Bicycle Riding, Walking, and Weight Gain in Premenopausal Women

Anne C. Lusk, PhD; Rania A. Mekary, PhD; Diane Feskanich, ScD; Walter C. Willett, MD, DrPH

Background: To our knowledge, research has not been conducted on bicycle riding and weight control in comparison with walking. Our objective was to assess the association between bicycle riding and weight control in premenopausal women.

Methods: This was a 16-year follow-up study of 18 414 women in the Nurses' Health Study II. Weight change between 1989 and 2005 was the primary outcome, and the odds of gaining more than 5% of baseline body weight by 2005 was the secondary outcome.

Results: At baseline, only 39% of participants walked briskly, while only 1.2% bicycled for more than 30 min/d. For a 30-min/d increase in activity between 1989 and 2005, weight gain was significantly less for brisk walking (−1.81 kg; 95% confidence interval [CI], −2.05 to −1.56 kg), bicycling (−1.59 kg; 95% CI, −2.09 to −1.08 kg), and other activities (−1.45 kg; 95% CI, −1.66 to −1.24 kg) but not for slow walking (+0.06 kg; 95% CI, −0.22 to 0.35 kg). Women who reported no bicycling in 1989 and increased to as little as 5 min/d in 2005 gained less weight (−0.74 kg; 95% CI, −1.41 to −0.07 kg; *P* value for trend, <.01) than those who remained nonbikers. Normal-weight women who bicycled more than 4 h/wk in 2005 had a lower odds of gaining more than 5% of their baseline body weight (odds ratio, 0.74; 95% CI, 0.56 to 0.98) compared with those who reported no bicycling; overweight and obese women had a lower odds at 2 to 3 h/wk (odds ratio, 0.54; 95% CI, 0.34 to 0.86).

Conclusions: Bicycling, similar to brisk walking, is associated with less weight gain and an inverse dose-response relationship exists, especially among overweight and obese women. Future research should focus on brisk walking and greater time spent bicycling.

Arch Intern Med. 2010;170(12):1050-1056

IN 1995, THE CENTERS FOR DISease Control and Prevention and the American College of Sports Medicine recommended that every US adult accumulate 30 minutes or more of moderate-intensity activity on most, preferably all, days of the week to address rising obesity and improve health[1]; similar recommendations were issued in 2008.[2] Nevertheless, 66% of adults are overweight or obese, 16% of children and adolescents are overweight, and 34% of children and adolescents are at risk of being overweight in the United States.[3]

Extensive research has been conducted on walking in relation to weight control,[4-6] but less has examined bicycling.[7] Of the studies conducted on bicycling, many have included primarily men,[8-11] combined walking and bicycling,[12-15] and been conducted in countries with different bicycle environments. In the United States, roads, lanes, and shared-use paths are the recommended facilities,[16-18] while in the Netherlands, facilities include barrier-protected and bicycle-exclusive cycle tracks.[19] In the Netherlands, where bicycle riding is actively supported by an extensive network of bicycle exclusive cycle tracks, 27% of the population bi-

cycles. Of this population of bicyclists, 55% are female.[20] In contrast, in the United States, only 0.5% of the commuting population 16 years and older bicycles, of which only 23% are female.[21] In 2007, only 48% of the US population engaged in the recommended levels of physical activity[22] compared with 64% in the Netherlands.[23] While based on different measures and not demonstrating causality, the obesity prevalence of men and women is 23.9% in the United States and 8.1% in the Netherlands.[24]

In previous articles, we reported that brisk walking was beneficial for the prevention of weight gain among women with normal weight[25] and for maintenance after weight loss,[26] whereas nonbrisk walking (ie, slow walking) was of little benefit except for women with excessive weight. We are extending this research to examine bicycle riding in association with weight gain in premenopausal women using data from the Nurses' Health Study II.

METHODS

SUBJECTS

The Nurses' Health Study II (NHSII) is an ongoing prospective study of 116 608 US female

Author Affiliations:
Departments of Nutrition (Drs Lusk, Mekary, and Willett) and Epidemiology (Drs Mekary and Willett), Harvard School of Public Health, and Channing Laboratory, Department of Medicine, Brigham and Women's Hospital, and Harvard Medical School (Drs Feskanich and Willett), Boston, Massachusetts.

nurses aged 25 to 42 years in 1989, who responded to a mailed questionnaire about their medical history, lifestyle, and health-related behaviors. Follow-up questionnaires have been mailed biennially. Body weight is assessed on every questionnaire, and physical activity (PA) has been assessed periodically, including in the 1989 and 2005 questionnaires. A food frequency questionnaire has been included every 4 years starting 1991. The overall response rate has been approximately 90% over the years of follow-up.

This investigation included the NHSII women who were premenopausal through 2005 (n=56 716). From these, we excluded women who were pregnant or lactating within 12 months of reporting weight (n=15 728); did not report their PA, walking pace, and weight in 1989 and 2005 (n=2820); reported extreme weight values (<37 kg or >182 kg) (n=1291); reported extreme weight changes (>40 kg lost or >60 kg gained) (n=15); had extreme baseline body mass index (BMI <15 or >45 [calculated as weight in kilograms divided by height in meters squared]) (n=670); had physical chronic conditions impairing exercise (n=3380); were unable to walk in 1989 or 2005 (n=106); or reported more than 240 min/d of total PA (n=2285). Further exclusions included reporting myocardial infarction, stroke, angina, or diabetes (n=8759) or cancer (n=3248) through 2005. After these exclusions, 18 414 healthy premenopausal women remained in the analysis.

