

Amount and intensity of physical activity and risk of incident cancer in the UK Biobank

Ms. Alaina H. Shreves, M.S.¹⁻³; Dr. Scott R. Small, DPhil.^{1,2,4}; Dr. Rosemary Walmsley^{1,2}; DPhil;
Dr. Shing Chan, DPhil^{1,2}; Dr. Pedro F. Saint-Maurice, Ph.D.^{3,6}; Dr. Steven C. Moore, Ph.D.³; Dr.
Keren Papier, Ph.D.⁵; Dr. Kezia Gaitskell, D.Phil.⁵; Dr. Ruth C. Travis, DPhil⁵; Dr. Charles E.
Matthews, Ph.D.³; Dr. Aiden Doherty, Ph.D.^{1,2}

Affiliations:

¹ Nuffield Department of Population Health, University of Oxford, UK.

² Big Data Institute, Li Ka Shing Centre for Health Information and Discovery, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK.

³ Division of Cancer Epidemiology and Genetics, National Cancer Institute, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD, USA.

⁴ Nuffield Department of Orthopaedics, Rheumatology and Musculoskeletal Sciences, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK.

⁵ Cancer Epidemiology Unit, Nuffield Department of Population Health, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK.

⁶ Breast Cancer Unit, Champalimaud Foundation, Lisbon, Portugal.

Corresponding author:

Aiden Doherty, Ph.D.
Professor of Biomedical Informatics
University of Oxford
Nuffield Department of Population Health
Big Data Institute, Old Road Campus
Oxford, UK OX3 7LF
Email: aiden.doherty@ndph.ox.ac.uk

Manuscript word count: 2 989 words

28 **KEY POINTS**

29 **Question:** What insights can we gain about the relationships between total daily activity, step
30 counts, and activity intensity on cancer risk using accelerometer data?

31 **Findings:** In an analysis of 86 556 individuals from the UK Biobank who provided a week of
32 accelerometer-based activity data, higher levels of total physical activity, reducing sedentary time
33 in favour of light or moderate-vigorous intensity activities, and higher daily step counts were
34 associated with a lower risk of certain cancers.

35 **Meaning:** For less active adults, increasing activity time and accumulating more daily steps may
36 be practical interventions for lowering the risk of some cancers.

ABSTRACT

Importance: The influence of total daily and light intensity activity on cancer risk remains unclear, as most existing knowledge is drawn from studies relying on self-reported leisure-time activities of moderate-vigorous intensity.

Objective: To investigate associations between total daily activity, including step counts, and activity intensity on incident cancer risk.

Design, Setting, and Participants: Prospective analysis of cancer-free UK Biobank participants who wore accelerometers for 7-days (between 2013-2015), followed for cancer incidence through national registries (mean follow-up 5.8 years (SD=1.3)).

Exposures: Time-series machine learning models derived daily total activity (average acceleration), behaviour time, step counts, and peak 30-minute cadence from wrist-based accelerometer data.

Main Outcomes and Measures: A composite cancer outcome of 13 cancers previously associated with low physical activity (bladder, breast, colon, endometrial, oesophageal adenocarcinoma, gastric cardia, head and neck, kidney, liver, lung, myeloid leukaemia, myeloma, and rectum) based on previous studies of self-reported activity. Cox proportional hazards regression models estimated hazard ratios (HR) and 95% confidence intervals (CI), adjusted for age, sex, ethnicity, smoking, alcohol, education, Townsend Deprivation Index, and reproductive factors. Associations of reducing sedentary time in favour of increased light and moderate-vigorous activity were examined using compositional data analyses.

Results: Among 86 556 participants (mean age 62.0 years (SD=7.9) at accelerometer assessment), 2 669 cancers occurred. Higher total physical activity was associated with a lower overall cancer risk ($HR_{1SD}=0.85$, [95%CI 0.81-0.89]). On average, reallocating one hour/day from sedentary behaviour to moderate-vigorous physical activity was associated with a lower risk ($HR=0.92$, [0.89-0.95]), as was reallocating one hour/day to light-intensity physical activity ($HR=0.94$, [0.92-0.96]). Compared to individuals taking 5 000 daily steps, those who took 9 000 steps had an 18% lower risk of physical-activity-related cancer ($HR=0.82$, [0.74-0.90]). We found no significant association with peak 30-minute cadence after adjusting for total steps.

Conclusion and Relevance: Higher total daily physical activity and less sedentary time, in favour of both light and moderate-vigorous intensity activity, were associated with a lower risk of certain cancers. For less active adults, increasing step counts by 4 000 daily steps may be a practical public health intervention for lowering the risk of some cancers.

INTRODUCTION

Epidemiological data indicate that over half of all new cancers in high-income countries could be avoided by modifying lifestyle factors, including addressing physical inactivity.^{1,2} However, quantifying the dose-dependent benefits of specific physical activity (PA) behaviours for cancer prevention remains challenging. Many existing studies rely on self-report questionnaires, which emphasize time spent in leisure-time activities of a moderate-vigorous intensity and may have recall errors and reporting biases.^{3,4} Time use data studies suggest that most individuals spend a significant amount of time devoted to work and household activities, with the majority of physically active time obtained from light-intensity physical activity (LIPA).⁵⁻⁷ Global adherence to PA recommendations, which primarily emphasize moderate-vigorous physical activity (MVPA), is generally poor.⁸ Consequently, there is a growing interest in understanding whether more accurate measures of MVPA show protective effects for cancer risk and if interventions to increase LIPA could be a valuable disease prevention strategy.

Wearable accelerometer devices provide objective measures of all daily activities, including sedentary and physically active time accumulated at home, work, during transportation, and in leisure-time.⁹ Accelerometer data can also be used to investigate how reallocating time from sedentary behaviour to either LIPA or MVPA could influence disease risk. Existing accelerometer-measured activity studies in cancer have primarily focused on cancer mortality and,¹⁰⁻¹⁴ to a limited extent, breast cancer risk.^{15,16}

To address these gaps and challenges, we aimed to understand the relationship between total daily activity and intensity, step counts, and incident cancer risk using a composite outcome of 13 cancer

sites previously associated with low PA in studies of self-reported leisure time activity.¹⁷ As a secondary analysis, we assessed the risks for all 13 PA-related cancers individually and, as case numbers allowed, for other site-specific cancers. We also conducted compositional data analyses to explore the impact of reallocating time from sedentary behaviour to LIPA and MVPA. Finally, for potential translation to the clinical and public health settings, we examined the dose-response relationship between step count, stepping intensity, and incident cancer. Step counts are an easily understandable metric among the general population and are reported by many consumer wearable devices and fitness trackers.¹⁸

METHODS

Study population

The UK Biobank is a prospective study that enrolled 502 536 adults in England, Scotland, and Wales between 2006-2010.^{19,20} At baseline, participants completed a questionnaire, provided biological data, and consented for linkage to electronic medical records. From June 2013 to December 2015, participants with valid emails were invited to wear an Axivity AX3 wrist-worn accelerometer for 7 days.⁷

Accelerometer data processing

Accelerometer data were processed using methods described by Doherty (“accelerometer”, v7.1.0).²¹ Total physical activity (PA) was calculated as the mean vector magnitude per epoch to derive an overall mean per day acceleration in milligravity (mg) units. This metric reflects the activity duration and intensity and has been validated against doubly labelled water.²¹

Proportions of time spent across sleep, sedentary behaviour (SB), light-intensity physical activity (LIPA), and moderate-vigorous physical activity (MVPA) per day, were calculated using random forest and hidden Markov model machine-learning methods.⁷ Missing time due to non-wear was imputed by averaging the behaviour in the corresponding times across all valid days.⁷

Step counts were calculated using a hybrid self-supervised learning model trained on ground truth free-living stepping data (“stepcount”, v3.1.1).²² Daily step count was reported as the median number of daily steps during the seven-day measurement period. Peak 30-minute cadence was calculated as the mean of the 30 highest daily cadence values, averaged across all days.²³ Further processing details are described in eTable 1.

Outcome ascertainment

The main outcome was a composite cancer outcome of 13 sites previously found to be associated with low PA (bladder, breast, colon, endometrial, oesophageal adenocarcinoma, gastric cardia, head and neck, kidney, liver, lung, myeloid leukaemia, myeloma, and rectal).¹⁷ Cancers were obtained by the UK Biobank through the National Health Service (NHS) Digital for participants from England and Wales and the NHS Central Register for participants from Scotland (details in eTable 2).²⁴ In secondary analyses, we assessed the risks for cancers not previously related to PA with at least 100 cases (eTable 3).

Analytic sample

Raw accelerometer data from 103 614 participants were processed, excluding study withdrawals. We further excluded participants with device calibration or data reading errors (>1% of values

outside $\pm 8g$ range), inadequate wear time (<72 hours), unreasonably high average acceleration (>100 mg), and lacking steps data.^{Citation} Individuals with cancer (excluding C44: non-melanoma skin cancer) before accelerometer wear and missing healthcare linkages or covariate data, were also excluded. The final analysis included 86 556 participants (eFigure 1).

Statistical analysis

Cox proportional hazards regression models estimated adjusted Hazard ratios (HRs) with 95% confidence intervals for a one standard deviation (SD) increase in total activity and incident cancer. We also assessed risks across quintiles of physical activity.

Attained age was the underlying time scale. Individuals who were cancer-free during follow-up were censored at their date of death or at the end of the follow-up period (31 December 2020, England; 31 December 2016, Wales; 30 November 2021 Scotland).

Multivariable models adjusted for sex (male, female), ethnicity (White, non-White), smoking status (never, previous, current unknown cigarettes/day, current <15 cigarettes/day, current ≥ 15 cigarettes/day), alcohol consumption (never, <3 times per week, ≥ 3 times per week), education (school leaver, further education, higher education), and deprivation based on the Townsend Deprivation Index (TDI) (quintiles ranging from least deprived to most deprived, based on the 2011 UK census).²⁵ Female-specific models were further adjusted for oral contraception ever use (no, yes, missing), hormone replacement therapy ever use (no, yes, missing), menopausal status (no, yes, missing/unknown), and parity (0, 1-2, 3+, missing). Covariate data were provided by participants at the UK Biobank baseline assessment and were chosen a priori based on existing

studies (Details in eTable 1). No violations of the proportional hazards assumption were observed for the exposures using Schoenfeld residuals.

Compositional data analyses, using the "epicoda" package, modelled associations between the relative time spent in SB, LIPA, MVPA, and sleep and cancer risk.⁷ First, we calculated the estimated HR associated with reallocating time to one behaviour from all other proportionally (e.g., reallocating one hour/day to LIPA from all other behaviours proportionally).⁷ Second, we estimated HRs for specific pairwise reallocations of time between behaviours (e.g., reallocating one hour/day from SB to LIPA, holding sleep and MVPA constant). For all compositional analyses, the estimated hazard ratios were relative to the mean behaviour composition among included participants for a hypothetical average participant.

Finally, we used restricted cubic splines to assess the relationship between step count and cancer incidence using a reference point at the 10th percentile and knots positioned at the 5th, 50th, and 90th percentiles. We employed *P*-values for linear trends to estimate significance of the overall association. Multivariable models were further adjusted for daily step count.

