1	Association between types of physical activity and risk of ischemic
2	heart disease based on US Guidelines: A systematic review and
3	meta-analysis
4	Jaewoo Cha ^{a*} , MPH, Jeehyun Kim ^a , MPH, and Kwan Hong ^a , MD, MPH
5	^a Department of Preventive Medicine, Korea University College of Medicine, Seoul, Republic
6	of Korea
7	* Corresponding author: Jaewoo Cha, MPH
8	Department of Preventive Medicine, Korea University College of Medicine
9	73, Goryeodae-ro, Seongbuk-gu, Seoul 02841, Republic of Korea
10	Tel: +82 10-5766-7651
11	Fax: +82 2-927-7220
12	Email: jaewoocha@hira.or.kr
13	

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

14 Abstract

15	Background: Mortality from ischemic heart disease (IHD) is increasing worldwide. There is
16	no available literature regarding the validity of US guidelines for IHD risk reduction through
17	physical exercise. In this meta-analysis, we aimed to measure the effectiveness of US
18	guidelines for physical activity in reducing IHD risk based on the types of exercise.
19	Methods: Six databases, including MEDLINE, EMBASE, Cochrane Library, CINAHL,
20	Scopus, and Web of Science, were searched from January 1, 2000, to November 6, 2022. The
21	most recent literature search was conducted on November 6, 2022, and only English-
22	language articles were included. Studies designed and conducted on humans on any type of
23	IHD-related physical activity were included. Study outcomes included heterogeneity among
24	the studies, overall effects of all types of physical activity, and IHD risk. The random effects
25	model was measured. A funnel plot was used to assess publication bias.
26	Results: When the US guidelines for physical activity were not applied, there was a high
27	level of heterogeneity in the effects of physical activity by type, with overall effects of 0.764
28	(odds ratio [OR], 95% confidence interval [CI]: 0.737-0.795). The effect of physical activity
29	on IHD was 0.593 (OR, 95% CI: 0.489-0.720). No publication bias was observed. After
30	applying the US guidelines for physical activity, there was a low level of heterogeneity in the
31	effects of physical activity by type and an observed OR of 0.515 (95% CI: 0.401-0.662) for
32	myocardial infarction.

33 Discussion: Each type of exercise had different effects on reducing IHD, and there were
34 certain beneficial results if the US guidelines for physical activity were satisfied.

35

36 Introduction

37	Ischemic heart disease (IHD) is the first leading cause of death worldwide [1]. Every year,
38	one-third of deaths worldwide are caused by IHD [1]. In the past, IHD was the most serious
39	health issue and leading cause of death in older people [2]. However, this disease is not
40	currently restricted to older people [3]. Symptoms of IHD include fast heartbeat, fainting
41	during exercise, sweating, and fatigue; the most common are chest pain and light-headedness
42	[2]. Engaging in physical activity is an effective and efficient strategy to prevent IHD [4].
43	Research shows that exercising could result in an up to three-fold IHD risk reduction [5]. The
44	metabolic equivalent of task (MET) method is commonly used to estimate exercise intensity
45	[6] and allows for the calculation of exercise intensity and duration.
10	Margover types of oversige are important in reducing the UID risk [7]. Considering this
46	Moreover, types of exercise are important in reducing the IHD risk [7]. Considering this,
47	several factors have led many governments to encourage regular physical activities [8,9]. For
48	example, the US physical activity guidelines suggest 150 min of moderate-level exercise or
49	75 min of weightlifting [10]. Furthermore, the US launched the 'move your way' campaign
50	based on these guidelines [11]. There have been many attempts to prove the validity of the
51	US guidelines to the public. Many studies have demonstrated that the US guidelines
52	effectively improve public health in the general population [12–16]. However, in reality,
53	people usually consider the type of exercise rather than its duration. This study had two aims:
54	first, to examine the types of exercise and IHD risk. Second, to perform a meta-analysis to
55	validate the US guidelines and determine efficient types of exercise.

56 Methods

57 This study was conducted in accordance with the PRISMA guidelines.

58 Search strategy and eligibility criteria

59	In this meta-analysis, six databases, including MEDLINE, EMBASE, Cochrane Library,
60	CINAHL, Scopus, and Web of Science, were searched from January 1, 2000, to November 4,
61	2022. The most recent literature search was conducted on November 4, 2022, and only
62	English-language articles were included. The Population, Intervention, Control, and
63	Outcomes (PICO) method was used to define study characteristics.
64	The inclusion criteria were derived from the PICO method. Exclusion criteria were: 1)
65	publication date before the year 2000, 2) not written in English, 3) not a primary study, 4) not
66	a research article, and 5) not relevant to the PICO criteria. Two authors made independent
67	extractions and discussed with the corresponding author if differences were observed.
68	
69	P: General population
70	I: Participants who satisfied the US guidelines for physical activity
71	C: Participants who did not satisfy the US guidelines for physical activity
72	O: Reduction of IHD risk
73	Categories of search terms
74	Physical activity [Mesh Terms and in title and abstract]: Exercise [Mesh], Physical
75	Conditioning, Human [Mesh], Dancing [Mesh], Swimming [Mesh], Walking [Mesh],
76	Running [Mesh], Bicycling [Mesh], Muscle Stretching Exercises [Mesh], Weight Lifting
77	[Mesh]

- 78 Ischemic Heart Disease [Mesh Terms and in title and abstract]: Myocardial Ischemia [Mesh]
- 79 Incidence [Mesh Terms and in title and abstract]: Incidence [Mesh], Heart Disease Risk
- 80 Factors [Mesh]
- 81 Human Subjects [Mesh Terms and in title and abstract]: NOT Models, Animal [Mesh]
- 82 Disease Models, Animal [Mesh], Animals [Mesh]
- 83 English Only [Mesh Terms and in title and abstract]: English [la]
- 84 Years [Mesh Terms and in title and abstract]: 2000:2030 [dp]
- 85 Study Design [Mesh Terms and in title and abstract]: NOT Systematic Reviews as Topic
- 86 [Mesh], Meta-Analysis as Topic [Mesh]

87 Data extraction and quality assessment

After the first title/abstract screening was performed using Microsoft Excel, data was collected through full-length paper reviews [17]. Two authors made an independent assessment of the studies and discussed with the corresponding author if differences were observed. Quality assessment was performed using the Newcastle/Ottawa Scale (NOS), commonly utilized for non-randomized controlled trials [18]. Two authors made an independent assessment of the studies extracted and discussed with the corresponding author if differences were observed.

