

Varela, A. R., Hallal, P. C., Grueso, J. M., Pediši, Ž., Salvo, D., Nguyen, A., Klepac, B., Bauman, A., Siefken, K., Hinckson, E., Oyeyemi, A. L., Richards, J., Khidir, E. D. S., Inoue, S., Amagasa, S., Jauregui, A., da Silva, M. C., Lee, I-M., Ding, M., Kohl, H. W., Ekelund, U., Heath, G. W., Powell, K. E., Foster, C., Memon, A. R., Doumbia, A., Rather, A. R., Razzaque, A., Diouf, A., Hino, A. A., Damasceno, A., Abebe, A. D., Florindo, A. A., Mannocci, A., Aringazina, A., Jurican, A. B., Poffet, A., Decelis, A., Carlin, A., Enescu, A., Avilés, A. M. O., Kontsevaya, A., Somhegyi, A., Vuillemin, A., El Hamdouchi, A., Théodore, A. A., Masanovic, B., Lynch, B. M., Medina, C., del Campo, C., Abdeta, C., Moreways, C., Ranasinghe, C., Howitt, C., Cameron, C., Juraki, D., Martinez-Gomez, D., Tladi, D., Diro, D. T., Adlakha, D., Miti, D., Bjelica, D., Biernat, E., Chisati, E. M., Lambert, E. V., Cerin, E., Lee, E.-Y., Riso, E.-M., Villalba, F. C., Assah, F., Lovri, F., Araya-Vargas, G. A., La Torre, G., Cruz, G. I. N., Baltaci, G., Al Sabbah, H., Nalecz, H., Nashandi, H. L., Park, H., Revuelta-Sánchez, I., Nusurupia, J. J., Zamora, J. L., Kopcakova, J., Brazo-Sayavera, J., Oppert, J.-M., Nie, J., Spence, J. C., Bradley, J., Stewart, M. J., Mitáš, J., Chen, J., Hylton, K. S., Fromel, K., Milton, K., Borodulin, K., Moustapha, K. A., Martinez-Folgar, K., Nasreddine, L., Christiansen, L. B., Malisoux, L., Maleté, L., Grepo-Jalao, L. C., Monteiro, L. Z., Al Subhi, L. K., Dakskobler, M., Alnaji, M., Garro, M. C., Hagströmer, M., Murphy, M. H., McLaughlin, M., Rivera-Morales, M., Scheinowitz, M., Shkodra, M., Piatkowska, M., Chaudhury, M., Alrashdi, N. Z., Mutrie, N., Murphy, N., Ahmad, N. H., Obeidat, N. A., Gómez, N. Y. R., Liangruenrom, N., Arnesto, O. D., Flores-Flores, O., Incarbone, O., Chimeddamba, O., Bovet, P., Magalhães, P., Jousilahti, P., Katewongsa, P., Gómez, R. A. L., Shihab, R. A., Ocansey, R., Veress, R., Marine, R., Carrizales-Ramos, R., Saeed, S. Y., El-Ashker, S., Green, S., Kasoma, S., Beretervide, S., Baldew, S.-S., Nichols, S., Khoo, S., Hosseini, S. A., Goenka, S., Gholamalishahi, S., Kosen, S., Compernelle, S., Enescu, S. P., Popovic, S., Paudel, S., Andrade, S., Titze, S., Davidson, T., Dusingizimana, T., Dorner, T. E., Kolbe-Alexander, T. L., Huong, T. T., Sychareun, V., Jarevska-Simovska, V., Puloka, V. K., Onywera, V., Wendel-Vos, W., Dionyssiotis, Y., Pratt, M. (2023). Status and Trends of Physical Activity Surveillance, Policy, and Research in 164 Countries: Findings From the Global Observatory for Physical Activity—GoPA! 2015 and 2020 Surveys. *Journal of Physical Activity and Health*, 20,(2), 112-128. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1123/jpah.2022-0464>

Dette er siste tekst-versjon av artikkelen, og den kan inneholde små forskjeller fra forlagets pdf-versjon. Forlagets pdf-versjon finner du her: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1123/jpah.2022-0464>

This is the final text version of the article, and it may contain minor differences from the journal's pdf version. The original publication is available here: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1123/jpah.2022-0464>

Status and trends of physical activity surveillance, policy, and research in 164 countries: findings from the Global Observatory for Physical Activity - GoPA! 2015 and 2020 surveys

ABSTRACT

Background

Physical activity (PA) surveillance, policy, and research efforts need to be periodically appraised to gain insight into national and global capacities for PA promotion. The aim of this paper was to assess the status and trends in PA surveillance, policy, and research in 164 countries.

Methods

We used data from the Global Observatory for Physical Activity (GoPA!) 2015 and 2020 surveys. Comprehensive searches were performed for each country to determine the level of development of their PA surveillance, policy, and research, and the findings were verified by the GoPA! Country Contacts. Trends were analyzed based on the data available for both survey years.

Results

The global 5-year progress in all three indicators was modest, with most countries either improving or staying at the same level. PA surveillance, policy, and research improved or remained at a high level in 48.1%, 40.6%, and 42.1% of the countries, respectively. PA surveillance, policy, and research scores decreased or remained at a low level in 8.3%, 15.8%, and 28.6% of the countries, respectively. The highest capacity for PA promotion was found in Europe and the lowest in Africa and low- and lower-middle-

income countries. Although a large percentage of the world's population benefit from at least some PA policy, surveillance, and research efforts in their countries, 49.6 million people are without PA surveillance, 629.4 million people are without PA policy, and 108.7 million live in countries without any PA research output. A total of 6.3 billion people or 88.2% of the world's population live in countries where PA promotion capacity should be significantly improved.

Conclusion

Despite the fact that PA is essential for health, there are large inequalities between countries and world regions in their capacity to promote PA. Coordinated efforts are needed to reduce the inequalities and improve the global capacity for PA promotion.

Status and trends of physical activity surveillance, policy, and research in 164 countries: findings from the Global Observatory for Physical Activity - GoPA! 2015 and 2020 surveys

INTRODUCTION

Before the 2019 SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) pandemic, it was estimated that approximately one in four adults did not meet the World Health Organization's (WHO) recommendations for physical activity¹. This has been widely recognized as a global health problem, primarily due to the increased risks of cardiovascular disease, several types of cancer, type 2 diabetes and a range of other chronic diseases associated with insufficient physical activity^{2,3}. Growing evidence from 2020 and 2021, has shown that the COVID-19 pandemic has had a detrimental impact on physical activity levels globally^{4,5} further exacerbating what was already a major public health issue⁵⁻⁸.

To tackle this problem, it is important for countries to have national policies that support a physically active lifestyle. Physical activity research and surveillance are needed to ensure that such policies are effective and based on empirical evidence. Physical activity surveillance, policy and research can therefore be considered as three pillars underpinning physical activity promotion⁹.