ASSESSMENT OF PA AND SEDENTARY BEHAVIOR

Participants were asked in 1989 and 2005 to report the average time spent per week in the previous year in each of the following recreational activities: walking or hiking outdoors, jogging (<10 min/mile), running (≥10 min/mile), bicycling (including stationary machine), calisthenics/aerobics/aerobic dance/rowing machine, tennis/squash/racquetball, lap swimming, or other aerobic activity (eg, lawn mowing). For each activity, women chose 1 of 10 duration categories, which ranged from 0 to 11 h/wk or more. For walking, women reported their usual pace in 1989 and 2005: easy (<2.0 mph), average (2.0-2.9 mph), brisk (3.0-3.9 mph), very brisk (≥4.0 mph), or unable to walk. For simplicity slow and average walking paces were collapsed under "slow walking" and brisk and very brisk walking paces, under "brisk walking." Women were also asked in 1989 and 2005 to report the average number of flights of stairs climbed daily. Stair climbing (minutes per day) was then estimated. Total discretionary activity (minutes per day) was the sum of the duration reported in each of the 9 activities reported at baseline and in 2005. The questionnaire has been validated in a random representative sample of NHSII participants (n=147).[27] When we used past-week activity recalls and 7-day activity diaries as the referent methods, the correlation (r) between activity reported on questionnaires and that of recalls was 0.79 and that reported on diaries was 0.62.

Duration of sitting at home was used as a measure of sedentary behavior (ie, inactivity). In 1989, total sitting at home was collected with one general question ("How many hours per week do you spend sitting at home?"), which was later expanded to 2 specific questions in 2005 ("How many hours per week do you spend: (1) Sitting at home while watching TV/VCR? (2) Other sitting at home (eg, reading, meal times, and at desk)?"). Because inactivity and, in particular, TV watching has been associated with obesity,[28] which might confound the associations with PA, total sitting at home was included in our models.

OUTCOME DEFINITIONS

Our primary outcome was defined as 16-year weight change between 1989 and 2005. The secondary outcome was defined as gaining more than 5% of weight from baseline in 1989 to the 16-year follow-up. Weight and height were assessed at baseline (1989), and weight was assessed on each follow-up questionnaire. Self-reported weight was strongly correlated in adults with measured weight (r=0.97).[29] Baseline BMI was calculated from self-reported baseline height and weight.

COVARIATES AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

Diet components that have previously been observed to be predictive of weight gain[30-33] were included in the analysis. Using a validated food frequency questionnaire, we included 1991 and 2003 intakes of sugar-sweetened beverages, energy-adjusted *trans* fats, and energy-adjusted dietary fiber in the model to account for changes in these covariates. Alcohol consumption at baseline (1989) and 2003 was also included. The other risk factors for weight change in the multivariate models were smoking status (never, past, or current), oral contraceptive use (never, past, or current), parity (nulliparous, 1, 2, or ≥3 births), and antidepressant intake (never, past, or current) at baseline and in 2005.

In the first set of analyses, multiple linear regression was used to assess the relation between change in total activity and change in weight over 16 years. Weight change was modeled as weight in 2005 as the outcome and 1989 baseline weight as a predictor. Both 1989 and 2005 activity were predictors in the model, therefore the β for 2005 activity represented 16-year change. In a second model, total activity was partitioned among slow walking, brisk walking, bicycling, and other activities (the other 7 assessed activities). Total activity and specific activities were modeled per an increase of 30 min/d, while holding the levels of other activities and covariates constant. We also conducted a stratified analysis by baseline weight status (underweight and normal weight [BMI <25] vs overweight or obese [BMI ≥25]) to assess effect modification. There were no important differences across the age strata; thus, the results were not stratified by age.

In addition, bicycling in 1989 and 2005 was categorized into 4 groups (0, ≤5, >5-15, and >15 min/d). The top and bottom categories in 1989 were cross-classified with the 4 categories in 2005 and were assessed in 2 other linear regression models.

To assess a dose-response relationship between bicycling and weight gain, logistic regression was used to estimate the odds ratio (OR) of gaining more than 5% of baseline body weight at the 16-year follow-up for categories of time spent bicycling at the end of this follow-up period (2005). Bicycling in 2005 was categorized into 5 groups using the collapsed categories from the questionnaire (0, 1-59 min/wk, 1-1.5 h/wk, 2-3 h/wk, and ≥4 h/wk). Mean (SE) weight changes were calculated for each of the bicycling categories.

RESULTS

The 1989 baseline characteristics of the study population by levels of slow walking, brisk walking, and bicycling are displayed (**Table 1**). Of the women, 50% reported they spent time walking slowly, 39% reported they spent time walking briskly, and 48% reported they spent time bicycling. For our sample, the mean time spent on slow walking was 7.8 min/d, brisk walking 8.5 min/d, and bicycling 4.6 min/d.