95 Outcomes

We assessed exercise types and IHD risks in the primary analysis. Secondary outcomes were
types and intensity of exercise that satisfied the US guidelines for physical activity and
reduction in IHD risk.

99 Data Analysis

100	We measured the results by assessing the odds ratio (OR) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs)
101	of the studies. These standards were applied to both categorical and numerical values. A
102	random-effect model was employed to analyze the results of a comprehensive search. The
103	obvious and statistical analyses of the meta-analysis were estimated using the I ² statistics
104	method [19]. After the data analysis process, a funnel plot was used to assess publication bias,
105	a major bias in systematic reviews/meta-analyses [20]. Meta-analysis was performed using R
106	Studio [21].

107 **Results**

108 Study population and selection

The literature search resulted in 7,612 articles, after eliminating duplicates. Only 270 studies
satisfied the inclusion and exclusion criteria regarding their titles and abstracts. We extracted
the full text of the 270 studies; however, only seven were included in the final analysis.
Studies were excluded if they were based on the wrong study population (13 studies) or did
not assess the types of exercise according to IHD outcomes. A total of 588,030 participants
were included in the selected studies (Fig 1).

115 **Fig 1**. Study flow chart

116 Literature review (Table 1)

Study 1 [22]: This cohort study was conducted in 2019 in the US; the types of exercise were aerobics, weight training, and mixed exercise according to the US guidelines for physical activity. The target diseases were hypertension, myocardial infarction (MI), high cholesterol,

120	stroke, and coronary heart disease. This study demonstrated the effect of combined moderate
121	to vigorous physical and muscle-strengthening activity guidelines on sampled adults from the
122	US. The expected risk of bias was recall bias because it was a self-report study.
123	Study 2 [23]: This cohort study was conducted in 2002 in the US. The types of exercises
124	were running, jogging, rowing, cycling, swimming, and racquet sports. The target disease
125	was coronary heart disease. The study aimed to explore the type, intensity, and amount of
126	exercise with respect to the risk of coronary heart disease in men. The expected risk of bias
127	was misclassification bias because it was a self-report study.
128	Study 3 [24]: This cohort study was conducted in 2020 in Finland. The types of exercises
129	were occupational exercise, walking or cycling to and from work, and Leisure-Time Physical
130	Activity (LTPA). The target disease was coronary heart disease. The study aimed to prove the
131	association between types of physical activity and a decade risk of MI using the Framingham
132	risk score. The expected risk of bias was recall bias because it was a self-report study.
133	Study 4 [25]: This cohort study was conducted in 2007 in the US, and the types of exercise
134	were walking, gardening, exercise cycling, bowling, calisthenics, exercise machines, dancing,
135	golfing, weight training, swimming, aerobics, and hiking. The target disease was MI. The
136	study investigated the association between the amount of LTPA and reduction of MI risk.
137	The expected risk of bias was recall bias because it was a self-report study.
138	Study 5 [26]: This cohort study was conducted in 2016 in the US. The types of exercise
139	considered were walking, gardening, cycling, bowling, calisthenics, exercise machines,
140	dancing, golfing, weight training, swimming, aerobics, and hiking. The target disease was
141	MI. The study aimed to investigate the association between the amount of LTPA and MI risk

142	reduction. The expected risk of bias was recall bias because it was a self-report study. The
143	authors also reported a possible underestimation of the association with MI risk for survivors.
144	Study 6 [27]: This cohort study was conducted in 2019 in the US. The exercises considered
145	were aerobics, basketball, bicycling, calisthenics, golf walking, racquet sports, running,
146	swimming, walking, and weight training. The target disease was MI. The study assessed the
147	association between the volume of LTPA measured by the MET-hours/week. The expected
148	risk of bias was recall bias because it was a self-report study.
149	Study 7 [28]: This cohort study was conducted in 2004 in Sweden. The types of exercise
150	were repetitive lifting at work, heavy lifting at work, and household work. The target disease
151	was MI. The study examined the relationship between participating in the types of exercise
152	and incidents of myocardial ischemia. The expected risk of bias was reporting and
153	misclassification bias because it was a self-report study.

Study	Authors	Date	Study	Types of	Target disease	Country	Objectives
No.			Design	Exercise			
1	Bennie JA,	2019	Cohort	Aerobics,	Hypertension,	USA	To demonstrate
	De Cocker		study	weight	MI, high		the combined
	К,			training, mixed	cholesterol,		MVPA and
	Teychenne				stroke, CHD		MSA
	MJ, Brown				Stioke, CIID		guidelines'
							effect on the

154 **Table 1**. Literature review of studies.

