 10,000 steps/day for 5-12 year old girls, and 11,000 steps/day for 13-16 year old boys. The optimized cut point for 13-16 year old girls (14,000 steps) did not significantly

**Table 3 Studies of steps/day related to indicators of healthy vs. unhealthy body composition in young people**

| Reference   | Sample Characteristics   | Step Counting Instrument                       | Monitoring Frame                            | Analytical Strategy   | Findings  |
|---|--|--|---|---|---|
| Tudor-Locke [23] 2004<br>Australia<br>Sweden<br>USA | 959 boys, 995 girls;<br>school children;<br>6 to 12 years                    | MyLife Stepper MLS-2000<br>Yamax, Tokyo, Japan | 4 week days                                 | Contrasting groups method to identify optimal steps/day related to BMI- defined normal weight vs. overweight/ obese IOTF                        | Boys: 15,000 steps/day<br>Girls: 12,000 steps/day   |
| Duncan [54] 2006<br>New Zealand                     | 454boys, 515girls;<br>elementary school children;<br>5 to 12 years           | NL-2000, New Lifestyles Inc., Lee's Summit, MO | 3 weekdays, 2 weekend days                  | Contrasting groups method to identify overweight vs. nonoverweight based on 95 <sup>th</sup> percentile for % body fat by bioelectric impedance | Boys: 16,000 steps/day<br>Girls: 13,000 steps/day   |
| Laurson [55] 2008<br>USA                            | 358 boys, 454 girls;<br>elementary school children;<br>6 to 12 years         | Digiwalker 200-SW                              | 4-7 days including at least one weekend day | ROC, specificity, sensitivity to determine maximal accuracy of identifying BMI-defined normal weight vs. overweight/ obese (IOTF criteria)      | Boys: 13,666<br>Girls: 9,983  |
| Dollman [56] 2010<br>Australia                      | 995 boys, 1,076 girls;<br>Nationally representative sample;<br>5 to 16 years | New Lifestyles 1000                            | 7 days including weekends                   | ROC, specificity, sensitivity to determine maximal accuracy of identifying BMI-defined normal weight vs. overweight/ obese (IOTF criteria)      | Boys (5-12 years): 12,000<br>Boys (13-16 years): 11,000<br>Girls (5-12 years): 10,000<br>Girls (13-16 years): NS findings |

Note: IOTF = International Obesity Task Force [58]

discriminate between those who were classified as normal weight versus overweight.

In summary, the two studies that have applied the contrasting groups method applied to different weight status criteria (BMI and percent body fat) have produced consistently high values for steps/day: 15,000-16,000 steps/day for boys and 12,000-13,000 steps/day for girls [23,54], but these findings may be an artefact of the samples studied [24]. The ROC analyses conducted in the other two studies [55,56] demonstrate better sensitivity and specificity with much lower values of steps/day (approximately 10,000-13,500 steps/day). Although Eisenmann et al. [57] reported that children not meeting the BMI-reference cut points were more likely to be classified as overweight, Beets et al. [24] also reported concerns about the sensitivity and specificity of the BMI-referenced cut points, and in particular questioned their utility across countries, for example in the U.S. where activity levels are lower (i.e., where even normal weight children have relatively lower activity levels). Across studies, the lowest estimate has been 10,000 steps/day, and most can agree that even lower values are of increasing concern, and higher values are increasingly desirable. However, since BMI is obviously influenced by more than just ambulatory activity, it may be more appropriate to seek agreement on a step-based translation of public health guidelines than to pursue a

more precise estimate associated with a healthy BMI in children and adolescents that is also universally applicable at this time.

### Discussion


Drawing from the studies reviewed above, the minimal recommendation (embodied in most public health guidelines world-wide) of 60 minutes of MVPA is associated with 10,000-14,000 free-living steps/day in preschool children ( $\approx$ 4-6 years of age), 13,000 to 15,000 steps/day in male primary/elementary schoolchildren, 11,000 to 12,000 steps/day in female primary/elementary school children, and 10,000-11,700 steps/day for adolescents. Boys and girls appear to be more similar in their step patterns during the preschool years and again in the adolescent years. In contrast, the consistent sex-associated discrepancy in steps/day observed in primary/elementary schoolchildren, perhaps most clearly illustrated in the sex-and-age specific graphs assembled by Beets et al.[12] representing data from 13 different countries, and the differential empirical evidence related to step-defined attainment of public health guidelines, is difficult to ignore but must continue to be debated and evaluated.

Overall, the primary/elementary schoolchildren values are reasonably compatible with matched normative data [11,12] and fit within ranges of criterion-referenced data

that have been associated with healthy body composition parameters [23]. Since adolescents (compared to children) steadily decline in their daily physical activity levels [11,12], the step-based recommendations above (e.g., translations of time- and intensity-based guidelines) are higher than existing normative data and therefore will be more difficult (but neither necessarily impossible nor contraindicated) for adolescents to achieve. There are no step values based on any health parameters (e.g., BMI, body fat percent, blood pressure, etc.) for adolescents or preschool children at this time to aid in interpretation.

As noted above, the notion of a graduated step index has been introduced for children [21]. The anchors for this index have been criticized [24] and there remains a concern about the appropriateness of labeling children as 'sedentary' [21]. An improvement to the original graduated step index would be to offer a more fully expanded steps/day scale. Such a scale would incorporate child and adolescent-specific step-based translations of public health guidelines within the context of the full lifespan, but also provide additional incremental "rungs" corresponding with roughly 10-minute bouts of activity. It would begin at zero and continue to 18,000+ steps/day (the highest mean value reported for any sample at this time, that is, Amish men [19]). Adoption of such a scale would be useful for both research and health promotion purposes. A schematic of this concept showing 1,000 step increments is presented in the accompanying Figure 1. The ranges shown in Figure 1 represent the best evidence (albeit preliminary) linking objectively monitored time in MVPA with steps/day.

The implied relationship between steps/day and various health outcomes is a primary consideration for setting any steps-based translation of physical activity guidelines. However, the data patterns presented above suggest that step cut points should also consider natural variation in average activity levels associated with age. However, then the concern is that as populations experience anticipated societal decreases in average activity levels, normative-based cut points would also decrease over time. This would make any static, standardized cut point out of touch with local reality, and therefore less useful. Standardized cut points, however they are set, would facilitate global comparisons (and they could be used to illuminate gross discrepancies in between-country behaviour). The compromise is within-country cut points that reflect normative behaviour and also include locally-relevant incremental levels, thereby providing additional "rungs on the ladder" for promotion of activity in less active populations. However, such a strategy must be cautiously applied to avoid validating or otherwise absolving, or even endorsing, underachievement



**Figure 1** Steps/day scale schematic linked to time spent in MVPA.

and thus promoting perpetuation of a low active lifestyle.

## Conclusions

The evidence accumulated to date indicates that there is no simple or "magical" number of steps/day that cuts across all ages. Preschool children are different from primary/elementary school age children, and children are different from adolescents, and the objectively monitored data presented in this review support this. In a similar way, dietary guidelines have historically recommended different amounts of various food groups depending on sex and age. Applying the findings reviewed herein, primary/elementary schoolchildren would be directed (in both public health messages and targeted interventions) to higher levels (boys 13,000-15,000 steps/day; girls 11,000-12,000 steps/day, as indicated by collected evidence reviewed above), adolescents

(10,000-11,700 steps/day) would be intermediate to children and adults [8], and adults and older adults [9] directed to the ranges more specifically appropriate for them, adjusting of course in consideration of abilities and lifestyles that must accommodate disability or chronic illnesses. No potentially stigmatizing labelling would be applied. Regardless, however, every individual would be able to identify their level and the ones immediately above.

If adopted, such a steps/day scale should continue to reinforce the importance and added value of taking at least an age-appropriate portion of daily steps (e.g., 6,000 steps over 60 minutes) at minimally moderate intensity, and if at all possible, at vigorous intensity, congruent with public health guidelines world-wide. Of course, non-ambulatory moderate and vigorous intensity activities (e.g., swimming, bicycling) are also valuable. Recommendations are based on a limited number of relevant studies and must therefore be considered preliminary. Further research is needed to confirm and extend values for directly measured cadences, associated speeds, and MET values in young people; continue to accumulate normative data (expected values) for both steps/day and MVPA across ages and populations; and, conduct more cross-sectional, longitudinal, and intervention studies in children and adolescents to inform the shape of dose-response curves of step-defined physical activity associated with various health parameters.

#### Acknowledgements and Funding

Production of this literature review has been made possible through a financial contribution from the Public Health Agency of Canada (PHAC). The funding body had no role in study design, in the collection, analysis, and interpretation of the data, in the writing of the manuscript, or in the decision to submit the manuscript for publication. The views expressed herein solely represent the views of the authors. We would like to thank Dr. David R. Bassett, Jr. (Department of Kinesiology, Recreation, and Sport Studies, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN, USA) for his thorough review of this manuscript prior to submission.

#### Author details

<sup>1</sup>Walking Behavior Laboratory, Pennington Biomedical Research Center, Baton Rouge, LA, USA. <sup>2</sup>Canadian Fitness and Lifestyle Research Institute, Ottawa, ON, Canada. <sup>3</sup>School of Public Health, University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia. <sup>4</sup>Department of Exercise Science, Arnold School of Public Health, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC, USA. <sup>5</sup>School of Health and Human Performance, Dublin City University, Dublin, Ireland. <sup>6</sup>Department of Movement and Sports Sciences, Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium. <sup>7</sup>Centre for Physical Activity and Nutrition, Auckland University of Technology. <sup>8</sup>Tokyo Gakugei University, Tokyo, Japan. <sup>9</sup>School of Education, University of Newcastle, New South Wales, Australia. <sup>10</sup>Health and Use of Time (HUT) Group, Sansom Institute for Health Research, University of South Australia, Adelaide, Australia. <sup>11</sup>School of Sport Sciences, Linneaus University, Kalmar, Sweden. <sup>12</sup>Department of Neurobiology, Care Sciences and Society, Karolinska Institute, Sweden. <sup>13</sup>School of Psychological Sciences and Health, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, UK. <sup>14</sup>Sedentary Living Lab, Faculty of Physical Education and Recreation, University of Alberta, Alberta, Canada. <sup>15</sup>Health Promotion and Exercise Program, National Institute of Health and Nutrition, Tokyo, Japan. <sup>16</sup>Departments of Exercise Science and Epidemiology

& Biostatistics, Arnold School of Public Health, University of South Carolina, Columbia, USA.

