NICOLAUS COPERNICUS UNIVERSITY IN TORUŃ

Quality in Sport. eISSN 2450-3118.

Journal Home Page
https://apcz.umk.pl/QS/index

LEWALSKI, Tymon, SŁUCHOCKA, Joanna, FLORCZYK, Martyna, LEWALSKI, Oskar, PŁUCIENNIK, Lidia, and JERUĆ, Klaudia. Physical Activity as Medicine – How Regular Movement Shapes Cardiovascular, Metabolic, Mental, Musculoskeletal, and Cognitive Health. Quality in Sport. 2026;53:69944. eISSN 2450-3118. https://doi.org/10.12775/QS.2026.53.69944

The journal has been awarded 20 points in the parametric evaluation by the Ministry of Higher Education and Science of Poland. This is according to the Annex to the announcement of the Minister of Higher Education and Science dated 05.01.2024, No. 32553. The journal has a Unique Identifier: 201398. Scientific disciplines assigned: Economics and Finance (Field of Social Sciences); Management and Quality Sciences (Field of Social Sciences).
Punkty Ministerialne z 2019 - aktualny rok 20 punktów. Załącznik do komunikatu Ministra Szkolnictwa Wyższego i Nauki z dnia 05.01.2024 Lp. 32553. Posiada Unikatowy Identyfikator Czasopisma: 201398. Przypisane dyscypliny naukowe: Ekonomia i finanse (Dziedzina nauk społecznych); Nauki o zarządzaniu i jakości (Dziedzina nauk społecznych).
The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this paper.
Received: 18.03.2026. Revised: 21.03.2026. Accepted: 22.03.2026. Published: 28.03.2026.

Physical Activity as Medicine - How Regular Movement Shapes Cardiovascular, Metabolic, Mental, Musculoskeletal, and Cognitive Health

Tymon Lewalski

lewalski.tymon@gmail.com

https://orcid.org/0009-0007-5345-2077

University of Warmia and Mazury in Olsztyn

Joanna Słuchocka
asiaslu@onet.pl
https://orcid.org/0009-0000-8143-2451
University of Warmia and Mazury in Olsztyn

Martyna Florczyk
martyna.gorlewskag4@gmail.com
https://orcid.org/0009-0000-6385-110X
RCKiK in Olsztyn

Oskar Lewalski
Oskar.lewalski@o2.pl
https://orcid.org/0009-0000-0914-0219
University of Warmia and Mazury in Olsztyn

Lidia Płuciennik
Lidi_PL@wp.pl
https://orcid.org/0009-0007-5860-9213
Medical University of Lodz

Klaudia Jeruć
klaudia.gorlewska.g4@gmail.com
https://orcid.org/0009-0000-8107-7736
Provincial Specialist Children's Hospital in Olsztyn named after Prof. Dr. Stanisław Popowski
Corresponding author: Tymon Lewalski, lewalski.tymon@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Physical activity is often discussed in the language of performance, body composition, or lifestyle, yet modern evidence shows that it also functions as a broad-spectrum medical intervention. The clinical importance of regular movement reaches far beyond calorie expenditure. Across population studies, randomized trials, and guideline documents, higher physical activity levels are linked to lower all-cause mortality, lower cardiovascular risk, reduced incidence of type 2 diabetes, better blood-pressure control, fewer depressive symptoms,

better sleep, improved functional capacity in older age, and stronger musculoskeletal health [1-7]. The strongest relative gains are often seen when previously inactive people begin doing even modest amounts of activity, supporting the now familiar but still underused message that some activity is better than none [1,3].This article reviews the medical case for physical activity with a focus suitable for a high-quality sports newspaper: what physical activity is, how it affects the body, why it protects health across the life course, and how much is required to generate meaningful benefit. It also addresses limits and caveats. Exercise is not a magic shield, and benefit depends on dose, consistency, recovery, and context. Nonetheless, current evidence supports a simple conclusion: physical activity remains one of the most accessible, scalable, and cost-effective tools in modern medicine. In a world shaped by sedentary work, screen exposure, and chronic disease, movement is not merely training; it is treatment.

Keywords: physical activity, exercise medicine, cardiovascular health, type 2 diabetes, depression, bone health, sleep, public health

1. Introduction: why the medical conversation about exercise has changed

For decades, sport pages treated exercise primarily as a matter of competition, conditioning, and willpower. Medicine now frames the same subject differently. Physical activity is increasingly understood as a determinant of population health and a frontline intervention for chronic disease prevention and management. The World Health Organization (WHO) states that regular physical activity contributes to the prevention and management of cardiovascular disease, cancer, and diabetes, while also reducing symptoms of depression and anxiety, supporting brain health, and improving overall well-being [1,2]. That breadth matters. Very few non-pharmacological interventions influence so many organ systems at once.

The epidemiological backdrop is sobering. WHO reported in 2024 that 31% of adults and 80% of adolescents worldwide do not meet recommended physical-activity levels, and that almost 1.8 billion adults were physically inactive in 2022 [2]. In other words, inactivity is not a marginal lifestyle issue. It is one of the defining health problems of the century. WHO further estimates that, if current trends are not reversed, the cost of physical inactivity to health systems between 2020 and 2030 could approach US$300 billion [2]. For sport journalism, this means physical activity is not only about elite success or recreational identity; it is also about disease burden, health-care spending, and years of life lost to preventable illness.