The Global Observatory for Physical Activity (GoPA!)¹⁰ was established in 2012 as an independent evidence- and expert-based surveillance system, to monitor and evaluate national physical activity surveillance, policy, and research worldwide. As such, GoPA! facilitates evidence-based physical activity promotion and supports global and national physical activity advocacy (<http://www.globalphysicalactivityobservatory.com/>). In 2015 GoPA! published its first report on worldwide physical activity surveillance, policy, and research, producing physical activity profiles (the Country Cards) for 139 countries^{11,12}. The report identified a wide range of gaps and differences in

physical activity surveillance, policy, and research across countries, world regions, and income groups. It was estimated that one third of the countries had periodic surveillance, one quarter had standalone physical activity policies and two thirds had physical activity research outputs, thus, consolidating the urgent case for periodic monitoring of these indicators¹¹.

The second GoPA! data collection was conducted from 2019 to 2020 (referred to as “GoPA! 2020 survey”), to enable evaluation of national and global changes in the capacity for physical activity promotion⁹. Such evaluation was needed to support global physical activity leadership and advocacy and to improve national capacities for physical activity promotion. The aim of this paper was to assess the trends in physical activity surveillance, policy, and research globally, based on data from the GoPA! 2015 and 2020 surveys.

METHODS

Identification of Country Contacts

GoPA! country representatives, also known as “Country Contacts”, were invited to participate in GoPA!. Through their work and experience as physical activity researchers, policymakers and practitioners, most Country Contacts represent academic and government sectors in the areas of physical activity and/or noncommunicable disease (NCD) prevention. An active search for new members is ongoing for the countries without a representative. Description of identification methods and complete list of Country Contacts can be found elsewhere^{9,11}.

Collection and processing of country-specific data

Sample of countries

Consistent with the protocol and standardized methodology established before the GoPA! 2015 survey^{11,12}, we collected data for 217 world countries/states/economies (hereafter referred to as “countries”). A full list of countries can be found elsewhere⁹. The same protocol was used in the GoPA! 2020 survey to ensure comparability of results between countries and over time¹¹. Only countries that had their data approved by Country Contacts were included in the analysis of this paper.

For some of the analyses, countries were grouped into six WHO regions, including Africa (AFRO), Eastern Mediterranean (EMRO), Europe (EURO), The Americas (PAHO), South-East Asia (SEARO), and Western Pacific (WPRO)¹³. Countries were also grouped by their gross national income per capita into High Income (HIC), Upper Middle Income (UMIC), Lower Middle Income (LMIC), and Low Income (LIC), according to the 2020 World Bank’s classification¹⁴. Information on total population and Gini inequality index was obtained from the World Bank¹⁴ and Our World in Data¹⁵ websites.

Physical activity surveillance

The GoPA! working group conducted comprehensive, systematic searches to identify national physical activity surveys and surveillance systems. The search for the GoPA! 2015 survey was conducted from July 2014 to September 2014, while the search for the GoPA! 2020 survey was conducted from April 2019 to August 2019. There were no language restrictions, and the team members doing the searches were fluent in English, Spanish, and Portuguese. Documents in these languages were thus included if they were relevant to the search topic. The searches included the following sources: 1) Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS) Program¹⁶; 2) the WHO STEPwise Approach to NCD Risk Factor Surveillance (STEPS) Report¹⁷; 3) Google using “national survey”, “physical activity”, and a country name as search terms; 4) Google using “Non-communicable disease”, “NCD”, “risk factors”, and “national survey” as search terms; 5) Google using a country name, “national survey”, and “NCD” as search terms; 6) the World

Health Survey (WHS)¹⁸; 7) information sourced from Guthold and coworkers at the WHO¹ (only in the GoPA! 2020 survey).

Physical activity policy

The GoPA! working group conducted comprehensive systematized searches through WHO MiNDbank, Google, and PubMed using “physical activity”, “national policy”, and “national plan” as search terms, to identify national physical activity plans and other physical activity-related policies. The search for the GoPA! 2015 survey was conducted from July 2014 to September 2014, while the search for the GoPA! 2020 survey was conducted from April to August 2019. There were no language restrictions, and the team members doing the searches were fluent in English, Spanish, and Portuguese. Documents in these languages were thus included if they were relevant to the search topic. In addition, before the 2020 survey, the GoPA! working group developed the GoPA! Policy Inventory version 3.0., to collect more detailed information on national physical activity policies directly from the Country Contacts. The development and data collection methods of the GoPA! Policy Inventory are described elsewhere¹⁹.

Physical activity research

The GoPA! working group conducted a systematic review of peer-reviewed articles to assess the quantity of physical activity research that was conducted using country-specific data and published between 1950 and 2019. The review was performed in accordance with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines and registered in the PROSPERO database (ref: CRD42017070153). The searches were conducted from August 2017 to May 2020 in PubMed, Scopus, and Web of Science databases. Details about the literature search can be found elsewhere^{9,10,12,20}.

The population-adjusted contribution to worldwide physical activity research was estimated for each country using the following formula: $\frac{(country's\ articles)/(country's\ population)}{(worldwide\ total\ articles)/(worldwide\ population)}$. To be considered as part of the country's research output, the article had to explicitly show that the research was conducted in the country or included local data. A score above 1 indicates a contribution to worldwide physical activity research above the global average and a score below 1 indicates a contribution below the global average. For each country, the score was estimated for the 2010-2014 and 2015-2019 periods.

Data assessment and approval

The GoPA! data collected through literature searches were reviewed and verified in 2015 and 2020 by representatives for 139 and 164 countries, respectively. Country Contacts could complement the information found in the literature searches with documents in the country's native language. For the purpose of comparisons between the first and second surveys, we used the data from 133 countries for which country contacts verified data in both surveys.

Scoring system

The GoPA! conceptual model for quantifying country-level capacity for physical activity promotion (i.e., an aggregate of data on surveillance, policy, and research for physical activity) was used to assign a rating for each country²¹. The scoring protocol and variable definitions are described in Table 1. Country Contacts revised and approved the country data, and the core research team scored and analyzed it based on the standardized scoring system presented in Table 1. More details on development of the country capacity categorization for physical activity promotion can be found elsewhere²¹.

[Insert Table 1 about here - Assessment of country progress in physical activity surveillance, policy and research capacity.]

Data analysis

Descriptive analyses of surveillance, policy, and research indicators were conducted for all countries in the sample and stratified by world region and income group. Physical activity surveillance, policy, and research progress was determined based on comparisons between the first and second surveys (Table 1). The statistical analyses were conducted in STATA (version 17.0, StataCorp, College Station, TX, US) and the graphs were conducted in R (version 4.1.3, R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria).