	WJ, Biddle						sampled adults
	SJH						from the US
2	Tanasescu	2002	Cohort	Running,	СНД	USA	To explore the
	М,		study	jogging,			type, intensity,
	Leitzmann			rowing,			and amount of
	MF, Rimm			cycling,			exercise in
	EB, Willett			swimming,			relation to the
	WC,			racquet sports			risk of coronary
	Stampfer						heart disease in
	MJ, Hu FB						men
3	Hu G,	2020	Cohort	Occupational	CHD	Finland	To prove
	Tuomilehto		study	exercise,			associations
	J, Borodulin			walking or			between types
	K, Jousilahti			cycling to and			of physical
	Р			from work,			activity and a
				LTPA			decade risk of
							CHD using the
							FRS
4	Lovasi GS,	2007	Case-	Walking,	MI	USA	To investigate
	Lemaitre		control	gardening,			the association
	RN,		study	exercise			between the
	Siscovick			cycling,			amount of

	DS, Dublin			bowling,			LTPA and
	S, Bis JC,			calisthenics,			reduction of MI
	Lumley T, et al.			exercise machines, dancing, golfing, weight training, swimming, aerobics, hiking			risk
5	Chomistek AK, Henschel B, Eliassen AH, Mukamal KJ, Rimm EB			Jogging, running, bicycling, swimming, tennis	CHD	USA	To assess the association between the volume of LTPA measured by MET- hours/wk
6	Porter AK, Schilsky S, Evenson KR, Florido R, Palta P,	2019	study	Aerobics, basketball, bicycling, calisthenics, golf walking,	Cardiovascular disease	USA	To examine the relationships between participation in the types of

	Holliday			racquet sports,			exercise and
	KM, et al.			running,			incident
				swimming,			myocardial
				walking,			ischemia
				weight training			
7	Fransson E,	2004	Cohort	Repetitive	MI	Sweden	For the
	De Faire U,		study	lifting at work,			estimation of
	Ahlbom A,			heavy lifting at			household
	Reuterwall			work,			work, exercise,
	C, Hallqvist			household			and
	J, Alfredsson			work			occupational
	L						physical
							activity, and
							risk of acute MI
							relatively. The
							potential
							interaction of
							physical activity
							was examined

Abbreviations: CHD, coronary heart disease; FRS, Framingham risk score; LTPA, LeisureTime Physical Activity; MET, metabolic equivalent of task; MI, myocardial infarction;
MVPA moderate to vigorous physical activity; MSA, and muscle strengthening activity

159 Quality assessment

160 The NOS was utilized to assess the quality of the selected studies.

161 Study outcomes

162 Concerning the types of exercise that satisfied the US guidelines for physical activity, there

163 were 11 values for aerobics, 6 for lifting, and 4 for mixed exercises. Regarding the details of

164 physical activity, there were 4 values for aerobics, 1 for dancing, 1 for hiking, 2 for

swimming, 1 for basketball, 1 for running, 1 for calisthenics, 1 for exercise machines, 3 for

166 weight training, 1 for biking, 1 for bowling, and 1 for mixed exercises.

167 The study design analysis included 9 values for case-control studies and 12 for cohort studies.

168 Target diseases comprised 12 values for MI; 4 for IHD, heart failure, or stroke; 3 for

169 myocardial ischemia; and 2 for stroke. Trim and Fill analysis and a funnel plot analysis were

170 performed to assess publication bias; however, none was observed (S1 Table 1).

171 **Primary outcomes**

172 Regarding heterogeneity of the studies, 96.1% of the included studies had a very high level of

173 heterogeneity when the random effects model was used. The overall effect of types of

physical activity on IHD was OR: 0.744 (95% CI: 0.740–0.748). The ORs for the standards

used were 0.813 (95% CI: 0.779–0.849) for aerobics, 0.917 (95% CI: 0.823–1.023) for

weight training, and 0.681 (95% CI: 0.637–0.727) for mixed exercises. For the target

diseases, the OR for hypertension was 0.752 (95% CI: 0.647–0.875), 0.819 (95% CI: 0.716-

178 0.938) for high cholesterol, 0.703 (95% CI: 0.634–0.779) for MI, 0.788 (95% CI: 0.751–

179 0.826) for IHD, 0.788 (95% CI: 0.715–0.869) for stroke, and 0.846 (95% CI: 0.788–0.909)

180 for heart failure. Across countries, the OR for studies in the US was 0.773 (95% CI: 0.742–

- 181 0.805), 0.702 (95% CI: 0.619–0.797) for those in Finland, and 0.779 (95% CI: 0.678-0.896)
- for those in Sweden (Fig 2). The funnel plot and trim and fill analysis showed no publicationbias (S1 Fig).
- **Fig 2**. Forest plot generated by types of exercise. TE, estimated treatment effect; seTE,
- standard error of treatment estimate; OR, odds ratio; CI, confidence interval

186 Secondary outcomes

- 187 Regarding heterogeneity of the studies, 16.1% of the studies showed heterogeneity. The ORs
- of aerobics, weight training, and mixed exercises were 0.607 (95% CI: 0.469–0.787), 0.569
- 189 (95% CI: 0.388–0.833), and 0.585 (95% CI: 0.370–0.924), respectively (Fig 3).
- **Fig 3**. Forest plot generated by standard satisfaction. TE, estimated treatment effect; seTE,
- 191 standard error of treatment estimate; OR, odds ratio; CI, confidence interval
- 192 For target diseases, the ORs for IHD were 0.515 (95% CI: 0.401–0.662), 0.777 (95% CI:
- 193 0.540–1.116), and 0.630 (95% CI: 0.356–1.114), respectively (Fig 4).
- **Fig 4.** Forest plot generated by target disease from studies that satisfied the US guidelines.
- 195 MI, myocardial infarction; CHD, coronary heart disease; TE, estimated treatment effect;
- 196 seTE, standard error of treatment estimate; OR, odds ratio; CI, confidence interval
- 197 For study designs, the OR for case-control studies was 0.503 (95% CI: 0.383–0.661) and
- 198 0.703 (95% CI: 0.533–0.927) for cohort studies . When exercises were included in the model,
- the OR for LTPA was 0.503 (95% CI: 0.383–0.661); 0.733 (95% CI: 0.444–1.212) for
- 200 aerobics; 0.880 (95% CI: 0.341–2.272) for basketball; 0.680 (95% CI: 0.327–1.415) for
- 201 running; 1.000 (95% CI: 0.340–2.939) for swimming; 0.738 (95% CI: 0.384–1.421) for
- weight training; and 0.540 (95% CI: 0.301–0.968) for mixed exercises.