We conducted several sensitivity analyses, including adjustment for body mass index (<25, 25-30, and 30+ kilograms/meters²) as measured at the assessment centre and dietary factors (fresh fruits and vegetable consumption (<3, 3-4.9, 5-7.9, or 8+ servings/day, missing); red and processed meat consumption (<1, 1-2.9, 3-4.9, or 5+ times/week, missing)). Two subgroup analyses were conducted, one among males and females, and the other among never smokers. To assess the potential influence of reverse causality, we repeated the analyses after excluding the first two years of follow-up. Statistical analyses were performed May-November 2023 using R (v4.2.2; R

Foundation for Statistical Computing). Two-sided P values of <0.05 was considered statistically significant.

Consent

Participants in the UK Biobank provided written informed consent. The study was approved by the National Information Governance Board for Health and Social Care and the National Health Service North West Multicentre Research Ethics Committee (06/MRE08/65). We adhered to the Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) reporting guidelines (eTable 4).²⁶

RESULTS

Among 86 556 participants, the mean age at accelerometer assessment was 62.0 years (SD=7.9). The majority were female (56%), identified as White (97%), and fell within the least deprived quintile of the Townsend Deprivation Index (50%) (Table 1). Throughout a mean follow-up of 5.8 years (SD=1.3; 504 557 person-years), 2 669 physical activity (PA)-related cancers accrued, with breast among females (n=995) being the most common (details in eTable 3).

Total daily PA and cancer incidence

Higher total PA was associated with a lower risk of PA-related cancer (hazard ratio (HR) per 1 SD (8.3 milligravity (mg) units), 0.85 [95% confidence interval (CI) 0.81-0.89]) in the multivariable-adjusted models (Figure 1; eTable 5). Similar associations were found in models assessing quintiles of total PA (eTable 6).

To explore which cancers contributed to this result, we also examined associations for individual cancer sites (Figure 1; eTable 5). With higher daily PA, we observed a significantly lower risk for seven types; gastric cardia (HR_{1SD}=0.39, [95% CI 0.22-0.70]), liver (HR_{1SD}=0.65, [0.47-0.90]), bladder (HR_{1SD}=0.69, [0.55-0.87]), lung (HR_{1SD}=0.75, [0.65-0.86]), endometrial (HR_{1SD}=0.78, [0.65-0.93]), colon (HR_{1SD}=0.84, [0.75-0.95]), and breast cancers (HR_{1SD}=0.91, [0.85-0.97]). There were also suggestive associations (HR < 0.9) for three cancers; oesophageal adenocarcinoma (HR_{1SD}=0.89, [0.68-1.16]), kidney (HR_{1SD}=0.86, [0.71-1.04]), and head and neck cancers (HR_{1SD}=0.84, [0.66-1.07]). Similar associations were found in models assessing quintiles of total PA (eTable 6).

In secondary analysis of non-PA-related cancer sites, we observed no protective association with prostate cancer, an inverse association with non-Hodgkin lymphoma (HR_{1SD}=0.85, [0.75-0.97]), and suggestive inverse associations for melanoma (HR_{1SD}=0.89, [0.79-1.01]) and pancreatic cancers (HR_{1SD}=0.86 [0.71-1.04]).

Compositional data analysis

First, we estimated the risks associated with each behaviour individually by reallocating time to one behaviour from all others proportionally for an average individual (eFigure 2). Reallocating one hour/day to LIPA from all other behaviours was associated with a 5% lower risk of PA-related cancer (HR=0.95, [0.93-0.97]) in multivariable-adjusted models. Reallocating one hour/day to MVPA from other behaviours was associated with a 6% lower cancer risk (HR=0.93, [0.90-0.97]). Reallocating one hour/day to sedentary behaviour (SB) was associated with a significantly higher

cancer risk (HR=1.03, [1.01-1.06]), but reallocating one hour/day to sleep was not (HR=1.01, [0.98-1.05]).

Next, we estimated the risks associated with specific pairwise reallocations of time between behaviours (Figure 2; eTable 7). For an average participant, reallocating one hour/day from SB to overall physical activity (LIPA + MVPA) was associated with a 7% lower risk (HR=0.93, [0.91-0.95]) in the multivariable-adjusted model. Reallocating one hour/day from SB to MVPA alone was associated with an 8% lower cancer risk (HR=0.92, [0.89-0.95]), and reallocating one hour/day from SB to LIPA was associated with a 6% lower risk (HR=0.94, [0.92-0.96]).

Step counts and cancer incidence

Higher daily step counts were associated with a lower risk of PA-related cancers (P for trend ≤ 0.001) after multivariable adjustments (eTable 8; Figure 3). Compared to individuals who took 5 000 daily steps (10th percentile, reference), individuals who took 9 000 daily steps had an 18% lower risk (HR=0.82, [0.74-0.90]), while those who took 13 000 steps had a 23% lower risk (HR=0.77, [0.69-0.86]). Individuals taking fewer than 5 000 steps had a higher risk.

Higher step intensity (peak 30-minute cadence) was associated with a lower risk of PA-related cancer prior to adjustment for total step counts (Table 2). Compared to individuals who took 70 steps/minute (10th percentile, reference), individuals who took 120 steps/minute had a lower cancer risk before (HR=0.72, [0.59-0.89]), but not after adjusting for total daily steps (HR=0.88, [0.69-1.14], P for trend=0.05).

Sensitivity analyses

Associations for total PA and cancer risk were slightly attenuated after adjusting for body mass index (BMI) in models per 1-SD of total activity (eTable 5), but the direction between the quintiles was consistent (eTable 6). BMI adjustment did not substantially alter results from the compositional analyses (eFigure 3; eTable 7) or the spline models for step count (eTable 8), nor did adjusting for dietary factors (eTables 5-8, eFigure 4).

Sex-specific models of 1-SD differences in total PA showed that patterns of association for cancer risk were similar among males and females for most cancer sites (eTables 9-10), as were findings from the compositional data analysis (eFigure 5). Protective associations were observed for step count and PA-related cancer risk in sex-specific models (eTable 11; Figure 3). Analyses conducted among never smokers were similar to our primary analysis (eTable 12; eFigure 6). After removing the first two years of follow-up, higher activity quintiles demonstrated protective associations for cancer risk, but the impact was more attenuated in lower activity categories (eTable 13; eFigure 7).

DISCUSSION

In this prospective analysis, higher total daily physical activity (PA) measured by accelerometers was associated with a composite of 13 cancers previously shown to be associated with PA in studies of self-reported leisure time activity.¹⁷ We also observed lower risks for 7 of these 13 cancers. Additionally, we found protective associations for minimizing sedentary time in favour of engaging in light intensity physical activity (LIPA) or moderate-vigorous physical activity (MVPA). Compared with individuals who took 5 000 steps per day, those who took 9 000 daily steps had an 18% lower risk of incident PA-related cancer. A weaker suggestive association with

higher step intensity was observed, but results were not significant after adjusting for total step count.

Results from our compositional data analysis are novel and suggest that less sedentary time in favour of LIPA or MVPA was associated with a lower risk of certain cancers. These findings align with previous studies indicating that sedentary behaviour may be associated with chronic disease risk factors and cancer development and progression.^{27–29} Notably, our finding that any intensity of PA was beneficial contrasts with findings from cardiovascular disease research, where intensity plays a more pivotal role in determining health benefits.^{7,27} A study by Stamatakis found that short bursts of vigorous intensity PA were associated with a lower risk of PA-related cancer among non-exercising adults.³⁰ Our findings suggests that efforts to decrease sedentary behaviour in favour of engaging in LIPA or MVPA activities, such as allocating more time to casual walking, household chores, home repairs, and gardening could also support cancer prevention efforts and might be feasible to incorporate into everyday routines. Further, our study was not limited to non-exercisers, which enhances the applicability of our findings.

Walking, a highly accessible and popular form of PA, is often considered an ideal exercise intervention due to its simplicity to track and minimal adverse effects.³¹ Our findings show that higher steps counts were associated with a lower risk for PA-related cancers. In terms of step intensity, we found a weaker but non-significant association after adjusting for total step count. These findings align with our compositional model results for total PA, which suggested that LIPA and MVPA were beneficial for cancer risk. Together, this suggests that walking at any pace may provide health benefits with respect to cancer incidence.

Our study adds new information to a limited literature base on the association between total daily PA and incident cancers.¹¹ Previous research in the UK Biobank cohort reported protective associations for self-reported PA and cancer, and we extend these findings for many site-specific cancers.^{28,32} Our findings align with other studies using accelerometer data that found physical activity may play a role in the prevention of PA-related cancers among older women³³ and for incident breast cancer.^{15,16} In addition to finding lower risk for 7 of the 13 PA-related cancers identified by Moore and colleagues,¹⁷ we also observed a protective association between total PA and non-Hodgkin lymphoma and suggestive associations for melanoma and pancreatic cancers. This suggests potential areas for future research, especially in samples with larger case counts.

Several hypothesized mechanisms linking higher PA with a lower cancer risk have been proposed. These mechanisms encompass hormonal changes, insulin levels, inflammation, immune function, and oxidative stress.²⁹ Some hypotheses suggest that PA may reduce cancer risk by influencing body weight, but we observed no substantial changes in model estimates after adjusting for body mass index, although measurements here were obtained several years before the accelerometer measurements, potentially introducing imprecise estimates over time.

Strengths and limitations

Our study has several strengths, including the use of accelerometer devices in a large and prospective cohort study, which reduces susceptibility to recall and reporting biases compared to most previous studies.^{3,4} Accelerometers captured a wide range of daily behaviours, including both sedentary and physically active activities, as well as step count. Further, we processed the accelerometer data using open-source methods.³⁴ Our sample included a wide age-range (43-78

years at accelerometer wear) of participants, making the cohort mature for analysing more common adult-onset cancers.^{19,35} Our results add to the limited literature on how physical activity impacts cancer risk across different cancer sites. We also employed compositional data analyses to model associations for 24-hour behaviours, rather than just individual behaviour risks. In addition, we controlled for key cancer risk factors and conducted extensive sensitivity analysis to examine major threats to the validity of our findings.

This study also had several limitations. The UK Biobank cohort includes middle to early late-aged individuals, potentially leading to underrepresentation of cancers with onset at more advanced ages. Secondly, the study is observational, and we cannot exclude the possibility of unmeasured and residual confounding. Reverse causation is also a possibility, as certain cancers may have been undiagnosed at the time of accelerometer wear and could have reduced daily PA. Nonetheless after removing the first two years of follow-up, we observed only minor attenuations. Future UK Biobank studies with additional follow-up will be required to investigate associations for less common cancers. Furthermore, we had accelerometer data from one period during middle-age; thus, we are also unable to draw conclusions about PA earlier in the life in relation to cancer risk. Finally, the study population drawn from the UK Biobank may not be representative of wider populations.³⁶ However, we believe that the etiological findings are still likely to have broader applicability.³⁷

Conclusion

Results from this prospective study suggest protective associations between engaging in higher levels of overall daily PA, reducing sedentary time in favour of engaging LIPA or MVPA, and

314 increasing daily step counts and cancer risk. These findings underscore the potential health benefits
315 of incorporating lower intensity activities into daily life during middle age, alongside promoting
316 higher intensity activities in public health initiatives focused on cancer prevention.

317 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

318 **Author Contributions:**

319 Shreves had full access to all the data in the study and takes responsibility for the integrity of the
320 data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

321 Concept and design: Shreves, Travis, Matthews, Doherty.

322 Acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data: Shreves, Small, Walmsley, Saint-Maurice, Papier,
323 Travis, Matthews, Doherty.

324 Drafting of the manuscript: Shreves, Travis, Matthews, Doherty.

325 Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content: All authors.