RESULTS

Global coverage

A total of 139 countries had representatives in the GoPA! 2015 survey (covering 64.1% of the countries and 84.0% of the world's population) and 164 countries had representatives in the GoPA! 2020 survey (covering 75.6% of the countries and 98.8% of the world's population). The number of countries with representatives in GoPA! surveys increased by 18.0% from 2015 to 2020. Of the 164 countries in 2020, 133 were also represented in 2015, while 6 countries (Bahrain, Bulgaria, Greenland, Maldives, Swaziland, and Tunisia) lost their representation (due to staff turnover of dedicated country contacts in most cases), and representatives from 31 new countries from Eastern Europe and the Caribbean and Pacific Islands contributed to the survey in 2020. In the GoPA! 2020 survey, 48 countries (29.3% of the GoPA!

countries) had more than one Country Contact. The number of countries with more than one GoPA! representative has increased since 2015.

The survey participation increased from 2015 to 2020 across all income groups and most world regions except SEARO as follows: HICs (+3.3%), UMICs (+13.0%), LMICs (+20.0%), and LICs (+8.0%), AFRO (+21.3%), EMRO (+9.1%), EURO (+8.1%), PAHO (+18.2%), SEARO (-9.1%), WPRO (+3.3%).

In both GoPA! surveys, a higher participation rate was associated with higher country income groups. Only 34.5% of low-income countries participated in GoPA! 2020 survey compared with 85.4% of high-income countries. The second set of GoPA! Country Cards, including 164 countries can be found in the “2nd Physical Activity Almanac”⁹, available at the GoPA! website (<http://www.globalphysicalactivityobservatory.com/>).

Status of global physical activity

The GoPA! 2020 survey found that 92.1% of countries conducted at least one national survey on physical activity, 66.5% of countries at least two surveys, while only 18.3% of countries had three or more surveys and a plan for a future survey. The percentage of countries with periodic physical activity surveillance varied by region and income group, from 30.4% in EURO to 8.3% in AFRO region (Figure 1), and from 27.1% in HICs to 0.0% in LICs (Figure 2).

The percentage of countries with physical activity policies also varied by world region (Figure 1). We found that 37.8% of the countries had a standalone physical activity policy, 45.1% had a physical activity policy embedded in their NCD prevention plan, and 17.1% did not have a physical activity policy. The highest percentage of countries with a standalone policy was in the EURO region (65.2%), followed by the PAHO and EMRO regions (35.7% in each). In terms of the income groups, 91.4% of HICs and

only 10.0% of LICs had a physical activity policy, either standalone or included in an NCDs policy (Figure 2). This constitutes almost a 10-fold difference between HICs and LICs in the prevalence of physical activity policies.

Furthermore, for 15.9% of countries we found no physical activity research output. In the EURO and WPRO regions, 78.3% and 73.3% of countries, respectively, had above average contributions to the global research output. For three quarters of countries in the SEARO region, the contribution was below the global average. The AFRO region had the second highest (after SEARO) percentage of countries with “low” research productivity. In most HICs and UMICs, research contribution was above the global average and in most LMICs and LICs, the contribution was below the global average.

[Insert Figure 1 about here - Physical activity surveillance, policy, and research characteristics by world region based on the 2020 GoPA! survey. AFRO indicates Africa; EMRO, Eastern Mediterranean; EURO, Europe; GoPA!, Global Observatory for Physical Activity; NCD, noncommunicable disease; PAHO, The Americas; SEARO, South-East Asia; WPRO, Western Pacific.

Note: The lighter-colored bars show the indicators’ lowest level (i.e., surveillance: no surveillance, policy: no plan, population-adjusted research: no research output). The darker-colored bars show the indicators’ highest level (i.e., surveillance: 3 national surveys, policy: standalone physical activity plan, research: above average of publications). For the most accurate interpretation of this graph (full range of color) please refer to the electronic version of the manuscript.]

[Insert Figure 2 about here - Physical activity surveillance, policy, and research characteristics by income group based on the 2020 GoPA! survey. GoPA! indicates Global Observatory for Physical

Activity; HIC, high-income country; LIC, low-income country; LMIC, lower-middle-income country; NCD, noncommunicable disease; UMIC, upper-middle-income country.

Note: The lighter-colored bars show the indicators' lowest level (i.e., surveillance: no surveillance, policy: no plan, population-adjusted research: no research output). The darker-colored bars show the indicators' highest level (i.e., surveillance: 3 national surveys, policy: standalone physical activity plan, research: above average of publications). For the most accurate interpretation of this graph (full range of color) please refer to the electronic version of the manuscript.]

The overall capacity for physical activity promotion varied greatly across world regions and income groups. The highest overall capacity was found for the EURO region (all three indicators at the highest level), followed by the WPRO region (two indicators at the highest level and one indicator at the middle level), and PAHO (two indicators at the highest level and one indicator at the lowest level). The lowest overall capacity for physical activity promotion was found for the AFRO region, with one indicator at the middle level and two indicators at the lowest level (Figure 3).

[Insert Figure 3 about here - Estimated number of countries with low, medium, and high capacity for physical activity promotion. AFRO indicates Africa; EMRO, Eastern Mediterranean; EURO, Europe;

PAHO, The Americas; SEARO, South-East Asia; WPRO, Western Pacific.

Note: The levels of the indicators, from lightest to darkest, are: Stayed at the same level of the indicator (light color), Improved or stayed at the highest level of the indicator, No data available for the indicator, and Decreased or stayed at the lowest level of the indicator (dark color). For the most accurate interpretation of this graph (full range of color) please refer to the electronic version of the manuscript.]

When translated into population estimates, the data suggest that 2.7 billion people (37.1%) lived in a country with periodic physical activity surveillance, 4.5 billion people (62.3%) in a country with at least two surveys, and 49.6 million people (0.7%) in a country with no surveys (Figure 4). In addition, 3.4 billion people (47.5%) lived in a country with a standalone physical activity policy, 3.1 billion people (43.7%) with physical activity included in an NCD prevention policy, and 629.4 million people (8.8%) in a country without a policy (Figure 4). For research, it was estimated that 1.7 billion people (24.1%) lived in a country with physical activity research productivity above the global average, 5.3 billion people (74.4%) with a productivity below the global average, and 108.7 million people (1.5%) without any physical activity research output (Figure 4).

[Insert Figure 4 about here - Global physical activity surveillance, policy, and research: GoPA! categories by country population, income, and region. Legend: Random noise was added to minimize countries' overplotting according to H. Wickham²² with the countries maintaining their position based on the indicator and income group. For example, POL and ITA both have 2 national surveys (upper left) and are high-income countries; the random noise prevents them from overlapping but keeps them in their respective positions inside the cell, as determined by the indicator and their respective income group classification. AFRO indicates Africa; EMRO, Eastern Mediterranean; EURO, Europe; GoPA!, Global Observatory for Physical Activity; HIC, high-income country; ITA, Italy; LIC, low-income country; LMIC, lower-middle-income country; PAHO, The Americas; POL, Poland; SEARO, South-East Asia; UMIC, upper-middle-income country; WPRO, Western Pacific.]