Modern guidelines reflect this expanded understanding. The 2020 WHO recommendations moved beyond narrow minimum thresholds and clarified several key principles: all adults should undertake regular physical activity; 150-300 minutes of moderate-intensity aerobic activity or 75-150 minutes of vigorous activity per week provides substantial benefit; muscle-strengthening exercise should be added on at least two days per week; and sedentary time should be reduced wherever possible [1]. Equally important, the guidelines emphasize that activity accumulated in any bout length counts. This represents a meaningful cultural shift. A brisk ten-minute walk between meetings, a stair-based commute, a lunchtime resistance session, or an evening cycle ride all contribute to the same biological account.

The clinical literature supports this more flexible model. Large dose-response analyses show that the relationship between physical activity and health is typically nonlinear: the sharpest risk reductions often occur when a person moves from doing almost nothing to doing something consistently [3]. This is one of the most important public-health messages in exercise science. Perfection is not the entry price for benefit. The inactive middle-aged office worker who starts walking daily may gain more medically than the already active amateur athlete who adds a small amount of extra volume. In practical terms, the body is unusually generous at the low end of the dose-response curve.

This article therefore takes a broad medical view of physical activity. It examines how movement influences cardiovascular function, blood pressure, metabolism, mental health, cognition, sleep, bones, joints, and functional ageing. It also considers special populations and the point at which more activity is not always better. The purpose is not to romanticize exercise. Rather, it is to explain, in evidence-based terms, why physical activity deserves to be discussed in the same sentence as prevention, treatment, and long-term health strategy.

2. What counts as physical activity, and why definitions matter

In everyday speech, people often use the words movement, exercise, fitness, training, and sport interchangeably. Medically, those distinctions matter. Physical activity refers to any bodily movement produced by skeletal muscles that requires energy expenditure. Exercise is a planned, structured, and repetitive subset of physical activity performed to improve or maintain fitness or health [1,2]. Sport is broader again, often combining physical effort with rules, competition, and skill. These categories overlap, but they are not identical.

This distinction becomes important when clinicians interpret the evidence. Many health benefits are associated with total physical activity volume rather than participation in formal exercise alone. A person who never enters a gym may still accumulate substantial activity

through walking, cycling for transport, physically demanding leisure, recreational games, or domestic tasks. Conversely, a person who completes three intense workouts each week but remains sedentary for the remaining waking hours may still carry significant health risk. The modern prescription is not only "exercise more," but also "sit less and move more often" [1].

Intensity also matters. Moderate-intensity activity includes brisk walking, easy cycling, or steady swimming performed hard enough to raise the heart rate while still allowing conversation. Vigorous activity includes running, fast cycling, many field sports, and interval work that substantially increases breathing and effort. A convenient physiological way to conceptualize this is through metabolic demand: vigorous activity generally compresses a higher dose of cardiorespiratory stimulus into less time. That is why 75-150 minutes of vigorous activity can substitute for 150-300 minutes of moderate activity in current guidelines [1].

Yet the obsession with intensity can mislead readers. Public-health evidence consistently shows that moderate activity is not a consolation prize. It is highly effective, especially when sustained over time. In the large 2023 dose-response meta-analysis by Garcia and colleagues, meaningful reductions in mortality and chronic disease risk were seen even below the classic recommendation threshold, with diminishing returns at higher volumes rather than an abrupt cutoff between "effective" and "ineffective" exercise [3]. This is one reason why walking remains such a powerful intervention. It is accessible, safe, scalable, and metabolically useful.

Resistance exercise deserves equal attention. Aerobic activity has historically dominated public messaging, but strength training is not merely aesthetic or performance-oriented. Muscle-strengthening work influences glucose disposal, insulin sensitivity, bone loading, functional capacity, and fall prevention, and it becomes increasingly important with advancing age [1,9,16,17]. A comprehensive prescription therefore includes both aerobic and resistance elements, ideally with some balance and mobility work as well.

Finally, cardiorespiratory fitness should not be ignored. Physical activity is a behavior; fitness is a biological adaptation. The two are related but not interchangeable. Recent evidence shows that higher cardiorespiratory fitness is a strong and consistent predictor of lower morbidity and mortality across large adult populations [5]. That makes exercise doubly valuable: first as a direct exposure linked to lower disease risk, and second as a mechanism for improving fitness, which itself carries prognostic meaning.

3. Biological mechanisms: how movement changes the body

The argument that exercise is "medicine" is not just metaphorical. Physical activity produces measurable changes in vascular biology, autonomic regulation, endocrine signaling, skeletal

muscle metabolism, body composition, bone remodeling, inflammatory status, and neurochemistry. A single bout of exercise can acutely change glucose uptake, mood state, blood flow, and sleep pressure. Repeated over weeks and months, these transient responses become chronic adaptations.

At the cardiovascular level, regular activity improves endothelial function, promotes vasodilation, enhances stroke volume, reduces resting heart rate, and can lower arterial stiffness. These changes help explain why active individuals often show lower blood pressure and better exercise tolerance than inactive peers [6,7]. Repeated muscular contractions also act like a peripheral pump, improving venous return and regional blood flow. Over time, the heart becomes more efficient and the vasculature more responsive.