326 Statistical analysis: Shreves.

327 Obtained funding: Shreves, Travis, Matthews, Doherty.

328 Administrative, technical, or material support: Shreves, Chan, Walmsley, Doherty.

329 Supervision: Doherty, Matthews, Travis.

330 **Conflict of Interest Disclosures:**

331 Shreves, Moore, Gaitskell, Travis, and Matthews declare no competing interests.

Doherty is supported by Novo Nordisk. Doherty accepted consulting fees from the University of Wisconsin (NIH R01 grant) and Harvard University (NIH R01 grant). Doherty received support for presentations at the International Conference on Soft Computing in Data Science 2021, Korean Society of Cardiology 2020, and Oxford International Study Abroad programme 2023. Doherty received support to attend the 2023 CTSU Joint Annual Collaborators' Meeting, London, 2023 Big Model AI for Drug Design workshop, Abu Dhabi, 2023 Festival of Genomics, London, 2022 Industry Symposium on Digital Biomarkers, EMBL-EBI, Cambridge, 2020 ELIXIR Bioinformatics Industry Forum, London, 2020 3rd NYU Biomedical and Biosystems Conference, Abu Dhabi, 2020 Academy of Medical Sciences, UK-Japan Symposium on Data-Driven Health. Doherty is a member of the 2021 Scientific advisory board EU IMI IDEA-FAST. Doherty received a donation from SwissRe to purchase equipment for accelerometer data collection in the China Kadoorie Biobank.

Doherty, Walmsley, and Chan have released accelerometer analysis software under an academic use license that could result in commercial entities paying license fees for their use.

Funding/Support:

Shreves, Saint-Maurice, Moore, and Matthews are supported by the National Institutes of Health's Intramural Research Program. Shreves is also supported by the National Institutes of Health's Oxford Cambridge Scholars Program. Walmsley is supported by HDR UK, an initiative funded by UK Research and Innovation, Department of Health and Social Care (England) and the devolved administrations. Papier is supported by Cancer Research UK (grant number C16077/A29186). Chan is supported Novo Nordisk. Doherty and Small are supported by the

353 Wellcome Trust (223100/Z/21/Z). Doherty is also supported by Novo Nordisk, Swiss Re, and the
 354 British Heart Foundation Centre of Research Excellence (grant number RE/18/3/34214). Travis is
 355 supported by Cancer Research UK (grant number C8221/A29017).

356 **Role of the Funder/Sponsor:**

357 The funders/sponsors had no role in the design of this study, the analysis and interpretation of the
 358 results, or drafting of the manuscript.

REFERENCES

1. Sung H, Ferlay J, Siegel R, et al. Global Cancer Statistics 2020: GLOBOCAN Estimates of Incidence and Mortality Worldwide for 36 Cancers in 185 Countries. *CA: A Cancer Journal for Clinicians*. 2021;71(3):209-249. doi:<https://doi.org/10.3322/caac.21660>
2. Islami F, Goding Sauer A, Miller KD, et al. Proportion and number of cancer cases and deaths attributable to potentially modifiable risk factors in the United States. *CA Cancer J Clin*. 2018;68(1):31-54. doi:10.3322/caac.21440
3. Shephard RJ. Limits to the measurement of habitual physical activity by questionnaires. *Br J Sports Med*. 2003;37(3):197-206; discussion 206. doi:10.1136/bjsm.37.3.197
4. Sallis JF, Saelens BE. Assessment of physical activity by self-report: status, limitations, and future directions. *Res Q Exerc Sport*. 2000;71 Suppl 2:1-14. doi:10.1080/02701367.2000.11082780
5. Tudor-Locke C, Leonardi C, Johnson WD, Katzmarzyk PT. Time Spent in Physical Activity and Sedentary Behaviors on the Working Day: The American Time Use Survey. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*. 2011;53(12):1382. doi:10.1097/JOM.0b013e31823c1402
6. Matthews CE, Berrigan D, Fischer B, et al. Use of previous-day recalls of physical activity and sedentary behavior in epidemiologic studies: results from four instruments. *BMC Public Health*. 2019;19(Suppl 2):478. doi:10.1186/s12889-019-6763-8
7. Walmsley R, Chan S, Smith-Byrne K, et al. Reallocation of time between device-measured movement behaviours and risk of incident cardiovascular disease. *Br J Sports Med*. Published online September 6, 2021. doi:10.1136/bjsports-2021-104050
8. Guthold R, Stevens GA, Riley LM, Bull FC. Worldwide trends in insufficient physical activity from 2001 to 2016: a pooled analysis of 358 population-based surveys with 1·9 million participants. *The Lancet Global Health*. 2018;6(10):e1077-e1086. doi:10.1016/S2214-109X(18)30357-7
9. Esliger DW, Tremblay MS. Physical activity and inactivity profiling: the next generation. *Can J Public Health*. 2007;98 Suppl 2:S195-207.
10. Dohrn IM, Kwak L, Oja P, Sjöström M, Hagströmer M. Replacing sedentary time with physical activity: a 15-year follow-up of mortality in a national cohort. *Clin Epidemiol*. 2018;10:179-186. doi:10.2147/CLEP.S151613
11. del Pozo Cruz B, Ahmadi MN, Lee IM, Stamatakis E. Prospective Associations of Daily Step Counts and Intensity With Cancer and Cardiovascular Disease Incidence and Mortality and All-Cause Mortality. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2022;182(11):1139-1148. doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2022.4000
12. Gilchrist SC, Howard VJ, Akinyemiju T, et al. Association of Sedentary Behavior With Cancer Mortality in Middle-aged and Older US Adults. *JAMA Oncology*. 2020;6(8):1210-1217. doi:10.1001/jamaoncol.2020.2045

13. Ensrud KE, Blackwell TL, Cauley JA, et al. Objective Measures of Activity Level and Mortality in Older Men. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*. 2014;62(11):2079-2087. doi:10.1111/jgs.13101
14. LaMonte MJ, Buchner DM, Rillamas-Sun E, et al. Accelerometer-Measured Physical Activity and Mortality in Women Aged 63 to 99. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*. 2018;66(5):886-894. doi:10.1111/jgs.15201
15. Guo W, Fensom GK, Reeves GK, Key TJ. Physical activity and breast cancer risk: results from the UK Biobank prospective cohort. *Br J Cancer*. 2020;122(5):726-732. doi:10.1038/s41416-019-0700-6
16. Hyde ET, LaCroix AZ, Evenson KR, et al. Accelerometer-measured physical activity and postmenopausal breast cancer incidence in the Women's Health Accelerometry Collaboration. *Cancer*. 2023;129(10):1579-1590. doi:10.1002/cncr.34699
17. Moore SC, Lee IM, Weiderpass E, et al. Association of Leisure-Time Physical Activity With Risk of 26 Types of Cancer in 1.44 Million Adults. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2016;176(6):816-825. doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2016.1548
18. Bassett DR, Toth LP, LaMunion SR, Crouter SE. Step Counting: A Review of Measurement Considerations and Health-Related Applications. *Sports Med*. 2017;47(7):1303-1315. doi:10.1007/s40279-016-0663-1
19. UK Biobank Limited. UK Biobank Enable your research. UK Biobank. Published June 24, 2021. Accessed August 31, 2022. <https://www.ukbiobank.ac.uk/enable-your-research>
20. Sudlow C, Gallacher J, Allen N, et al. UK Biobank: An Open Access Resource for Identifying the Causes of a Wide Range of Complex Diseases of Middle and Old Age. *PLOS Medicine*. 2015;12(3):e1001779. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1001779
21. Doherty A, Jackson D, Hammerla N, et al. Large Scale Population Assessment of Physical Activity Using Wrist Worn Accelerometers: The UK Biobank Study. *PLOS ONE*. 2017;12(2):e0169649. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0169649
22. Small SR, Chan S, Walmsley R, et al. Development and Validation of a Machine Learning Wrist-worn Step Detection Algorithm with Deployment in the UK Biobank. Published online February 22, 2023;2023.02.20.23285750. doi:10.1101/2023.02.20.23285750
23. Saint-Maurice PF, Troiano RP, Bassett DR Jr, et al. Association of Daily Step Count and Step Intensity With Mortality Among US Adults. *JAMA*. 2020;323(12):1151-1160. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.1382
24. Conroy MC, Lacey B, Bešević J, et al. UK Biobank: a globally important resource for cancer research. *Br J Cancer*. 2023;128(4):519-527. doi:10.1038/s41416-022-02053-5
25. 2011 UK Townsend Deprivation Scores - UK Data Service CKAN. Accessed June 28, 2023. <https://statistics.ukdataservice.ac.uk/dataset/2011-uk-townsend-deprivation-scores>
26. von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, et al. Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies. *BMJ*. 2007;335(7624):806-808. doi:10.1136/bmj.39335.541782.AD

27. Cao Z, Xu C, Zhang P, Wang Y. Associations of sedentary time and physical activity with adverse health conditions: Outcome-wide analyses using isotemporal substitution model. *eClinicalMedicine*. 2022;48:101424. doi:10.1016/j.eclinm.2022.101424
28. Morris JS, Bradbury KE, Cross AJ, Gunter MJ, Murphy N. Physical activity, sedentary behaviour and colorectal cancer risk in the UK Biobank. *Br J Cancer*. 2018;118(6):920-929. doi:10.1038/bjc.2017.496
29. Friedenreich CM, Ryder-Burbidge C, McNeil J. Physical activity, obesity and sedentary behavior in cancer etiology: epidemiologic evidence and biologic mechanisms. *Molecular Oncology*. 2021;15(3):790-800. doi:10.1002/1878-0261.12772
30. Stamatakis E, Ahmadi MN, Friedenreich CM, et al. Vigorous Intermittent Lifestyle Physical Activity and Cancer Incidence Among Nonexercising Adults: The UK Biobank Accelerometry Study. *JAMA Oncology*. 2023;9(9):1255-1259. doi:10.1001/jamaoncol.2023.1830
31. Morris JN, Hardman AE. Walking to Health. *Sports Med*. 1997;23(5):306-332. doi:10.2165/00007256-199723050-00004
32. Ding D, Buskirk JV, Nguyen B, et al. Physical activity, diet quality and all-cause cardiovascular disease and cancer mortality: a prospective study of 346 627 UK Biobank participants. *Br J Sports Med*. 2022;56(20):1148-1156. doi:10.1136/bjsports-2021-105195
33. Parada H, McDonald E, Bellettiere J, Evenson KR, LaMonte MJ, LaCroix AZ. Associations of accelerometer-measured physical activity and physical activity-related cancer incidence in older women: results from the WHI OPACH Study. *Br J Cancer*. 2020;122(9):1409-1416. doi:10.1038/s41416-020-0753-6
34. Bassett DR, Troiano RP, Mcclain JJ, Wolff DL. Accelerometer-based Physical Activity: Total Volume per Day and Standardized Measures. *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise*. 2015;47(4):833-838. doi:10.1249/MSS.0000000000000468
35. UK Biobank Limited. *UK Biobank Malignant Cancer Summary Report*.; 2022. Accessed December 9, 2021. <https://biobank.ndph.ox.ac.uk/~bbdatan/CancerSummaryReport.html>
36. Fry A, Littlejohns TJ, Sudlow C, et al. Comparison of Sociodemographic and Health-Related Characteristics of UK Biobank Participants With Those of the General Population. *Am J Epidemiol*. 2017;186(9):1026-1034. doi:10.1093/aje/kwx246
37. Batty GD, Gale CR, Kivimäki M, Deary IJ, Bell S. Comparison of risk factor associations in UK Biobank against representative, general population based studies with conventional response rates: prospective cohort study and individual participant meta-analysis. *BMJ*. 2020;368:m131. doi:10.1136/bmj.m131

TABLES AND FIGURES

Table 1. Overall physical activity metrics by demographic characteristic in 86 556 UK Biobank participants.