Trends in global physical activity based on the first and second GoPA! surveys

Physical activity surveillance

The comparison of physical activity indicators included 133 countries. In regard to national physical activity surveillance, the majority of countries improved or remained at the same level (Figure 5). The WPRO region had the highest share of countries (69.0%) where the indicator improved or stayed at the highest level, compared to the AFRO region where 15.4% of countries stayed (i.e., have never had periodic surveillance) or decreased to the lowest level of the indicator (i.e., previously reported any kind of surveillance but in the 2020 survey did not report current surveillance efforts or future plans). A decreased capacity was reported in 5.0%, 3.4%, and 2.6% of the EURO, WPRO, and PAHO countries, respectively (data not shown in tables).

In terms of income groups, an equal or increased surveillance capacity was found for 49.2% of the HICs, 50.0% of UMICs, 40.7% of LMICs, and 60.0% of LICs. Twenty percent of the LICs decreased their score or stayed at the lowest level of the indicator (Figure 6).

Physical activity policy

The comparison of physical activity policy indicators showed that most countries also improved or remained at the same level (Figure 5). EURO was the region with the highest percentage of countries (71.8%) that improved or stayed at the highest level for this indicator. AFRO was the region with the highest percentage of countries (30.8%) that stayed or decreased to the lowest level for the indicator (i.e., did not report the existence of any policy or reported the existence of an NCD plan including physical activity in only one of the two GoPA! surveys). A decreased capacity was reported in 11.8%, 10.0%, 5.1%, and 3.4% of PAHO, EMRO, EURO, and WPRO countries, respectively (data not shown in tables).

More than half of HICs (60.0%) improved or stayed at the highest level for this indicator, while this was achieved by 38.9% of UMICs, 7.4% LMICs, and none of the LICs. Also, 20.0% of LICs decreased or stayed at the lowest level for this indicator (Figure 6).

Physical activity research

The comparison of physical activity research indicators showed that most countries in the EURO and WPRO regions (76.9% and 55.2%, respectively) improved or stayed at the highest level of the indicator, whereas 75.0% of countries in the SEARO region and 69.0% of countries in the AFRO region decreased or remained at the lowest level (Figure 5). The population-adjusted research productivity improved or stayed the same in 72.3% of HICs, 19.4% of UMICs, and 7.4% of LMICs. The population-adjusted research productivity in all low-income countries decreased or stayed at the lowest level for this indicator (i.e., a contribution to worldwide physical activity research below the global average) (Figure 6).

When analyzing the changes in all three indicators collectively, 38.5%, 10.3%, and 5.9% of countries in the EURO, WPRO, and PAHO regions, respectively, improved or stayed at the highest level for all three indicators. In the SEARO and EMRO regions, 25.0% and 10.0% of the countries stayed at the same level for all three indicators, respectively. Twenty-three percent of countries in the AFRO region decreased or stayed at the lowest level for all three indicators (data not shown in tables).

[Insert Figure 5 about here - Progress in national physical activity surveillance, policy, and research by world region. Note: The reference period was 2015–2020 for surveillance and policy and 2010–2019 for research. The inner circles in each radial plot accumulate a percentage, thus the first inner circle represents 20.0% and the last inner circle represents 100.0%. Each region is represented by a color, for example, the first radial plot (top left) shows that 69.0% of countries in Q7 the WPRO region (dark blue) improved or stayed at the highest surveillance level. AFRO indicates Africa; EMRO, Eastern

Mediterranean; EURO, Europe; PAHO, The Americas; SEARO, South-East Asia; WPRO, Western Pacific.]

[Insert Figure 6 about here - Progress in national physical activity surveillance, policy, and research by income group.]

Note: The reference period was 2015–2020 for surveillance and policy and 2010–2019 for research. The inner circles in each radial plot accumulate a percentage, thus the first inner circle represents 20.0% and the last inner circle represents 100.0%. Each income group is represented by a color, for example, the first radial plot (top left) shows that 60.0% of the LICs (dark green) improved or stayed at the highest surveillance level. HIC indicates high-income country; LIC, low-income country; LMIC, lower-middle-income country; UMIC, upper-middle-income country.

Note: The income groups from lightest to darkest on the color scale are: HIC, UMIC, LMIC, and LIC.

For the most accurate interpretation of this graph (full range of color) please refer to the electronic version of the manuscript.]

DISCUSSION

The key findings on the status and progress in physical activity surveillance, policy, and research based on data from the GoPA! 2015 and 2020 surveys are: First, the overall capacity for physical activity promotion varied greatly across countries, world regions, and income groups. The highest capacity was found for EURO, followed by WPRO and PAHO regions, and the lowest was found for the AFRO region and low- and lower-middle-income countries. This translated to an estimated 145 million people or 2.0% of the world's population living in countries with a low capacity for or no data on physical activity

promotion. Second, although most countries benefit from some kind of physical activity surveillance, policy and research, having periodic national physical activity surveillance, standalone policies and high research productivity (i.e., all of the three elements underpinning physical activity promotion) is very uncommon. In particular, an estimated 6.3 billion people or 88.2% of the world's population live in countries where the capacity for physical activity promotion can be significantly improved. 3.1 billion of these people live in low- and lower middle-income countries. Third, almost 70.0% of the world's population (5.0 billion people) live in a country without periodic physical activity surveillance, 10.0% of the world's population (629.4 million people) live in a country without any physical activity policy and at least 75.0% of the population (5.4 billion people) live in a country with physical activity research productivity below the global average. Fourth, the global 5-year progress in surveillance, policy and research indicators was modest, with LICs and the AFRO, EMRO and SEARO regions lagging even further behind.

Many individuals live in countries that do not have adequate physical activity surveillance, policy, and research for facilitating physical activity promotion²³⁻²⁵. Physical activity is often incorrectly considered to be an individual rather than collective responsibility²⁶, while in fact political, social, economic and built environments play key roles in shaping population physical activity behavior²⁷⁻³². Putting the 'blame' on individuals while failing to prioritize physical activity in national public health agendas is malpractice and may explain why the global prevalence of physical activity has not improved in the last decades^{1,33,34}.

According to our study, most countries do not have periodic physical activity surveillance. This finding is in accordance with the new NCD Progress Monitor 2022 report showing that fewer than 20.0%

of WHO Member States conducted a STEPS survey or other comprehensive health examination survey every five years³⁵. This widespread lack of periodic physical activity surveillance hinders the implementation and evaluation of evidence-based physical activity policies. Public health initiatives to increase physical activity need to be clearly prioritized in national policies and physical activity surveillance is of utmost importance for assessing the overall effectiveness of these interventions. Improving national surveillance must be a public health priority, to monitor prevalence and trends and to better inform the development and evaluation of national health policies.