#### Authors' contributions

CT-L and CLC conceived and designed the project. CT-L acquired the data and prepared analysis for initial interpretation. All authors contributed to subsequent analysis and interpretation of data. CT-L prepared a draft of the manuscript. All authors contributed to critically revising the manuscript for important intellectual content. MWB, JSD, DRL, TSO, edit checked the tables. All authors gave final approval of the version to be published and take public responsibility for its content.

#### Competing interests

The following authors declare they have no competing interests: CT-L, MWB, SB, GMC, SD, YH, DRL, TSO, AR, DAR, JCS, and ST. CLC is associated with the Canadian Fitness and Lifestyle Research Institute which is funding in part by the Public Health Agency of Canada (PHAC). AR has served as medical advisor for Keep Walking Scandinavia AB, a company in the wellness sector with online consulting, online distribution of literature and online distribution of pedometers of different brands. SNB receives book royalties (<\$5,000/year) from Human Kinetics; honoraria for service on the Scientific/Medical Advisory Boards for Alere, Technogym, Santech, and Jenny Craig; and honoraria for lectures and consultations from scientific, educational, and lay groups. During the past 5-year period SNB has received research grants from the National Institutes of Health, Department of Defence, Body Media, and Coca Cola.

Received: 15 November 2010 Accepted: 28 July 2011

Published: 28 July 2011

#### References

1. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services: **2008 Physical Activity Guidelines for Americans: Be Active, Healthy, and Happy!** Washington, D. C.; 2008.
2. Public Health Agency of Canada & Canadian Society for Exercise Physiology: **Canada's Physical Activity Guide to Healthy Active Living for Children.** Ottawa, Ont: Public Health Agency; 2002.
3. Public Health Agency of Canada & Canadian Society for Exercise Physiology: **Canada's Physical Activity Guide to Healthy Active Living for Youth.** Ottawa, Ont: Public Health Agency; 2002.
4. Timmons BW, Naylor PJ, Pfeiffer KA: **Physical activity for preschool children—how much and how?** *Can J Public Health* 2007, **98**(Suppl 2): S122-134.
5. Tudor-Locke C, Johnson WD, Katzmarzyk PT: **Accelerometer-determined steps/day in U.S. children and youth.** *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2010, **42**:2244-2250.
6. Craig CL, Cameron C, Griffiths JM, Tudor-Locke C: **Descriptive epidemiology of youth pedometer-determined physical activity: CANPLAY.** *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2010, **42**:163-1643.
7. Tudor-Locke C, Myers AM: **Methodological considerations for researchers and practitioners using pedometers to measure physical (ambulatory) activity.** *Res Q Exerc Sport* 2001, **72**:1-12.
8. Tudor-Locke C, Craig CL, Brown WJ, Clemes SA, De Cocker K, Giles-Corti B, Hatano Y, Inoue S, Matsudo SM, Mutrie N, et al: **How many steps/day are enough? For adults.** *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act* 2011, **8**:79.
9. Tudor-Locke C, Craig CL, Aoyagi Y, Bell RC, Croteau KA, De Bourdeaudhuij I, Ewald B, Gardner AW, Hatano Y, Lutes LD, et al: **How many steps/day are enough? For older adults and special populations.** *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act* 2011, **8**:80.
10. Rowlands AV, Eston RG, Ingledew DK: **Relationship between activity levels, aerobic fitness, and body fat in 8- to 10-yr-old children.** *J Appl Physiol* 1999, **86**:1428-1435.
11. Tudor-Locke C, McClain JJ, Hart TL, Sisson SB, Washington TL: **Expected values for pedometer-determined physical activity in youth.** *Res Q Exerc Sport* 2009, **80**:164-174.
12. Beets MW, Bornstein D, Boughle A, Cardinal BJ, Morgan CF: **Pedometer-measured physical activity patterns of youth: a 13-country review.** *Am J Prev Med* 2010, **38**:208-216.
13. Vincent SD, Pangrazi RP: **An examination of the activity patterns of elementary school children.** *Pediatr Exerc Sci* 2002, **14**:432-441.

14. The President's Challenge: Physical Activity & Fitness Awards Program. [http://www.presidentschallenge.org].
15. Cardon G, De Bourdeaudhuij I: A pilot study comparing pedometer counts with reported physical activity in elementary schoolchildren. *Pediatr Exerc Sci* 2004, **16**:355-367.
16. Rowlands AV, Eston RG: Comparison of accelerometer and pedometer measures of physical activity in boys and girls, ages 8-10 years. *Res Q Exerc Sport* 2005, **76**:251-257.
17. Lubans D, Morgan P: Evaluation of an extra-curricular school sport programme promoting lifestyle and lifetime activity for adolescents. *J Sports Sci* 2008, **26**:519-529.
18. Craig CL, Tudor-Locke C, Cragg S, Cameron C: Process and Treatment of Pedometer Data Collection for Youth: The CANPLAY Study. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2010, **42**:430-435.
19. Bassett DR Jr, Schneider PL, Huntington GE: Physical activity in an Old Order Amish community. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2004, **36**:79-85.
20. Tudor-Locke C, Bassett DR Jr: How many steps/day are enough? Preliminary pedometer indices for public health. *Sports Med* 2004, **34**:1-8.
21. Tudor-Locke C, Hatano Y, Pangrazi RP, Kang M: Revisiting "How many steps are enough?". *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2008, **40**:S537-543.
22. Tudor-Locke C, Johnson WD, Katzmarzyk PT: Accelerometer-determined steps per day in US adults. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2009, **41**:1384-1391.
23. Tudor-Locke C, Pangrazi RP, Corbin CB, Rutherford WJ, Vincent SD, Raustorp A, Tomson LM, Cuddihy TF: BMI-referenced standards for recommended pedometer-determined steps/day in children. *Prev Med* 2004, **38**:857-864.
24. Beets MW, Le Masurier GC, Beighle A, Rowe DA, Morgan CF, Rutherford J, Wright M, Darst P, Pangrazi R: Are current body mass index referenced pedometer step-count recommendations applicable to US youth? *J Phys Act Health* 2008, **5**:665-674.
25. Canadian Society of Exercise Physiology: *The Canadian Physical Activity, Fitness & Lifestyle Approach (CPAFLA): CSEP-Health & Fitness Program's Health-Related Appraisal and Counselling Strategy*. 3 edition. Ottawa, Ont.: Canadian Society of Exercise Physiology; 2003.
26. Lubans DR, Morgan PJ, Tudor-Locke C: A systematic review of studies using pedometers to promote physical activity among youth. *Prev Med* 2009, **48**:307-315.
27. Kang M, Marshall SJ, Barreira TV, Lee JO: Effect of pedometer-based physical activity interventions: a meta-analysis. *Res Q Exerc Sport* 2009, **80**:648-655.
28. Bravata DM, Smith-Spangler C, Sundaram V, Gienger AL, Lin N, Lewis R, Stave CD, Olkin I, Sirard JR: Using pedometers to increase physical activity and improve health: a systematic review. *JAMA* 2007, **298**:2296-2304.
29. Richardson CR, Newton TL, Abraham JJ, Sen A, Jimbo M, Swartz AM: A meta-analysis of pedometer-based walking interventions and weight loss. *Ann Fam Med* 2008, **6**:69-77.
30. Tudor-Locke C, Sisson SB, Collova T, Lee SM, Swan PD: Pedometer-determined step count guidelines for classifying walking intensity in a young ostensibly healthy population. *Can J Appl Physiol* 2005, **30**:666-676.
31. Marshall SJ, Levy SS, Tudor-Locke CE, Kolkhorst FW, Wooten KM, Ji M, Macera CA, Ainsworth BE: Translating physical activity recommendations into a pedometer-based step goal: 3000 steps in 30 minutes. *Am J Prev Med* 2009, **36**:410-415.
32. Graser SV, Groves A, Prusak KA, Pennington TR: Pedometer steps-per-minute, moderate intensity, and individual differences in 12-14-year-old youth. *J Phys Act Health* 2011, **8**:272-278.
33. Graser SV, Pangrazi RP, Vincent WJ: Step It Up: Activity Intensity Using Pedometers. *JOPERD* 2009, **80**:22-24.
34. Lubans DR, Morgan PJ, Collins CE, Boreham CA, Callister R: The relationship between heart rate intensity and pedometer step counts in adolescents. *J Sports Sci* 2009, **27**:591-597.
35. Jago R, Watson K, Baranowski T, Zakeri I, Yoo S, Baranowski J, Conry K: Pedometer reliability, validity and daily activity targets among 10- to 15-year-old boys. *J Sports Sci* 2006, **24**:241-251.
36. Scraggs PW: Quantifying activity time via pedometry in fifth- and sixth-grade physical education. *J Phys Act Health* 2007, **4**:215-227.
37. Scraggs PW: Middle school physical education physical activity quantification: a pedometer steps/min guideline. *Res Q Exerc Sport* 2007, **78**:284-292.
38. Scraggs PW: A comparative analysis of pedometry in measuring physical activity of children. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2007, **39**:1837-1846.
39. Scraggs PW, Beveridge SK, Eisenman PA, Watson DL, Shultz BB, Ransdell LB: Quantifying physical activity via pedometry in elementary physical education. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2003, **35**:1065-1071.
40. Scraggs PW, Beveridge SK, Watson DL, Clocksin BD: Quantifying physical activity in first-through fourth-grade physical education via pedometry. *Res Q Exerc Sport* 2005, **76**:166-175.
41. Scraggs PW, Mungen JD, Oh Y: Quantifying moderate to vigorous physical activity in high school education: a pedometer steps/minute standard. *Meas Phys Educ Exerc Sci* 2010, **14**:104-115.
42. Beets MW, Beighle A, Bottai M, Rooney L, Tilley F: Pedometer-determined step count guidelines for afterschool programs. *J Phys Act Health* .
43. Ainsworth BE, Haskell WL, Whitt MC, Irwin ML, Swartz AM, Strath SJ, O'Brien WL, Bassett DR, Schmitz KH, Emplaincourt PO, et al: Compendium of physical activities: an update of activity codes and MET intensities. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2000, **32**:S498-504.
44. Physical Activity Guidelines Advisory Committee: *Physical Activity Guidelines Advisory Committee Report, 2008* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services; 2008.
45. Troiano RP, Berrigan D, Dodd KW, Masse LC, Tilert T, McDowell M: Physical activity in the United States measured by accelerometer. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2008, **40**:181-188.
46. American College of Sports Medicine: Position Stand. The recommended quantity and quality of exercise for developing and maintaining cardiorespiratory and muscular fitness, and flexibility in healthy adults. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 1998, **30**:975-991.
47. Haskell WL, Lee IM, Pate RR, Powell KE, Blair SN, Franklin BA, Macera CA, Heath GW, Thompson PD, Bauman A: Physical activity and public health: updated recommendation for adults from the American College of Sports Medicine and the American Heart Association. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2007, **39**:1423-1434.
48. Janssen I, Leblanc AG: Systematic review of the health benefits of physical activity and fitness in school-aged children and youth. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act* 2010, **11**:40.
49. Cardon G, De Bourdeaudhuij I: Comparison of pedometer and accelerometer measures of physical activity in preschool children. *Pediatr Exerc Sci* 2007, **19**:205-214.
50. Tanaka C, Tanaka S: Daily physical activity in Japanese preschool children evaluated by triaxial accelerometry: the relationship between period of engagement in moderate-to-vigorous physical activity and daily step counts. *J Physiol Anthropol* 2009, **28**:283-288.
51. Beighle A, Pangrazi RP: Measuring children's activity levels: The association between step-counts and activity time. *J Phys Act Health* 2006, **3**:221-229.
52. Adams MA, Caparosa S, Thompson S, Norman GJ: Translating physical activity recommendations for overweight adolescents to steps per day. *Am J Prev Med* 2009, **37**:137-140.
53. Olds T, Ridley K, Dollman J, Maher C: The validity of a computerised use of time recall, the Multimedia Activity Recall for Children and Adolescents. *Pediatr Exerc Sci* 2010, **22**:34-43.
54. Duncan JS, Schofield G, Duncan EK: Step count recommendations for children based on body fat. *Prev Med* 2007, **44**:42-44.
55. Laurson KR, Eisenmann JC, Welk GJ, Wickel EE, Gentile DA, Walsh DA: Evaluation of youth pedometer-determined physical activity guidelines using receiver operator characteristic curves. *Prev Med* 2008, **46**:419-424.
56. Dollman J, Olds TS, Esterman A, Kupke T: Pedometer step guidelines in relation to weight status among 5- to 16-year-old Australians. *Pediatr Exerc Sci* 2010, **22**:288-300.
57. Eisenmann JC, Laurson KR, Wickel EE, Gentile D, Walsh D: Utility of pedometer step recommendations for predicting overweight in children. *Int J Obes (Lond)* 2007, **31**:1179-1182.
58. Cole TJ, Bellizzi MC, Flegal KM, Dietz WH: Establishing a standard definition for child overweight and obesity worldwide: international survey. *BMJ* 2000, **320**:1240-1243.
59. Raustorp A, Pangrazi RP, Stahle A: Physical activity level and body mass index among schoolchildren in south-eastern Sweden. *Acta Paediatr* 2003, **93**:400-404.
60. Parfitt G, Eston RG: The relationship between children's habitual activity level and psychological well-being. *Acta Paediatr* 2005, **94**:1791-1797.
61. Zizzi S, Vitullo E, Rye J, O'Hara-Tompkins N, Abildso C, Fisher B, Bartlett M: Impact of a Three-week Pedometer Intervention on High School