Figure 1. Association of mean accelerometer-measured physical activity with risk of incident cancers in 86 556 UK Biobank participants.

Figure 2. Hazard ratios for balance between movement behaviours and incident physical-activity-related cancer risk associated in 86 556 UK Biobank participants.

Figure 3. Dose-response associations between daily step count and physical-activity-related cancer risk in 86 556 UK Biobank participants.

Table 2. Adjusted hazard ratios for peak 30-minute cadence and physical activity-related cancer risk in 86 556 UK Biobank participants.

Table 1. Overall physical activity metrics by demographic characteristic in 86 556 UK Biobank participants.


Characteristic		No. (%)	Overall acceleration (mg)	Daily step count Median (IQR)	Peak 30 min cadence (steps/min) Median (IQR)
Overall		86 556 (100)	27.3 (22.7-32.7)	9 073 (6 834-11 686)	91 (81-101)
Sex	Female	48 478 (56)	27.8 (23.2-33.1)	9 004 (6 812-11 560)	92 (82-102)
	Male	38 078 (44)	26.7 (22.0-32.3)	9 152 (6 870-11 878)	90 (81-100)
Age (years)	40-49	7 693 (9)	30.5 (25.6-36.7)	9 393 (7 126-12 070)	95 (85-105)
	50-59	25 659 (30)	29.1 (24.4-34.8)	9 204 (6 996-11 913)	93 (84-103)
	60-69	38 214 (44)	26.8 (22.3-31.9)	9 166 (6 922-11 772)	91 (81-100)
	70-79	14 990 (17)	24.3 (20.2-28.9)	8 430 (6 255-10 868)	87 (77-96)
Ethnicity	Non-white	2 726 (3)	28.5 (23.7-34.1)	8 720 (6 508-11 376)	91 (80-102)
	White	83 830 (97)	27.3 (22.6-32.7)	9 084 (6 845-11 696)	91 (81-101)
Quintiles of Townsend Deprivation Index	Least Deprived	43 574 (50)	27.4 (22.8-32.7)	9 080 (6 922-11 633)	90 (81-100)
	2nd Quintile	19 542 (23)	27.3 (22.6-32.7)	9 078 (6 817-11 656)	91 (81-101)
	3rd Quintile	12 151 (14)	27.4 (22.7-32.9)	9 164 (6 816-11 862)	93 (82-103)
	4th Quintile	8 381 (10)	27.0 (22.1-32.7)	8 970 (6 586-11 802)	93 (82-103)
	Most Deprived	2 908 (3)	26.6 (21.6-32.4)	8 812 (6 293-11 664)	94 (81-104)
Education qualifications	School leaver	19 817 (23)	26.8 (22.0-32.2)	8 621 (6 428-11 229)	89 (79-99)
	Further education	28 993 (33)	27.3 (22.6-32.7)	8 883 (6 644-11 543)	90 (80-100)
	Higher education	37 746 (44)	27.6 (23.0-33.0)	9 434 (7 208-12 009)	93 (84-103)
Smoking status	Never	49 736 (57)	27.6 (23.0-33.1)	9 183 (6 980-11 762)	92 (82-102)
	Previous smoker	30 805 (36)	27.0 (22.4-32.4)	8 984 (6 720-11 671)	90 (80-100)
	Current, unknown cig/day	2 351 (3)	27.0 (22.3-32.2)	9 037 (6 766-11 730)	90 (80-100)
	Current, < 15 cig/day	899 (1)	25.6 (21.0-31.1)	8 160 (5 989-10 690)	86 (75-97)
	Current, ≥ 15 cig/day	2 765 (3)	25.3 (20.5-30.8)	8 108 (5 808-10 818)	87 (75-96)
Alcohol consumption	Never	4 859 (6)	26.4 (21.5-32.1)	8 530 (6 120-11 313)	89 (78-100)
	< 3 times/week	39 335 (45)	27.1 (22.4-32.5)	8 762 (6 554-11 379)	90 (80-100)
	3+ times/week	42 362 (49)	27.6 (23.0-33.0)	9 411 (7 186-12 000)	92 (83-102)
Body mass index, kg/m ²	≤ 24.9 kg/m ²	33 234 (38)	29.4 (24.6-35.2)	9 754 (7 548-12 401)	95 (85-105)
	25-29.9 kg/m ²	36 206 (42)	26.9 (22.5-32.1)	9 094 (6 916-11 653)	91 (81-100)
	30+ kg/m ²	17 116 (20)	24.2 (20.0-29.1)	7 610 (5 564-10 060)	85 (74-95)
Fruit and vegetable consumption	< 3 servings/day	3 683 (4)	25.6 (20.7-30.8)	8 187 (5 930-10 973)	88 (78-99)
	3-4.9 servings/day	14 167 (16)	26.7 (22.0-32.0)	8 781 (6 580-11 342)	90 (80-100)

Characteristic		No. (%)	Overall acceleration (mg)	Daily step count Median (IQR)	Peak 30 min cadence (steps/min) Median (IQR)
	5-7.9 servings/day	36 127 (42)	27.3 (22.7-32.7)	9 117 (6 918-11 682)	91 (82-101)
	8+ servings/day	31 857 (37)	27.9 (23.2-33.3)	9 232 (6 981-11 922)	92 (82-101)
	Missing	722 (1)	26.4 (21.2-32.6)	8 914 (6 127-11 825)	90 (79-100)
Red and processed meat consumption	Less than 1 time/week	6 802 (8)	29.3 (24.3-35.1)	9 674 (7 256-12 397)	96 (85-106)
	1-2.9 times/week	33 047 (38)	27.5 (22.9-32.9)	9 091 (6 906-11 682)	92 (82-102)
	3-4.9 times/week	25 399 (29)	27.1 (22.5-32.5)	8 992 (6 768-11 582)	91 (81-100)
	5+ times/week	20 927 (24)	26.6 (21.9-32.0)	8 964 (6 676-11 567)	90 (80-99)
	Missing	381 (0)	28.2 (21.5-34.1)	9 158 (6 190-12 077)	91 (79-101)
Self-reported usual walking pace	Brisk pace	41 087 (47)	29.0 (24.3-34.6)	9 630 (7 422-12 250)	94 (85-104)
	Steady average pace	41 381 (48)	26.2 (21.8-31.2)	8 737 (6 575-11 294)	89 (80-99)
	Slow pace	3 907 (5)	21.9 (17.6-26.8)	6 352 (4 150-8 870)	77 (64-89)
	None of the above	76 (0)	23.5 (18.5-29.3)	5 527 (2 945-9 778)	78 (54-87)
	Missing	105 (0)	18.9 (13.9-23.5)	3 397 (1 102-5 684)	56 (26-72)
Self-rated overall health	Excellent	19 332 (22)	29.2 (24.5-35.0)	9 765 (7 566-12 386)	95 (85-104)
	Good	51 914 (60)	27.4 (22.8-32.6)	9 140 (6 946-11 727)	91 (82-101)
	Fair	13 079 (15)	25.0 (20.6-30.2)	8 100 (5 885-10 650)	87 (76-97)
	Poor	2 089 (2)	22.1 (17.6-27.2)	6 378 (4 064-8 983)	78 (64-90)
	Missing	142 (0)	23.3 (19.6-28.4)	7 928 (5 528-10 270)	85 (75-95)
Wear season	Spring	19 875 (23)	27.7 (23.0-33.2)	9 207 (6 946-11 880)	92 (82-102)
	Summer	22 946 (27)	27.9 (23.1-33.4)	9 514 (7 208-12 186)	91 (82-101)
	Autumn	25 518 (29)	27.2 (22.7-32.6)	8 966 (6 794-11 522)	91 (81-101)
	Winter	18 217 (21)	26.3 (21.9-31.5)	8 518 (6 398-11 058)	90 (80-101)
Females^a		48 478 (100)	27.8 (23.2-33.1)	9 004 (6 812-11 560)	92 (82-102)
Number of live births	0	10 373 (21)	27.9 (23.3-33.4)	9 060 (6 792-11 700)	94 (83-105)
	1-2	27 689 (57)	27.8 (23.3-33.1)	8 964 (6 796-11 490)	92 (82-101)
	3+	10 403 (21)	27.7 (23.1-32.9)	9 080 (6 863-11 606)	91 (81-101)
	Missing	13 (0)	29.6 (27.4-35.4)	9 048 (8 602-12 202)	91 (87-101)
Had menopause	No	13 166 (27)	30.0 (25.2-35.6)	9 304 (7 094-11 913)	95 (85-105)
	Yes	28 028 (58)	27.1 (22.7-32.1)	9 022 (6 838-11 550)	91 (81-101)
	Missing/Not sure	7 284 (15)	26.8 (22.3-31.9)	8 406 (6 290-10 923)	89 (79-100)
Hormone-replacement therapy ever use	No	31 109 (64)	28.5 (24.0-34.0)	9 215 (7 016-11 805)	94 (83-103)
	Yes	17 283 (36)	26.4 (22.1-31.3)	8 612 (6 473-11 102)	89 (79-99)

Characteristic		No. (%)	Overall acceleration (mg)	Daily step count Median (IQR)	Peak 30 min cadence (steps/min) Median (IQR)
	Missing	86 (0)	26.2 (21.6-32.1)	7 854 (6 521-10 788)	87 (79-100)
Oral contraceptive pill ever use	No	7 027 (14)	26.9 (22.4-32.3)	8 816 (6 685-11 295)	91 (80-101)
	Yes	41 381 (85)	27.9 (23.4-33.2)	9 037 (6 835-11 591)	92 (82-102)
	Missing	70 (0)	29.2 (23.8-33.0)	8 848 (6 806-11 994)	90 (83-104)


Activity metrics reported as median (interquartile range (IQR)). TDI = Townsend Deprivation Index, mg = milligravity, min=minute, cig = cigarettes, kg/m² = kilograms/meters². ^aAmong female participants, N=48 478.

Figure 1. Association of mean accelerometer-measured physical activity with risk of incident cancers in 86 556 UK Biobank participants.




The standard deviation (SD) of total physical activity (PA) was 8.3 milligravity unit in the main analytical sample. Hazard ratios (HR) and 95% confidence intervals (CI) were estimated using a Cox proportional hazards regression model. Cases are incident cancers. PA-related cancer was defined as 13 site specific cancers (oesophageal adenocarcinoma, liver, lung, kidney, gastric cardia, endometrial, myeloid leukaemia, myeloma, colon, head and neck, rectal, bladder, and breast). Models used age as the underlying time variable and were adjusted for sex, ethnicity, smoking status, alcohol consumption, deprivation, and education. For breast cancer and endometrial cancer, models were adjusted for use of oral contraception, use of hormone replacement therapy, menopausal status, and parity. Participants were limited to males for prostate cancer (N=38 078), females for breast cancer (N=48 478), and females without a history of hysterectomy for endometrial cancer (N=41 010).

Figure 2. Hazard ratios for balance between movement behaviours and incident physical-activity-related cancer risk associated in 86 556 UK Biobank participants.