Progress in the development of national physical activity policies has been slow and unequal. Standalone physical activity policies are seen more frequently in HICs and in the EURO region, compared with other income groups and world regions. From a health equity perspective and in accordance with the United Nations' declaration on the prevention of NCDs³⁶ LMICs and LICs countries should be supported in their efforts to increase funding, implement surveillance systems²⁵ that are consistent and sustainable, improve research and public health capacity, governance and political will related to physical activity promotion. Whole-of-government and systems approaches that facilitate physically active lifestyles are also needed^{37,38} as recommended in the WHO Global Action Plan for Physical Activity^{39,40} and GoPA!-like policy monitoring initiatives such as the NCD Country Capacity Survey from the WHO Global Health Observatory⁴¹, and the Health-Enhancing Physical Activity (HEPA) monitoring framework for the European Union⁴². These approaches may help countries tackle the rising burden of NCDs²⁵, and to build healthier and more resilient populations in the context of the current challenges of pandemics and climate change⁴³.

Even though LMICs are home to more than 80.0% of the world's population, they collectively conduct less physical activity research than HICs. More physical activity research infrastructure is urgently needed in LMICs to inform the development of contextually relevant policies and programs for this major part of the global population³⁹. Due to limited resources⁴⁴⁻⁴⁶ building research capacity in LMICs is often challenging and requires coordinated efforts at individual, institutional, and national levels^{47,48}, and familiarity with the local context and its challenges. The academic community in HICs should help develop global capacity for physical activity research by sharing their expertise and resources with researchers from LMICs.

The AFRO region had the lowest capacity for physical activity promotion and showed limited progress between 2015 and 2020. There are several potential explanations. First, countries in this region remain focused on the prevention and management of prevalent infectious diseases such as malaria, HIV/AIDS, and tuberculosis. Infectious diseases present competing priorities for policymakers considering how to address physical activity promotion and the dual burden of NCDs and infectious diseases. Second, the majority of countries in sub-Saharan Africa, where NCDs are highly prevalent and have been on the rise over the past two decades^{49,50}, are LICs or LMICs with limited resources to develop national physical activity surveillance, policy, and research. Third, despite the previous efforts of the African Physical Activity Network to increase physical activity capacity in the region, developing a viable and sustainable workforce remains a challenge for many countries^{51,52}.

Strengths and limitations

The key strengths of this study are: (1) analysis of physical activity surveillance, policy, and research indicators from two-thirds of the world's countries verified by Country Contacts (local experts);

(2) first of its kind evaluation of temporal changes in physical activity surveillance, policy, and research based on two surveys (2015 and 2020) with standardized indicators; (3) a good representation of countries from different world regions and income groups; and (4) the scoring system employed provided a straightforward measure of progress of physical activity surveillance, policy, and research with meaningful comparisons across world regions and income groups.

However, some limitations of the study must be taken into account while interpreting our findings. First, 53 countries were not included in the current study, because they did not have GoPA! Country Contacts. Most of these 53 countries are in the AFRO and EMRO regions, and this lack of data may have affected the evaluation and comparisons between regions. Second, only the availability of reported physical activity policies was analyzed. It is possible that in some countries physical activity policies and research production exist within the gray literature or informal documents but were not reported by the Country Contact or were not picked up by the comprehensive searches. Third, other monitoring efforts use different indicators to quantify various elements of physical activity policy limiting comparability. For example, the HEPA monitoring framework for the European Union⁴² and the Active Healthy Kids Global Alliance⁵³ are limited to the European Union countries and children, respectively. Fourth, GoPA! has yet to conduct case studies to shed light on the country specific circumstances that contributed to the observed progress on indicators but might not have been captured by the scoring method employed. Finally, we did not assess the quality of physical activity surveillance, policy, and research. Having systems in place that do not include underrepresented subgroups in the population or that are not implemented with fidelity may not improve the capacity for physical activity promotion. Although such an analysis would provide additional important insights into the capacity for physical activity promotion, it was beyond the scope of the current study.

CONCLUSIONS

The overall capacity for physical activity promotion is remarkably unequal across world regions and income groups and global 5-year progress in physical activity surveillance, policy, and research was modest. Therefore, the vast majority of the world's population live in countries where physical activity promotion capacity should be significantly improved. Most countries do not have periodic surveillance of physical activity and a standalone physical activity policy. In nearly every sixth country no research on physical activity was conducted from 2010-2020. GoPA! will continue to monitor physical activity surveillance, policy, and research globally and identify strategies to increase the capacity for national physical activity promotion. GoPA! will also continue to make the case for national physical activity promotion using multi-sectoral approaches consistent with the WHO Global Action Plan for Physical Activity⁴⁰. Ensuring healthy, resilient and active populations and communities worldwide remains a key public health goal.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to thank all GoPA! Country Contacts and their teams for reviewing, providing, and approving data for their countries. We appreciate their contributions over the past decade. In particular we would like to thank: Aaron Sim (Singapore), Abchir Houdon, (Djibouti), Angela Koh (Singapore), Audrey Tong (Singapore), Bharathi Viswanathan (Seychelles), Franklyn Edwin Prieto Alvarado (Colombia), Enrique Medina Sandino (Nicaragua), Galina Obreja (Republic of Moldova), Geoffrey P. Whitfield (United States), Gladys Bequer (Cuba), Isabel Cardenas (Bolivia), Juan Rivera (Mexico), Kyaw Zin Thant (Myanmar), Lisa Indar (Caribbean Islands), Louay Labban (Syrian Arab

Republic), Lyna E. Fredericks (Virgin Islands), Migle Baceviciene (Lithuania), Mya Lay Sein (Myanmar), Nazan Yardim (Turkey), Olavur Jokladal (Faeroe Islands), Omar Badjie (Gambia), Saad Hassan Aden (Djibouti), Sawadogo Amidou (Burkina Faso), Seyed Ali Hosseini (Iran), Sigridur Lara Gudmundsdottir (Iceland), Takese Foga (Jamaica), Tatiana I Andreeva (Ukraine), Than Naing Soe (Myanmar), Thelma Sanchez (Costa Rica), Tigri Tertulie Lamatou Nawal (Benin), Vera Amanda Solís (Nicaragua), and Wilbroad Mutale (Zambia). We also wish to thank to Cintia Borges and Paulo Ferreira from Universidade Federal de Pelotas, Brazil for the graphic design and GoPA! website management. This research was funded in part by the University of California San Diego, USA, Universidad Federal de Pelotas, Brazil, and Universidad de los Andes, Colombia.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

ARV, PH, and MP coordinated the data collection within the GoPA! surveys and conceptualized the study. GoPA! Country Contacts contributed to data collection, revision, and approval of the physical activity surveillance, policy, and research indicators. ARV, JMG, and AN analyzed the data and drafted the first version of the manuscript. ZP, DS, BK, KS, EJ, EDSK, ALO, JR, SI, SA, AJ, MP, PH provided feedback on the first version of the manuscript. ZP, ALO, MP, PH wrote parts of the manuscript. ARV, MP, JMG, AN, ZP, BK, KS, EJ, EDSK, ALO, JR, SI, SA, AJ, MC, DS, IML, AB, ML, HKIII, UE, GH, KP, CF, PH, MP provided feedback on the second version of the manuscript. All authors revised and approved the final version of the manuscript.

