INTRODUCTION

The prevalence of overweight and obesity has increased rapidly over the past decades throughout the world. This has raised serious public health concerns because of the association between overweight and obesity and increased risk of a wide range of chronic diseases, including cardiovascular diseases, type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM), and all-cause mortality. It is well established that physical activity (PA) has many positive health benefits, including increased life expectancy and reduced chances of being diagnosed with cardiovascular diseases (CVD). In addition, physical inactivity has large economic consequences, including healthcare costs and productivity loss.
Research has also shown that the effects of PA on health outcomes can differ by socioeconomic background, lifestyle, and initial health status. PA in general has been found to significantly contribute to reducing risks of health problems and improve health for specific risk groups, such as overweight and obese individuals. Gill and Cooper found that an individual’s BMI level plays a major role in the risk of being diagnosed with T2DM. Consequently, a “one size fits all” mass-population strategy may not provide the most appropriate approach. This leads to the question to what extent sport participation is associated with lower health risks for different levels of BMI, in comparison with other types of leisure-time PA. However, to our knowledge, no study exists that investigates the relationship between sport participation and health outcomes in relation to BMI levels.

The objective of our study was to investigate the association of sport participation with the incidence of prediabetes, T2DM, and all-cause mortality, and assess this association across individuals with healthy weight, overweight, and obesity. In addition, we compared the outcomes of sport participation with those of the other types of leisure-time PA: cycling, gardening, doing odd jobs, and walking.

2 METHODS

2.1 Sample

The LifeLines cohort study is a large population-based cohort study and biobank of 167 729 persons living in the northern part of the Netherlands. Participants are screened through physical examination, including anthropometry. In addition, they fill in questionnaires on, among others, demographics, health status, lifestyle, and psychosocial matters. The LifeLines study is constructed conform to the Declaration of Helsinki. All participants of LifeLines signed a declaration, where he/she approved of the use of the (anonymized) data and material for scientific purposes. Baseline measurements (1A) took place from 2006 until 2013. A full-population follow-up measurement (2A) was conducted between 2014 and 2017, with new physical examinations and questionnaires for the full (surviving) population. Intermediate questionnaire surveys (1B and 1C) were conducted with an interval of around 1.5 years. From the 167 729 participants of the LifeLines study, we excluded persons under age 25, a BMI below 18.5, or with missing or implausible data for any of the variables included in our analysis. In total, 97 212 participants were eligible for our study on all-cause mortality (see flowchart Figure S1 in the Supplement). Due to a limited response to the follow-up questionnaires and glucose measurement and exclusion of persons with prediabetes at baseline (for the analysis of the incidence of prediabetes at follow-up), the remaining sample size was 76 141 for T2DM and 54 452 for prediabetes.

2.2 Sport participation assessment and BMI

Sports participation, as well as the other types of PA (cycling, gardening, doing odd jobs, and walking), was assessed using the short questionnaire to assess health-enhancing physical activity questionnaire (SQUASH). SQUASH is a validated questionnaire that inquires participants about the frequency and duration of participation in several types of PA, including sport participation. Respondents were asked about their amount of PA in minutes per week, for a normal week in the preceding months. In SQUASH, cycling and walking are only considered part of sport participation if they were done as a leisure-time sport discipline (i.e., leisure-time cycling with a racing bike or a mountain bike), while for all other purposes (such as commuting or shopping) they are categorized as the separate “cycling” and “walking” PA types. An individual can thus take part in both cycling as a sport and cycling for other purposes, but the amount of time spent participating in one or the other must be allocated to each specific PA type (in order to avoid double counting). For BMI, height and weight were measured using standard anthropometry procedures at baseline. Persons with a BMI of 18.5-24.9 kg/m² were classified as “healthy weight,” those with a BMI of 25.0-29.9 kg/m² as “overweight,” and those with a BMI of 30.0 kg/m² and higher as “obese.”