203 **Discussion**

Our study showed that aerobics and weight training have beneficial effects on IHD. Without 204 205 the US guidelines for physical activity, there was a high level of heterogeneity in the effects 206 of physical activity by type, with overall effects of 0.764 (OR; 95% CI: 0.737-0.795). No 207 publication bias was observed. However, after applying the US guidelines for physical 208 activity, there was a low level of heterogeneity in its effects and an observed OR of 0.515 209 (95% CI: 0.401–0.662) for MI. A significant reduction in the heterogeneity of the studies 210 after applying the US guidelines suggests that these recommend certain levels of exercise 211 intensity and include the duration of exercise irrespective of the types of exercise. There was no significant difference among countries. In a previous related study, increased physical 212 activity was found to be associated with lower blood pressure in hypertensive individuals, 213 214 increased high-density lipoprotein cholesterol levels in a dose-response manner, and reduced 215 incidence of diabetes [29]. The health benefits of physical activity can be achieved by 216 engaging in moderate-intensity physical activity (brisk walking) for at least 30 min per day, 5 217 days per week, or vigorous activity (jogging) for 20 min or more, 3 days per week. 218 Combinations of the two types of activity can also be performed. Furthermore, a mendelian randomization study reported that genetically predicted self-reported vigorous physical 219 220 activity was significantly associated with a lower risk of MI (OR: 0.24, 95% CI: 0.08–0.68; p-value: 0.007) [30]. Additionally, those results were consistent after the sensitivity analysis. 221 222 The INTERHEART study demonstrated that regular exercise reduced the risk of MI (OR: 223 0.86) [31]. A different study, which followed 84,129 women who engaged in moderate or vigorous exercise for over 30 min per day, reported a relative risk of 0.17 [32]. 224

The strength of the current study was that the beneficial effects of physical activity oncardiovascular health were reported with the US guidelines for physical activity. The level,

types, and intensity of physical activity were associated with the regular and designedguidelines for physical activity.

This study had some limitations. First, there was a possibility of length bias in the mixed session; therefore, the OR may have been lower. Second, we classified the exercise types, but did not account for the baseline and post-exercise development of muscle or body fat. For example, a research article published in 2015 found that quadriceps strength was highly correlated with reduced mortality due to coronary artery disease [33].

234 Conclusions

Although many research papers have focused on exercise and its efficiency in MI risk 235 reduction, the association between this reduction and exercise type has not been well-236 237 researched. This study conducted a meta-analysis to assess which types of exercise efficiently reduce MI and assess efficiency according to the US guidelines for physical activity. This 238 239 study concluded that beneficial results were obtained if the US guidelines for physical 240 activity were followed. This also shows the need for the implementation of health policies regarding regular physical activity, which could aid in preventing an increase in IHD 241 incidence and its negative outcomes, especially MI. Community-based programs for regular 242 physical activity are reportedly effective in reducing the IHD risk [11]. Therefore, community 243 and national programs, such as the "move your way" program, should be implemented to 244 245 improve the population's cardiovascular health [11].

Further research should aim to show the efficiency of IHD risk reduction, as previous casecontrol studies with experimental design have shown the likelihood of patients with IHD benefitting from regular exercise practice.

249

250 Author contributions

- **Jaewoo Cha**: the conception and design of the study, or acquisition of data, or analysis and
- 252 interpretation of data, drafting the article or revising it critically for important intellectual
- 253 content.. Kwan Hong: final approval of the version to be submitted., Jeehyun Kim: final
- approval of the version to be submitted.

256 **References**

- 257 [1] A.E. Moran, Epidemiology and global burden of ischaemic heart disease". In: A.J. Camm
- et al., (Eds.) The ESC Textbook of Cardiovascular Medicine. third ed., ESC Publishing,
- 259 Oxford, 2018,. pp. 297–304.
- 260 [2] Mayo Clinic, Myocardial ischemia, Mayo Foundation for Medical Education and
- 261 Research. <u>https://www.mayoclinic.org/diseases-conditions/myocardial-ischemia/symptoms-</u>
- 262 <u>causes/syc-20375417</u> (accessed 7 November, 2022).
- 263 [3] C. Dong, X. Bu, J. Liu, L. Wei, A. Ma, T. Wang, Cardiovascular disease burden
- attributable to dietary risk factors from 1990 to 2019: A systematic analysis of the Global
- Burden of Disease study, Nutr. Metab. Cardiovasc. Dis. 32 (2022) 897–907.
- 266 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.numecd.2021.11.012.
- 267 [4] World Health Organization. Physical activity. https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-
- sheets/detail/physical-activity (accessed 11 October, 2022).
- 269 [5] C. Fiuza-Luces, A. Santos-Lozano, M. Joyner, P. Carrera-Bastos, O. Picazo, J.L. Zugaza,
- et al, Exercise benefits in cardiovascular disease: beyond attenuation of traditional risk
- 271 factors, Nat. Rev. Cardiol. 15 (2018) 731–743. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41569-018-0065-1.
- [6] M. Jetté, K. Sidney, G. Blümchen, Metabolic equivalents (METS) in exercise testing,
- exercise prescription, and evaluation of functional capacity, Clin. Cardiol. 13 (1990) 555-
- 274 565. https://doi.org/10.1002/clc.4960130809.
- [7] H.D. Sesso, R.S. Paffenbarger, T. Ha, I.M. Lee, Physical activity and cardiovascular
- disease risk in middle-aged and older women, Am. J. Epidemiol. 150 (1999) 408–416.
- 277 https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.aje.a010020.