Metabolically, contracting muscle is a major sink for circulating glucose. Exercise stimulates glucose uptake through both insulin-dependent and insulin-independent pathways, meaning that movement can improve glycemic control even before major changes in body weight occur [9,10]. Resistance training increases muscle mass and therefore expands the tissue available for glucose disposal. Aerobic training improves mitochondrial density, oxidative capacity, and substrate flexibility. Combined training often provides the broadest metabolic benefit because it addresses both cardiovascular capacity and muscular adaptation [10,11].

Inflammation is another pathway. Chronic inactivity is linked to low-grade systemic inflammation and adverse adipokine profiles. Exercise tends to shift this biology in a favorable direction, reducing inflammatory burden and improving insulin sensitivity markers in many populations [10]. That is one reason physical activity influences diseases that seem, at first glance, quite different from one another. The same intervention that improves blood pressure can also improve glycemic control, reduce visceral adiposity, and moderate inflammatory tone.

In the brain, exercise affects neurotransmitters, stress physiology, cerebral blood flow, and neuroplasticity. Regular activity is associated with lower depressive symptom burden, improved sleep, and, in some studies, slower cognitive decline in older adults [12-15]. These effects are not uniform and should not be oversold. Exercise is not a universal cure for psychiatric or neurodegenerative disease. But the convergence of psychological, vascular, metabolic, and neurobiological pathways helps explain why its impact is clinically meaningful.

The musculoskeletal system responds just as clearly. Bones adapt to loading. Muscles adapt to tension. Tendons and connective tissues adapt to repeated, appropriately dosed stress. In postmenopausal women, structured exercise has been shown to improve or preserve bone mineral density, while in older adults multicomponent activity helps maintain balance, strength,

and mobility [16,17]. These are not cosmetic outcomes. They influence independence, fracture risk, fall risk, and quality of life.

Taken together, these mechanisms demonstrate why exercise does not behave like a single-purpose therapy. It resembles a multi-target intervention whose exact effects depend on the person, the dose, the modality, and the consistency of exposure. That complexity can frustrate simplistic headlines, but it is precisely what makes physical activity so powerful in clinical practice.

4. Cardiovascular protection: the strongest and most consistent story

Among all the health outcomes linked to physical activity, cardiovascular protection remains the most robust and clinically persuasive. The evidence spans cohort studies, randomized trials, guideline statements, and meta-analyses. Leisure-time physical activity is consistently associated with lower incidence of cardiovascular disease, coronary heart disease, stroke, and atrial fibrillation, with inverse dose-response relationships across a broad range of activity levels [3,4]. For public understanding, that means the core message has remained remarkably stable: people who move more in their leisure time tend to suffer fewer cardiovascular events.

This does not mean every type of physical activity carries the same protective signal. One of the more nuanced recent findings comes from the 2024 systematic review by Kazemi and colleagues, which found clear benefit from leisure-time physical activity but no comparable overall benefit from occupational physical activity for cardiovascular outcomes [4]. This supports what is sometimes called the “physical activity paradox.” Physically demanding work often involves prolonged low-control effort, static loading, insufficient recovery, or adverse psychosocial conditions. It cannot be assumed to mimic the health effects of voluntary, well-distributed leisure exercise.

Cardiorespiratory fitness adds another layer. In 2024, Lang and colleagues reviewed meta-analytic evidence covering more than 20.9 million observations and concluded that higher cardiorespiratory fitness is strongly and consistently associated with lower risk of mortality and multiple chronic conditions [5]. For clinicians and coaches, this is highly relevant. Fitness is not just a performance metric. It is an index of physiological resilience. A better aerobic engine usually reflects better integrated function of the heart, lungs, vessels, skeletal muscles, and autonomic nervous system.

Blood pressure illustrates how quickly some benefits can become clinically tangible. The American Heart Association has argued that physical activity should be considered a critical first-line treatment for many adults with elevated blood pressure or cholesterol, not merely an

optional add-on after diagnosis [6]. This position is supported by intervention data. In a 2024 dose-response meta-analysis of randomized trials, aerobic exercise in people with hypertension lowered systolic and diastolic blood pressure in a dose-dependent fashion, with the greatest reduction observed around 150 minutes per week, approximately -7.23 mmHg systolic and -5.58 mmHg diastolic [7]. Those are not trivial shifts. At population scale, they translate into meaningful reductions in stroke and heart-disease risk.

Why are these effects so important in a sports-newspaper context? Because sport culture often exaggerates the dramatic and overlooks the cumulative. The public sees marathons, finish lines, and body transformations. Medicine sees quieter gains: a lower resting blood pressure, improved endothelial function, better cholesterol handling, a healthier waist circumference, and a lower ten-year risk score. Many of these improvements occur well before major visual changes. Readers who judge exercise solely by how quickly it alters appearance may underestimate its medical value.