REFERENCES

1. 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. *Lancet Glob Health*. 2018 Oct 1;6(10):e1077–86.
2. Warburton DER, Bredin SSD. Health benefits of physical activity. *Curr Opin Cardiol*. 2017 Sep;32(5):541–56.
3. Saunders TJ, McIsaac T, Douillette K, Gaulton N, Hunter S, Rhodes RE, et al. Sedentary behaviour and health in adults: an overview of systematic reviews. *Applied Physiology, Nutrition, and Metabolism*. 2020 Oct;45(10 (Suppl. 2)):S197–217.
4. Stockwell S, Trott M, Tully M, Shin J, Barnett Y, Butler L, et al. Changes in physical activity and sedentary behaviours from before to during the COVID-19 pandemic lockdown: a systematic review. *BMJ Open Sport Exerc Med*. 2021 Jan 1;7(1):e000960.
5. Ramirez Varela A, Sallis R, Rowlands A v., Sallis JF. Physical Inactivity and COVID-19: When Pandemics Collide. *J Phys Act Health*. 2021 Oct 1;18(10):1159–60.
6. Sallis R, Young DR, Tartof SY, Sallis JF, Sall J, Li Q, et al. Physical inactivity is associated with a higher risk for severe COVID-19 outcomes: a study in 48 440 adult patients. *Br J Sports Med*. 2021 Oct 1;55(19):1099–105.
7. Rowlands A v., Kloecker DE, Chudasama Y, Davies MJ, Dawkins NP, Edwardson CL, et al. Association of Timing and Balance of Physical Activity and Rest/Sleep With Risk of COVID-19: A UK Biobank Study. *Mayo Clin Proc*. 2021 Jan;96(1):156–64.
8. Lobelo F, Bienvenida A, Leung S, Mbanya A, Leslie E, Koplan K, et al. Clinical, behavioural and social factors associated with racial disparities in COVID-19 patients from an integrated healthcare system in Georgia: a retrospective cohort study. *BMJ Open*. 2021;11(5):e044052.

9. Ramírez Varela A, Hallal P, Pratt M, Bauman A, Borges C, Lee IM, et al. Global Observatory for Physical Activity (GoPA!): 2nd Physical Activity Almanac, Global Observatory for Physical Activity (GoPA!) [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2022 Feb 1]. Available from: <https://indd.adobe.com/view/cb74644c-ddd9-491b-a262-1c040caad8e3>. Accessed February 2, 2022.
10. Global Observatory for Physical Activity. GoPA! Global Observatory for Physical Activity [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2022 Jun 10]. Available from: <https://new.globalphysicalactivityobservatory.com/goals/>
11. Ramírez Varela A, Pratt M, Powell K, Lee IM, Bauman A, Heath G, et al. Worldwide Surveillance, Policy and Research on Physical Activity and Health: The Global Observatory for Physical Activity - GoPA! J Phys Act Health. 2017 Sep 1;14(9):701–9.
12. Ramírez Varela A, Pratt M, Borges C, Hallal P, Lee IM, Powell KE, et al. Global Observatory for Physical Activity (GoPA!): 1st Physical Activity Almanac, Global Observatory for Physical Activity (GoPA!) [Internet]. 2016 [cited 2022 Jul 10]. Available from: <https://indd.adobe.com/view/f8d2c921-4daf-4c96-9eaf-b8fb2c4de615>
13. WHO. The Global Health Observatory [Internet]. World Health Organization. 2014 [cited 2014 Aug 31]. Available from: <https://www.who.int/data/gho>. Accessed September 1, 2014.
14. World Bank. The World Bank [Internet]. World Bank. 2014 [cited 2015 Aug 31]. Available from: <http://data.worldbank.org/country>. Accessed September 1, 2015.
15. Our World in Data. Our World in Data [Internet]. Our World in Data. [cited 2022 Feb 1]. Available from: <https://ourworldindata.org>. Accessed April 1, 2017.

16. The DHS Program. Demographic and Health Survey (DHS) [Internet]. The DHS Program. [cited 2022 Feb 1]. Available from: <https://dhsprogram.com/methodology/Survey-Types/DHS.cfm>. Accessed February 1, 2022.
17. WHO. National STEPS Reports [Internet]. World Health Organization. [cited 2022 Feb 1]. Available from: <https://www.euro.who.int/en/health-topics/noncommunicable-diseases/pages/monitoring-and-surveillance/tools-and-initiatives/who-stepwise-approach-to-surveillance>. Accessed February 1, 2022.
18. WHO. World Health Survey (WHS) [Internet]. WHO Multi-Country Studies Data Archive. [cited 2022 Feb 1]. Available from: <https://apps.who.int/healthinfo/systems/surveydata/index.php/catalog/whs>
19. Klepac Pogrmilovic B, Ramirez Varela A, Pratt M, Milton K, Bauman A, Biddle SJH, et al. National physical activity and sedentary behaviour policies in 76 countries: availability, comprehensiveness, implementation, and effectiveness. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*. 2020 Dec 18;17(1):116.
20. Ramírez Varela A, Nino Cruz GI, Hallal P, et al. Global, regional, and national trends and patterns in physical activity research since 1950: a systematic review. Vol. 18, *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*. BioMed Central Ltd; 2021. p. 1–15.
21. Ramírez Varela A, Salvo D, Pratt M, et al. Worldwide use of the first set of physical activity Country Cards: The Global Observatory for Physical Activity - GoPA! *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*. 2018 Mar 27;15(1).
22. Wickham H. *ggplot2: Elegant Graphics for Data Analysis* [Internet]. Springer-Verlag New York; 2016 [cited 2022 Jun 12]. Available from: <https://ggplot2.tidyverse.org>