- Students' Daily Step Counts and Perceptions of Physical Activity. *Am J Health Edu* 2006, **37**:35-40.
62. Raustorp A, Ludvigsson J: Secular trends of pedometer-determined physical activity in Swedish school children. *Acta Paediatr* 2007, **96**:1824-1828.
63. Duncan MJ, Al-Nakeeb Y, Woodfield L, Lyons M: Pedometer determined physical activity levels in primary school children from central England. *Prev Med* 2007, **44**:416-420.
64. Raustorp A, Svenson K, Perlinger T: Tracking of pedometer-determined physical activity: a 5-year follow-up study of adolescents in Sweden. *Pediatr Exerc Sci* 2007, **19**:228-238.
65. Reed JA, Brittenham SW, Phillips DA, Carlisle CS: A Preliminary Examination of the Fitness Levels of Children Who Meet the President's Council Physical Activity Recommendation. *Physical Educator* 2007, **64**:159-167.
66. Downs SM, Marshall D, Ng C, Willows ND: Central adiposity and associated lifestyle factors in Cree children. *Appl Physiol Nutr Metab* 2008, **33**:476-482.
67. Hohepa M, Schofield G, Kolt GS, Scragg R, Garrett N: Pedometer-determined physical activity levels of adolescents: differences by age, sex, time of week, and transportation mode to school. *J Phys Act Health* 2008, **5**(Suppl 1):S140-152.
68. Belton S, Brady P, Meegan S, Woods C: Pedometer step count and BMI of Irish primary school children aged 6-9 years. *Prev Med* 2010, **50**:189-192.

doi:10.1186/1479-5868-8-78

Cite this article as: Tudor-Locke *et al.*: How Many Steps/Day are Enough? for Children and Adolescents. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity* 2011 **8**:78.

**Submit your next manuscript to BioMed Central  
and take full advantage of:**

- Convenient online submission
- Thorough peer review
- No space constraints or color figure charges
- Immediate publication on acceptance
- Inclusion in PubMed, CAS, Scopus and Google Scholar
- Research which is freely available for redistribution

Submit your manuscript at  
[www.biomedcentral.com/submit](http://www.biomedcentral.com/submit)







RESEARCH

Open Access

## How Many Steps/day are Enough? For Adults

Catrine Tudor-Locke<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Cora L Craig<sup>2,3</sup>, Wendy J Brown<sup>4</sup>, Stacy A Clemes<sup>5</sup>, Katrien De Cocker<sup>6</sup>, Billie Giles-Corti<sup>7</sup>, Yoshiro Hatano<sup>8</sup>, Shigeru Inoue<sup>9</sup>, Sandra M Matsudo<sup>10</sup>, Nanette Mutrie<sup>11</sup>, Jean-Michel Oppert<sup>12</sup>, David A Rowe<sup>11</sup>, Michael D Schmidt<sup>13,14</sup>, Grant M Schofield<sup>15</sup>, John C Spence<sup>16</sup>, Pedro J Teixeira<sup>17</sup>, Mark A Tully<sup>18</sup> and Steven N Blair<sup>19</sup>

### Abstract

Physical activity guidelines from around the world are typically expressed in terms of frequency, duration, and intensity parameters. Objective monitoring using pedometers and accelerometers offers a new opportunity to measure and communicate physical activity in terms of steps/day. Various step-based versions or translations of physical activity guidelines are emerging, reflecting public interest in such guidance. However, there appears to be a wide discrepancy in the exact values that are being communicated. It makes sense that step-based recommendations should be harmonious with existing evidence-based public health guidelines that recognize that "some physical activity is better than none" while maintaining a focus on time spent in moderate-to-vigorous physical activity (MVPA). Thus, the purpose of this review was to update our existing knowledge of "How many steps/day are enough?", and to inform step-based recommendations consistent with current physical activity guidelines. Normative data indicate that healthy adults typically take between 4,000 and 18,000 steps/day, and that 10,000 steps/day is reasonable for this population, although there are notable "low active populations." Interventions demonstrate incremental increases on the order of 2,000-2,500 steps/day. The results of seven different controlled studies demonstrate that there is a strong relationship between cadence and intensity. Further, despite some inter-individual variation, 100 steps/minute represents a reasonable floor value indicative of moderate intensity walking. Multiplying this cadence by 30 minutes (i.e., typical of a daily recommendation) produces a minimum of 3,000 steps that is best used as a heuristic (i.e., guiding) value, but these steps must be taken *over and above* habitual activity levels to be a true expression of free-living steps/day that also includes recommendations for minimal amounts of time in MVPA. Computed steps/day translations of time in MVPA that also include estimates of habitual activity levels equate to 7,100 to 11,000 steps/day. A direct estimate of minimal amounts of MVPA accumulated in the course of objectively monitored free-living behaviour is 7,000-8,000 steps/day. A scale that spans a wide range of incremental increases in steps/day and is congruent with public health recognition that "some physical activity is better than none," yet still incorporates step-based translations of recommended amounts of time in MVPA may be useful in research and practice. The full range of users (researchers to practitioners to the general public) of objective monitoring instruments that provide step-based outputs require good reference data and evidence-based recommendations to be able to design effective health messages congruent with public health physical activity guidelines, guide behaviour change, and ultimately measure, track, and interpret steps/day.

### Background

Around the world, physical activity guidelines are written and promoted by government and non-governmental agencies to provide direction for recommended amounts of physical activity required to benefit health, essentially answering the question "how much is enough?" These guidelines are typically expressed in terms of frequency,

duration, and intensity parameters and are based on decades of epidemiological and intervention research that has almost exclusively relied on self-reported physical activity behaviours. The recent release of the U.S. Physical Activity Guidelines [1] acknowledges that "some physical activity is better than none" while maintaining a focus on time spent in moderate-to-vigorous physical activity (MVPA). The evolution of objective monitoring of physical activity using pedometer and accelerometer technology offers an opportunity to extend guidelines to include recommendations for objectively monitored

\* Correspondence: Tudor-Locke@pbrc.edu

<sup>1</sup>Walking Behavior Laboratory, Pennington Biomedical Research Center, Baton Rouge, LA, USA

Full list of author information is available at the end of the article

parameters reflective of time spent in MVPA in the context of free-living behaviour.

The data generated by accelerometers are robust and can be downloaded and converted into time spent in various intensities of physical activity and inactivity by applying accepted accelerometer-specific cut points (i.e., intensity-linked activity counts that represent a proprietary digitized integration of a movement event and its acceleration). Although the importance of these data in terms of studying frequency and duration of intensity-specific activity is unquestionable, accelerometers typically are relatively expensive and require additional personnel time and expertise to manage and manipulate the data to derive these end points. In contrast, pedometers are inexpensive, easy to use, and the step output is readily available (i.e., digitally displayed on screen) and easily interpretable as an indicator of overall volume of physical activity. The output of pedometers and accelerometers is clearly related [2]. Although accelerometers are now also being used to capture and describe step data in nationally representative surveys [3], pedometers are more likely to be used in public health and clinical applications and adopted by the general public due to their relative low cost, practicality, and interpretability.