In 2005, on average, participants reported spending more time walking briskly (9.0 min/d), some time walking slowly (5.9 min/d), and the least amount of time bicycling (2.5 min/d). The mean time spent sitting at home was 5 times (153 min/d) as much as total time spent in total activity (30.5 min/d), especially if they were overweight (175 min/d). Compared with lean women, overweight women spent

Table 1. Baseline (1989) Age-Standardized Characteristics According to Levels of Slow Walking, Brisk Walking, and Biking for 18 414 US Premenopausal Women in the Nurses' Health Study II[a]

| | Walking, min/d | | | | | Biking, min/d | | |
| | Zero | Slow Walking | | Brisk Walking | | | | |
Characteristic	0	>0-9	≥10	>0-9	≥10	0	>0-9	≥10
No. of women	1921	5789	3438	3025	4241	9556	6405	2453
Age, y	32.0	31.7	31.3	31.4	31.6	31.8	31.4	31.1
Total discretionary physical activity, min/d	20.0	19.8	62.1	25.0	65.5	31.0	36.3	77.8
Total walking, min/d	0	4.8	33.6	5.5	33.2	15.2	15.2	23.7
Slow walking, min/d	0	4.8	33.6	0	0	7.6	7.4	9.7
Brisk walking, min/d	0	0	0	5.5	33.2	7.7	7.8	14.0
Bicycle riding, min/d	3.6	2.9	6.1	3.5	7.1	0	4.0	24.1
Other activities, min/d	16.3	12.1	22.5	16.0	25.2	15.8	17.1	30.1
BMI at 1989	23.0	23.5	23.1	22.5	22.5	23.0	23.0	22.9
Weight change, 1989 to 2005, kg	9.4	9.5	9.4	9.1	9.0	9.1	9.4	9.8
Sitting at home, min/d	115	118	118	117	112	121	113	109
Energy intake, kcal/d	1710	1784	1835	1780	1788	1778	1797	1794
Alcohol intake, g/d	3.2	2.9	3.2	3.4	3.4	3.0	3.2	3.7
Sugar-sweetened beverage intake, servings/d[b]	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.4
Trans fat intake, g/d[c]	3.4	3.4	3.3	3.2	3.0	3.3	3.3	2.9
Fiber intake, g/d[c]	17.5	17.4	18.2	18.3	19.6	17.8	18.3	19.9
Current smoking, %	12.0	10.8	9.7	10.2	7.6	11.1	9.2	6.8
Oral contraceptive use, %	23.7	22.3	20.8	23.0	24.1	22.5	21.8	25.3
Parity, No. of births	1.1	1.3	1.2	1.0	0.9	1.2	1.1	0.9
Antidepressant use, %	0.5	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.2

Abbreviations: BMI, body mass index (calculated as weight in kilograms divided by height in meters squared).
[a] Data are reported as means unless otherwise indicated.
[b] Sugar-sweetened beverages include sugar-sweetened carbonated beverages, punch, fruit drinks, lemonade, or iced tea.
[c] Energy-adjusted values.

more time walking slowly (7.6 vs 5.5 min/d) and less time walking briskly (5.4 vs 10 min/d). Even though most women did not spend considerable time bicycling, on average, overweight women (2 min/d) and lean women (2.7 min/d) bicycled comparable amounts of time.

PA TYPES AND 16-YEAR WEIGHT CHANGE

Between 1989 and 2005, all women gained a mean (SD) 9.3 (9.7) kg. For a BMI less than 25, women gained a mean (SD) 8.4 (7.9) kg; for a BMI of 25 or greater, women gained a mean (SD) 12.6 (13.4) kg. In parallel, women decreased the mean (SD) time spent on their total discretionary activity by 8.6 (43.3) min/d, and more specifically, decreased the mean (SD) times spent on slow walking by 1.9 (21.8) and bicycling by 2.1 (12.2) min/d. Only the mean (SD) time spent on brisk walking slightly increased by 0.5 (23.1) min/d.

In linear regression models using change in PA as a continuous variable and controlling for baseline activity and other risk factors, a 30-min/d increase in total discretionary activity between 1989 and 2005 was associated with less weight gain (–1.31 kg, 95% CI, –1.44 to –1.18), whereas a 30-min/d increase in total time sitting at home was associated with greater weight gain (+0.21 kg, 95% CI, +0.18 to +0.25) (**Table 2**). When we partitioned the change in total discretionary activity, the estimated weight gain for a 30-min/d increase in all women was significantly less for brisk walking (–1.81 kg; 95% CI, –2.05 to –1.56), bicycling (–1.59 kg; 95% CI, –2.09 to –1.08), and for other activities (–1.45 kg; 95% CI, –1.66 to –1.24), whereas an increase in slow walking was not associated with less weight

gain (+0.06 kg; 95% CI, –0.22 to +0.35). In our cohort, only a few women (1.2%) actually attained this increase of 30 min/d in bicycling. The benefits of brisk walking, bicycling, and other activities were significantly stronger among overweight and obese women (BMI ≥25) compared with lean women (BMI <25) (*P* value for interaction, <.01 for all), whereas slow walking continued to show no benefit even among overweight and obese women (–0.60 kg, 95% CI, –1.35 to +0.16) (*P* value for interaction, .74).

BICYCLING AND WEIGHT GAIN PREVENTION

In women who did not bicycle in 1989 and increased their bicycling in 2005, less weight gain was seen even for 5-min/d or less increase in bicycling (–0.74 kg; 95% CI, –1.41 to –0.07), and even lower weight gain was seen with greater duration of bicycling (*P* value for trend, <.001) (**Figure**, A). In comparison, women who initially bicycled for more than 15 min/d at baseline and who decreased their bicycling time in 2005 to more than 5 to 15 min/d gained more weight (+2.13 kg; 95% CI, +0.35 to +3.92), which accrued with more reduction in bicycling (*P* value for trend, .005) (Figure, B).