23. Ramirez Varela A, Klepac Pogrmilovic B, Hallal PC, del Portillo C, Pedišić Ž, Kohl H, et al. Global physical activity. In: *Physical Activity in Low- and Middle-Income Countries*. London: Routledge; 2021. p. 11–24.
24. Bellew B, Nau T, Smith BJ, Pogrmilovic BK, Pedišić Ž, Bauman AE. Physical activity policy actions. In: Siefken K, Ramirez Varela A, Waqanivalu T, Schulenkorf N, editors. *Physical Activity in Low- and Middle-Income Countries*. London: Routledge; 2021. p. 44–62.
25. Pedišić Ž, Craig CL, Bauman AE. Physical activity surveillance in the context of low- and middle-income countries. In: Siefken K, Ramirez Varela A, Waqanivalu T, Schulenkorf N, editors. *Physical Activity in Low- and Middle-Income Countries*. London: Routledge; 2021. p. 90–108.
26. Ding D, Ramirez Varela A, Bauman AE, Ekelund U, Lee IM, Heath G, et al. Towards better evidence-informed global action: lessons learnt from the Lancet series and recent developments in physical activity and public health. *Br J Sports Med*. 2020 Apr;54(8):462–8.
27. Bosdriesz JR, Witvliet MI, Visscher TL, Kunst AE. The influence of the macro-environment on physical activity: a multilevel analysis of 38 countries worldwide. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*. 2012;9(1):110.
28. Ding D, Adams MA, Sallis JF, Norman GJ, Hovell MF, Chambers CD, et al. Perceived neighborhood environment and physical activity in 11 countries: Do associations differ by country? *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*. 2013;10(1):57.
29. Cameron AJ, van Stralen MJM, Kunst AE, te Velde SJ, van Lenthe FJ, Salmon J, et al. Macroenvironmental Factors Including GDP per Capita and Physical Activity in Europe. *Med Sci Sports Exerc*. 2013 Feb;45(2):278–85.
30. Giles-Corti B, Donovan RJ. The relative influence of individual, social and physical environment determinants of physical activity. *Soc Sci Med*. 2002 Jun;54(12):1793–812.

31. Giles-Corti B, Timperio A, Bull F, Pikora T. Understanding Physical Activity Environmental Correlates: Increased Specificity for Ecological Models. *Exerc Sport Sci Rev.* 2005 Oct;33(4):175–81.
32. Bauman AE, Reis RS, Sallis JF, Wells JC, Loos RJ, Martin BW. Correlates of physical activity: why are some people physically active and others not? *The Lancet.* 2012 Jul;380(9838):258–71.
33. Ramirez Varela A. Worldwide Research, Surveillance and Policy on Physical Activity: The Global Observatory for Physical Activity – GoPA! [Pelotas]: Universidade Federal de Pelotas; 2018.
34. Sallis JF, Bull F, Guthold R, Heath GW, Inoue S, Kelly P, et al. Progress in physical activity over the Olympic quadrennium. *The Lancet.* 2016 Sep;388(10051):1325–36.
35. World Health Organization. Noncommunicable diseases progress monitor 2022. World Health Organization; 2022.
36. United Nations General Assembly. Political declaration of the high-level meeting of the general assembly on the prevention and control of noncommunicable diseases (2011 Sept. 19). New York: United Nations [Internet]. 2012 [cited 2022 Jul 4]. Available from: <https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/LTD/N11/497/77/PDF/N1149777.pdf?OpenElement>. Accessed July 5, 2022.
37. Bellew W, Smith BJ, Nau T, Lee K, Reece L, Bauman A. Whole of systems approaches to physical activity policy and practice in Australia: The ASAPa project overview and initial systems map. *J Phys Act Health.* 2020;17(1):68–73.
38. Stanley I, Neumann-Podczaska A, Wieczorowska-Tobis K, Mensink GBM, Rosas LG, Do S, et al. Health surveillance indicators for diet and physical activity: what is available in European data sets for policy evaluation? *Eur J Public Health.* 2022 May 17;

39. Pratt M, Ramirez Varela A, Salvo D, Kohl III HW, Ding D. Attacking the pandemic of physical inactivity: what is holding us back? *Br J Sports Med.* 2020 Jul;54(13):760–2.
40. World Health Organization. Global action plan on physical activity 2018–2030: more active people for a healthier world. World Health Organization; 2018.
41. World Health Organization. NCD Country Capacity Survey [Internet]. Noncommunicable Disease Surveillance, Monitoring and Reporting, The Global Health Observatory. 2022 [cited 2022 Sep 25]. Available from: <https://www.who.int/teams/ncds/surveillance/monitoring-capacity/ncdcs>. Accessed September 25, 2022.
42. Whiting S, Mendes R, Morais ST, Gelius P, Abu-Omar K, Nash L, et al. Promoting health-enhancing physical activity in Europe: Surveillance, policy development and implementation 2015–2018. *Health Policy (New York).* 2021 Aug;125(8):1023–30.
43. Heymann D, Kickbusch I, Ihekweazu C, Khor SK. A new understanding of global health security: three interlocking functions [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2022 Jun 10]. Available from: <https://globalchallenges.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/A-new-understanding-of-global-health-security-UPDATED.pdf>. Accessed June 11, 2022.
44. Docquier F. The brain drain from developing countries. *IZA World of Labor.* 2014;31.
45. Li R, Ruiz F, Culyer AJ, Chalkidou K, Hofman KJ. Evidence-informed capacity building for setting health priorities in low- and middle-income countries: A framework and recommendations for further research. *F1000Res.* 2017 Mar 7;6:231.
46. Siefken K, Varela AR, Waqanivalu T, Schulenkorf N. *Physical Activity in Low- and Middle-Income Countries.* London: Routledge; 2021.

47. Ahmed A, Daily JP, Lescano AG, Golightly LM, Fasina A. Challenges and Strategies for Biomedical Researchers Returning to Low- and Middle-Income Countries after Training. *Am J Trop Med Hyg.* 2020 Mar 5;102(3):494–6.
48. Lambert EV, Kolbe-Alexander T, Adlakha D, Oyeyemi A, Anokye NK, Goenka S, et al. Making the case for ‘physical activity security’: the 2020 WHO guidelines on physical activity and sedentary behaviour from a Global South perspective. *Br J Sports Med.* 2020 Dec 25;54(24):1447–8.
49. Bigna JJ, Noubiap JJ. The rising burden of non-communicable diseases in sub-Saharan Africa. *Lancet Glob Health.* 2019 Oct;7(10):e1295–6.
50. Gouda HN, Charlson F, Sorsdahl K, Ahmadzada S, Ferrari AJ, Erskine H, et al. Burden of non-communicable diseases in sub-Saharan Africa, 1990–2017: results from the Global Burden of Disease Study 2017. *Lancet Glob Health.* 2019 Oct;7(10):e1375–87.
51. Global Observatory for Physical Activity, Oyeyemi A. The Global Observatory for Physical Activity - GoPA!: Africa Policy Brief [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2022 Jul 10]. Available from: <https://new.globalphysicalactivityobservatory.com/Documents/Policy%20Brief%20AFRO.pdf>. Accessed July 11, 2022.
52. Oyeyemi AL, Oyeyemi AY, Omotara BA, Lawan A, Akinroye KK, Adedoyin RA, et al. Physical activity profile of Nigeria: implications for research, surveillance and policy. *Pan African Medical Journal.* 2018;30.
53. Tremblay MS, Gonzalez SA, Katzmarzyk PT, Onywera VO, Reilly JohnJ. Physical Activity Report Cards: Active Healthy Kids Global Alliance and the Lancet Physical Activity Observatory. *J Phys Act Health.* 2015 Mar;12(3):297–8.