Hazard ratios are relative to the mean behaviour composition (8.1 hours/day sleep, 10.5 hours/day sedentary behaviour (SB), 4.9 hours/day light intensity physical activity behaviours (LIPA), 0.46 hours/day (27.4 minutes/day) moderate-vigorous intensity physical activity behaviours (MVPA)). Physical-activity-related cancer was defined as 13 site specific cancers (oesophageal adenocarcinoma, liver, lung, kidney, gastric cardia, endometrial, myeloid leukaemia, myeloma, colon, head and neck, rectal, bladder, and breast). Models used attained age as the underlying time variable and were adjusted for sex, ethnicity, smoking status, alcohol consumption, deprivation, and education. Models are based on 2 669 events in 86 556 participants. hr = hour.

Figure 3. Dose-response associations between daily step count and physical-activity-related cancer risk in 86 556 UK Biobank participants.



Estimated hazard ratios and 95% confidence intervals were computed using a Cox proportional hazards regression model with restricted cubic spline functions. Observations were trimmed at the 1% and 99% of the distribution and 3 knots were placed at the 5th, 50th, and 95th percentile for the exposures. The ~10th percentile was set as the referent group (5 000 steps). Physical-activity-related cancer was defined as 13 site specific cancers (oesophageal adenocarcinoma, liver, lung, kidney, gastric cardia, endometrial, myeloid leukaemia, myeloma, colon, head and neck, rectal, bladder, and breast). The male model was limited to 38 078 participants and the female model was limited to 48 478 participants. Models used attained age as the underlying time variable and were adjusted for ethnicity, smoking status, alcohol consumption, deprivation, and education. The overall model (A) was further adjusted for sex and the female model (C) was further adjusted for use of oral contraception, use of hormone replacement therapy, menopausal status, and parity. The shading on the lower axis represents sample clustering of daily step counts.

Table 2. Adjusted hazard ratios for peak 30-minute cadence and physical activity-related cancer risk in 86 556 UK Biobank participants.

	Model 1	Model 2
Peak 30-minute cadence (steps/minute)	HR (95% CI)	HR (95% CI)
60	1.14 (1.02 - 1.27)	1.10 (0.98 - 1.23)
70 (REF, ~10 th percentile)	1.00 (1.00 - 1.00)	1.00 (1.00 - 1.00)
80	0.88 (0.80 - 0.96)	0.91 (0.83 - 1.00)
90	0.82 (0.73 - 0.92)	0.89 (0.78 - 1.01)
100	0.77 (0.69 - 0.87)	0.88 (0.76 - 1.02)
110	0.74 (0.65 - 0.84)	0.87 (0.73 - 1.04)
120 (~95 th percentile)	0.72 (0.59 - 0.89)	0.88 (0.69 - 1.14)
<i>P</i> value for linear trend	<0.001	0.05

Estimated hazard ratios (HRs) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) were computed using a Cox proportional hazards regression model with restricted cubic spline functions. Observations were trimmed at the 1% and 99% of the distribution and 3 knots were placed at the 5th, 50th, and 95th percentile for the exposures. The ~10th percentile was set as the referent (REF) group (70 steps per minute). Models used age as the underlying time variable and were adjusted for sex, ethnicity, smoking status, alcohol consumption, deprivation, and education. Model 2: Model 1 + median daily step count. Physical activity-related cancer was defined as 13 site specific cancers (oesophageal adenocarcinoma, liver, lung, kidney, gastric cardia, endometrial, myeloid leukaemia, myeloma, colon, head and neck, rectal, bladder, and breast).

eTABLES

eTable 1: Definition of variables from the UK Biobank data.

eTable 2. Coding and number of site-specific cancer incident cases in UK Biobank participants.

eTable 3. Tabulation of number of incident primary events per cancer site in 86 556 UK Biobank participants.

eTable 4. Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement.

eTable 5. Sequential model adjustments for total physical activity (milligravity units) and risk of incident cancer in 86 556 UK Biobank participants.

eTable 6. Sequential model adjustments for quintile of total physical activity (milligravity units), quintile of median daily step count, and risk of incident physical-activity-related cancer in 86 556 UK Biobank participants.

eTable 7. Changes in behaviour time and physical-activity-related cancer risk in 86 556 UK Biobank participants.

eTable 8. Sequential model adjustments for median daily step count and physical-activity-related cancer risk in 86 556 UK Biobank participants.

eTable 9. Sequential model adjustments for total physical activity (milligravity units) and risk of incident cancer in the UK Biobank among 38 078 male UK Biobank participants.

eTable 10. Sequential model adjustments for total physical activity (milligravity units) and risk of incident cancer in the UK Biobank among 48 478 female UK Biobank participants.

eTable 11. Sex-specific adjusted hazard ratios for median daily step count and physical-activity-related cancer risk in 38 078 male UK Biobank participants and 48 478 female UK Biobank participants.

eTable 12. Models for quintile of total physical activity (milligravity units), quintile of median daily step count, and risk of incident physical-activity-related cancer in UK Biobank participants who were never smokers (N=49 736).

eTable 13. Models for quintile of total physical activity (milligravity units), quintile of median daily step count, and risk of incident physical-activity-related cancer in 86 556 UK Biobank participants before and after removing the first two years of follow-up (N=83 435).

eFIGURES

eFigure 1. Participant flow diagram for the analysis of daily physical activity and step count measured by accelerometers in UK Biobank participants.

eFigure 2. Hazard Ratios reallocating time to a given movement behaviour from all other behaviours proportionally and incident physical-activity-related cancer in 86 556 UK Biobank participants.

eFigure 3. Hazard ratios for all behaviour pairs and incident physical-activity-related cancer risk for estimated using a multivariable-adjusted Cox regression model in 86 556 UK Biobank participants before (blue) and after adjusting for body mass index as a sensitivity analysis.

eFigure 4. Hazard ratios for all behaviour pairs and incident physical-activity-related cancer risk for estimated using a multivariable-adjusted Cox regression model in 86 556 UK Biobank participants before (blue) and after adjusting for dietary factors as a sensitivity analysis.

eFigure 5. Hazard ratios for all behaviour pairs and incident physical-activity-related cancer risk for estimated using a multivariable-adjusted Cox regression model among 48 478 female participants (blue) and 38 078 male participants (red).

eFigure 6. Hazard ratios for all behaviour pairs and incident physical-activity-related cancer risk for estimated using a multivariable-adjusted Cox regression model in 86 556 UK Biobank participants before (blue) and after restricting to never smokers (red, N=49 736).

eFigure 7. Hazard ratios for all behaviour pairs and incident physical-activity-related cancer risk for estimated using a multivariable-adjusted Cox regression model in 86 556 UK Biobank participants before (blue) and after removing the first two years of follow-up (red, N=83 435).

eTable 1. Definition of variables from the UK Biobank data.

Characteristic	Source	Notes	UK Biobank field	Coding Notes
OUTCOME				
Age at first cancer event	Cancer Registry, Death Registry	First ICD-10 code in cancer registry or death registry data. Full list of ICD-10 and ICD-O-3 codes are described in detail in eTable 1.	Derived from 100092	
Age at loss-to-follow up	Death Registry		Derived from 100093	
EXPOSURE				
Total physical activity	Accelerometry	Derived using the Biobank Accelerometer Analysis Tool, “accelerometer”, version 7.1.0. Details: https://github.com/OxWearables/biobankAccelerometerAnalysis		
Step count	Accelerometry	Derived using the “stepcount” tool, version 3.1.1. Details can be found at: https://github.com/OxWearables/stepcount		
Peak 30 second cadence	Accelerometry	Derived using the “stepcount” tool, version 3.1.1. Details can be found at: https://github.com/OxWearables/stepcount		
Sleep	Accelerometry	Derived using the Biobank Accelerometer Analysis Tool, “accelerometer”, version 7.1.0. Details: https://github.com/OxWearables/biobankAccelerometerAnalysis		
Sedentary behaviour	Accelerometry	Derived using the Biobank Accelerometer Analysis Tool, “accelerometer”, version 7.1.0. Details: https://github.com/OxWearables/biobankAccelerometerAnalysis		
Light intensity physical activity behaviour	Accelerometry	Derived using the Biobank Accelerometer Analysis Tool, “accelerometer”, version 7.1.0. Details: https://github.com/OxWearables/biobankAccelerometerAnalysis		

Characteristic	Source	Notes	UK Biobank field	Coding Notes
Moderate-vigorous intensity physical activity behaviours	Accelerometry	Derived using the Biobank Accelerometer Analysis Tool, "accelerometer", version 7.1.0. Details: https://github.com/OxWearables/biobankAccelerometerAnalysis		
EXCLUSION VARIABLES – MAIN ANALYSIS				
Prior incident cancer	Cancer Registry	Cancer-related ICD-10 codes in cancer registry data prior to accelerometry wear date.	Derived from 100092	
ADJUSTMENT VARIABLES – MAIN ANALYSIS				
Age	Baseline	Attained age was the underlying timescale in survival analyses; participants entered the study at the end of accelerometer wear.	Derived from 90011, 34, 52	
Sex	Baseline		31	Male, Female
Ethnicity	Baseline		Derived from 21000	White, non-White
Smoking status	Baseline		Derived from 20116, 3456	Never, previous, current unknown cigarettes/day, current < 15 cigarettes per day, or current ≥ 15 cigarettes per day
Alcohol consumption	Baseline		Derived from 1558	Never, <3 times per week, or ≥ 3 times per week
Education	Baseline		Derived from 6138	School leaver, Further education (education beyond O-Levels/CSEs, excluding college/ university degree) and Higher education (college/university degree)
Townsend Deprivation Index	Baseline	Townsend Deprivation Index of address at time of UKB baseline assessment.	Derived from 189	Divided by quintile of the UK population based on the 2011 UK census ^a
Parity	Baseline	Among females only	Derived from 2734	0, 1-2, 3+, Missing
Use of hormone replacement therapy	Baseline	Among females only	Derived from 2814	No, Yes, Missing

Characteristic	Source	Notes	UK Biobank field	Coding Notes
Use of oral contraceptives pill	Baseline	Among females only	Derived from 2784	No, Yes, Missing
Menopausal status	Baseline	Among females only	Derived from 2724	No, Yes, Not sure or Missing
ADJUSTMENT VARIABLES – SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS				
Body mass index	Baseline		Derived from 21001	For descriptive analyses: Underweight/Normal weight (≤ 24.9 kilograms/meters ²), Overweight (25–29.9 kilograms/meters ²), Obese (30+ kilograms/meters ²)
Frequency of red and processed meat consumption	Baseline		Derived from 1369, 1379, 1389, 1349	<1, 1–2.9, 3–4.9, 5+ times/week, Missing
Frequency of fresh fruit and vegetable consumption	Baseline		Derived from 1289, 1299, 1309	<3, 3–4.9, 5–7.9, 8+ servings/day, Missing
DESCRIPTIVE VARIABLES – DESCRIPTIVE TABLES				
Self-reported usual Walking pace			924	Slow pace, Steady average pace, Brisk pace, None of the above
Self-rated overall health			2178	Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor
Wear season			Derived from 90001	Winter, Spring, Summer, Autumn

^a Deprivation based on the 2011 UK census (2011 UK Townsend Deprivation Scores - UK Data Service CKAN. Accessed June 28, 2023. <https://statistics.ukdataservice.ac.uk/dataset/2011-uk-townsend-deprivation-scores>)

eTable 2. Coding and number of site-specific cancer incident cases in UK Biobank participants.