The various and emerging step-based recommendations from around the world are catalogued in Table 1 and reflect public interest in such guidance. As can be seen from the table, there appears to be a wide discrepancy in the range of step-based recommendations that are being communicated. Yet internationally, similar frequency-, duration-, and intensity-based public health guidelines are

endorsed: 30 minutes (at times up to 60 minutes) per day (or 150-210 minutes/week) in MVPA, typically in minimal 10 minute bouts [4-9]. These widely accepted, evidence-based adult public health physical activity guidelines were originally formulated in terms of preventing morbidity and mortality. As framed, these frequency-, duration-, and intensity- based guidelines imply that the recommended dose of physical activity should be taken *over and above* a baseline level (of lower intensity activities) that has never been explicitly described, and may in fact be changing as a result of societal trends, which further complicates the issue. Public health guidelines [1] also now state that, especially for inactive adults, "some physical activity is better than none," and this recognition sets the stage for an expanded yet still compatible step-based message that also accommodates recommended amounts of time in MVPA.

In order to avoid being construed as simply another source of confusion and disagreement, it makes sense that any step-based recommendation should be harmonious with existing physical activity guidelines. They are "not intended to supplant existing public health recommendations, but rather supplement them" [10]. However, there is an opportunity to posit a total number of steps/day so that both habitual activity levels (taken in the course of free-living and not necessarily of at least moderate intensity) and suggested increments in physical activity that meet frequency-, duration-, and intensity-based parameters are considered in the recommended 'dose.' The question "How many steps/day are enough?" has been previously reviewed [11,12]. The literature related to objective monitoring of physical activity is

**Table 1 Government/agency/professional organization step-based recommendations from around the world**

| Government/<br>agency/<br>professional organization                     | Step-based recommendation   |
|---|---|
| Queensland Health (Australia)   | Sponsors 10,000 Steps: "aims to increase the day-to-day activity of Australians by encouraging you to use a step-counting pedometer to accumulate 'incidental' physical activity as part of your everyday living" ( <a href="http://www.10000steps.org.au/">http://www.10000steps.org.au/</a> )   |
| National Heart Association of Australia                                 | Produced a brochure in 2009 "Making every step count" ISBN 978-1-921226-71-7, <a href="http://www.heartfoundation.org.au">http://www.heartfoundation.org.au</a> , that says "a suggested target for healthy adults is 10,000 steps per day."  |
| U.S. President's Challenge Physical Activity and Fitness Awards Program | Recommends 8,500 steps/day for adults, and 13,000 and 11,000 steps/day for boys and girls respectively ( <a href="http://www.presidentschallenge.org/challenge/active/index.shtml">http://www.presidentschallenge.org/challenge/active/index.shtml</a> )  |
| America on the Move   | Promotes walking an extra 2,000 steps in addition to eating 100 less calories each day to stop weight gain( <a href="http://aom3.americaonthemove.org/">http://aom3.americaonthemove.org/</a> )   |
| National Obesity Forum (U.K)  | Indicates that 3,000 to 6,000 steps/day is sedentary, 7,000 to 10,000 steps is moderately active, and > 11,000 steps/day is very active. ( <a href="http://www.nationalobesityforum.org.uk/healthcare-professionals-mainmenu-155/treatment-mainmenu-169/192-useful-tools-and-agencies.html">http://www.nationalobesityforum.org.uk/healthcare-professionals-mainmenu-155/treatment-mainmenu-169/192-useful-tools-and-agencies.html</a> )          |
| Northern Ireland's Public Health Agency                                 | Promotes an additional 30 minutes of daily walking or 3000 steps ( <a href="http://www.getalifegetactive.com/adults/walking/walking">http://www.getalifegetactive.com/adults/walking/walking</a> )  |
| Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare of Japan [77]                    | Recommends: "for individuals who intend to promote health mainly through physical activity, a daily walk of 8,000 to 10,000 steps is set as the target. The report indicates that 8,000 to 10,000 steps/day is approximately equivalent to 60 minutes of walking per day at an intensity of 3 METs, and that it is also approximately equivalent to 23 MET-hours/week of MVPA which is the recommended physical activity level in this guideline. |

growing at a considerable rate and it is again time to address this question. The purpose of this review therefore was to update and identify gaps in the evidence to inform step-based recommendations congruent with current physical activity guidelines and otherwise to extend guidelines to include recommendations for "How many steps/day are enough?"

## Methods

In February 2010, the Public Health Agency of Canada (PHAC) commissioned a literature review designed to identify how many steps are approximately equivalent to public health guidelines in children/adolescents, adults, and older adults/special populations. A professional librarian identified 1,594 articles by conducting a search of English language literature published since 2000 in CINAHL, ERIC, MEDLINE, PsycINFO, SocINDEX, and SPORTDiscus using the keywords (pedomet\* or accelerometer\*) and step\* and ((physical activity) or walk\*). This list was reduced to 837 articles once duplicates, remaining non-English language articles, dissertations, non-peer reviewed articles, and those obviously not dealing with step-defined human physical activity were removed. Abstracts for this reduced list of articles were initially read by the first author to identify relevant articles and electronic copies of these were assembled using Endnote X3 (Thomson Reuters, New York). Additional articles were identified from article reference lists. Relevant content was tabulated and/or summarized by the first author. Select researchers from around the world with experience in collecting objectively monitored step data were invited to identify any missing literature (including known in-press articles), critically review the report, edit check and verify assembled data, and intellectually contribute by participating in the writing of a series of consensus documents (children/adolescents [13], adults, and older adults/special populations [14]) intended to provide step-based recommendations congruent with public health guidelines (given the limitations detailed below). This specific review is focused on healthy adults approximately 20-65 years of age, although the upper limit was not rigid (as driven by the identified literature), and living without disability or chronic illness. The child/adolescent [13] and older adult/special populations [14] literature is reviewed separately. No other inclusion criteria were used other than relevance to the question at hand.

Identified themes emerged as the literature was reviewed and provide a structure for the remainder of this article: 1) normative data (i.e., expected values); 2) incremental changes expected from interventions; 3) controlled studies that determine exact step-based conversions of timed behaviour; 4) computing a step translation of duration- and intensity-based physical activity guidelines (e.g., steps/day associated with time spent in MVPA); 5) directly

measured steps/day indicative of minimal time in MVPA taken under free-living conditions; and, 6) steps/day associated with various health outcomes. Essentially, each section represents a 'mini-review.' At times the search strategy was exhaustive and the exact number of articles identified is presented under the appropriate heading below (e.g., controlled studies). Exceptions occur in the case of identified current review articles (e.g., normative data, interventions). The findings of these reviews were simply summarized herein and select original articles are referred to only to make specific points. Where appropriate, details of studies are presented in tables; inconsistencies in reporting within and across tables (e.g., instrument brand, model, etc.) reflect underlying reporting inconsistencies between original articles.

## Results

### Normative data (expected values)

An early review of 32 studies published between 1980 and 2000 [15] indicated that healthy younger adults (approximately 20-50 years of age) take 7,000-13,000 steps/day. Many more studies of step-defined physical activity measured using pedometers and accelerometers are published today, including a more recent review article of adult normative data. Specifically, Bohannon [16] used a meta-analytic approach to summarize and present steps/day taken by healthy adults (18+ years of age). Forty-two studies published between 1983 and 2004 were identified. Reported values for adults under 65 years of age ranged from approximately 5,400 steps/day (in a U.S. sample of multiethnic women mean age 54.2 years [17]) to 18,000 steps/day (in a sample of Amish men mean age 34 years [18]). Excluding the Amish sample, overall mean steps/day was 9,448 (95% CI = 8,899-9,996). The NHANES accelerometer data were adjusted to facilitate interpretation on a pedometer-based scale, since accelerometers typically detect more steps than pedometers [19,20]. The findings indicate that, on average, U.S. adults take approximately 6,500 steps/day [3], not too different from two other U.S. estimates based on pedometer data: Colorado ( $\approx$ 6,800 steps/day) [21] and South Carolina ( $\approx$ 5,900 steps/day) [22]. A more recent article reported that U.S. adults average approximately 5,100 steps/day when measured by a pedometer [23]. In contrast, other representative samples indicate that Japanese people aged 15+ years take an average of approximately 7,200 steps/day [24], Western Australians aged 18+ years take approximately 9,600 steps/day [25], Belgian adults aged 25-75 years take approximately 9,600 steps/day [26], and Swiss adults aged 25-74 years of age take approximately 8,900 steps/day (women) and 10,400 steps/day (men) [27]. Despite differences in instrumentation used, the ability to compare results across studies that have used research-quality pedometers is reasonably good [28].

In 2004 Tudor-Locke and Bassett [11] introduced the concept of a graduated step index for healthy adults: 1) < 5,000 steps/day ('sedentary'); 2) 5,000-7,499 steps/day ('low active'); 3) 7,500-9,999 steps/day ('somewhat active'); 4)  $\geq$ 10,000-12,499 steps/day ('active'); and 5)  $\geq$ 12,500 steps/day ('highly active'). This index was revisited and given additional support in 2008 as part of an updated review of "How many steps/day are enough?" [12] and in 2009 the original 'sedentary' level (i.e., < 5,000 steps/day) was further split into two additional graduations: < 2,500 steps/day ('basal activity') and 2,500-4,999 steps/day ('limited activity') [3]. The utility of this graduated step index has been assessed in terms of discriminating individuals by body mass index (BMI) [29] and reflecting increased cardiometabolic risk [30] (reviewed in more detail below). Thus, step-based estimates of U.S. adults' habitual physical activity would classify the population as 'low active' according to this existing step-defined physical activity scale [11,12].

Sixteen free-living healthy adult studies (Table 2) were identified that reported the percentage of their samples achieving specified step-defined cut points, including applying cut points associated with the graduated step index described above. Five used 10,000 steps/day as an exclusive cut point (no other cut point was considered). Eight reported using the graduated step index originally proposed by Tudor-Locke and Bassett [11]. Two studies of South African samples that also made use of the graduated step index were excluded from Table 1 because their lower age limits extended into adolescence [31,32], beyond the scope of this specific review. Apparent patterns from Table 1 include: younger adults are more likely to achieve 10,000 steps/day, U.S. samples are more likely to take < 5,000 steps/day compared to Australian samples, and those with lower incomes are also more likely to take < 5,000 steps/day than high income earners. The studies that have reported data using versions of the graduated step index provide more robust (i.e., more levels) data for comparison and tracking purposes than those that have only reported relative attainment of any single value of steps/day.