- [8] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Prompts to encourage physical activity.
- 279 https://www.cdc.gov/physicalactivity/activepeoplehealthynation/strategies-to-increase-
- physical-activity/prompts-to-encourage-physical-activity.html (accessed 11 October, 2022).
- [9] W. Ahrens, Evaluation of policy measures to promote a healthy diet and physical activity:
- the PEN project, Eur. J. Public. Health. 30 (2020) ckaa165.325.
- 283 https://doi.org/10.1093/eurpub/ckaa165.325
- [10] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Physical activity.
- 285 https://www.cdc.gov/physicalactivity/index.html (Accessed 11 October, 2022).
- [11] US Department of Health and Human Services, Move Your Way. Walk. R Univ Dance.
- 287 Play. What's Your Move? https://health.gov/moveyourway (accessed 11 October, 2022).
- 288 [12] N.M. Arias-Palencia, M. Solera-Martínez, L. Gracia-Marco, P. Silva, V. Martínez-
- 289 Vizcaíno, J. Cañete-García-Prieto, et al, Levels and patterns of objectively assessed physical
- activity and compliance with different public health guidelines in university students PLoS
- 291 One. 10 (2015) e0141977. <u>https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0141977</u>.
- [13] M. Weed, Evidence for physical activity guidelines as a public health intervention:
- 293 efficacy, effectiveness, and harm A critical policy sciences approach, Health. Psychol.
- 294 Behav. Med. 4 (2016) 56–69. https://doi.org/10.1080/21642850.2016.1159517.
- [14] R.R. Pate, P.S. Freedson, J.F. Sallis, W.C. Taylor, J. Sirard, S.G. Trost, et al,
- 296 Compliance with physical activity guidelines: prevalence in a population of children and
- 297 youth, Ann. Epidemiol. 12 (2002) 303–308. https://doi.org/10.1016/s1047–2797(01)00263-0.
- [15] M.R. Carnethon, Physical activity and cardiovascular disease: how much is enough, Am.
- 299 J. Lifestyle. Med. 3 (2009) 44S–49S. https://doi.org/10.1177/1559827609332737.

- 300 [16] P.J. Teixeira, E.V. Carraça, D. Markland, M.N. Silva, R.M. Ryan, Exercise, physical
- 301 activity, and self-determination theory: a systematic review, Int. J. Behav. Nutr. Phys. Act. 9
- 302 (2012) 78. https://doi.org/10.1186/1479-5868-9-78.
- 303 [17] Microsoft Corporation. Microsoft Excel [internet]; 2018. Microsoft Website.
- 304 <u>https://office.microsoft.com/excel</u> (accessed 28 September 2022).
- 305 [18] The Ottawa Hospital Research Institute. The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for
- 306 assessing the quality of nonrandomized studies in meta-analyses.
- 307 https://www.ohri.ca/programs/clinical_epidemiology/oxford.asp (accessed 28 September
 308 2022).
- 309 [19] P.T. von Hippel, The heterogeneity statistic I(2) can be biased in small meta-analyses,
- 310 BMC Med. Res. Methodol. 15 (2015) 35. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-015-0024-z.
- 311 [20] J.A. Sterne, A.J. Sutton, J.P. Ioannidis, N. Terrin, D.R. Jones, J. Lau, et al,
- 312 Recommendations for examining and interpreting funnel plot asymmetry in meta-analyses of
- randomised controlled trials, BMJ. 343 (2011) d4002. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.d4002.
- 314 [21] RStudio Team RStudio: Integrated Development for R. RStudio, PBC, Boston, MA
- 315 (2020) URL <u>http://www.rstudio.com/</u> (accessed 28 September 2022).
- 316 [22] J.A. Bennie, K. De Cocker, M.J. Teychenne, W.J. Brown, S.J.H. Biddle, The
- 317 epidemiology of aerobic physical activity and muscle-strengthening activity guideline
- adherence among 383,928 U.S. adults, Int. J. Behav. Nutr. Phys. Act. 16 (2019) 34.
- 319 https://doi.org/10.1186/s12966-019-0797-2.

- 320 [23] M. Tanasescu, M.F. Leitzmann, E.B. Rimm, W.C. Willett, M.J. Stampfer, F.B. Hu,
- 321 Exercise type and intensity in relation to coronary heart disease in men, JAMA. 288 (2002)
- 322 1994–2000. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.288.16.1994.
- 323 [24] G. Hu, J. Tuomilehto, K. Borodulin, P. Jousilahti, The joint associations of occupational,
- 324 commuting, and leisure-time physical activity, and the Framingham risk score on the 10-year
- risk of coronary heart disease, Eur. Heart. J. 28 (2007) 492–498.
- 326 https://doi.org/10.1093/eurheartj/ehl475.
- 327 [25] G.S. Lovasi, R.N. Lemaitre, D.S. Siscovick, S. Dublin, J.C. Bis, T. Lumley, et al,
- 328 Amount of leisure-time physical activity and risk of nonfatal myocardial infarction, Ann.
- 329 Epidemiol. 17 (2007) 410–416. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annepidem.2006.10.012.
- 330 [26] A.K. Chomistek, B. Henschel, A.H. Eliassen, K.J. Mukamal, E.B. Rimm, Frequency,
- type, and volume of leisure-time physical activity and risk of coronary heart disease in young
- 332 women, circulation. 134 (2016) 290–299.
- 333 https://doi.org/10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.116.021516.
- 334 [27] A.K. Porter, S. Schilsky, K.R. Evenson, R. Florido, P. Palta, K.M. Holliday, A.R.
- Folsom, The association of sport and exercise activities with cardiovascular disease risk: The
- 336 Atherosclerosis Risk in Communities (ARIC) Study, J. Phys. Act. Health. 16 (2019) 698-
- 337 705. https://doi.org/10.1123/jpah.2018-0671.
- 338 [28] E. Fransson, U. De Faire, A. Ahlbom, C. Reuterwall, J. Hallqvist, L. Alfredsson, The
- risk of acute myocardial infarction: interactions of types of physical activity, Epidemiology.
- 340 15 (2004) 573–582. https://doi.org/10.1097/01.ede.0000134865.74261.fe.
- 341 [29] K.M. Kessler, Primary prevention of coronary heart disease in women through diet and
- 342 lifestyle, N. Engl. J. Med. 343 (2000) 1814. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJM200007063430103