The dose-response shape also matters. Garcia and colleagues showed that the greatest proportional reduction in mortality and disease risk often occurs among people moving from inactivity to modest activity, with benefits continuing but flattening at higher volumes [3]. This has practical implications for sports journalism. The most important training session in public health is often not a maximal effort or a technical masterpiece. It is the first repeated session that changes a person's baseline from sedentary to active.

In clinical communication, the cardiovascular case for physical activity is therefore unusually strong. It is supported by plausibility, consistency, biological mechanism, and intervention data. Not every health claim made for exercise reaches that standard. This one does.

5. Metabolic health and type 2 diabetes: exercise beyond weight loss

One of the most damaging myths in public discussion is that exercise matters mainly because it burns calories. In reality, physical activity powerfully affects metabolic health even when body-weight change is modest. This is especially important in type 2 diabetes and prediabetes, conditions driven not simply by excess energy intake but by insulin resistance, altered muscle metabolism, visceral adiposity, and impaired glucose regulation.

The landmark Diabetes Prevention Program showed how potent lifestyle change can be. In adults at high risk for diabetes, an intervention built around weight reduction and at least 150 minutes of physical activity per week reduced diabetes incidence by 58%, outperforming metformin in the original trial [8]. Although the lifestyle package included dietary modification,

the trial remains central to the argument that physical activity is a therapeutic exposure, not just a supportive habit.

The 2022 American College of Sports Medicine consensus statement on exercise and type 2 diabetes reinforced this view, emphasizing that regular aerobic exercise improves glycemia and often lowers hemoglobin A1c by roughly 0.5 to 0.7 percentage points in adults with type 2 diabetes, while also reducing daily hyperglycemic excursions [9]. Those changes are clinically relevant and compare favorably with some pharmacologic effects, especially when one considers the additional benefits on blood pressure, fitness, physical function, and mood.

Importantly, different exercise modalities contribute through overlapping but distinct mechanisms. Aerobic training enhances mitochondrial function, oxidative metabolism, and insulin sensitivity. Resistance training increases lean mass and helps preserve muscle, which is crucial because skeletal muscle is a primary site for glucose disposal. Combined training often offers the best of both worlds. In sedentary adults without diabetes, Silva and colleagues found that combined training improved selected glucose-metabolism markers and inflammatory parameters [10]. In middle-aged and older adults with type 2 diabetes, Zhang and colleagues reported that combined aerobic and resistance exercise improved cognition, metabolic health, physical function, and health-related quality of life [11].

This matters because diabetes is not a single-organ disease. It influences vessels, nerves, kidneys, sleep, cognition, mood, and function. A treatment that improves glycemia but does little for physical capacity or mental well-being is incomplete. Exercise, by contrast, often improves several of these domains at once. For an older adult with diabetes, better leg strength, better balance, better sleep, and better confidence walking outdoors may be as meaningful as a laboratory improvement.

Another key point is timing and consistency. Exercise benefits glucose regulation acutely, sometimes within hours, but these effects are not permanent. Long gaps between activity sessions can allow insulin sensitivity to regress. That is why routine matters more than heroic inconsistency. Three months of regular walking, cycling, swimming, or combined gym work will generally do more for metabolic health than one spectacular weekend of exertion surrounded by inactivity.

Public discourse often asks a narrow question: “What is the best exercise for diabetes?” The medical answer is more practical. The best exercise is the one that is safe, repeatable, enjoyable enough to sustain, and combined with adequate weekly volume. Walking programs, cycling, resistance circuits, interval training, swimming, and sport-based recreation can all be

effective if matched to the individual's age, comorbidity profile, baseline fitness, and risk of hypoglycemia or injury.

Thus the metabolic story of exercise is not a story of vanity. It is a story of tissue sensitivity, glucose handling, inflammatory balance, and disease prevention. In an era when type 2 diabetes continues to expand globally, that story deserves much more space in the sports pages.

6. Mental health, mood, and the brain: exercise as psychiatric support

The mental-health effects of physical activity are among the most publicly appealing and scientifically challenging parts of exercise medicine. On one hand, the signal is strong enough that it can no longer be dismissed as anecdote. On the other hand, the pathway from movement to mood is influenced by context, expectation, social connection, symptom severity, and the quality of the underlying research. The responsible conclusion is not that exercise replaces psychiatric care, but that it can be a meaningful part of it.

In 2024, Noetel and colleagues published a large systematic review and network meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials and concluded that exercise is an effective treatment for depression, with walking or jogging, yoga, and strength training showing particularly favorable effects [12]. Their work also suggested that higher-intensity exercise may provide stronger antidepressant effects in some contexts, though tolerability and adherence remain decisive. That nuance matters. The "best" program is not the one with the largest theoretical effect if the patient cannot maintain it.

The evidence is not confined to treatment studies. Pearce and colleagues, in a 2022 systematic review and meta-analysis, found that physical activity was associated with lower risk of developing depression and that meaningful mental-health benefits were observed even below public-health recommendation levels [13]. This is a particularly useful message for readers who feel excluded by formal exercise culture. A person does not need to become an athlete to achieve a measurable mental-health dividend from becoming more active.