### Interventions

Three different meta-analytic reviews of controlled and/or quasi-experimental studies have summarized the effects of pedometer-based physical activity interventions in adults, published in 2007 [33], 2008 [34], and 2009 [35], respectively. In addition, a selective review [36] has re-examined the studies published in the two earlier reviews [33,34] to gain insight into why pedometers are effective behaviour change instruments. We therefore only offer a brief summary of these findings here. The use of pedometers in behaviour modification programs increases physical activity by approximately 2,000 [35] to

2,500 steps/day [33,34]. This level of increase is associated with modest weight loss [33,34] and improvements in blood pressure [33]. Studies employing a step goal [33], and in particular a 10,000 steps/day goal [35], appear to have had the greatest impact on increasing physical activity. As previously noted, however [36], few studies have evaluated alternative goals to 10,000 steps/day, and no study to date has systematically evaluated dose-response effects of different steps/day goals. Therefore it may be premature to make firm conclusions about the efficacy, effectiveness, or appropriateness of any specific step-based goal in terms of behaviour change. It is possible that working towards *any* goal that represents an increase over baseline values is likely to be much more important, from a behavioural perspective at least, than the value of the exact target number [36]. It is important to acknowledge that the nature of a goal (i.e., an objective that defines intention at the level of the individual) differs from, but may overlap, the concept of step-based recommendations consistent with public health physical activity guidelines pursued herein. It is also clear that other cognitive and behavioural strategies are important to incorporate into successful intervention programs [37].

### Controlled studies

Eight controlled studies (Table 3) have been conducted using treadmills [38-43], tracks [40], or hallways [44] to determine exact step-based conversions of timed continuous ambulation. Sufficient data were reported in all these studies to summarize cadence (steps/minute values), speed (reported in either miles/hr or km/hr, otherwise converted here), and METs as reported, imputed, or otherwise inferred from Compendium of Physical Activity [45] values and summarized in Table 4. Each of these strategies is indicated in the table notes. The correlation between the mean values for steps/minute and speed (miles/hr or km/hr) is presented in Table 4 is  $r = 0.97$  (strong). The correlation between steps/minute and MET level is also strong ( $r = 0.94$ ). Cadence is known to be the primary strategy for increasing free-living walking speed [46] and although stride lengthening becomes relatively more important in running, cadence still increases with running speed [47]. The five studies that directly measured the number of steps and verified absolutely-defined moderate intensity activity [38-40,43,44] came to similar conclusions: despite inter-individual variation, 100 steps/minute represents a reasonable heuristic (i.e., guiding) value for absolutely-defined moderate intensity walking.

### Computed step count translations for physical activity guidelines

As noted above, five separate studies can be used to support the assertion that 3,000 steps in 30 minutes is approximately equivalent to at least moderate intensity walking in

**Table 2 Studies of free-living behaviour reporting percent of participants meeting select step-defined cut points in adults**

| First Author                        | Sample Characteristics  | Instrument  | Monitoring Frame | Steps/day cut points used   | % Meeting Specified Cut point  |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|------------------|---|--|
| Tudor-Locke [22]<br>USA<br>2004     | 76 men, 133 women; population-based survey of Sumter County, South Carolina; 18+ years of age | Yamax SW-200, Yamax Corporation, Tokyo, Japan   | 7 days           | 5,000<br>9,000<br>10,000  | 44% < 5,000<br>19.6 ≥ 9,000<br>13.9% ≥ 10,000  |
| Miller [50]<br>Australia<br>2004    | 74 men, 111 women; workplace employees; 18 to 75 years  | Yamax SW 700  | 7 days           | 10,000  | Men: 24.4%<br>Women: 34.2%   |
| Behrens [51]<br>USA<br>2005         | 18 men, 18 women; college students; 23.3 ± 3.1 years  | Digi-walker (Model DW-200, Yamax, Tokyo, Japan)<br>Actigraph 7164, Manufacturing Technology Incorporated, Fort Walton Beach, FL | 7 days           | 10,000  | 80%  |
| Wyatt [21]<br>USA<br>2005           | 344 men, 386 women; 18+ years of age; Colorado statewide representative sample                | Yamax SW-200, Yamasa Corporation, Tokyo, Japan  | 4 days           | Adult Graduated Step Index  | 33% < 5,000<br>29% 5,000-7,499<br>22% 7,500-9,999<br>9% 10,000-12,500<br>7% > 12,5000  |
| Behrens [78]<br>USA<br>2005         | 204 men, 237 women; college students; 20.05 ± 1.82 years                                      | Actigraph 7164, Manufacturing Technology Incorporated, Fort Walton Beach, FL  | 7 days           | 10,000  | Overall: 67.35%<br>Men: 69.6%<br>Women: 65.4%  |
| Hornbuckle [79]<br>USA<br>2005      | 69 women; self-identified African American volunteers; 40-62 years of age                     | New Lifestyles Digi-Walker SW-200, New Lifestyles, Inc., Lees Summit MO   | 7 days           | Adult Graduated Step Index  | 38% < 5,000<br>46% 5,000-7,499<br>16% ≥7,500   |
| Bennett [80]<br>USA<br>2006         | 153 men, 280 women; Multiethnic low-income housing residents; 18 to 70+ years                 | Yamax SW200   | 5 days           | sedentary index: 5,000; normative for healthy adults: 7,000-13,000; normative for healthy older adults: 6,000-8,500 | 56% < 5,000<br>24% 7,000-13,000<br>8% of those 50+ took between 6,000 and 8,500  |
| McCormack [25]<br>Australia<br>2006 | 205 men, 223 women; state wide community sample; ≥18 years                                    | Yamax Digi-walker SW-700  | 7 days           | 10,000  | Men: 50.2%<br>Women: 40.8%   |
| De Cocker [26]<br>Belgium<br>2007   | 598 men, 624 women; random sample from public record office; 25 to 75 years                   | Yamax Digiwalker SW-200 (Yamax, Tokyo, Japan)   | 7 days           | Adult Graduated Step Index  | 12.9% < 5000<br>19.4% 5000-7499<br>26.2% 7500-9999<br>21.1% 10,000-12,500<br>20.5% > 12,5000   |
| De Cocker [81]<br>Belgium<br>2008   | 146 men, 164 women; healthy adults; 38.7 ± 11.9 years   | Yamax Digiwalker SW-200, (Yamax, Tokyo, Japan)  | 7 days           | 7,500<br>10,000<br>12,500   | ≥7,500: 80.6%<br>≥10,000: 45%<br>≥12,500: 39.4%  |
| Mitsui [82]<br>Japan<br>2008        | 62 men, 117 women; recruited through medical check-up at public health center; 48 to 69 years | EM-180, YAMASA, Tokyo, Japan  | 7 days           | Adult Graduated Step Index  | Men<br>30.6% < 5000<br>25.8% 5000-7499<br>17.7% 7500-9999<br>25.8% ≥10000<br>Women<br>28.2% < 5000<br>35.0% 5000-7499<br>24.8% 7500-9999<br>12.0% ≥10000 |
| Payn [74]<br>USA<br>2008            | 25 men, 60 women; community sample, ambulatory and without cognitive impairment; 45+ years    | Yamax Digi Walker SW-200, Yamax USA, Inc., San Antonio, TX  | 7 days           | Adult Graduated Step Index  | 29.4% ≤ 5000<br>43.5% 5001-9999<br>27.1% ≥ 10,000  |

**Table 2 Studies of free-living behaviour reporting percent of participants meeting select step-defined cut points in adults (Continued)**

|                                     |   |   |   |   |  |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|
| McKercher [59]<br>Australia<br>2009 | 766 men, 869 women;<br>young adults participating in a<br>longitudinal study;<br>26 to 36 years | Yamax Digiwalker SW-200   | 7 days                                      | Adult Graduated Step<br>Index   | Men<br>8.2% < 5,000<br>29.6% 5,000-7,499<br>27.7% 7,500-9,999<br>19.7% 10,000-<br>12,499<br>14.8% 12,500+<br>Women<br>6.7% < 5,000<br>28.2% 5,000-7,499<br>33.5% 7,500-9,999<br>21.1% 10,000-<br>12,499<br>10.6% 12,500+   |
| Schmidt [30]<br>Australia<br>2009   | 887 men, 906 women; 26 to 36 years  | Yamax SW-200  | 7 days                                      | Adult Graduated Step<br>Index   | Men<br>7.8% 0-4,999<br>27.9% 5,000-7,499<br>27.3% 7,500-9,999<br>21.4% 10,000-<br>12,999<br>15.7% 12,500+<br>Women<br>6.2% 0-4,999<br>27.9% 5,000-7,499<br>33.2% 7,500-9,999<br>21.3% 10,000-<br>12,999<br>11.4% 12,500+   |
| Tudor-Locke [83]<br>USA<br>2011     | 1781 men, 1963 women;<br>NHANES participants (nationally<br>representative);<br>20 to 85+ years | ActiGraph AM-7164; censored<br>data to approximate<br>pedometer outputs | 7 days                                      | Adult Graduated Step<br>Index with additional<br>sedentary categories | Men<br>14.1% < 2,500<br>20.6% 2,500-4,999<br>24.2% 5,000-7,499<br>19.3% 7,500-9,999<br>10.9% 10,000-<br>12,499<br>10.8% 12,500+<br>Women<br>14.1% < 2,500<br>20.6% 2,500-4,999<br>24.2% 5,000-7,499<br>19.3% 7,500-9,999<br>13.2% 10,000-<br>12,499<br>10.8% 12,500+ |
| Clemes [84]<br>UK<br>2011           | 44 men<br>52 women; 18 to 65 years  | SW-200 pedometer (New<br>Lifestyles, Inc., Lees Summit,<br>MO)          | 4 weeks in<br>summer and<br>again in winter | 10,000 steps/day  | Normal weight<br>Summer 60% ≥<br>10,000<br>Winter 35% ≥<br>10,000<br>Overweight<br>Summer 43% ≥<br>10,000<br>Winter 35% ≥<br>10,000  |

Adult Graduated Step Index [11]: 1) < 5,000 steps/day ('sedentary'); 2) 5,000-7,499 steps/day ('low active'); 3) 7,500-9,999 steps/day ('somewhat active'); 4) ≥10,000-12,499 steps/day ('active'); and 5) ≥12,500 steps/day ('highly active'). These categories were reinforced in an updated review in 2008 [12] and in 2009 the original 'sedentary' level was segmented into two additional levels: < 2,500 steps/day ('basal activity') and 2,500 to 4,999 steps/day ('limited activity') [3].