2.3 Outcome variables

Outcome variables in our analysis were dummy variables for the incidence of prediabetes, T2DM, and all-cause mortality, measured at any time beyond baseline. Following the 2003 American Diabetes Association diagnostic criteria (ADA), participants who registered a fasting glucose from 5.6 to
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2.3 Outcome variables

Outcome variables in our analysis were dummy variables for the incidence of prediabetes, T2DM, and all-cause mortality, measured at any time beyond baseline. Following the 2003 American Diabetes Association diagnostic criteria (ADA), participants who registered a fasting glucose from 5.6 to
6.9 mmol/L at follow-up were identified as incident cases for prediabetes. Following Dèschenes et al.,28 participants were identified as having T2DM at a follow-up period (1B, 1C, or 2A), if they (a) self-reported a newly developed doctor-diagnosed T2DM; (b) were measured to have a fasting glucose value of 7.0 mmol/L or higher; or (c) had a hemoglobin A1c (HbA1c, the hemoglobin type that is bound to glucose) value of 6.5%. Mortality is registered in LifeLines on a monthly basis, and we used data to the end of 2019.

2.4 Covariates

To adjust for confounding, we followed the model of Pedicic et al.,15 which uses directed acyclic graphs to show the relation between possible confounders on sport participation and all-cause mortality risk. We believe this model is also applicable to other PA types and health outcomes. The model includes sociodemographic factors, unhealthy lifestyle, adiposity, health status, and amount of PA as confounders. For socioeconomic determinants, we included age, sex, education, and net household income in the analysis. Lifestyle variables included alcohol consumption, smoking status, and diet quality (ie, the LifeLines Diet Score).29 For health status, the presence of depression and burnout for mental health was included as well as doctor-diagnosed cardiovascular diseases and cancer. In addition, the amount of leisure-time was included as a covariate as well as subjective well-being (following the RAND-36 questionnaire)30) to account for general health status. Finally, the PA-type categories are not exclusive, that is, one person can be a participant in more than one PA type. To account for physical activities other than the one that is investigated, we calculated an physical activity score (PA Score) for each individual, based on the amount of participation in these other physical activities. Here, this covariate is calculated by multiplying the number of hours being physically active in a given PA type by the metabolic equivalent (MET), summed over all PA types except the PA type for which the health effect was being estimated.31 This PA Score is therefore different for every PA type.

2.5 Analysis

In this study, we assessed the associations between sport participation (any versus none) and the incidence of prediabetes, T2DM, and all-cause mortality, for three BMI types.31 For this analysis, we estimated several Cox proportional hazards regression models. The Cox proportional hazards model was chosen because it can take into account the time-to-event, that is, the time between baseline measurement (1A) and the first moment of incidence; as well as time at risk, that is, the time between baseline and the last measurement (2A for prediabetes and T2DM, or the end of 2019 for morbidity). For each model, the hazard ratio was measured for participating in a certain type of PA, compared with not participating in that type of PA (with a set hazard ratio of 1). In addition, the data for each type of PA differed on one covariate: the amount of PA done on other PA types (PA Score).

First, we estimated the association of sport participation with prediabetes and T2DM incidence and all-cause mortality, with only age and sex as covariates (Model 1; see Data S1 for model specifications). This model was estimated for sport participation as well as the other PA types.

Next, a model with all covariates (as mentioned above) including BMI-level dummy variables (for overweight and obesity) was estimated (Model 2).

Finally, we estimated the association of sport participation stratified by BMI-level subpopulations (Model 3). In this model, BMI level variables were excluded, as well as non-relevant covariates, as determined by a log-rank test of equality (see Data S1 for more details). Again, we also estimated this model for the other PA types.

So, in total 15 models were estimated: The 3 types of models mentioned above were estimated for 5 different PA types. For each of the models, we present the hazard ratio (HR) for participating in a given PA type with a 95% confidence interval (CI) and P-values, with HRs with a P-value below 0.05 identified as statistically significant. Analysis was carried out with Stata 13 (Stata Corp. LLC, College Station, Texas, USA).