- 343 [30] H.D. Sesso, R.S. Paffenbarger, I.M. Lee, Physical activity and coronary heart disease in
- men: The Harvard Alumni Health Study, Circulation. 102 (2000) 975–980.
- 345 <u>https://doi.org/10.1161/01.cir.102.9.975</u>
- 346 [31] I.M. Lee, H.D. Sesso, Y. Oguma, R.S. Paffenbarger, Relative intensity of physical
- activity and risk of coronary heart disease, Circulation. 107 (2003) 1110–1116.
- 348 https://doi.org/10.1161/01.cir.0000052626.63602.58.
- 349 [32] S. Yusuf, S. Hawken, S. Ounpuu, T. Dans, A. Avezum, F. Lanas, et al, Effect of
- 350 potentially modifiable risk factors associated with myocardial infarction in 52 countries (the
- 351 INTERHEART study): case-control study, Lancet. 364 (2004) 937–952.
- 352 https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(04)17018-9.
- 353 [33] K. Kamiya, T. Masuda, S. Tanaka, N. Hamazaki, Y. Matsue, A. Mezzani, et al,
- 354 Quadriceps Strength as a Predictor of Mortality in Coronary Artery Disease, Am. J. Med. 128
- 355 (2015) 1212–1219. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amjmed.2015.06.035</u>.

357 Supporting information

- 358 S1 Table. Newcastle-Ottawa Scale of study assessment.
- 359 S1 Fig. Funnel plot of study