adults, based on a cadence of 100 steps/minute [38-40,43,44]. To be considered a true translation of public health guidelines' focus on time in MVPA, however, these steps should be of at least moderate intensity (i.e., be ≥100 steps/minute), accumulated in at least 10 minute bouts, and should be taken *over and above* some baseline level of

steps/day indicative of sedentarism. Since a value of ≤5,000 steps/day had been proposed as a 'sedentary lifestyle index' [11,12,48], summing this value and the supplemental steps/day considered minimally representative of recommended amounts of time in MVPA produces a floor value of approximately 8,000 steps/day. Some physical activity

**Table 3 Controlled study designs that have informed “how many steps/day are enough?” in adults**

| Reference                        | Sample Characteristics   | Step Counting Instrumentation                                | Protocol   | Analysis strategy   | Findings   |
|----------------------------------|--|--|--|---|--|
| Welk [41] 2000 USA               | 17 males, 14 females<br>Cooper Aerobics Center employees<br>29.0 ± 8.0 years                   | Yamax Digi-Walker (Yamax Inc., Tokyo, Japan), observed tally | walk/jog a track and/or treadmill mile at 4, 6, and 7.5 miles/hr (6.4, 9.66, and 12.8 km/hr*)  | steps taken for each pace extrapolated from 4mph pace steps in 30 minutes moderate intensity  | 3,800-4,000 steps would approximate 30 minutes of moderate intensity walking   |
| Tudor-Locke [38] 2005 USA        | 25 males, 25 females<br>university community<br>18 to 39 years                                 | Yamax SW-200, Yamax Corp., Tokyo, observed tally             | 6-minute treadmill bouts at 4.8, 6.4, and 9.7 km/hr  | VO <sub>2</sub> from expired gases<br>Regression METs predicted from steps/minute   | 3,000-4,000 steps in 30 minutes of moderate intensity walking based on a threshold cadence of 100 steps/min  |
| Marshall [39] 2009 USA           | 39 males, 58 females<br>community sample of Latino adults<br>32.1 ± 10.6 years                 | Yamax SW-200, observed tally                                 | 6-minute treadmill bouts at 2.4, 3.0, 3.5, 4.1 miles/hr (3.86, 4.83, 5.64, and 8.04 km/hr*)  | VO <sub>2</sub> from expired gases; METs predicted from steps/minute<br>multiple regression, mixed modelling, receiver operating curves   | Inter-individual variation apparent however, minimally 3,000 steps in 30 minutes of moderate intensity walking based on a threshold cadence of 100 steps/min   |
| MacPherson [42] 2009 New Zealand | 12 males, 15 females<br>university students<br>18 to 39 years                                  | Observed tally   | 10,000 steps on treadmill at 3.2 and 6.4 km/hour   | time to complete and PAEE kcal from Tritrac-R3D accelerometer   | most participants could achieve at least 150 kcal in energy expenditure with 10,000 steps at the slow walk (median 255 kcal, range 148-401). Faster walking produced a higher energy expenditure (median 388 kcal, range 294-901). |
| Beets [44] 2010 USA              | 9 males, 11 females;<br>healthy adults;<br>26.4 ± 4.5 years                                    | Observed tally   | 6-minute hallway bouts at 1.8, 2.7, 3.6, 4.5, and 5.4 km/hr*   | Random effects models to predict steps/min from METs and anthropometric measures  | Inter-individual variation apparent however, minimally 3,000 steps in 30 minutes of moderate intensity walking based on a threshold cadence of 100 steps/min   |
| Rowe [40] 2011 UK, USA           | 37 males, 38 females; university students, employees, and their families;<br>32.9 ± 12.4 years | Observed tally   | 6-minute treadmill bouts at randomly assigned sets of slow (mean 4.3 km/hr), medium (5.0 km/hr), fast (5.8 km/hr) speeds<br>And<br>Over-ground track walks (at least 4 minutes) at treadmill-determined cadences (cued by metronome) | Mixed model regression analysis to predict METs from cadence, anthropometric measures, stride length  | Inter-individual variation apparent however, minimally 3,000 steps in 30 minutes of moderate intensity walking based on a threshold cadence of 100 steps/min   |
| Abel [43] 2011 USA               | 9 males, 10 females;<br>university population, frequent runners;<br>28.8 ± 6.8 years           | Observed tally   | 10-minute treadmill bouts at walking (3.24, 4.8, and 6.42 km/hr*) and running speeds (8.04, 9.66, 11.28 km/hr*)  | Linear and non-linear regression analysis to predict METs from cadence<br>Mixed ANOVA:<br>Between subjects (sex), within subject effect of speed for cadence, stride length, VO <sub>2</sub> , and METs | Inter-individual variation apparent however, 100 steps/minute a reasonable estimate of moderate intensity walking  |

\*reported speeds converted to km/hr.

guidelines recommend up to 60 minutes of activity that is of at least moderate intensity [6,9]. Multiplying 60 minutes by 100 steps/minute results in 6,000 steps, that when added to a ‘sedentary’ level of 5,000 steps/day produces a total value of 11,000 steps/day. Therefore, a simple arithmetical translation of free-living physical activity that also includes recommended amounts of time in MVPA is 8,000 to 11,000 steps/day for adults, applied with the caveats listed above, and if expressed as a daily recommendation.

It is important to emphasize that these calculations consider only activities that generate steps. There are, of course, a wide range of human activities that may or may not generate steps, for example, those that may include upper body movement. However, bipedal locomotor activity is a fundamental aspect of human movement. Additionally, it has been shown that wrist-worn accelerometers add little extra information to those worn at the waist (and therefore are also most sensitive to ambulatory

**Table 4 Speed, MET levels, and cadence from track, treadmill, and hallway walking/running studies of adults**

| Reference         | Speed (miles/hr)  | Speed (km/hr)      | MET                | Cadence (spm)    |
|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| Beets [44]        | 1.12 <sup>A</sup> | 1.8 <sup>A</sup>   | 2.0 <sup>B</sup>   | 64 <sup>C</sup>  |
| Beets [44]        | 1.68 <sup>A</sup> | 2.70 <sup>A</sup>  | 2.4 <sup>B</sup>   | 81 <sup>C</sup>  |
| MacPherson [42]   | 1.99 <sup>D</sup> | 3.2                | 2 <sup>E</sup>     | 93               |
| Abel [43]         | 2.01 <sup>F</sup> | 3.24 <sup>F</sup>  | 3.1 <sup>B</sup>   | 96 <sup>C</sup>  |
| Beets [44]        | 2.24 <sup>A</sup> | 3.6 <sup>A</sup>   | 2.7 <sup>B</sup>   | 96 <sup>C</sup>  |
| Marshall [39]     | 2.4               | 3.86 <sup>G</sup>  | 3.09 <sup>H</sup>  | 109 <sup>I</sup> |
| Rowe [40]         | 2.7               | 4.3                | 2.94 <sup>J</sup>  | 102              |
| Beets [44]        | 2.8 <sup>A</sup>  | 4.50 <sup>A</sup>  | 3.2 <sup>B</sup>   | 106 <sup>C</sup> |
| Abel [43]         | 2.98 <sup>F</sup> | 4.80 <sup>F</sup>  | 4.0 <sup>B</sup>   | 114 <sup>C</sup> |
| Tudor-Locke [38]  | 2.98 <sup>D</sup> | 4.8                | 3.60               | 108 <sup>C</sup> |
| Marshall [39]     | 3                 | 4.83 <sup>G</sup>  | 3.73 <sup>H</sup>  | 115 <sup>I</sup> |
| Rowe [40]         | 3.1               | 5.0                | 3.46 <sup>J</sup>  | 114              |
| Beets [44]        | 3.36 <sup>A</sup> | 5.40 <sup>A</sup>  | 3.9 <sup>B</sup>   | 115 <sup>C</sup> |
| Marshall [39]     | 3.5               | 5.64 <sup>G</sup>  | 4.94 <sup>H</sup>  | 124 <sup>I</sup> |
| Rowe [40]         | 3.6               | 5.8                | 4.2 <sup>J</sup>   | 125              |
| Abel [43]         | 3.99 <sup>F</sup> | 6.42 <sup>F</sup>  | 5.5 <sup>B</sup>   | 127 <sup>C</sup> |
| Tudor-Locke [38]  | 3.98 <sup>D</sup> | 6.4                | 5.25               | 127 <sup>C</sup> |
| Welk [41]         | 4                 | 6.44               | 5.25 <sup>K</sup>  | 129 <sup>L</sup> |
| MacPherson [42]   | 3.98 <sup>D</sup> | 6.4                | 5.25 <sup>K</sup>  | 129              |
| Marshall [39]     | 4.1               | 6.60 <sup>G</sup>  | 6.85 <sup>H</sup>  | 134 <sup>I</sup> |
| Abel [43]*        | 5.0 <sup>F</sup>  | 8.04 <sup>F</sup>  | 9.18 <sup>B</sup>  | 158 <sup>C</sup> |
| Abel [43]*        | 6.0 <sup>F</sup>  | 9.66 <sup>F</sup>  | 10.93 <sup>B</sup> | 165 <sup>C</sup> |
| Welk [41]*        | 6                 | 9.66               | 10 <sup>M</sup>    | 163 <sup>N</sup> |
| Tudor-Locke [38]* | 6.02 <sup>D</sup> | 9.7                | 10.00              | 161 <sup>C</sup> |
| Abel [43]*        | 7.01 <sup>F</sup> | 11.28 <sup>F</sup> | 12.98 <sup>B</sup> | 170 <sup>C</sup> |
| Welk [41]*        | 7.5               | 12.08              | 12.5 <sup>O</sup>  | 165 <sup>P</sup> |

\* Jogging/running.

Note: Superscripts denote values derived from information contained in original manuscript.

<sup>A</sup> Converted from reported meters/second.

<sup>B</sup> METs determined by weighted average METs reported for males and females.

<sup>C</sup> Cadence determined by weighted average spm reported for males and females.

<sup>D</sup> Converted from reported km/hr.

<sup>E</sup> Compendium code 1179: walking on job, less than 2.0 mph (in office or lab area), very slow.

<sup>F</sup> Converted from reported meters/minute.

<sup>G</sup> Converted from reported miles/hr.

<sup>H</sup> METs determined by weighted average METs for normal weight, overweight, obese.