To assess if a dose-response relationship was evident, we re-examined change in activity as a categorical variable, with 2005 activity as the predictor controlled for 1989 baseline activity. Compared with women who did not bicycle in 2005, those who engaged in bicycling 4 h/wk or more were less likely to gain weight (OR, 0.71; 95% CI, 0.55 to 0.93) after controlling for other covariates (**Table 3**). There was a significant inverse dose-response relationship between increased time spent bicycling in 2005 and

Table 2. Predictors of 16-Year Weight Change[a] by a 30-min/d Increase in Physical Activity and Inactivity Between 1989 and 2005 Among 18 414 US Premenopausal Women, for All Women and Women Stratified by 1989 Baseline BMI

	β (95% CI)			
Variable	All Women (n=18 414)	BMI <25 (n=14 518)	BMI ≥25 (n=3896)	P Value for Interaction
Weight change 1989-2005, mean (SD), kg	9.3 (9.7)	8.4 (7.9)	12.6 (13.4)	
Model 1				
Total discretionary activity				<.001
Simple model[b]	−1.52 (−1.65 to −1.38)	−1.14 (−1.26 to −1.02)	−3.06 (−3.49 to −2.63)	
Multivariate-adjusted model[c]	−1.31 (−1.44 to −1.18)	−0.94 (−1.06 to −0.82)	−2.76 (−3.19 to −2.34)	
Total sitting at home				<.001
Simple model[b]	0.25 (0.21 to 0.28)	0.22 (0.19 to 0.26)	0.29 (0.20 to 0.38)	
Multivariate-adjusted model[c]	0.21 (0.18 to 0.25)	0.19 (0.16 to 0.23)	0.23 (0.14 to 0.32)	
Model 2				
Slow walking				.74
Simple model[d]	0.01 (−0.28 to 0.30)	0.17 (−0.11 to 0.45)	−0.70 (−1.48 to 0.08)	
Multivariate-adjusted model[e]	0.06 (−0.22 to 0.35)	0.16 (−0.12 to 0.44)	−0.60 (−1.35 to 0.16)	
Brisk walking				<.001
Simple model[d]	−2.07 (−2.32 to −1.83)	−1.39 (−1.61 to −1.17)	−6.10 (−7.01 to −5.19)	
Multivariate-adjusted model[e]	−1.81 (−2.05 to −1.56)	−1.13 (−1.35 to −0.92)	−5.28 (−6.18 to −4.38)	
Bicycle riding				<.001
Simple model[d]	−1.82 (−2.33 to −1.31)	−1.35 (−1.81 to −0.89)	−3.30 (−5.07 to −1.53)	
Multivariate-adjusted model[e]	−1.59 (−2.09 to −1.08)	−1.12 (−1.58 to −0.67)	−3.23 (−4.96 to −1.50)	
Other activities[f]				<.001
Simple model[d]	−1.63 (−1.85 to −1.42)	−1.29 (−1.49 to −1.10)	−2.99 (−3.75 to −2.23)	
Multivariate-adjusted model[e]	−1.45 (−1.66 to −1.24)	−1.11 (−1.30 to −0.91)	−2.88 (−3.63 to −2.14)	

Abbreviations: BMI, body mass index (calculated as weight in kilograms divided by height in meters squared); CI, confidence interval.
[a] Based on linear regression coefficients (95% CI) for every 30-min/d increase in 2005 physical activity and inactivity.
[b] In the simple model, the change in total discretionary activity and total sitting at home were analyzed in the same model and adjusted for 1989 baseline age, weight, total discretionary activity, and total time sitting at home.
[c] Adjusted for the factors listed in footnote b plus the following covariates: height (1989), total mean alcohol intake (1989-2003) (0, >0-<2.5, 2.5-5, >5-10, or >10 g/d), mean sugar-sweetened beverage intake (1991-2003) (0, >0-0.5, >0.5-1, or >1 servings/d), energy-adjusted *trans* fat (1991-2003) (≤2.5, >2.5-3, >3-4, or >4 g/d), energy-adjusted fiber intake (1991-2003) (5-15, >15-20, >20-25, or >25 g/d), oral contraceptive use (1989-2005) (never, current, or past), smoking (1989-2005) (never, past [0-7 pack years], past [≥8 pack years], current [>0-19 pack years], or current [≥20 pack years]), parity (1989-2005) (never given birth, 1 birth, 2 births, or ≥3 births), antidepressant intake (1989-2005) (never, current, or past).
[d] Change in slow walking, brisk walking, bicycle riding, and other activities were analyzed in the same model and are adjusted for 1989 baseline age, weight, slow walking, brisk walking, bicycle riding, other activities, and total sitting at home.
[e] Same model as described in footnote d plus adjustment for the additional covariates listed in footnote c.
[f] Other activities included jogging, running, swimming, other aerobic activities (eg, lawn mowing), aerobics, tennis, and stair climbing.