Cancer site	Cancer registry ICD-10 (if applicable, ICD-O-3) ^e	Death registry ICD-10 codes
Physical-activity-related cancers		
Bladder	C670-679	C670-679
Breast ^a	C500-509	C500-509
Colon	C180-189	C180-189
Endometrial ^b	C540-549 and C559	C540-549 and C559
Gastric cardia	C160	C160
Head and neck	C000-009 C019-029, C079-C089, C040-049, C030-039, C050-059, C060-069, C110-119 C090-099, C100-109, C129, C130-139, C140, C142, C148, C320-329	C000-009 C019-029, C079-C089, C040- 049, C030-039, C050-059, C060-069, C110-119 C090-099, C100-109, C129, C130-139, C140, C142, C148, C320-329
Kidney	C640-659	C640-659
Liver	C220-229	C220-229
Lung	C340-349	C340-349
Myeloid leukaemia	Any histology of 9840, 9861, 9865-9867, 9869, 9871-9874, 9895-9897, 9898, 9910-9911, 9920, 9891, 9863, 9875-9876, 9945-9946, 9860, 9930	Histology based
Myeloma	C880-889, C900-909 ^f	C880-889, C900-909
Oesophageal adenocarcinoma	C150-159 & histologies: 8140, 8142, 8144, 8261, 8310, 8480, 8481, 8570	Histology based
Rectal	C190-209	C190-209
Other site-specific cancers		
Anal	C210-219	C210-219
Brain	C710-719	C710-719
Cervix ^a	C530-539	C530-539
Gallbladder	C230-239	C230-239
Gastric non-cardia	C161-169	C161-169
Hodgkin lymphoma	C810-819 ^f	C810-819
Melanoma skin	C430-439, only histologies: 8720-8790	C430-439

Cancer site	Cancer registry ICD-10 (if applicable, ICD-O-3)^e	Death registry ICD-10 codes
Non-Hodgkin lymphoma	C820-869, C911, or any histologies of 9823, 9670	C820-869, C911
Chronic lymphocytic leukaemia	C911	C911
Other leukaemia	C910-959, excluding cases classified as Myeloid leukaemia and non-Hodgkin lymphoma ^f	C910-959, excluding cases classified as Myeloid leukaemia and non-Hodgkin lymphoma ^f
Oesophageal squamous cell carcinoma	C150-159, only histologies: 8041,8070,8071,8072,8074	Histology based
Ovary ^c	C560-569	C560-569
Pancreas	C250-259	C250-259
Prostate ^d	C610-619	C610-619
Small intestine	C170-179	C170-179
Thyroid	C730-739	C730-739

^aAmong females, ^bAmong females with no history of hysterectomy, ^cAmong females with no history of bilateral oophorectomy, ^dAmong males.

^eUnless stated, definitions exclude ICD-O-3 histology codes 9050-9055, 9140, 9590-9992 cell types, which includes Kaposi sarcoma (9140), mesothelioma (9050–9055), lymphomas, leukaemias, myelomas, lymphoreticular, and immunoproliferative diseases (9050-9055, 9140, 9590-9992).

^fUnless stated, definitions exclude ICD-O-3 histology codes 9050-9055 and 9140, which includes Kaposi sarcoma (9140) and mesothelioma (9050–9055).

eTable 3. Tabulation of number of incident primary events per cancer site in 86 556 UK Biobank participants.

	Overall	Male	Female
Cancer type	N=86 556	N=38 078	N=48 478
Physical-activity-related cancers	2 669	898	1 771
Bladder	109	86	23
Breast ^a	995	NA	995
Colon	381	207	174
Endometrial ^b	153	NA	153
Gastric cardia	22	18	<5 ^a
Head and neck	88	68	20
Kidney	141	83	58
Liver	60	34	26
Lung	295	148	147
Myeloid leukaemia	43	18	25
Myeloma	107	61	46
Oesophageal adenocarcinoma	68	56	12
Rectal	209	121	88
Other site-specific cancers			
Anal	26	6	20
Brain	79	42	37
Cervix ^a	12	NA	12
Gallbladder	10	6	<5 ^a
Gastric non-cardia	40	25	15
Hodgkin lymphoma	12	7	5
Melanoma skin	328	181	147
Non-Hodgkin lymphoma	316	176	140
Chronic lymphocytic leukaemia	76	49	27
Oesophageal squamous cell carcinoma	29	12	17
Other leukaemia	27	18	9
Ovary ^c	66	NA	66
Pancreas	145	80	65
Prostate ^d	1380	1380	NA
Small intestine	30	14	16
Thyroid	43	15	28

Physical-activity-related cancer was defined as 13 site specific cancers (oesophageal adenocarcinoma, liver, lung, kidney, gastric cardia, endometrial, myeloid leukaemia, myeloma, colon, head and neck, rectal, bladder, and breast). ^aAmong females, ^bAmong females with no history of hysterectomy, ^cAmong males, ^dAmong females with no history of bilateral oophorectomy. ^eUK Biobank policy states that tables should have a minimum number of 5 reported participants within a cell.

eTable 4. Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement.

	Item No.	Recommendation	Page No.
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	1, 3
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	3
Introduction			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	5-6
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	5-6
Methods			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	5-9
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	6-7
Participants	6	(a) <i>Cohort study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up <i>Case-control study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of case ascertainment and control selection. Give the rationale for the choice of cases and controls <i>Cross-sectional study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants	6-8
		(b) <i>Cohort study</i> —For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed <i>Case-control study</i> —For matched studies, give matching criteria and the number of controls per case	NA
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	6-9, eTable 1, eTable 2
Data sources/measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	6-9, eTable 1

	Item No.	Recommendation	Page No.
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	9
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	6-8, eFigure 1
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	6-9, eTable 1
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	8-10
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	9
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	6-9, eTable1, eFigure 1
		(d) <i>Cohort study</i> —If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed <i>Case-control study</i> —If applicable, explain how matching of cases and controls was addressed <i>Cross-sectional study</i> —If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy	8, eFigure 1
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	9
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	eFigure 1
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	eFigure 1
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	eFigure 1
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	Table 1
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	Table 1
		(c) <i>Cohort study</i> —Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)	10
Outcome data	15*	<i>Cohort study</i> —Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time	10, eTable 3
		<i>Case-control study</i> —Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary measures of exposure	NA
		<i>Cross-sectional study</i> —Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	NA

	Item No.	Recommendation	Page No.
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	Table 2, eTables 5-13.
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	eTable 6, eTable 12, eTable 13
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	NA
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	12-13
Discussion			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	10-12
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	15-16
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	16
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	15-16
Other information			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	19-20

eTable 5. Sequential model adjustments for total physical activity (milligravity units) and risk of incident cancer in 86 556 UK Biobank participants.

		Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Cancer type	Case count	HR per 1 SD (95% CI)	HR per 1 SD (95% CI)	HR per 1 SD (95% CI)
Physical-activity-related cancer	2 669	0.85 (0.81-0.88)	0.85 (0.81-0.89)	0.88 (0.84-0.92)
Bladder	109	0.63 (0.50-0.80)	0.69 (0.55-0.87)	0.71 (0.56-0.90)
Breast	995	0.90 (0.85-0.97)	0.91 (0.85-0.97)	0.91 (0.85-0.98)
Colon	381	0.84 (0.75-0.94)	0.84 (0.75-0.95)	0.88 (0.78-0.99)
Endometrial	153	0.76 (0.63-0.91)	0.78 (0.65-0.93)	0.89 (0.74-1.07)
Gastric cardia	22	0.31 (0.17-0.56)	0.39 (0.22-0.70)	0.47 (0.25-0.85)
Head and neck	88	0.75 (0.59-0.97)	0.84 (0.66-1.07)	0.82 (0.64-1.04)
Kidney	141	0.80 (0.66-0.98)	0.86 (0.71-1.04)	0.89 (0.73-1.08)
Liver	60	0.62 (0.45-0.86)	0.65 (0.47-0.90)	0.72 (0.52-1.00)
Lung	295	0.64 (0.55-0.74)	0.75 (0.65-0.86)	0.77 (0.66-0.89)
Myeloid Leukaemia	43	0.95 (0.68-1.33)	0.97 (0.78-1.19)	1.00 (0.81-1.24)
Myeloma	107	0.94 (0.76-1.16)	0.97 (0.70-1.36)	1.03 (0.74-1.45)
Oesophageal adenocarcinoma	68	0.78 (0.59-1.04)	0.89 (0.68-1.16)	1.01 (0.77-1.33)
Rectal	209	0.96 (0.83-1.12)	0.99 (0.85-1.14)	1.00 (0.86-1.16)
Melanoma skin	328	0.90 (0.79-1.01)	0.89 (0.79-1.01)	0.90 (0.80-1.03)
Non-Hodgkin lymphoma	316	0.85 (0.75-0.96)	0.85 (0.75-0.97)	0.87 (0.76-0.99)
Pancreas	145	0.84 (0.69-1.01)	0.86 (0.71-1.04)	0.90 (0.74-1.09)
Prostate	1 380	1.05 (0.99-1.11)	1.04 (0.98-1.10)	1.03 (0.97-1.10)

The standard deviation (SD) of physical activity was 8.3 milligravity unit in the main analytical sample. Hazard ratios (HR) and 95% confidence intervals (CI) were estimated using a Cox proportional hazards model. Models used age as the underlying time variable. Model 1: Unadjusted. Model 2: adjusted for sex, ethnicity, smoking status, alcohol consumption, deprivation, and education. Model 3: Model 2 + adjusted for body mass index. For breast cancer and endometrial cancer, Model 2 and Model 3 were adjusted for ever use of oral contraception, ever use of hormone replacement therapy, menopausal status, and parity. Participants were limited to males for prostate cancer (N=38 078), females for breast cancer (N=48 478), and females without a history of hysterectomy for endometrial cancer (N=41 010).

eTable 6. Sequential model adjustments for quintile of total physical activity (milligravity units), quintile of median daily step count, and risk of incident physical-activity-related cancer in 86 556 UK Biobank participants.

			Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Quintile of total daily physical activity	Total	Case count	HR (95% CI)	HR (95% CI)	HR (95% CI)	HR (95% CI)
Q1: <21.6	17 311	718	REF	REF	REF	REF
Q2: 21.6-25.4	17 311	569	0.84 (0.75-0.93)	0.84 (0.75-0.93)	0.86 (0.77-0.96)	0.84 (0.75-0.94)
Q3: 25.5-29.1	17 311	522	0.80 (0.71-0.89)	0.79 (0.71-0.89)	0.83 (0.74-0.93)	0.80 (0.71-0.90)
Q4: 29.2-34.2	17 311	460	0.74 (0.65-0.83)	0.74 (0.65-0.83)	0.78 (0.69-0.88)	0.75 (0.66-0.84)
Q5: 34.3+	17 312	400	0.69 (0.61-0.78)	0.70 (0.61-0.79)	0.76 (0.66-0.86)	0.71 (0.62-0.80)
<i>P</i> value for linear trend			<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
Quintile of daily step count	Total	Case count	HR (95% CI)	HR (95% CI)	HR (95% CI)	HR (95% CI)
Q1: < 6 319	17 308	687	REF	REF	REF	REF
Q2: 6 319-8 187	17 302	542	0.80 (0.71-0.90)	0.82 (0.74-0.92)	0.85 (0.76-0.95)	0.85 (0.74-0.98)
Q3: 8 188-10 009	17 315	513	0.76 (0.68-0.85)	0.79 (0.71-0.89)	0.83 (0.74-0.93)	0.83 (0.72-0.95)
Q4: 10 010-12 415	17 318	494	0.74 (0.66-0.83)	0.78 (0.69-0.88)	0.83 (0.73-0.93)	0.79 (0.69-0.91)
Q5: 12 416+	17 313	433	0.66 (0.59-0.75)	0.71 (0.63-0.80)	0.76 (0.67-0.86)	0.76 (0.66-0.88)
<i>P</i> value for linear trend			<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001

Hazard ratios (HR) and 95% confidence intervals (CI) were estimated using a Cox proportional hazards model. Physical-activity-related cancer was defined as 13 site specific cancers (oesophageal adenocarcinoma, liver, lung, kidney, gastric cardia, endometrial, myeloid leukaemia, myeloma, colon, head and neck, rectal, bladder, and breast). Models used age as the underlying time variable. Model 1: Unadjusted. Model 2: adjusted for sex, ethnicity, smoking status, alcohol consumption, deprivation, and education. Model 3: Model 2 + adjusted for body mass index. Model 4: Model 2 + adjusted for fruit and vegetable intake, and red and processed meat intake. REF = reference.

eTable 7. Changes in behaviour time and physical-activity-related cancer risk in 86 556 UK Biobank participants.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Change in behaviour time	HR (95% CI)	HR (95% CI)	HR (95% CI)	HR (95% CI)
1 hour/day to LIPA from SB	0.97 (0.95-1.00)	0.94 (0.92-0.96)	0.95 (0.93-0.97)	0.94 (0.92-0.96)
1 hour/day to MVPA from SB	0.87 (0.84-0.90)	0.92 (0.89-0.95)	0.94 (0.91-0.98)	0.92 (0.89-0.95)
1 hr/day to Any PA from SB	0.94 (0.93-0.96)	0.93 (0.91-0.95)	0.94 (0.92-0.96)	0.93 (0.91-0.95)
1 hr/day to MVPA from LIPA	0.90 (0.86-0.93)	0.99 (0.94-1.03)	1.00 (0.96-1.05)	0.99 (0.94-1.03)

Hazard ratios (HR) and 95% confidence intervals (CI) for incident physical-activity-related cancer associated with reallocating time to from one behaviour to another behaviour. Models are based on 2 669 events in 86 556 participants. HRs are relative to the mean behaviour composition (8.1 hours/day sleep, 10.5 hours/day sedentary behaviour (SB), 4.9 hours/day light intensity physical activity behaviours (LIPA), 0.46 hours/day (27.4 minutes/day) moderate-vigorous intensity physical (MVPA) activity behaviours). The "Any PA" category represents time in either LIPA or MVPA and was generated using a combined category for LIPA and MVPA activity time. Physical-activity-related cancer was defined as 13 site specific cancers (oesophageal adenocarcinoma, liver, lung, kidney, gastric cardia, endometrial, myeloid leukaemia, myeloma, colon, head and neck, rectal, bladder, and breast). Models used age as the underlying time variable. Model 1: Unadjusted. Model 2: adjusted for sex, ethnicity, smoking status, alcohol consumption, deprivation, and education. Model 3: Model 2 + adjusted for body mass index. Model 4: Model 2 + adjusted for fruit and vegetable intake, and red and processed meat intake. Models are based on 2 669 events in 86 556 participants.

eTable 8. Sequential model adjustments for median daily step count and physical-activity-related cancer risk in 86 556 UK Biobank participants.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Median daily steps	HR (95% CI)	HR (95% CI)	HR (95% CI)	HR (95% CI)	HR (95% CI)
3 000	1.27 (1.11 - 1.45)	1.22 (1.07 - 1.40)	1.19 (1.04 - 1.36)	1.22 (1.07 - 1.39)	1.22 (1.04 - 1.44)
5 000 (REF, ~10 th percentile)	1.00 (1.00 - 1.00)	1.00 (1.00 - 1.00)	1.00 (1.00 - 1.00)	1.00 (1.00 - 1.00)	1.00 (1.00 - 1.00)
7 000	0.86 (0.80 - 0.92)	0.88 (0.82 - 0.94)	0.90 (0.83 - 0.96)	0.88 (0.82 - 0.94)	0.88 (0.80 - 0.96)
9 000	0.79 (0.71 - 0.87)	0.82 (0.74 - 0.90)	0.85 (0.77 - 0.94)	0.82 (0.74 - 0.91)	0.82 (0.73 - 0.93)
11 000	0.76 (0.68 - 0.84)	0.79 (0.71 - 0.88)	0.84 (0.75 - 0.93)	0.80 (0.72 - 0.89)	0.79 (0.70 - 0.90)
13 000	0.73 (0.65 - 0.82)	0.77 (0.69 - 0.86)	0.82 (0.73 - 0.92)	0.78 (0.69 - 0.87)	0.78 (0.67 - 0.89)
16 000 (~95 th percentile)	0.66 (0.57 - 0.77)	0.71 (0.61 - 0.82)	0.76 (0.65 - 0.88)	0.72 (0.61 - 0.83)	0.75 (0.62 - 0.90)
<i>P</i> value for linear trend	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001

Estimated hazard ratios (HR) and 95% confidence intervals (CI) were computed using a Cox proportional hazards model with restricted cubic spline functions. Observations were trimmed at the 1% and 99% of the distribution and 3 knots were placed at the 5th, 50th, and 95th percentile for the exposures in the main sample. The ~10th percentile was set as the referent group (5 000 steps). Physical-activity-related cancer was defined as 13 site specific cancers (oesophageal adenocarcinoma, liver, lung, kidney, gastric cardia, endometrial, myeloid leukaemia, myeloma, colon, head and neck, rectal, bladder, and breast). Models used age as the underlying time variable. Model 1: Unadjusted. Model 2: adjusted for sex, ethnicity, smoking status, alcohol consumption, deprivation, and education. Model 3: Model 2 + adjusted for body mass index. Model 4 + adjusted for fruit and vegetable intake, and red and processed meat intake. Model 5: Model 2 with 2-year exclusion, N=81 790. REF = reference.

eTable 9. Sequential model adjustments for total physical activity (milligravity units) and risk of incident cancer in the UK Biobank among 38 078 male UK Biobank participants.

		Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Cancer type	Case count	HR per 1 SD (95% CI)	HR per 1 SD (95% CI)	HR per 1 SD (95% CI)
Physical-activity-related cancer	898	0.77 (0.71-0.84)	0.80 (0.74-0.87)	0.84 (0.78-0.91)
Bladder	86	0.70 (0.54-0.92)	0.72 (0.56-0.95)	0.76 (0.58-1.00)
Breast	NA	NA	NA	NA
Colon	207	0.77 (0.65-0.91)	0.76 (0.64-0.90)	0.80 (0.67-0.95)
Endometrial	NA	NA	NA	NA
Gastric cardia	18	0.34 (0.17-0.67)	0.41 (0.21-0.79)	0.49 (0.25-0.98)
Head and neck	68	0.86 (0.65-1.13)	0.91 (0.69-1.18)	0.88 (0.67-1.16)
Kidney	83	0.85 (0.66-1.09)	0.89 (0.69-1.13)	0.90 (0.70-1.16)
Liver	34	0.76 (0.50-1.15)	0.77 (0.51-1.17)	0.84 (0.55-1.29)
Lung	148	0.54 (0.43-0.68)	0.64 (0.52-0.80)	0.68 (0.54-0.84)
Myeloid Leukaemia	18	1.04 (0.63-1.72)	1.11 (0.67-1.82)	1.26 (0.76-2.10)
Myeloma	61	0.92 (0.69-1.22)	0.93 (0.70-1.24)	0.94 (0.70-1.27)
Oesophageal adenocarcinoma	56	0.83 (0.61-1.13)	0.89 (0.66-1.20)	1.01 (0.74-1.38)
Rectal	121	0.95 (0.78-1.16)	0.96 (0.79-1.17)	0.98 (0.80-1.20)
Melanoma skin	181	0.90 (0.77-1.07)	0.88 (0.75-1.05)	0.90 (0.76-1.08)
Non-Hodgkin lymphoma	176	0.91 (0.77-1.08)	0.90 (0.75-1.07)	0.91 (0.76-1.09)
Pancreas	80	0.84 (0.64-1.09)	0.86 (0.66-1.11)	0.93 (0.71-1.21)
Prostate	1 380	1.05 (0.99-1.11)	1.04 (0.98-1.10)	1.03 (0.97-1.10)

The standard deviation (SD) of physical activity was 8.3 milligravity unit in the main analytical sample. Hazard ratios (HR) and 95% confidence intervals (CI) were estimated using a Cox proportional hazards model. Models used age as the underlying time variable. Model 1: Unadjusted. Model 2: adjusted for ethnicity, smoking status, alcohol consumption, deprivation, and education. Model 3: Model 2 + adjusted for body mass index.

eTable 10. Sequential model adjustments for total physical activity (milligravity units) and risk of incident cancer in the UK Biobank among 48 478 female UK Biobank participants.

		Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Cancer type	Case count	HR per 1 SD (95% CI)	HR per 1 SD (95% CI)	HR per 1 SD (95% CI)
Physical-activity-related cancer	1 771	0.87 (0.83-0.92)	0.88 (0.84-0.93)	0.90 (0.86-0.95)
Bladder	23	0.56 (0.33-0.94)	0.54 (0.31-0.91)	0.52 (0.30-0.90)
Breast	995	0.90 (0.85-0.97)	0.91 (0.85-0.97)	0.91 (0.85-0.98)
Colon	174	0.95 (0.80-1.12)	0.94 (0.80-1.11)	0.96 (0.81-1.14)
Endometrial	153	0.76 (0.63-0.91)	0.78 (0.65-0.93)	0.89 (0.74-1.07)
Gastric cardia	<5 ^a	NA	NA	NA
Head and neck	20	0.55 (0.32-0.96)	0.61 (0.36-1.05)	0.59 (0.34-1.04)
Kidney	58	0.78 (0.58-1.06)	0.82 (0.61-1.11)	0.88 (0.64-1.19)
Liver	26	0.48 (0.29-0.80)	0.50 (0.30-0.84)	0.55 (0.32-0.93)
Lung	147	0.75 (0.62-0.91)	0.86 (0.71-1.04)	0.87 (0.72-1.06)
Myeloid Leukaemia	25	0.89 (0.57-1.38)	0.89 (0.57-1.39)	0.90 (0.57-1.42)
Myeloma	46	0.99 (0.72-1.36)	1.01 (0.74-1.39)	1.08 (0.79-1.49)
Oesophageal adenocarcinoma	12	0.80 (0.41-1.55)	0.89 (0.46-1.72)	1.02 (0.51-2.01)
Rectal	88	1.02 (0.82-1.27)	1.02 (0.82-1.28)	1.03 (0.82-1.29)
Melanoma skin	147	0.92 (0.77-1.09)	0.90 (0.75-1.08)	0.90 (0.75-1.09)
Non-Hodgkin lymphoma	140	0.80 (0.66-0.97)	0.81 (0.67-0.98)	0.82 (0.67-1.00)
Pancreas	65	0.86 (0.65-1.14)	0.88 (0.66-1.17)	0.87 (0.65-1.17)
Prostate	NA	NA	NA	NA

The standard deviation (SD) of physical activity was 8.3 milligravity unit in the main analytical sample. Hazard ratios (HR) and 95% confidence intervals (CI) were estimated using a Cox proportional hazards model. Models used age as the underlying time variable. Model 1: Unadjusted. Model 2: Adjusted for ethnicity, smoking status, alcohol consumption, deprivation, education, ever use of oral contraception, ever use of hormone replacement therapy, menopausal status, and parity. Model 3: Model 2 + adjusted for body mass index. Participants were limited to females without a history of hysterectomy for endometrial cancer, N=41 010. ^aUK Biobank policy states that tables should have a minimum number of 5 reported participants within a cell.

eTable 11. Sex-specific adjusted hazard ratios for median daily step count and physical-activity-related cancer risk in 38 078 male UK Biobank participants and 48 478 female UK Biobank participants.