Shudy	TE se	TE Odds Ratio	OR	95%-CI	
type = Aerobics Bennie JA_2019 Bennie JA_2019	-0.315 0.0		0.770	[0.714: 0.747] [0.753: 0.788]	
Bennie JA_2019 Bennie JA_2019 Bennie JA_2019	-0.386 0.0 -0.329 0.0 -0.236 0.0	231 1	0.720	[0.650; 0.711] [0.668; 0.753] [0.751; 0.831]	
Tanasescu M_2002 Tanasescu M_2002	-0.329 0.0	139 -	0.720	[0.611; 0.649] [0.706; 1.073]	
Tanasescu M_2002 Tanasescu M_2002	-0.462 0.1	510	0.630 0.790	[0.469; 0.847] [0.533; 1.171]	
Tanasescu M_2002 Tanasescu M_2002 Tanasescu M_2002	-0.755 0.0 -0.545 0.0 -0.274 0.0	956	0.580	[0.406; 0.545] [0.481; 0.700] [0.667; 0.866]	
Tanasesou M_2002 Tanasesou M_2002	-0.151 0.0	217	0.860	[0.734; 1.008] [0.544; 0.878]	
Tanasesou M_2002 Tanasesou M_2002 Tanasesou M_2002	-0.163 0.1 -0.315 0.1 -0.073 0.1	041	0.730	[0.626; 1.155] [0.595; 0.895] [0.704; 1.228]	
Tanasesou M_2002 Tanasesou M_2002 Tanasesou M_2002	-0.198 0.0 -0.094 0.0 -0.274 0.0	664	0.910	[0.732; 0.918] [0.799; 1.037] [0.641; 0.901]	
Tanasescu M_2002 Tanasescu M_2002	-0.128 0.1	041	0.880 0.690	0.718; 1.079] [0.599; 0.795]	
Tanasesou M_2002 Tanasesou M_2002 Tanasesou M_2002	-0.198 0.0 -0.020 0.0 0.068 0.0	664] +	0.980	[0.664: 0.983] [0.860; 1.116] [0.923; 1.240]	
Tanasesou M. 2002 Tanasesou M. 2002 Tanasesou M. 2002	-0.094 0.1 0.058 0.1 -0.083 0.0	214	0.910	[0.746; 1.110] [0.836; 1.345] [0.781; 1.084]	
Tanasescu M_2002 Tanasescu M_2002	0.068 0.0	M2 1+	1,070	[0.883; 1.297] [0.502; 0.949]	
Tanasseou M_2002 Tanasseou M_2002 Tanasseou M_2002	-0.301 0.1 0.077 0.1 0.191 0.1	504	1.080	[0.526; 1.041] [0.804; 1.450] [0.866; 1.691]	
Tanasesou M_2002 Tanasesou M_2002	-0.030 0.1 0.077 0.1	129	0.970	[0.777; 1.210] [0.842; 1.386]	
Gang Hu_2007 Gang Hu_2007 Gang Hu_2007	-0.020 0.0 -0.083 0.0 -0.616 0.1	780	0.920	[0.818; 1.175] [0.790; 1.072] [0.440; 0.663]	
Gang Hu_2007 Andrea K. Chomist_2016 Andrea K. Chomist_2016		889	0.740	[0.559: 0.851] [0.511: 1.072] [0.561: 1.381]	
Andrea K. Chomiat_2016 Andrea K. Chomiat_2016	-0.494 0.2 -0.342 0.3	948	0.610 0.710	0.342; 1.087] [0.361; 1.397]	
Andrea K. Chomist_2016 Andrea K. Chomist_2016 Andrea K. Chomist_2016	0.148 0.1	122 1	1.160	[0.783; 1.381] [0.844; 1.584] [0.783; 1.381]	
Andrea K. Chomiat_2016 Andrea K. Chomiat_2016	0.104 0.2 0.039 0.1	264	1.110	0.712; 1.730] [0.744; 1.453]	
Andrea K. Chomiat_2016 Andrea K. Chomiat_2016 Andrea K. Chomiat_2016	-0.329 0.0	984	0.720	[0.577; 0.849] [0.594; 0.873] [0.478; 0.779]	
Andrea K. Chomiat, 2016 Andrea K. Chomiat, 2016 Andrea K. Chomiat, 2016	-0.274 0.2 -0.030 0.3	515	0.760 0.970	[0.464; 1.244] [0.514; 1.831] [0.172; 0.423]	
Andrea K. Chomist_2016 Andrea K. Chomist_2016	0.095 0.3	231	0.400	[0.205; 0.780] [0.584; 2.072]	
Andrea K. Chomiet_2016 Andrea K. Chomiet_2016 Andrea K. Chomiet_2016	-0.777 0.2	730	0.460	[0.573; 2.036] [0.269; 0.786] [0.292; 1.114]	
Andrea K. Chomist. 2016 Andrea K. Chomist. 2016 Andrea K. Chomist. 2016	-0.446 0.1	274	0.640	[0.519: 0.790] [0.576: 0.950] [0.722: 1.096]	
medRxiv preprint doi: https://do (which was not-certified by	i.org/10	.1101/2023.03.06	.23286885	; this vers	ion posted March 7, 2023. Th ranted medRxiv a license to
Porter_2019 Porter_2019	-0.139 0.0	It is made availat	ole under a	CC-BY 4	.0 International license .
Porter_2019 Porter_2019 Porter_2019	0.000 0.0	546 -	0.890	[0.844; 1.185] [0.832; 0.953] [0.651; 0.864]	
Porter_2019 Porter_2019	-0.128 0.1	450	0.880	[0.662; 1.169] [0.839; 1.053]	
Porter_2019 Porter_2019 Porter_2019	-0.139 0.0 -0.366 0.0 0.000 0.0	896 -	0.680	[0.742; 1.019] [0.570; 0.811] [0.844; 1.185]	
Porter_2019 Porter_2019 Porter_2019	-0.117 0.0 -0.288 0.0 -0.128 0.1	122 +	0.750	[0.832; 0.953] [0.651; 0.864] [0.662; 1.169]	
Porter_2019 Porter_2019	-0.062 0.0	578 -	0.940 0.870	0.839; 1.053] [0.742; 1.019]	
Ponter_2019 Ponter_2019 Ponter_2019	-0.385 0.0 0.000 0.0 -0.117 0.0	667 +	1.000	[0.570; 0.811] [0.844; 1.185] [0.832; 0.953]	
Common effects model Random effects model Heterogeneity: r ² = 87%, r ²	= 0.0263, p =	0.01		[0.766; 0.783] [0.779; 0.849]	
type = Weight training Bennie JA_2019	-0.139 0.0		0.870	[0.855: 0.885]	
Bennie JA_2019 Bennie JA_2019	-0.062 0.0	145	0.940 0.770	[0.924; 0.958] [0.748; 0.792]	
Bennie JA_2019 Bennie JA_2019 Porter_2019	-0.236 0.0 -0.366 0.0 -0.211 0.1	173	0.680	[0.768; 0.813] [0.657; 0.703] [0.653; 1.005]	
Porter_2019 Porter_2019 Franseon_2004	-0.211 0.1 -0.211 0.1 0.207 0.1	099 +	0.810	[0.653; 1.005] [0.653; 1.005] [0.921; 1.642]	
Fransson_2004 Fransson_2004	0.199 0.1 0.255 0.3	562	1 220	[0.898; 1.657] [0.714; 2.332]	
Franson_2004 Franson_2004 Franson_2004	0.399 0.3 0.131 0.1 0.239 0.1	532	1,140	[0.727; 3.065] [0.844; 1.539] [0.904; 1.784]	