Figure. Increased and decreased bicycling and weight change. A, Increased bicycling: includes only women who did not initially bicycle (0 min/d) at baseline (1989) (n=9556). The figure reflects the slope of weight change if women remained in the nonbicycling category in 2005 (reference) or if they increased their bicycling in 2005. B, Decreased bicycling: includes only women who initially bicycled for more than 15 min/d at baseline (1989) (n=1506). The figure reflects the slope of weight change if women remained in the high bicycling activity category in 2005 (reference) or if they decreased their bicycling in 2005. Error bars represent the standard error for weight change. *Adjusted for 1989 baseline age, weight, plus the covariates listed in Table 2 footnote c.

odds of weight gain (*P* value for trend, <.001). The results appeared to be stronger in women with excess baseline weight compared with lean women. The mean [SE] weight gain was the smallest (5.5 [0.4] kg) in women who engaged in 4 h/wk or more of bicycling compared with women who bicycled for less time.

Table 3. Odds Ratio of Gaining 5% or More of Baseline Body Weight Between 1989 and 2005 by Time Spent Bicycle Riding in 2005 While Adjusting for Baseline Bicycling (1989) Among Premenopausal Women, for All Women and Women Stratified by 1989 BMI

| | Bicycle Riding in 2005 | | | | | P Value for Trend |
	0 min/d	1-59 min/wk	1-1.5 h/wk	2-3 h/wk	≥4 h/wk	
All women, No.	13 432	2886	1259	564	273	
Mean weight change, kg (SE)	9.7 (0.1)	8.6 (0.2)	8.0 (0.2)	6.9 (0.3)	5.6 (0.4)	
Simple OR (95% CI)[a]	1 [Ref]	0.92 (0.83-1.01)	0.79 (0.69-0.90)	0.68 (0.56-0.81)	0.56 (0.43-0.72)	
Multivariate OR (95% CI)[b]	1 [Ref]	0.97 (0.88-1.08)	0.94 (0.82-1.08)	0.85 (0.70-1.02)	0.71 (0.55-0.93)	.004
BMI <25, No.	10 391	2382	1045	469	231	
Mean weight change, kg (SE)	8.7 (0.1)	7.9 (0.2)	7.6 (0.2)	6.8 (0.3)	5.5 (0.4)	
Simple OR (95% CI)[a]	1 [Ref]	0.95 (0.85-1.05)	0.82 (0.71-0.94)	0.75 (0.61-0.92)	0.58 (0.44-0.76)	
Multivariate OR (95% CI)[b]	1 [Ref]	1.00 (0.90-1.12)	0.95 (0.82-1.11)	0.95 (0.76-1.17)	0.74 (0.56-0.98)	.10
BMI ≥25, No.	3041	504	214	95	42	
Mean weight change, kg (SE)	13.1 (0.2)	11.9 (0.6)	10.2 (0.9)	7.4 (1.2)	5.7 (1.9)	
Simple OR (95% CI)[a]	1 [Ref]	0.78 (0.63-0.97)	0.68 (0.50-0.92)	0.43 (0.28-0.66)	0.47 (0.25-0.89)	
Multivariate OR (95% CI)[b]	1 [Ref]	0.86 (0.68-1.09)	1.02 (0.72-1.43)	0.54 (0.34-0.86)	0.53 (0.26-1.05)	.006

Abbreviation: Ref, reference.
[a] Adjusted for 1989 baseline age, weight, and bicycling.
[b] Adjusted for 1989 baseline age, weight, and bicycling; 1989 baseline and 2005 slow walking, brisk walking, other activity, and total sitting at home; plus the covariates listed in Table 2 footnote c.

COMMENT

In this large 16-year prospective cohort study of premenopausal women, an increase in time spent bicycling was associated with a significantly lower change in weight, and this relationship was stronger among women with excess weight. For women who did not bicycle in 1989, less weight gain was evident for even a small increase to 5 min/d or less in 2005. Conversely, women who bicycled for 15 min/d or more in 1989 were at a higher risk of weight gain if they decreased or stopped bicycling in 2005.

Although brisk walking, unlike slow walking, has been suggested as a beneficial PA, only 39% of the women reported that they walked briskly at baseline, while 50% reported they walked slowly. Walking briskly can be difficult, especially for women who are overweight or obese or those with arthritis or other disabilities.[34] Overweight women spent half the time walking briskly (5.4 min/d) compared with lean women (10 min/d), while overweight and lean women spent comparable times bicycling (2.0 and 2.7 min/d, respectively).

Unlike discretionary gym time, bicycling could replace time spent in a car for necessary travel of some distance to work, shops, or school as activities of daily living. Bicycling could then be an unconscious form of exercise because the trip's destination, and not the exercise, could be the goal.[35]

Research on bicycling in addition to walking is relatively new.[36] Although bicycling was found to be inversely associated with weight gain, fewer studies have included women, many studies have combined walking and bicycling, and several studies have been conducted in countries with bicycle environments different from the United States. Our findings agree with Littman et al,[37] who conducted a study in western Washington State and found that fast bicycling, and not slow walking, in nonobese men between the ages of 53 and 57 years was associated with weight attenuation. Though the age range was similar to the women in our study, this finding was only for lean men. In France and Northern Ireland, Wagner et al[38] studied 8865 men aged 50 to 59 years and found that men who walked or bicycled to work for more than 30 min/d had a lower BMI of 0.3, a smaller waist circumference of 1 cm, and BMI change of 0.06 compared with men who did not walk or bicycle to work. While this study agreed with our positive association between brisk walking, bicycling, and obesity reduction, the study only included men and walking was not differentiated between slow and brisk, even though the walking time was more than 30 min/d.