Table 1. Assessment of country progress in physical activity surveillance, policy and research capacity.

Categories' designation	National Physical Activity Surveillance	National Physical Activity Policy	Population-Adjusted Physical Activity Research Contribution
Green: Improved or stayed at the highest level of the indicator	Green: Periodic physical activity surveillance (first, most recent and next surveys were determined from the 2015 and 2020 GoPA! surveys) OR an increase in the number of surveys identified in the 2020 GoPA! survey	Green: Standalone physical activity policies in the 2015 and 2020 GoPA! surveys OR transition to a standalone policy in the 2020 GoPA! survey	Green: Physical activity research was above the global average in both 2010-2014 AND 2015-2019 periods
Yellow: Stayed at the same level of the indicator	Yellow: First and most recent surveys were determined, but not a plan for a next or future survey including physical activity	Yellow: NCD plans including physical activity in the 2015 and 2020 GoPA! surveys OR a standalone physical activity policy in the 2015 but not in the 2020 GoPA! survey	Yellow: Physical activity research was above the global average in 2010-2014 OR 2015-2019 periods
Red: Decreased or stayed at the lowest level of the indicator	Red: Only a first survey was determined from the 2015 and 2020 GoPA! surveys (not a most recent or next/future survey) OR there was no surveillance data for the 2020 GoPA! survey	Red: NCD plans including physical activity in the 2015 OR 2020 GoPA! survey (but not both)	Red: Physical activity research was below the global average in both 2010-2014 AND 2015-2019 periods
Black: No data available for the indicator	Black: No physical activity surveillance data	Black: No physical activity policy data	Black: No physical activity research articles

Abbreviation: GoPA!, Global Observatory for Physical Activity; NCD, noncommunicable disease.




Figure 1. Physical activity surveillance, policy, and research characteristics by world region based on the 2020 GoPA! survey. AFRO indicates Africa; EMRO, Eastern Mediterranean; EURO, Europe; GoPA!, Global Observatory for Physical Activity; NCD, noncommunicable disease; PAHO, The Americas; SEARO, South-East Asia; WPRO, Western Pacific.

Note: The lighter-colored bars show the indicators' lowest level (i.e., surveillance: no surveillance, policy: no plan, population-adjusted research: no research output). The darker-colored bars show the indicators' highest level (i.e., surveillance: 3 national surveys, policy: standalone physical activity plan, research: above average of publications). For the most accurate interpretation of this graph (full range of color) please refer to the electronic version of the manuscript.




Figure 2. Physical activity surveillance, policy, and research characteristics by income group based on the 2020 GoPA! survey. GoPA! indicates Global Observatory for Physical Activity; HIC, high-income country; LIC, low-income country; LMIC, lower-middle-income country; NCD, noncommunicable disease; UMIC, upper-middle-income country.

Note: The lighter-colored bars show the indicators' lowest level (i.e., surveillance: no surveillance, policy: no plan, population-adjusted research: no research output). The darker-colored bars show the indicators' highest level (i.e., surveillance: 3 national surveys, policy: standalone physical activity plan, research: above average of publications). For the most accurate interpretation of this graph (full range of color) please refer to the electronic version of the manuscript.






Figure 3. Estimated number of countries with low, medium, and high capacity for physical activity promotion. AFRO indicates Africa; EMRO, Eastern Mediterranean; EURO, Europe; PAHO, The Americas; SEARO, South-East Asia; WPRO, Western Pacific.

Note: The levels of the indicators, from lightest to darkest, are: Stayed at the same level of the indicator (light color), Improved or stayed at the highest level of the indicator, No data available for the indicator, and Decreased or stayed at the lowest level of the indicator (dark color). For the most accurate interpretation of this graph (full range of color) please refer to the electronic version of the manuscript.


a) National physical activity surveillance




b) National physical activity policy



c) National physical activity population-adjusted research



Population (M)



Region



Figure 4. Global physical activity surveillance, policy, and research: GoPA! categories by country population, income, and region. Note: Random noise was added to minimize countries' overplotting according to H. Wickham²² with the countries maintaining their position based on the indicator and income group. For example, POL and ITA both have 2 national surveys (upper left) and are high-income countries; the random noise prevents them from overlapping but keeps them in their respective positions inside the cell, as determined by the indicator and their respective income group classification. AFRO indicates Africa; EMRO, Eastern Mediterranean; EURO, Europe; GoPA!, Global Observatory for Physical Activity; HIC, high-income country; ITA, Italy; LIC, low-income country; LMIC, lower-middle-income country; PAHO, The Americas; POL, Poland; SEARO, South-East Asia; UMIC, upper-middle-income country; WPRO, Western Pacific.




Figure 5. Progress in national physical activity surveillance, policy, and research by world region. Note: The reference period was 2015–2020 for surveillance and policy and 2010–2019 for research. The inner circles in each radial plot accumulate a percentage, thus the first inner circle represents 20.0% and the last inner circle represents 100.0%. Each region is represented by a color, for example, the first radial plot (top left) shows that 69.0% of countries in Q7 the WPRO region (dark blue) improved or stayed at the highest surveillance level. AFRO indicates Africa; EMRO, Eastern Mediterranean; EURO, Europe; PAHO, The Americas; SEARO, South-East Asia; WPRO, Western Pacific. For the most accurate interpretation of this graph (full range of color) please refer to the electronic version of the manuscript.


Improved or stayed at the highest level of the indicator

Stayed at the same level of the indicator


Decreased or stayed at the lowest level of the indicator

No data available for the indicator

a) Progress in national physical activity surveillance



b) Progress in national physical activity policy



c) Progress in national physical activity population-adjusted research




Figure 6. Progress in national physical activity surveillance, policy, and research by income group.

Note: The reference period was 2015–2020 for surveillance and policy and 2010–2019 for research. The inner circles in each radial plot accumulate a percentage, thus the first inner circle represents 20.0% and the last inner circle represents 100.0%. Each income group is represented by a color, for example, the first radial plot (top left) shows that 60.0% of the LICs (dark green) improved or stayed at the highest surveillance level. HIC indicates high-income country; LIC, low-income country; LMIC, lower-middle-income country; UMIC, upper-middle-income country.

Note: The income groups from lightest to darkest on the color scale are: HIC, UMIC, LMIC, and LIC. For the most accurate interpretation of this graph (full range of color) please refer to the electronic version of the manuscript.