Why might exercise help? Several explanations are plausible and not mutually exclusive. Biologically, exercise influences neurotransmitters, stress hormones, inflammatory signaling, and neuroplastic pathways. Psychologically, it can improve self-efficacy, routine, sleep, and perceived control. Socially, sport and group exercise reduce isolation. Behaviorally, physical activity can displace sedentary rumination and create structure in days otherwise organized around screens and stress. The multiplicity of mechanisms is a strength, not a weakness. It helps explain why different modalities can work for different people.

Cognition is a related but distinct domain. In a 2024 systematic review and meta-analysis, Iso-Markku and colleagues concluded that physical activity may postpone cognitive decline among older adults, though the effect size at population level appeared modest [14]. That cautious wording is important. Exercise should not be sold as a guaranteed shield against dementia. Yet even modest slowing of cognitive decline, if real across populations, can have major public-health implications. Furthermore, cognition does not exist in isolation. Improvements in vascular health, sleep, mood, and diabetes control may indirectly support brain function even when direct cognitive effects are small.

For sports journalists, the temptation is to write the easy headline: “Exercise cures depression” or “Training prevents dementia.” Neither is precise enough. A better formulation would be this: regular physical activity is a credible, evidence-based support for mental health and healthy ageing of the brain, especially when integrated into a broader care plan. It is not a miracle. It is a meaningful modifier of risk and symptoms.

This balanced framing matters for readers who are struggling. Overstating exercise can produce guilt in those who are least able to be active. Understating it wastes a genuine therapeutic opportunity. The medical literature supports a middle path: exercise is not everything, but it is more than optional.

7. Sleep, recovery, and the hidden value of movement

Sleep is often treated as a recovery issue for athletes and a luxury issue for everyone else. In medical reality, sleep is a central pillar of metabolic, cardiovascular, psychological, and cognitive health. Physical activity and sleep influence one another bidirectionally. Poor sleep reduces motivation, impairs glucose handling, and can lower exercise capacity. Regular activity, in turn, often improves sleep quality, sleep efficiency, and daytime functioning.

Evidence is strongest in middle-aged and older adults. Gao and colleagues, in a 2024 network meta-analysis, found that exercise improved sleep quality and that aerobic exercise appeared particularly effective when assessed using the Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index [15]. These findings fit common clinical experience: regular daytime movement can improve sleep pressure, circadian stability, mood, and anxiety regulation, all of which feed into better night-time rest.

The practical implications are wider than they first appear. Better sleep can improve appetite regulation, insulin sensitivity, reaction time, emotional control, and pain tolerance. For a recreational athlete, that may mean more consistent training. For a patient with hypertension or diabetes, it may mean better disease control. For an older adult, it may mean less fatigue,

fewer naps, and greater confidence in daily tasks. In other words, the sleep benefit of exercise can magnify other health effects.

However, timing and dose still matter. Very intense exercise close to bedtime may be stimulating for some individuals. Excess training volume without recovery can also worsen sleep, especially when accompanied by rising stress, under-fueling, or overreaching. The best clinical advice is therefore individualized: regular movement is usually beneficial for sleep, but the schedule should fit the person's physiology, work pattern, and symptom profile.

From a communication perspective, sleep is a useful bridge between elite sport and public health. Athletes understand that recovery is part of performance. The same principle applies outside competition. When exercise improves sleep, it does not simply make a person feel more rested; it contributes to a more stable internal environment in which other protective adaptations are more likely to flourish.

8. Bone, muscle, joints, and functional ageing

The musculoskeletal benefits of physical activity are sometimes overshadowed by cardiovascular headlines, yet they become increasingly important with age. Longevity without physical function is an incomplete victory. Many adults do not fear disease in the abstract as much as they fear frailty, falls, chronic pain, and dependence. Exercise speaks directly to those concerns.

Bone health is one clear example. In postmenopausal women, who face accelerated bone loss due to hormonal change, structured exercise training can preserve or improve bone mineral density. Mohebbi and colleagues, in an updated 2023 systematic review and meta-analysis, reported favorable effects of exercise on bone mineral density in postmenopausal women, with the response influenced by training characteristics and potential moderators [16]. The important practical lesson is that bones respond to loading, but they respond best when the loading is repeated, progressive, and sufficiently osteogenic. Casual low-impact movement is better than none, yet it may not provide the same skeletal stimulus as resistance work, impact activity where appropriate, or well-designed multicomponent training.

Muscle is just as important. Age-related loss of muscle mass and strength is associated with poorer mobility, higher fall risk, lower insulin sensitivity, and worse resilience during illness. Resistance training can help maintain strength reserve, which is one of the most underappreciated predictors of independence in later life. The person who can rise from a chair easily, carry groceries, climb stairs, and recover balance after a misstep is living with a form of health that laboratory values alone cannot capture.

Falls prevention makes this especially concrete. The 2020 WHO guidelines recommend that older adults include multicomponent physical activity emphasizing balance and strength training at least three days per week to enhance functional capacity and reduce falls risk [1]. Subsequent evidence synthesis for the US Preventive Services Task Force also supported exercise-based approaches for fall prevention in community-dwelling older adults [17]. In a sports-newspaper setting, this may seem far removed from traditional athletic coverage. It should not. Balance, lower-limb strength, and coordination are performance qualities in youth and independence qualities in old age. The same physical capacities remain valuable across the lifespan, even if the final outcome changes.