	Male	Female
Median daily steps	HR (95% CI)	HR (95% CI)
3 000	1.42 (1.15 - 1.75)	1.11 (0.93 - 1.33)
5 000 (REF, ~10 th percentile)	1.00 (1.00 - 1.00)	1.00 (1.00 - 1.00)
7 000	0.81 (0.72 - 0.91)	0.92 (0.84 - 1.01)
9 000	0.72 (0.61 - 0.85)	0.87 (0.77 - 0.99)
11 000	0.69 (0.57 - 0.82)	0.86 (0.75 - 0.98)
13 000	0.69 (0.57 - 0.84)	0.82 (0.71 - 0.94)
16 000 (~95 th percentile)	0.65 (0.50 - 0.84)	0.74 (0.61 - 0.90)
<i>P</i> value for linear trend	<0.001	<0.001

Estimated hazard ratios (HR) and 95% confidence intervals (CI) were computed using a Cox proportional hazards model with restricted cubic spline functions. Observations were trimmed at the 1% and 99% of the distribution and 3 knots were placed at the 5th, 50th, and 95th percentile for the exposures in the main sample. The ~10th percentile was set as the referent group (5 000 steps). Physical-activity-related cancer was defined as 13 site specific cancers (oesophageal adenocarcinoma, liver, lung, kidney, gastric cardia, endometrial, myeloid leukaemia, myeloma, colon, head and neck, rectal, bladder, and breast). Models used attained age as the underlying time variable and were adjusted for ethnicity, smoking status, alcohol consumption, deprivation, and education. The overall model was further adjusted for sex and the female model was further adjusted for ever use of oral contraception, ever use of hormone replacement therapy, menopausal status, and parity. REF = reference.

eTable 12. Models for quintile of total physical activity (milligravity units), quintile of median daily step count, and risk of incident physical-activity-related cancer in UK Biobank participants who were never smokers (N=49 736).

Quintile of physical activity	Total	Case count	HR (95% CI)
Q1: <22.0	9 947	335	REF
Q2: 22.0-25.7	9 946	269	0.83 (0.70-0.97)
Q3: 25.8-29.5	9 948	265	0.83 (0.71-0.98)
Q4: 29.6-34.5	9 947	244	0.80 (0.67-0.94)
Q5: 34.6+	9 948	195	0.68 (0.57-0.82)
<i>P</i> value for linear trend			<0.001
Quintile of daily step count	Total	Case count	HR (95% CI)
Q1: <6 480	9 941	308	REF
Q2: 6 480-8 318	9 953	281	0.93 (0.79-1.09)
Q3: 8 319-10 109	9 943	253	0.84 (0.71-0.99)
Q4: 10 110-12 469	9 951	255	0.85 (0.72-1.01)
Q5: 12, 470+	9 948	211	0.73 (0.61-0.87)
<i>P</i> value for linear trend			0.001


Physical-activity-related cancer was defined as 13 site specific cancers (oesophageal adenocarcinoma, liver, lung, kidney, gastric cardia, endometrial, myeloid leukaemia, myeloma, colon, head and neck, rectal, bladder, and breast). Hazard ratios (HR) and 95% confidence intervals (CI) were estimated using a Cox proportional hazards model. Models used age as the underlying time variable. Model was adjusted for sex, ethnicity, alcohol consumption, deprivation, and education. REF = reference.

eTable 13. Models for quintile of total physical activity (milligravity units), quintile of median daily step count, and risk of incident physical-activity-related cancer in 86 556 UK Biobank participants before and after removing the first two years of follow-up (N=83 435).


Quintile of physical activity	Total	Case count	HR (95% CI)
Q1: <21.7	16 687	480	REF
Q2: 21.7-25.4	16 687	374	0.83 (0.72-0.95)
Q3: 25.5-29.2	16 687	367	0.84 (0.73-0.96)
Q4: 29.3-34.3	16 687	320	0.77 (0.67-0.89)
Q5: 34.4+	16 687	280	0.73 (0.63-0.85)
<i>P</i> value for linear trend			0.001
Quintile of daily step count	Total	Case count	HR (95% CI)
Q1: < 6 343	16 687	456	REF
Q2: 6 343-8 205	16 683	371	0.85 (0.74-0.98)
Q3: 8 206-10 021	16 689	353	0.83 (0.72-0.95)
Q4: 10 022-12 433	16 682	333	0.79 (0.69-0.91)
Q5: 12 434+	16 694	308	0.76 (0.66-0.88)
<i>P</i> value for linear trend			<0.001

Hazard ratios (HR) and 95% confidence intervals (CI) were estimated using a Cox proportional hazards model. Physical-activity-related cancer was defined as 13 site specific cancers (oesophageal adenocarcinoma, liver, lung, kidney, gastric cardia, endometrial, myeloid leukaemia, myeloma, colon, head and neck, rectal, bladder, and breast). Models used age as the underlying time variable. Model was adjusted for sex, ethnicity, smoking status, alcohol consumption, deprivation, and education. REF = reference.

eFigure 1. Participant flow diagram for the analysis of daily physical activity and step count measured by accelerometers in UK Biobank participants.




eFigure 2. Hazard Ratios reallocating time to a given movement behaviour from all other behaviours proportionally and incident physical-activity-related cancer in 86 556 UK Biobank participants.




Hazard ratios (HR) and 95% confidence intervals (CI) for incident physical-activity-related cancer associated with reallocating time to from one behaviour to another behaviour proportionally. Models are based on 2 669 events in 86 556 participants. Hazard ratios are relative to the mean behaviour composition (8.1 hours/day sleep, 10.5 hours/day sedentary behaviour (SB), 4.9 hours/day light intensity physical activity behaviours (LIPA), 0.46 hours/day (27.4 minutes/day) moderate-vigorous intensity physical (MVPA) activity behaviours). Models used attained age as the underlying time variable and were adjusted for sex, ethnicity, smoking status, alcohol consumption, deprivation, and education. Models are based on 2 669 events in 86 556 participants.

eFigure 3. Hazard ratios for all behaviour pairs and incident physical-activity-related cancer risk for estimated using a multivariable-adjusted Cox regression model in 86 556 UK Biobank participants before (blue) and after adjusting for body mass index as a sensitivity analysis.




Hazard ratios are relative to the mean behaviour composition (8.1 hours/day sleep, 10.5 hours/day sedentary behaviour, 4.9 hours/day light intensity physical activity behaviours, 0.46 hours/day (27.4 minutes/day) moderate-vigorous intensity physical activity behaviours). Models used attained age as the underlying time variable and were adjusted for sex, ethnicity, smoking status, alcohol consumption, deprivation, and education. Models are based on 2 669 events in 86 556 participants. SB = sedentary behaviour, LIPA = light intensity activity, MVPA = moderate-vigorous intensity activity, hr = hour.

eFigure 4. Hazard ratios for all behaviour pairs and incident physical-activity-related cancer risk for estimated using a multivariable-adjusted Cox regression model in 86 556 UK Biobank participants before (blue) and after adjusting for dietary factors as a sensitivity analysis.




Hazard ratios are relative to the mean behaviour composition (8.1 hours/day sleep, 10.5 hours/day sedentary behaviour, 4.9 hours/day light intensity physical activity behaviours, 0.46 hours/day (27.4 minutes/day) moderate-vigorous intensity physical activity behaviours). Models used attained age as the underlying time variable and were adjusted for sex, ethnicity, smoking status, alcohol consumption, deprivation, and education. Models are based on 2 669 events in 86 556 participants. SB = sedentary behaviour, LIPA = light intensity activity, MVPA = moderate-vigorous intensity activity, hr = hour.

eFigure 5. Hazard ratios for all behaviour pairs and incident physical-activity-related cancer risk for estimated using a multivariable-adjusted Cox regression model among 48 478 female participants (blue) and 38 078 male participants (red).




Hazard ratios are relative to the mean behaviour composition in each sex (female – 8.2 hours/day sleep, 10.1 hours/day sedentary behaviour, 5.3 hours/day light intensity physical activity behaviours, 0.38 hours/day (22.8 minutes/day) moderate-vigorous intensity physical activity behaviours; male – 7.9 hours/day sleep, 11.0 hours/day sedentary behaviour, 4.5 hours/day light intensity physical activity behaviours, 0.58 hours/day (35.0 minutes/day) moderate-vigorous intensity physical activity behaviours). Models used attained age as the underlying time variable and were adjusted for ethnicity, smoking status, alcohol consumption, deprivation, and education. Female models were further adjusted for ever use of oral contraception, ever use of hormone replacement therapy, menopausal status, and parity. Model is based on 1 771 events in 48 478 female participants and 898 events in 38 078 male participants. SB = sedentary behaviour, LIPA = light intensity activity, MVPA = moderate-vigorous intensity activity, hr = hour.

eFigure 6. Hazard ratios for all behaviour pairs and incident physical-activity-related cancer risk for estimated using a multivariable-adjusted Cox regression model in 86 556 UK Biobank participants before (blue) and after restricting to never smokers (red, N=49 736).



Hazard ratios are relative to the mean behaviour composition in each sample (full sample – 8.1 hours/day sleep, 10.5 hours/day sedentary behaviour, 4.9 hours/day light intensity physical activity behaviours, 0.46 hours/day (27.4 minutes/day) moderate-vigorous intensity physical activity behaviours; Non-smoking subgroup – 8.1 hours/day sleep, 10.4 hours/day sedentary behaviour, 5.0 hours/day light intensity physical activity behaviours, 0.48 hours/day (28.7 minutes/day) moderate-vigorous intensity physical activity behaviours). Models used attained age as the underlying time variable and were adjusted for ethnicity, smoking status, alcohol consumption, deprivation, and education. The main model is based on 2 669 events in 86 556 participants and the sensitivity analysis model is based on 1 308 events in 49 736 participants. SB = sedentary behaviour, LIPA = light intensity activity, MVPA = moderate-vigorous intensity activity, hr = hour.

eFigure 7. Hazard ratios for all behaviour pairs and incident physical-activity-related cancer risk for estimated using a multivariable-adjusted Cox regression model in 86 556 UK Biobank participants before (blue) and after removing the first two years of follow-up (red, N=83 435).



Hazard ratios are relative to the mean behaviour composition in each sample (full sample – 8.1 hours/day sleep, 10.5 hours/day sedentary behaviour, 4.9 hours/day light intensity physical activity behaviours, 0.46 hours/day (27.4 minutes/day) moderate-vigorous intensity physical activity behaviours; sample with at least 2-years follow-up – 8.1 hours/day sleep, 10.5 hours/day sedentary behaviour, 4.9 hours/day light intensity physical activity behaviours, 0.46 hours/day (27.6 minutes/day) moderate-vigorous intensity physical activity behaviours). Models used attained age as the underlying time variable and were adjusted for ethnicity, smoking status, alcohol consumption, deprivation, and education. The main model is based on 2 669 events in 86 556 participants and the sensitivity analysis model is based on 1 821 events in 83 435 participants. SB = sedentary behaviour, LIPA = light intensity activity, MVPA = moderate-vigorous intensity activity, hr = hour.