Fransson_2004 Fransson_2004 Common effect model	0.378 0.4	138	1.560	[0.599; 3.560] [0.570; 4.271] [0.844; 0.861]	
Random effects model Heterogeneity: i ² = 90%, x ²	= 0.0312, p =	0.01		[0.823; 1.023]	
type = Mixed Bennie JA_2019 Bennie JA_2019	-0.400 0.0			[0.662; 0.678] [0.751; 0.769]	
Bennie JA_2019 Bennie JA_2019	-0.616 0.0	145	0.540	[0.525; 0.558] [0.583; 0.617]	
Bennie JA_2019 Tanasesou M_2002 Tanasesou M_2002	-0.616 0.0 -0.223 0.1 -0.073 0.1	195 +	0.800	[0.522: 0.559] [0.585: 1.094] [0.646: 1.339]	
Tanasesou M_2002 Tanasesou M_2002 Tanasesou M_2002	-0.174 0.0 -0.010 0.0 -0.261 0.2	954 1-	0.990	[0.717; 0.985] [0.821; 1.194] [0.482; 1.230]	
Tanasescu M_2002 Gang Hu_2007	-0.892 0.2	003	0.410 0.740	[0.277; 0.607] [0.661; 0.829]	
Gang Hu_2007 Gang Hu_2007 Gang Hu_2007	-0.416 0.0 -0.416 0.0 -0.030 0.0	696	0.660	[0.576; 0.756] [0.554; 0.787] [0.847; 1.111]	
Gang Hu_2007 Gang Hu_2007 Gang Hu_2007	-0.545 0.0 -0.635 0.0 -0.616 0.1	669 i	0.530	[0.484; 0.695] [0.447; 0.628] [0.399; 0.731]	
Gang Hu_2007 GINA S. LOVAS	-0.301 0.0	896	0.740 0.590	[0.617; 0.887] [0.495; 0.703]	
GINA S. LOVAS GINA S. LOVAS GINA S. LOVAS	-0.365 0.1 -0.431 0.1 -0.892 0.0	159	0.650	[0.557; 0.829] [0.518; 0.816] [0.344; 0.489]	
GINA S. LOVAS GINA S. LOVAS GINA S. LOVAS	-0.635 0.1 -0.288 0.1 -0.386 0.1	744	0.750	[0.422; 0.666] [0.533; 1.056] [0.472; 0.960]	
GINA S. LOVAS GINA S. LOVAS	-0.654 0.1	162	0.520 0.480	[0.414; 0.653] [0.371; 0.620]	
GINA S. LOVAS GINA S. LOVAS GINA S. LOVAS	-0.892 0.1 -0.462 0.1 -0.494 0.1	717	0.630	[0.328.0.512] [0.450; 0.882] [0.436; 0.854]	
Andrea K. Chomist_2016 Andrea K. Chomist_2016 Andrea K. Chomist_2016	-0.041 0.1	542 ++-	0.960	[0.717; 1.781] [0.707; 1.304] [0.648; 1.251]	
Andrea K. Chomiat. 2016 Andrea K. Chomiat. 2016 Andrea K. Chomiat. 2016	0.010 0.1	565	1.010 0.510	[0.698; 1.482] [0.430; 0.605] [0.521; 0.811]	
Porter_2019 Porter_2019	-0.128 0.1	450	0.880	[0.662; 1.169] [0.773; 1.002]	
Porter_2019 Porter_2019 Porter_2019	-0.288 0.0 -0.128 0.0 -0.288 0.0	664 -	0.750	[0.625: 0.899] [0.773: 1.002] [0.625: 0.899]	
Porter_2019 Porter_2019	-0.128 0.0	664	0.880 0.750	[0.773; 1.002] [0.625; 0.899]	
Franson_2004 Franson_2004 Franson_2004	-0.274 0.0 -0.400 0.1 -0.462 0.0	071	0.670	[0.827.0.922] [0.543.0.827] [0.519:0.764]	
Franson 2004 Franson 2004 Franson 2004	-0.635 0.1 -0.174 0.1 -0.288 0.1	129	0.530 0.840	[0.434: 0.647] [0.673: 1.048] [0.587: 0.958]	
Franson_2004 Franson_2004	-0.386 0.1 -0.545 0.1	159	0.680	[0.548; 0.843] [0.462; 0.728]	
Fransson_2004 Fransson_2004 Fransson_2004	-0.371 0.1 -0.968 0.0 -0.478 0.1	960	0.380	[0.522; 0.912] [0.315; 0.459] [0.433; 0.888]	
Franson_2004 Franson_2004 Franson_2004	-1.171 0.1 -0.186 0.1 -0.821 0.1	506 1	0.310 0.830	[0.231; 0.416] [0.584; 1.181] [0.350; 0.553]	
Fransson_2004 Fransson_2004	-0.261 0.2	390	0.770 0.410	0.482; 1.230] [0.277; 0.607]	
Fransson_2004 Fransson_2004 Fransson_2004	0.239 0.1 0.385 0.2 0.451 0.2	401	- 1.470 1.570	[0.909; 1.775] [0.918; 2.353] [0.889; 2.771]	
Franson 2004 Franson 2004 Franson 2004	-0.073 0.2 -0.128 0.2 0.095 0.3	531	0.930	[0.566; 1.527] [0.523; 1.481] [0.538; 2.250]	
Fransson_2004 Fransson_2004	-0.248 0.0	809 ÷	0.780 0.830	[0.666; 0.914] [0.696; 0.969]	
Franson_2004 Franson_2004 Common effect model	-0.598 0.1 -0.462 0.1		0.630	[0.451; 0.671] [0.496; 0.800] [0.680; 0.689]	
Random effects model Heterogeneity: 1 ² = 54%, 1 ²	= 0.0811, p =	4		[0.637; 0.727]	
Common effect model Random effects model Heteropeneity: p ² = 95%, t ²	• 0.0524		0.764	[0.740; 0.748] [0.734; 0.795]	
Test for subgroup different	oes (commo	0.2 0.5 1.0 2 n effect): 0] = 1306.96, df = 2 effect): 0] = 28.70, df = 2 (p	2 (p < 0.01)		

Figure 2



Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 0\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$, p = 0.98

- Common effect model Random effects model
- Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 0\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$, p = 1.00
- Test for subgroup differences (commom effect): $\chi^2 = 0.08$, df = 2 (p = 0.96) Test for subgroup differences (random effects): $\chi^2 = 0.08$, df = 2 (p = 0.96)

0.593 [0.489; 0.720] 0.593 [0.489; 0.720]

Figure 3




Figure 1





Figure 4

Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$, p = 0.87

Common effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$, p = 1.00



0.593 [0.489; 0.720] 0.593 [0.489; 0.720]

Test for subgroup differences (common effect): $x_2^2 = 3.36$, df = 2 (p = 0.19) Test for subgroup differences (endom effect): $x_2^2 = 3.36$, df = 2 (p = 0.19)