In an Australian study that included men (n=3810) and women (n=3022), Wen and Rissel[39] found that men who bicycled to work (n=93) were significantly less likely to be overweight and obese (39.8%) compared with those who drove to work (60.8%), but these inverse relationships were not evident in the women studied (n=10), which could be owing to the lack of power. In men (n=195) and women (n=216), walking to work was not inversely associated with overweight or obesity, and the authors suggested that this may be because walking was not sufficiently vigorous or the distance was not great enough to affect weight. Their findings concur with ours. Bicycling by men in that study was associated with less weight gain.

Hemmingsson et al[36] conducted a randomized trial in abdominally obese women (age 30-60 years) with success defined as bicycling 2 km/d or more (primary) or walking 10 000 steps per day (secondary) for an 18-month duration. The intervention group members were given bicycles and followed a PA prescription of walking or bicycling, while the control group members were given program support and pedometers. The intervention group was more likely to bicycle than the control group (38.7% vs 8.9%), while both groups had the same compliance rates for walking. Both groups achieved similar waist reductions (−2.1 cm and −2.6 cm, respectively; P=.72). Though none of the participants reported bicycling at baseline, 29% of the women bicycled as part of the intervention group. In our study, overweight and obese women bicycled for approximately the same amount of time as lean women but did not walk briskly for the same amount of time as lean women. The study conducted in Sweden supports our finding that overweight and obese women will bicycle and can then achieve weight control.

While our research found significant associations between bicycling and less weight gain, dose-response associations, and greater benefits for overweight and obese women, as previously shown in other studies,[25,26,40] our research also revealed how few women bicycled for a substantial period. Though 48% indicated that they bicycled and may have been on a stationary machine, they bicycled on average for only 2.5 min/d. Of these bicyclists, only 13% bicycled for 10 min/d or more at baseline and only 1.2% bicycled for 30 min/d or longer. Perhaps more women did not bicycle for longer periods because of a lack of bicycle environments comfortable to them and an emphasis in the United States on walking. Compared with bicycling,[7] multiple studies have been conducted on walking, described as the "near perfect form of exercise."[5] Perhaps walking has been identified as beneficial because it has been compared, in the US car-centric nation, with not walking.[41,42] The research that has been conducted on bicycling in the United States has included bicycle environments based on the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) bicycle guidelines[18] and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) teachings,[43] which favor roads, lanes, and shared-use paths. The guidelines have been based primarily on the perceptions of male bicyclists perhaps because more men bicycle,[21] and the studies have thus included a higher percentage of male respondents.[8-10] Research conducted in Minnesota, Canada, and Australia has suggested that women have a greater preference for separation from vehicle traffic.[44-47]

Compared with the United States, the Dutch use 50- to 60-year-old male and female bicyclists as the design models in their bicycle facility guidelines,[19(pp39-56)] and these guidelines detail bicycle-exclusive cycle tracks and cycle track intersection and curb cut treatments.[19,48] On Dutch roads with car speeds of 80 km/h (49.71 mph), a separate cycle track is recommended parallel to the road, and on Dutch roads, which bicyclists share with cars, the recommended car speed is 30 km/h (18.6 mph).[19] Though the Netherlands might be acculturated as a bicycle country, Canada's *Technical Handbook of Bikeway Design* handbook features cycle tracks and other European bicycle facilities.[49]

As a result of being car-centric or being overly cautious about trying different bicycle facilities, in the United States, 9% of the population walks for commuting, whereas only 0.5% commutes by bicycle.[24] In the Netherlands, 22% of the population walks and 27% commutes by bicycle.[20] Individuals who have available comfortable bicycle infrastructure may still require individual determinants, such as self-efficacy and interest in bicycling, but they have, as a start, the infrastructure. Notably, if individuals have comfortable bicycle environments and they then bicycle, they are less likely to have medical risk factors and likely to have lower overall mortality.[50-53]

There are several limitations to this study. First, the sample was not a random sample from the United States and the women in the study were better educated (all nurses) and primarily white. Second, our PA measurements are inevitably imperfect, which would tend to attenuate the association between PA and weight control. While objective measures of PA may have been desirable, the validity of our self-reported PA questions has been documented.[27,54] Third, the intensity of bicycling was not recorded, and the assessment did not discriminate between regular biking and riding a stationary bicycle. Fourth, only recreational PA was assessed and not total PA, (ie, not time spent in activity doing housework or nursing work). Finally, although the different activities were analyzed in terms of minutes per day, information about the frequency of bicycling is lacking from our questionnaires such that we are unable to determine if there is any difference between someone engaging in 70 min/wk all at once vs someone bicycling 10 minutes every day.

These limitations notwithstanding, there are several strengths. First, this research included a large sample size followed with repeated measurements over 16 years. Second, women with conditions affecting weight such as pregnancy-related or postpartum weight gain were excluded. Finally, information on a wide variety of potentially confounding behavioral and demographic variables was collected at every assessment, which allowed us to assess different activity types and weight change associations independent of these potential confounders.

In conclusion, bicycling, like brisk walking, is associated with reduced weight gain in premenopausal women, especially among overweight and obese women. In the United States, brisk walking should not only be encouraged, but additional research should also be conducted to determine which bicycle environments might be preferred by the largest percentage of the population, as in the Netherlands. If facilities were designed based on women's requests, the outcome might lead to bicycle facilities in the United States that are comfortable to more people and facilitate greater weight control.