3 RESULTS

3.1 Population characteristics

Population characteristics at baseline measurement of the full dataset (for all-cause mortality) are presented in Table 1. Follow-up was on average 4.8 ± 2.1 years for both prediabetes and diabetes, corresponding to 258 147 and 357 913 person-years of survival, respectively. For all-cause mortality, follow-up was 7.7 ± 1.6 years, corresponding to 753 197 person-years. Incidence was 3547 for prediabetes, 1086 for diabetes, and 1379 for all-cause mortality (Table S1). For all three health outcomes, the incidence rate was lowest for the healthy weight category and highest for obesity.

The all-cause mortality study group was predominantly female (58.4%) with an average age of 46.5 years at baseline. Females and middle-aged persons are over-represented compared with the general population of the northern part of the Netherlands, but this is in line with the total population of LifeLines.31 Of the population, 43.3% was of a healthy weight (median BMI: 22.9 kg/m²), 41.0% was overweight (median BMI: 26.9 kg/m²), and 15.7% was obese (median BMI: 32.4 kg/m²). Persons with a healthy weight participated...
more in sport (61.9%) than overweight persons (55.3%), while less than half (46.0%) of the obese persons participated in sport.

The all-cause mortality study group was somewhat older and included relatively more higher educated and high-income individuals than the full LifeLines dataset (see Table S2 for a more detailed breakdown of the datasets). The main reason for this is the exclusion of persons below 25 years old. For

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Healthy weight (BMI 18.5-24.9 kg/m²)</th>
<th>Overweight (BMI 25.0-29.9 kg/m²)</th>
<th>Obese (BMI ≥30.0 kg/m²)</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>42 139</td>
<td>39 819</td>
<td>15 254</td>
<td>97 212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (% female)</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>58.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (%)</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (%)</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (&lt;2000 Euro, %)</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (&gt;3000 Euro, %)</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current (%)</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former, excl. current (%)</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No/little (&lt;1 glass/week, %)</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy (≥ 5 days/week, %)</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition (LifeLines diet score)</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure-time (avg. min./week)</td>
<td>535.2</td>
<td>582.3</td>
<td>517.8</td>
<td>551.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA score per week (median)</td>
<td>115.6</td>
<td>117.5</td>
<td>109.4</td>
<td>115.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure-time PAb score (median)</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVDc at baseline (%)</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancer at baseline (%)</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMIa (median)</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanatory variables

Sport participation (any, %) 61.9 55.3 46.0 56.7
Other types of physical activity

Cycling, not in sport (any, %) 66.3 64.5 59.8 64.5
Gardening (any, %) 56.3 58.3 51.1 56.3
Odd jobs (any, %) 40.8 48.8 40.4 44.0
Walking, not in sport (any, %) 78.2 76.7 73.4 76.8
Dependent variables

Prediabetes (ADA) at follow-up (%) 3.4 8.1 13.3 6.5
T2DMd at follow-up, not baseline (%) 0.5 1.6 3.9 1.4
All-cause mortality (until 2019, %) 1.0 1.7 1.8 1.4

aBody mass index.
bPhysical activity.
cCardiovascular disease.
dType 2 diabetes mellitus.
LifeLines population, the risks of selection bias for the sub-populations appear to be relatively small.

### 3.2 | Sport participation

Table 2 shows the outcomes of the Cox hazard ratio regressions with age and sex as confounders (Model 1) for sport participation, as well as the other PA types. In this simple model, sport participation was associated with significant reduced risks for all health outcomes, with the largest reduced risk (HR = 0.68, 95% CI: 0.60-0.77) for T2DM. Of the other PA types, only cycling was associated with significantly lower risk for all three health outcomes.

Table 3 shows the outcomes of full-model Cox hazard ratio regressions, including BMI type as a confounder (Model 2), for sport participation on all three health outcomes. Sport participation was associated with a significantly lower risk for prediabetes (HR = 0.86, 95% CI: 0.81-0.92). For T2DM (HR = 0.88, 95% CI: 0.78-1.00) and all-cause mortality (HR = 0.91, 95% CI: 0.81-1.01), the associated risks of sport participation were also lower, but insignificant. For prediabetes and T2DM, but not mortality, overweight and obesity were significantly associated with a much higher risk of incidence, when compared to healthy weight persons.