<sup>I</sup> Cadence determined by weighted average hand-counted spm for normal weight, overweight, obese.

<sup>J</sup> Converted from reported VO<sub>2</sub>.

<sup>K</sup> MET assumed to be the same as that for 6.4 km/hr pace in Tudor-Locke et al. [38].

<sup>L</sup> Cadence determined by dividing weighted mean steps for men and women (1936) by time taken to complete a mile (15 min).

<sup>M</sup> Compendium code 12050: running, 6 mph (10 minute mile).

<sup>N</sup> Cadence determined by dividing weighted mean steps for men and women (1631) by time taken to complete a mile (10 min).

<sup>O</sup> Compendium code 12080: running, 7.5 mph (8 minute mile).

<sup>P</sup> Cadence determined by dividing weighted mean steps for men and women (1317) by time taken to complete a mile (8 min).

activity detected while on the wrist) [49]. The calculation above focused on adding recommended amounts of MVPA to baseline physical activity levels and therefore presumes 30 minutes of MVPA in a day. Some public health guidelines now clearly promote 150 minutes/week as the minimal amount of health-related moderate intensity [1,7]. A computed translation of this expression is 15,000 steps/week, again based on the 100 steps/minute heuristic value described above. Considering 7 days at a baseline level of 5,000 steps/day (or 35,000 steps/week), adding these extra 15,000 steps/week (for a total of 50,000 steps/week), and averaging over 7 days, produces an average of approximately 7,100 steps/day. Adding an extra 30,000 steps/week (i.e., up to 300 minutes/week [1,7]), produces an overall estimate of approximately 9,300 steps/day averaged over a week.

In summary, a computed translation of daily free-living ambulatory physical activity for adults that includes allowance for recommended amounts of time in MVPA is 8,000 to 11,000 steps/day. Allowing for a more flexible accumulation pattern that may include some "off" days, and averaged across a week, the estimate is 7,100 to 9,300 step/day. Together these estimates span 7,100 to 11,000 steps/day. In both cases, it remains important to emphasize that at least a portion of these steps (3,000 for the daily accumulation and 15,000 of the weekly total accumulation) are minimally taken at an intensity of at least 100 steps/minute (i.e., moderate intensity, absolutely defined), and in bouts of at least 10 minutes.

#### Direct studies of step equivalents of physical activity guidelines

Six studies (Table 5) were identified that have attempted to provide steps/day translations of recommended amounts of either time spent in MVPA or energy expended (kcal) in healthy adults. Tudor-Locke et al. [48] reported that people who averaged 30 minutes/day of accelerometer-determined MVPA also accumulated 8,000 pedometer-determined steps/day when the two instruments were worn concurrently. Miller and Brown [50] reported that working adults who self-reported accumulating at least 150 minutes of MVPA in a week averaged 9,547 steps/day. Behrens et al. [51] reported that college students who accumulated at least 30 minutes of moderate intensity activity (vigorous intensity not considered) averaged 11,822 steps/day. In the latter two studies, mean values of the sample can be influenced by skewed data, and the process does not effectively capture a



**Table 5 Studies that have attempted to set steps/day cut points in adults relative to time spent in MVPA or energy expended**

| First Author               | Sample Characteristics   | Instrument  | Monitoring Frame | Analytical Strategy  | Findings  |
|----------------------------|--|---|------------------|--|---|
| Tudor-Locke [48] 2002 USA  | 27 men, 25 women university community 38.2 ± 12.0 years                                | Yamax SW-200, Yamax Corporation, Tokyo, Japan; CSA 7164 Version 2.2, Computer Science Applications, Inc., Shalimar, FL  | 7 days           | Mean steps/day associated with the step/day quartile distribution in which participants accumulated an average of 30 min/day accelerometer-determined MVPA | 8,000 steps/day corresponded with accumulating 30 minutes of MVPA people taking > 12,500 took more moderate and vigorous activity than any other group  |
| Miller [50] 2004 Australia | 74 men, 111 women workplace employees 18 to 75 years                                   | Yamax SW 700; Active Australia questionnaire  | 7 days           | Steps/day equivalent to 150+ minutes/week self-reported MVPA   | Those who met guidelines averaged 9,547 ± 2,655 steps/day   |
| Behrens [51] 2005 USA      | 18 men, 18 women college students 23.3 ± 3.1 years                                     | Digi-walker (Model DW-200, Yamax, Tokyo, Japan) Actigraph 7164, Manufacturing Technology Incorporated, Fort Walton Beach, FL  | 7 days           | Steps/day related to 30+ minutes of accelerometer-determined moderate physical activity  | 11,822 steps/day  |
| Jordan [52] 2005 USA       | 111 postmenopausal women intervention participants 45-75 years                         | Accusplit Eagle 120 (AE 120)  | 7 days           | Steps/day associated with attaining prescribed and verified exercise equivalent to 120-150 min/week or 8kcal/kg/week EE                                    | 3-4 days of 10,000 steps/day met energy expenditure guidelines for the week or approximately 7300 steps/day (imputed from reported data)  |
| Macfarlane [53] 2008 China | 30 men, 19 women apparently healthy 15 to 55 years                                     | SW-700, Yamax Corporation, Tokyo, Japan MTI 7164, MTI Actigraph, Fort Walton Beach, FL Tritrac RT3, Stayhealthy INC., Monrovia, CA Heart rate monitor, Team system, Polar OY, Finland | 7 days           | Selected 25th percentile of steps/day distribution; examined sensitivity/specificity of achieving 30 minutes MVPA measured by various instruments          | 8,000 steps/day   |
| Tudor-Locke [83] 2011 USA  | 1781 men, 1963 women; NHANES participants (nationally representative); 20 to 85+ years | ActiGraph AM-7164; censored data to approximate pedometer outputs   | 7 days           | Step-defined activity category where at least 30 minutes of MVPA was accumulated   | Men who took 7,500-9,999 steps/day accumulated 38 minutes MVPA; women who achieved 10,000-12,499 steps/day accumulated 36 minutes of MVPA (women who achieved 7,500-9,999 steps/day accumulated 25 minutes of MVPA) |

threshold value necessarily associated with achieving public health guidelines.

Jordan et al. [52] described total steps/day associated with attaining prescribed and verified exercise equivalent to 120-150 minutes/week or 8 kcal/kg/week of energy expenditure in a sample of post-menopausal women participating in an intervention study. They found that 3-4 days of 10,000 steps/day met energy expenditure guidelines for the week, and when considered along with data collected beyond the formal exercise setting, that is, in the course of daily living outside of exercise sessions and on non-exercise days, was equivalent to approximately 7,300 steps/day (imputed from data reported in the original

article). MacFarlane et al. [53] selected the 25th percentile of steps/day distribution in 49 Hong Kong Chinese people aged 15-55 years, examined sensitivity/specificity of achieving 30 minutes MVPA measured by various instruments across quartiles of steps/day distribution, and reported that the 25<sup>th</sup> percentile value of 8,000 steps/day provided the best overall accuracy, sensitivity and specificity compared with higher quartile splits.

Finally, Tudor-Locke et al. [54] adjusted the 2005-2006 NHANES accelerometer data to more closely represent pedometer-based scaling and considered concurrently detected minute-by-minute step and activity count data from over 3,500 individuals with at least one valid day of

wear time defined as 10/24 hours/day. Considering any minute spent in MVPA, they reported that 30 minutes/day was associated with approximately 8,000 steps/day for both men and women. A focused analysis on a subsample of participants with 7 valid days indicated that 150 minutes/week of MVPA was associated with approximately 7,000 steps/day (or 49,000 steps/week). The authors concluded that 7,000 to 8,000 steps/day, acknowledging that more is better, is a reasonably simple message that is also congruent with public health recommendations focused on minimal amounts of MVPA. A caveat is that these data considered any minute above MVPA, and therefore do not reflect an exact translation of public health guidelines that include a directive for minimal bout lengths. However, the chasm between these guidelines that have been traditionally based on self-reported activity and objectively monitored activity has been pointed out previously by users of these NHANES data [55].

In summary, directly studied estimates of free-living behaviour suggest that a total daily volume of ambulatory physical activity associated with meeting minimal amounts of MVPA is at least 7,000-8,000 steps/day. This range is similar to the threshold produced from the assumption-based computations above (i.e., 7,100 steps/day). Collectively, the results suggest that the designation of 'active' originally reserved for achieving at least 10,000 steps/day [11,12], actually encompasses a range that begins as low as 7,000 steps/day if 'active' is intended to indicate likelihood of achieving recommended amounts of weekly MVPA. Spread out over a week, more modest increases of  $\approx$  2,800 steps on three days/week, in line with just 50% of public health guidelines, and relative to a sedentary baseline (i.e.,  $\approx$  4,700 steps/day) have produced important improvements in a number of health outcomes [52,56-58]. This is in keeping with the recent physical activity guidelines [1] that acknowledge that, especially for inactive adults, "some physical activity is better than none."

#### **Steps/day associated with various health outcomes**

Although this section does not deal directly with a step-based translation of existing physical activity guidelines, five cross-sectional studies were identified that have attempted to set steps/day cut points relative to any health-related outcome, and these fit under the general purpose of this review to consider "how many steps/day are enough?" McKercher et al. [59] reported that women who achieved  $\geq$  7,500 steps/day had a 50% lower prevalence of depression than women taking  $<$  5,000 steps/day. No additional benefit for depression was observed from attaining higher step-defined physical activity levels. Men who achieved  $\geq$  12,500 steps/day also had a 50% reduction in prevalence of depression compared with those taking  $<$

5,000 steps/day. Only the women's results were statistically significant.

Krumm et al. [29] examined the relationship between pedometer-determined steps/day and body composition variables in 93 post-menopausal women. In relation to BMI, a linear relationship was observed such that women who took 5,000-7,500 steps/day had a significantly lower BMI than those who took  $<$  5,000 steps/day. Further, women who took 7,500-9,999 steps/day had a significantly lower BMI than those who took 5,000-7,500 steps/day. There was no significant difference in BMI between women who took 7,500-9,999 steps/day and those who took  $>$  10,000 steps/day.