REFERENCES
---

1. Pate RR, Pratt M, Blair SN, et al. Physical activity and public health: a recommendation from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the American College of Sports Medicine. *JAMA*. 1995;273(5):402-407.

2. US Department of Health and Human Services. *2008 Physical Activity Guidelines for Americans.* Washington, DC: US Dept of Health and Human Services; 2008.

3. Wang Y, Beydoun MA. The obesity epidemic in the United States—gender, age, socioeconomic, racial/ethnic, and geographic characteristics: a systematic review and meta-regression analysis. *Epidemiol Rev.* 2007;29:6-28.

4. Ogilvie D, Foster CE, Rothnie H, et al; Scottish Physical Activity Research Collaboration. Interventions to promote walking. *BMJ*. 2007;334(7605):1204.

5. Morris JN, Hardman AE. Walking to health. *Sports Med.* 1997;23(5):306-332.

6. Manson JE, Greenland P, LaCroix AZ, et al. Walking compared with vigorous exercise for the prevention of cardiovascular events in women. *N Engl J Med.* 2002; 347(10):716-725.

7. Dill J. Bicycling for transportation and health: the role of infrastructure. *J Public Health Policy.* 2009;30(suppl 1):S95-S110.

8. Moritz W. Adult Bicyclists in the United States. *Transp Res Rec.* 1998;1636:1-7.

9. Moritz W. Survey of North American bicycle commuters: design and aggregate results. *Transp Res Rec.* 1997;1578:91-101.

10. Wachtel A, Lewiston D. Risk factors for bicycle-motor vehicle collisions at intersections. *ITE Journal.* 1994;64(9):30-35.

11. Harkey DL, Reinfurt DW, Knuiman M, Sorton A. *Development of the Bicycle Compatibility Index: A Level of Service Concept, Final Report.* Washington, DC: Federal Highway Administration; August 1998. Report FHWA-RD-98-072.

12. Hamer M, Chida Y. Active commuting and cardiovascular risk: a meta-analytic review. *Prev Med.* 2008;46(1):9-13.

13. Pikora T, Giles-Corti B, Bull F, Jamrozik K, Donovan R. Developing a framework for assessment of the environmental determinants of walking and cycling. *Soc Sci Med.* 2003;56(8):1693-1703.

14. Matthews CE, Jurj AL, Shu XO, et al. Influence of exercise, walking, cycling, and overall nonexercise physical activity on mortality in Chinese women. *Am J Epidemiol.* 2007;165(12):1343-1350.

15. Ogilvie D, Egan M, Hamilton V, Petticrew M. Promoting walking and cycling as an alternative to using cars: systematic review. *BMJ.* 2004;329(7469):763.

16. American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials. *Guide for the Development of New Bicycle Facilities.* Washington, DC: American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials; 1981.

17. American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials. *Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities.* Washington, DC: American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials; 1991.

18. American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials. *Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities.* Washington, DC: American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials; 1999.

19. CROW (Centre for Research and Contract Standardization in Civil and Traffic Engineering). *Design Manual for Bicycle Traffic.* Ede, the Netherlands: CROW; 2006. CROW record 25.

20. Pucher J, Buehler R. Making cycling irresistible. *Transp Rev.* 2008;28(4):495-528.

21. US Census Bureau. American community survey b08006 sex of workers by means of transportation to work. 2007. http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/DTTable ?_bm=y&-geo_id=01000US&-ds_name=ACS_2007_1YR_G00_&-_lang=en&-_caller=geoselect&-state=dt&-format=&-mt_name=ACS_2007_1YR_G2000 _B08006. Accessed October 2, 2008.

22. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Physical Activity Statistics, State Statistics, State Summary Data, 2007. http://apps.nccd.cdc.gov/PASurveillance /StateSumResultV.asp. Accessed November 20, 2009.

23. TNO (Dutch Report on Trends in Physical Activity and Health in The Netherlands). Bewegen in Nederland 2000-2008. 2009. http://www.tno.nl/downloads /KvL-L.09-10.785Mu_laag1.pdf. Accessed November 30, 2009.

24. Bassett DR Jr, Pucher J, Buehler R, Thompson DL, Crouter SE. Walking, cycling, and obesity rates in Europe, North America, and Australia. *J Phys Act Health.* 2008;5(6):795-814.

25. Mekary RA, Feskanich D, Malspeis S, Hu FB, Willett WC, Field AE. Physical activity patterns and prevention of weight gain in premenopausal women. *Int J Obes (Lond).* 2009;33(9):1039-1047.

26. Mekary RA, Feskanich D, Hu FB, Willett WC, Field AE. Physical activity in relation to long-term weight maintenance after intentional weight loss in premenopausal women. *Obesity (Silver Spring).* 2010;18(1):167-174.

27. Wolf AM, Hunter DJ, Colditz GA, et al. Reproducibility and validity of a self-administered physical activity questionnaire. *Int J Epidemiol.* 1994;23(5):991-999.

28. Hu FB, Li TY, Colditz GA, Willett WC, Manson JE. Television watching and other sedentary behaviors in relation to risk of obesity and type 2 diabetes mellitus in women. *JAMA.* 2003;289(14):1785-1791.