Joints present a more nuanced picture. Many adults with osteoarthritis fear exercise, assuming that movement will accelerate wear. Yet the evidence does not support blanket avoidance. In a 2024 Cochrane review, Lawford and colleagues concluded that exercise probably improves pain, physical function, and quality of life in people with knee osteoarthritis, at least in the short term [18]. This does not mean all loading is benign or that very high repetitive impact is risk free. It means that appropriately prescribed exercise usually helps rather than harms, and that inactivity is rarely a good long-term strategy for painful degenerative joints.

For readers, the musculoskeletal message is both practical and reassuring. Exercise is not only about adding years to life; it is also about adding strength, balance, and competence to those years. A body that moves regularly tends to remain more useful to the person living in it.

9. How much is enough? Dose, steps, and the real-world prescription

One of the most common questions in exercise medicine is deceptively simple: how much activity is enough to matter? Guidelines offer a clear starting point. Adults should aim for 150-300 minutes of moderate-intensity aerobic activity per week or 75-150 minutes of vigorous activity, alongside muscle-strengthening exercise on two or more days [1]. For older adults, balance-focused multicomponent activity is also recommended [1]. These are not arbitrary numbers. They reflect the range in which substantial health benefits are repeatedly observed.

Yet the phrase “enough to matter” should be interpreted with caution. The evidence does not show an on-off switch at 150 minutes. Instead, it shows a graded relationship. The 2023 dose-response meta-analysis by Garcia and colleagues demonstrated substantial protection against chronic disease and mortality from relatively small increases in activity among inactive adults, with benefits continuing beyond the minimum recommendation but tending to flatten at higher volumes [3]. The practical translation is elegant: the guideline target is a strong benchmark, but clinically useful benefit begins earlier.

Step-count research has helped make this message more tangible. Paluch and colleagues, in a 2022 meta-analysis of 15 international cohorts, found that taking more steps per day was associated with progressively lower all-cause mortality, up to levels that varied by age [19]. A 2024 umbrella review and updated meta-analysis by Rodríguez-Gutiérrez and colleagues similarly reported a nonlinear association between daily steps and mortality, with a protective threshold beginning at roughly 3000 steps per day and further reductions at higher counts [20]. Step targets are not a perfect replacement for intensity-based prescriptions, but they are highly useful in communication because they translate abstract guidance into something visible on a wristwatch or phone.

It is important, however, not to reduce exercise medicine to a single number. Eight thousand steps accumulated through brisk walking is not physiologically identical to eight thousand steps achieved through fragmented low-intensity movement. Nor do step counts capture cycling, rowing, swimming, resistance training, or many sports very well. Steps are a helpful entry point, especially for sedentary adults, but a complete prescription still considers modality, intensity, strength work, and recovery.

In real life, the best prescription is often modular. For example, a weekly program might include four days of brisk walking or cycling, two short resistance sessions, and one session focused on balance, mobility, or sport-specific recreation. This structure is flexible enough for busy adults and medically broad enough to influence multiple health domains. It also aligns better with adherence science than rigid, all-or-nothing plans.

A useful public-health rule is therefore this: start where the person is, not where the guideline finishes. Someone currently doing almost no activity should first build frequency and routine. Someone already walking daily may next add intensity or resistance training. Someone with strong aerobic habits but low strength may need the reverse. The dose that matters most is the dose that becomes sustainable.

10. Special populations and tailored advice

Physical activity recommendations are most effective when they are individualized. The broad principles remain stable, but the route into regular movement differs by age, health status, and functional capacity.

Children and adolescents need activity not only for body composition but for bone development, motor competence, and cognitive growth. WHO recommends an average of 60 minutes per day of moderate-to-vigorous activity across the week, with vigorous and muscle- and bone-strengthening activity included at least three days weekly [1]. At the population level,

the fact that 80% of adolescents do not meet recommended activity levels should concern sport systems as much as health systems [2]. The issue is not merely future obesity or future disease. It is the loss of movement literacy during formative years.

Older adults should generally follow adult aerobic and strengthening recommendations, but with added emphasis on balance and multicomponent training [1]. This is one of the clearest examples of exercise as function-preserving medicine. In later life, the aim is not only reducing disease risk but also maintaining confidence, gait stability, and independence.

Pregnancy is another area where outdated caution still lingers. WHO states that, in the absence of contraindications, pregnant and postpartum women should undertake regular physical activity and aim for at least 150 minutes of moderate-intensity aerobic activity per week, together with muscle-strengthening work as appropriate [1]. These recommendations are linked to lower risk of gestational hypertension, gestational diabetes, excessive gestational weight gain, delivery complications, and postpartum depression [1]. The language of fragility should therefore be replaced by the language of safe adaptation.

People living with chronic disease often believe exercise is either dangerous or futile. In many cases the opposite is true. Adults with hypertension, dyslipidemia, type 2 diabetes, osteoarthritis, and many other chronic conditions can derive considerable benefit from tailored physical activity [6-11,18]. What matters is matching the mode and intensity to the individual's symptoms, medication profile, and risk factors. A person with neuropathy, for example, may require low-impact options and careful foot care. A person with advanced osteoarthritis may begin with cycling, aquatic work, or supervised strengthening. Good exercise medicine does not deny limitations; it works around them.