Although Dwyer et al. [60] did not expressly set any specific steps/day cut point, they did document an inverse cross-sectional relationship between steps/day and markers of obesity in a population-based adult sample. Further, the logarithmic nature of the relationship was such that greater relative differences in waist circumference and BMI were observed for those taking habitually lower steps/day. Specifically, an extra 2,000 steps/day for someone habitually taking only 2,000 steps/day was associated with a 2.8 cm lower waist circumference in men compared with 0.7 cm lower for men already walking 10,000 steps/day. The corresponding values for potential reductions in waist circumference for women were 2.2 and 0.6 cm, respectively, for a 2,000 step addition to the two habitual walking level examples. Not surprisingly, there were larger differences in both waist circumference and BMI between those reporting 2,000 steps/day and those reporting higher counts of 10,000, 15,000 or 20,000 steps/day, but the relative benefits of small differences at lower habitual levels were still notable.

Tudor-Locke et al. [61] applied a contrasting groups method to identify optimal steps/day related to BMI-defined normal weight vs. overweight/obese in an amalgamated data base featuring pedometer and BMI data that were independently collected but using similar protocols and the same type of pedometer from Australia, Canada, France, Sweden, and the USA. Despite data limitations (e.g., fewer data available for men than women), the researchers suggested that a total number of steps/day related to a normal BMI in adults would range from 11,000 to 12,000 in men and from 8,000 to 12,000 in women, and that values were consistently lower in older age groups than in younger age groups. Spring-levered pedometers are known to undercount steps related to obesity, so the values in this data base reflect that potential threat to validity [62]. However, their use does not completely misrepresent the general findings that steps/day differ significantly across BMI-defined obesity categories, even when measured by more sensitive accelerometers [63]. Once again, however, since pedometers are more

likely to be used in clinical and public health applications, the presentation of pedometer-determined steps/day as detected in free-living populations, that include obese individuals, is relevant and therefore defensible.

It is important to consider whether we are asking the wrong question (at least for some health parameters): "How many steps/day are enough?" The question itself promotes a single-minded pursuit of threshold values, a presumed phenomenon that may not accurately characterize the true shape of a specific dose-response curve. Further, if such a threshold exists, it might only be readily achieved by a small and possibly already active subsample of any population. Recently, there has been growing interest in the study of sedentary behaviour and its potentially deleterious effects on health [64,65]. Considering this, it may be that the more appropriate question to ask in terms of pedometer-determined physical activity cut points is "How many steps/day are too few?" In support of this notion, many of the studies herein could be re-interpreted to conclude what levels of step-defined physical activity were associated with compromised health outcomes. For example, Schmidt et al. [30] reported that individuals taking < 5,000 steps/day had a substantially higher prevalence of a number of adverse cardiometabolic risk factors than those taking higher steps/day. From a public health practice point of view it is both rational and appealing to focus on motivating behaviour change in the larger portions of the population with low to very low physical activity levels rather than to focus solely on tailoring messages that may very well only appeal to subsamples that are already comparatively active. The adoption and use of a fully expanded steps/day scale that incorporates step-based translations of recommended amounts of MVPA would facilitate efforts designed to communicate both "How many steps/day are enough?" and also "How many steps/day are too few?"

In summary, it may be that specific thresholds of step-defined physical activity are associated in different ways with specific health outcomes. For example, relatively greater benefits in body composition parameters may be realized with small increments (e.g., adding 2,000 steps/day) over low levels of habitual activity in individuals who already have excess body fat, but "normalization" (with no further needed improvements) may require optimally higher physical activity levels (e.g., 11,000 to 12,000 steps/day in men, 8,000 to 12,000 step/day in women) and be relatively more difficult to achieve. Other health parameters may exhibit a more classic threshold effect, for example, positive effects on depression at  $\geq 7,500$  steps/day [59]. The concept of distinctly different dose-response curves related to physical activity is in keeping with the findings presented at the historic dose-response symposium in 2001 [66].

## Discussion

Human movement is not limited to bipedal locomotion, however, such locomotion is a fundamental part of daily life and is a prominent focus of public health physical activity guidelines. Steps can be accumulated throughout the day during chores, occupational requirements, child care, errands, and transportation. Walking for exercise remains the most frequently reported leisure-time activity [67]. Other types of sport and exercise can also be viewed as strategies to increase steps/day [68], but some activities, for example, swimming, and bicycling, are alternative healthy physical activities that do not easily lend themselves to tracking with pedometers [69]. We acknowledge that step-based recommendations for physical activity might be more appropriate and better received by the large segment of the population who do not regularly engage in any sport or other exercise apart from walking. Incorporating at least 30 minutes, or approximately 3,000-4,000 steps, of brisk walking should be emphasized with the promotion of any step-based recommendation, in line with public health guidelines' focus on time in MVPA. The additional benefits of engaging in even more vigorous intensity activities, and activities that do not necessarily focus exclusively on bipedal locomotion, should also be acknowledged [1].

Current public health physical activity guidelines are derived from accumulated knowledge gained over the past several decades primarily from epidemiological and intervention studies of self-reported physical activity. To be clear, messages to perform at least 30 minutes of moderate intensity activity on most, preferably all days of the week [70] (or more recently, at least 150 minutes/week in moderate intensity, 75 minutes/week in vigorous intensity physical activity, or a combination of both [1,7]) can be, for the most part, traced back to research participants' subjective descriptions of this duration, intensity, and frequency of leisure-time physical activity behaviour. The well-designed dose-response to exercise in women (DREW) study clearly demonstrated that previously sedentary women who performed even 50% of physical activity guidelines, expressed in terms of energy expenditure and objectively verified, reaped benefits in terms of significant improvements in measured cardiorespiratory fitness [56], for example. However, with the advent of body worn objective monitoring technologies there has been a keen interest in providing an objectively determined translation of the physical activity guidelines as stated, particularly with reference to time in MVPA. It is quite easy to ask someone to walk on a treadmill for 30 minutes at moderate intensity and produce a precise estimate of directly observed steps taken, for example. However, it is important to emphasize that the rich collection of research that has informed public health guidelines to

date is based, for the most part, on self-reported behavior, that is, people's unique perceptions and accounts of their own behaviour. We have come to accept that, although there is a correlation [2], there is a disconnect between self-reported and objectively monitored physical activity; agreement between cross-tabulated NHANES accelerometer and self-reported physical activity data was only 18.3% (men, 20-59 y) to 32.7% (women, 60+ y) [55]. Further, those with absolutely no accelerometer-determined time spent in MVPA self-reported accumulating 43.1 to 65.2 minutes/day in MVPA [55]. To be very clear, it remains possible that self-reported frequency and time spent in absolutely defined MVPA actually equates to a lesser amount of objectively monitored behaviour than a direct and objective measurement of free-living activity, that includes the same amount of MVPA, would suggest. Alternatively, it is plausible that people have been systematically over-reporting absolute intensity of activity, as evident from the observed discrepancy between concurrent estimates of self-reported and objectively measured activity [55].

Any time a cut point of any type is set, there is an inevitable trade-off between sensitivity and specificity. Sensitivity is the proportion of true positives (values that are classified correctly as positive) relative to the sum of both true positives and false negatives and specificity is the proportion of true negatives (values that are classified correctly as negative) relative to the sum of both true negatives and false positives. For example, and hypothetically, if we set 10,000 steps/day as a cut point indicative of attaining public health guidelines that includes meeting minimal requirements for MVPA, we would anticipate that there will be some people who take 10,000 steps/day and do not accumulate 30 minutes of MVPA in at least 10-minute bouts (false positives) and also people who take less than 10,000 steps/day and still manage to accumulate 30 minutes of MPVA in at least 10-minute bouts (false negatives). This phenomenon is known [41,71-74]. If we raise the cut point to say, 12,500 steps/day, we can increase specificity and reduce the number of false positives. The trade-off is decreased sensitivity: we misclassify those who achieve sufficient MVPA at lower steps/day values. A higher cut point is desirable in research if we really want to save resources, and are willing to 'let some slip by' in a focused effort to locate those for our research studies who are most likely to be accumulating appropriate amounts of time spent in MVPA. Alternatively, if we lower the cut point to say, 7,500 steps/day, sensitivity is increased (i.e., more people meeting MVPA guidelines will be correctly classified) at the expense of decreased specificity (i.e., more people who do not meet MVPA guidelines will be incorrectly classified as if they have met them). This latter scenario is likely to be more acceptable in terms of public health strategies to communicate healthful

levels of physical activity, especially if they are communicated as minimal cut points, above which additional benefits may be reaped. Regardless, it is important to realize that, whatever threshold is selected, there will be "exceptions to the rule" and these must be tolerated, otherwise confidence in any guideline can deteriorate.

Using a graduated step index as originally developed [11] to categorize escalating levels of pedometer-determined physical activity represents an important evolution beyond single value estimates of "How many steps/day are enough?" (e.g., 10,000 steps/day). Any single value, although attractive in terms of simplistic messaging, is vulnerable to "exceptions to the rule" and must be repeatedly declared with several caveats. Further, it can undermine credibility in communicating the importance of a physically active lifestyle to health at any age when it is perceived that disagreement and confusion exist. In contrast, a graduated step index has the potential to bridge research and practice because it has utility in research (e.g., reporting health outcomes across step-defined physical activity levels, tracking population levels of achievement, etc.), clinical practice (screening, prescription, compliance, etc.), behaviour change (goal-setting, self-monitoring, feedback, etc.), and public health practice (surveillance, evaluation, communication, etc.). Increased physical activity can be captured individually or on a population level by attainment of relatively higher levels within the graduated step index. The graduated levels are congruent with the now accepted concept that some activity is better than none, that increased levels of activity should be approached progressively, and that health may be optimized at higher levels, although some relatively important health benefits may be realized even with improvements over the lowest levels [1].

A further improvement to the original graduated step index would be to offer a more fully expanded steps/day scale with additional "rungs on the ladder," which may be very important when applied to low active individuals and populations. Such a scale would incorporate step-based translations of public health recommendations for MVPA (e.g., superimposed on the scale), but also provide additional incremental "rungs" corresponding with roughly 10-minute bouts of activity, beginning at zero and continuing to 18,000+ steps/day, the highest mean value reported for a sample at this time: Amish men [18]. This concept is shown in Figure 1. The arrows, which suggest that more is even better, are superimposed over the fully expanded scale in Figure 1 and summarize steps/day ranges congruent with recommendations for time in MVPA across the lifespan. The base of the arrow indicates a minimal amount of recommended steps for a subgroup. For example, the range for adults is 7,000-8,000 steps/day, at least 3,000 of which should be accumulated at a brisk pace. To emphasize, this is only a threshold and the arrow indicates that more is even better. Individual and