29. Rimm EB, Stampfer MJ, Colditz GA, Chute CG, Litin LB, Willett WC. Validity of self-reported waist and hip circumferences in men and women. *Epidemiology.* 1990;1(6):466-473.

30. Koh-Banerjee P, Chu NF, Spiegelman D, et al. Prospective study of the association of changes in dietary intake, physical activity, alcohol consumption, and smoking with 9-y gain in waist circumference among 16 587 US men. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 2003; 78(4):719-727.

31. Schulze MB, Manson JE, Ludwig DS, et al. Sugar-sweetened beverages, weight gain, and incidence of type 2 diabetes in young and middle-aged women. *JAMA.* 2004;292(8):927-934.

32. Phelan S, Wyatt H, Nassery S, et al. Three-year weight change in successful weight losers who lost weight on a low-carbohydrate diet. *Obesity (Silver Spring).* 2007; 15(10):2470-2477.

33. Kruger J, Blanck HM, Gillespie C. Dietary practices, dining out behavior, and physical activity correlates of weight loss maintenance. *Prev Chronic Dis.* 2008; 5(1):A11.

34. Larsson UE, Mattsson E. Perceived disability and observed functional limitations in obese women. *Int J Obes Relat Metab Disord.* 2001;25(11):1705-1712.

35. Csikszentmihalyi M. *Finding Flow: The Psychology of Engagement With Everyday Life.* New York, NY: Basic Books; 1997.

36. Hemmingsson E, Udden J, Neovius M, Ekelund U, Rossner S. Increased physical activity in abdominally obese women through support for changed commuting habits: a randomized clinical trial. *Int J Obes (Lond).* 2009;33(6):645-652.

37. Littman AJ, Kristal AR, White E. Effects of physical activity intensity, frequency, and activity type on 10-y weight change in middle-aged men and women. *Int J Obes (Lond).* 2005;29(5):524-533.

38. Wagner A, Simon C, Ducimetiere P, et al. Leisure-time physical activity and regular walking or cycling to work are associated with adiposity and 5 y weight gain in middle-aged men. *Int J Obes Relat Metab Disord.* 2001;25(7):940-948.

39. Wen LM, Rissel C. Inverse associations between cycling to work, public transport, and overweight and obesity. *Prev Med.* 2008;46(1):29-32.

40. Gordon-Larsen P, Hou N, Sidney S, et al. Fifteen-year longitudinal trends in walking patterns and their impact on weight change. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 2009;89(1):19-26.

41. Frank LD, Andresen MA, Schmid TL. Obesity relationships with community design, physical activity, and time spent in cars. *Am J Prev Med.* 2004;27(2):87-96.

42. Frank LD, Schmid TL, Sallis JF, Chapman J, Saelens BE. Linking objectively measured physical activity with objectively measured urban form: findings from SMARTRAQ. *Am J Prev Med.* 2005;28(2)(suppl 2):117-125.

43. Federal Highway Administration. *Federal Highway Administration University Course on Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation.* Washington, DC: US Dept of Transportation Federal Highway Administration; 2005.

44. Krizek KJ, Johnson PJ, Tilahun N; Transportation Research Board. Gender differences in bicycling behavior and facility preferences. In: *Research on Women's Issues in Transportation: Report of a Conference.* Vol 2: Technical Papers. Washington, DC; 2005:31-40. Conference Proceedings 35.

45. Health Canada. *National Survey on Active Transportation, Go for Green, Environics, 1998. Summary Report.* http://www.mpo-swfl.org/content/BikePed/bike _flash.pdf. Accessed August, 19, 2009.

46. Garrard J, Rose G, Lo SK. Promoting transportation cycling for women: the role of bicycle infrastructure. *Prev Med.* 2008;46(1):55-59.

47. Garrard J, Crawford S, Hakman N. Revolutions for women: increasing women's participation in cycling for recreation and transport, summary of key findings. http: //www.bv.com.au/file/Revs%20exec%20summary%2012Oct06.pdf. Accessed August 19, 2009.

48. CROW (Centre for Research and Contract Standardization in Civil and Traffic Engineering). *Sign Up for the Bike: Design Manual for a Cycle-Friendly Infrastructure.* Vol NL-6710BA. Ede, the Netherlands: CROW; 1993.

49. Velo Quebec. *Technical Handbook of Bikeway Design.* 2nd ed. Quebec, ON, Canada: Ministere des Transport du Quebec and the Secretariat au loisir et au sport; 2003.

50. Huy C, Becker S, Gomolinsky U, Klein T, Thiel A. Health, medical risk factors, and bicycle use in everyday life in the over-50 population. *J Aging Phys Act.* 2008; 16(4):454-464.

51. Cooper AR, Wedderkopp N, Wang H, Andersen LB, Froberg K, Page AS. Active travel to school and cardiovascular fitness in Danish children and adolescents. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 2006;38(10):1724-1731.

52. Andersen LB, Haraldsdottir J. Changes in CHD risk factors with age: a comparison of Danish adolescents and adults. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 1994;26(8):967-972.

53. Andersen LB, Schnohr P, Schroll M, Hein HO. All-cause mortality associated with physical activity during leisure time, work, sports, and cycling to work. *Arch Intern Med.* 2000;160(11):1621-1628.

54. Chasan-Taber S, Rimm EB, Stampfer MJ, et al. Reproducibility and validity of a self-administered physical activity questionnaire for male health professionals. *Epidemiology.* 1996;7(1):81-86.