Even among athletes, tailoring matters. The active person is not automatically healthy. Relative energy deficiency, overtraining, recurrent injury, sleep disruption, and cardiovascular symptoms all require clinical attention. Sport does not exempt the body from medical rules. It simply changes the context in which those rules are applied.

11. When more is not always better: risks, limits, and responsible messaging

A medical article about physical activity should not become propaganda. Exercise has risks as well as benefits, and responsible recommendations acknowledge them. Sudden vigorous activity in previously sedentary adults can provoke musculoskeletal injury or, rarely, acute cardiovascular events. Repetitive overload without recovery can produce tendinopathy, stress injury, hormonal disruption, sleep disturbance, or chronic fatigue. Competitive sport can also normalize pain and under-recovery in ways that are medically counterproductive.

At the population level, however, these risks must be interpreted proportionately. For most inactive adults, the danger of remaining sedentary is far greater than the danger of beginning appropriately dosed movement [1,3]. WHO explicitly notes that pre-exercise medical clearance is generally unnecessary for individuals without contraindications who are starting light- or moderate-intensity activity not exceeding the demands of brisk walking or ordinary daily living [1]. This matters because exaggerated caution can become another barrier to participation.

The more difficult challenge is messaging around high-volume training. The nonlinear dose-response curve for benefit does not imply that very active people are harming themselves by default. Many individuals tolerate high training volumes well. But it does mean that the largest marginal health gains are not found only at the extreme end. That is important in media culture, where exercise is often represented through exceptional bodies doing exceptional things. Public readers may wrongly infer that only intense sport "counts." The evidence argues the opposite: elite-style volume is unnecessary for most of the health benefit.

Another limit is social context. Advising exercise without addressing environment can sound naive. Safe pavements, parks, affordable facilities, school sport access, flexible work patterns, and supportive urban design all influence whether a person can actually follow the prescription. Inactivity is partly individual behavior, but it is also shaped by policy and infrastructure. A quality sports newspaper should be able to hold both truths at once.

Finally, exercise should not be framed as a moral test. People living with depression, chronic pain, obesity, disability, poverty, or long work hours may face substantial barriers. The correct medical response is not blame but problem-solving: identify the safest, smallest, most realistic increase in movement and build from there. A ten-minute walk repeated five times a week may be more therapeutically meaningful than an idealized plan that never begins.

Exercise medicine is strongest when it is honest. Physical activity is powerful, but it is not magic. It works best when the dose is matched to the person, when recovery is respected, and when health systems and communities make movement possible rather than merely desirable.

12. A practical weekly template for adult readers

For healthy adults seeking a broadly protective weekly routine, the most evidence-based template remains remarkably simple:

- 150-300 minutes per week of moderate-intensity aerobic activity, or 75-150 minutes of vigorous activity, or a combination of both [1].
- Muscle-strengthening exercise on at least two days per week, covering major muscle groups [1].

- Less sitting and more frequent movement breaks during the day [1,2].
- For older adults, at least three days weekly of balance-focused or multicomponent activity [1].
- For beginners, progression through consistency first, then duration, then intensity.

In practical form, that might mean brisk walking for 30 minutes on five days per week, plus two 20- to 30-minute resistance sessions. Another reader might achieve the same target through cycling to work, one weekend sport session, and two gym-based strength workouts. The format is flexible; the physiological principles are not.

A useful communication strategy is to think in layers. Layer one is daily movement: walking, stairs, short active commutes, standing breaks. Layer two is deliberate aerobic work. Layer three is strength and balance. When these layers coexist, the medical profile of physical activity becomes much more complete.

The central point for readers is encouraging rather than intimidating: the most important plan is not the most advanced one. It is the one that can be repeated next week.

13. Conclusion

The modern medical case for physical activity is no longer speculative. It is supported by guideline bodies, prospective cohort studies, randomized trials, and systematic reviews. Regular movement lowers cardiovascular risk, improves blood pressure and metabolic health, helps prevent or delay type 2 diabetes, supports mental health, improves sleep, contributes to bone and muscle integrity, and helps preserve function with age [1-20]. Higher cardiorespiratory fitness is consistently associated with lower morbidity and mortality, and many of the greatest relative benefits appear when inactive people begin moving at all [3,5].

For a sports newspaper, that should change the frame. Exercise is not only a story about medals, physiques, or discipline. It is a story about public health, clinical medicine, ageing, resilience, and equity. The person walking to work, the older adult performing balance drills, the patient doing resistance training after a diabetes diagnosis, and the recreational runner building weekly mileage are all participating in the same broad medical phenomenon: using movement to modify risk.

The final message is both scientific and practical. Some physical activity is better than none. More activity is generally better up to a point. Strength matters. Balance matters. Sitting less matters. Consistency matters most. If modern medicine had to choose one low-cost intervention capable of influencing multiple major chronic diseases at once, physical activity would remain

near the top of the list. In that sense, one of the oldest human behaviors has become one of the most important prescriptions.

Disclosure

Author's Contribution:

Conceptualization: TL, JS, MF

Methodology: TL, JS, MF

Resources: OL, LP, KJ

Writing- rough preparation: TL, JS, MF, OL, LP, KJ

Writing- review and editing: TL

Supervision: TL

Funding: No external funding was received

Institutional Review Board Statement: Not applicable

Informed Consent Statement: Not applicable

Data Availability Statement :Not applicable

All authors have read and agreed with the published version of the manuscript.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Declaration of the use of generative AI and AI-assisted technologies in the writing process. In preparing this work, the authors used ChatGPT for the purpose of checking grammar and improving readability. After using this tool, the authors have reviewed and edited the content as needed and accept full responsibility for the substantive content of the publication.

References

1. Bull FC, Al-Ansari SS, Biddle S, et al. World Health Organization 2020 guidelines on physical activity and sedentary behaviour. Br J Sports Med. 2020;54(24):1451-1462.
2. World Health Organization. Physical activity. Fact sheet. Updated June 26, 2024.
3. Garcia L, Pearce M, Abbas A, et al. Non-occupational physical activity and risk of cardiovascular disease, cancer and mortality outcomes: a dose-response meta-analysis of large prospective studies. Br J Sports Med. 2023;57(15):979-989.
4. Kazemi A, Soltani S, Aune D, et al. Leisure-time and occupational physical activity and risk of cardiovascular disease incidence: a systematic-review and dose-response meta-analysis of prospective cohort studies. Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act. 2024;21(1):45.

5. Lang JJ, Prince SA, Merucci K, et al. Cardiorespiratory fitness is a strong and consistent predictor of morbidity and mortality among adults: an overview of meta-analyses representing over 20.9 million observations from 199 unique cohort studies. Br J Sports Med. 2024;58(10):556-566.
6. Barone Gibbs B, Hivert MF, Jerome GJ, et al. Physical Activity as a Critical Component of First-Line Treatment for Elevated Blood Pressure or Cholesterol: Who, What, and How? A Scientific Statement From the American Heart Association. Hypertension. 2021;78(2):e26-e37.
7. Jabbarzadeh Ganjeh B, Zeraattalab-Motlagh S, Jayedi A, et al. Effects of aerobic exercise on blood pressure in patients with hypertension: a systematic review and dose-response meta-analysis of randomized trials. Hypertens Res. 2024;47(2):385-398.
8. Knowler WC, Barrett-Connor E, Fowler SE, et al. Reduction in the incidence of type 2 diabetes with lifestyle intervention or metformin. N Engl J Med. 2002;346(6):393-403.
9. Kanaley JA, Colberg SR, Corcoran MH, et al. Exercise/Physical Activity in Individuals with Type 2 Diabetes: A Consensus Statement from the American College of Sports Medicine. Med Sci Sports Exerc. 2022;54(2):353-368.
10. Silva FM, Duarte-Mendes P, Teixeira AM, et al. The effects of combined exercise training on glucose metabolism and inflammatory markers in sedentary adults: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Sci Rep. 2024;14(1):1936.
11. Zhang J, Tam WWS, Hounsri K, Kusuyama J, Wu VX. Effectiveness of combined aerobic and resistance exercise on cognition, metabolic health, physical function, and health-related quality of life in middle-aged and older adults with type 2 diabetes mellitus: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Arch Phys Med Rehabil. 2024;105(8):1585-1599.
12. Noetel M, Sanders T, Gallardo-Gómez D, et al. Effect of exercise for depression: systematic review and network meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials. BMJ. 2024;384:e075847.
13. Pearce M, Garcia L, Abbas A, et al. Association Between Physical Activity and Risk of Depression: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. JAMA Psychiatry. 2022;79(6):550-559.
14. Iso-Markku P, Aaltonen S, Kujala UM, et al. Physical Activity and Cognitive Decline Among Older Adults: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. JAMA Netw Open. 2024;7(2):e2354285.

15. Gao X, Qiao Y, Chen Q, Wang C, Zhang P. Effects of different types of exercise on sleep quality based on Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index in middle-aged and older adults: a network meta-analysis. J Clin Sleep Med. 2024;20(7):1193-1204.
16. Mohebbi R, Shojaa M, Kohl M, et al. Exercise training and bone mineral density in postmenopausal women: an updated systematic review and meta-analysis of intervention studies with emphasis on potential moderators. Osteoporos Int. 2023;34(7):1145-1178.
17. Guirguis-Blake JM, Perdue LA, Coppola EL, Bean SI. Interventions to Prevent Falls in Older Adults: Updated Evidence Report and Systematic Review for the US Preventive Services Task Force. JAMA. 2024;332(1):58-69.
18. Lawford BJ, Hall M, Hinman RS, Van der Esch M, Harmer AR, Spiers L, Kimp A, Dell'Isola A, Bennell KL. Exercise for osteoarthritis of the knee. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2024;12(12):CD004376.
19. Paluch AE, Bajpai S, Bassett DR Jr, et al. Daily steps and all-cause mortality: a meta-analysis of 15 international cohorts. Lancet Public Health. 2022;7(3):e219-e228.
20. Rodríguez-Gutiérrez E, Torres-Costoso A, del Pozo Cruz B, et al. Daily steps and all-cause mortality: an umbrella review and meta-analysis. Prev Med. 2024;185:108047.