### 3.3 | Stratification by BMI type

Table 4 shows the results of the final model (Model 3) multivariate analyses of the association with prediabetes, T2DM, and all-cause mortality for sport participation, as well as other PA types, by BMI type.

For prediabetes, sport participation was associated with risk reductions for all three BMI types. For healthy weight (HR = 0.78, 95% CI: 0.68-0.90) and overweight (HR = 0.88, 95% CI: 0.80-0.97), this reduction is significant, but not for obese persons (HR = 0.90, 95% CI: 0.79-1.03). Moreover, the difference in reduction of the prediabetes risk associated with sport participation, between persons on a healthy weight and those with obesity, was significant.

Most other PA types had hazard ratios around 1, indicating no association with lower prediabetes risks. However, for persons with overweight, cycling was associated with a significantly lower risk of prediabetes.

The full-model analysis of the associated risks of T2DM shows that sport participation is associated with lower, but not significant, T2DM risks for person with a healthy weight (HR = 0.86, 95% CI: 0.63-1.19) and overweight (HR = 0.86, 95% CI: 0.71-1.03). The HR for obesity was somewhat higher but also below 1.00 (HR = 0.93, 95% CI: 0.78-1.13). In comparison, cycling is associated with a significant lower T2DM risk for overweight persons (HR = 0.72, 95% CI: 0.59-0.87), while also having lower hazard ratios than sport participation for the other BMI types. By contrast, the other PA types had higher HRs and were not significantly associated with lower T2DM risks for any of the BMI types.

For all-cause mortality, sport participation was found to be significantly associated with lower all-cause mortality risks only for persons on a healthy weight (HR = 0.79, 95% CI: 0.65-0.96). For obesity, the association of sport participation with all-cause mortality risks was even somewhat higher than for non-participants (HR = 1.06, 95% CI: 0.83-1.36). Of the other PA types, cycling was significantly associated with lower all-cause mortality risks for all BMI types and gardening for persons on a healthy weight. The largest risk reduction associated with cycling was for obese persons (HR = 0.73, 95% CI: 0.57-0.93). For persons with obesity, all other PA types are associated with non-significant, but lower all-cause mortality risks.

### 4 | DISCUSSION

In this study, we examined the association of sport participation with prediabetes, T2DM, and all-cause mortality. Our study contributes to the small, but growing, literature on the relation between sport participation and health outcomes. By

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PA type</th>
<th>Prediabetes</th>
<th>T2DM¹</th>
<th>Mortality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HR (95% CI)</td>
<td>HR (95% CI)</td>
<td>HR (95% CI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport participation</td>
<td>0.74 (0.69-0.79)**</td>
<td>0.68 (0.60-0.77)**</td>
<td>0.78 (0.70-0.87)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling</td>
<td>0.83 (0.77-0.89)**</td>
<td>0.64 (0.56-0.73)**</td>
<td>0.69 (0.61-0.77)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardening</td>
<td>0.94 (0.88-1.01)</td>
<td>0.88 (0.77-0.99)</td>
<td>0.80 (0.72-0.89)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odd jobs</td>
<td>0.95 (0.88-1.02)</td>
<td>1.00 (0.88-1.15)</td>
<td>0.91 (0.81-1.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking</td>
<td>0.96 (0.89-1.04)</td>
<td>0.82 (0.71-0.94)**</td>
<td>0.89 (0.79-1.01)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Type 2 diabetes mellitus.
²Abbreviations: HR, hazard ratio; CI, confidence interval.
*P < 0.05,
**P < 0.01, hazard ratios compared not participating in that kind of PA.
including prediabetes and T2DM, our study ventured into new but interesting territory.

Our study is the first to stratify the relation of sport participation with health outcomes by BMI types. Direct comparisons with similar stratifying strategies are thus limited. We found that sport participation is associated with significantly reduced risks for prediabetes for the healthy weight and overweight categories; and for T2DM for overweight persons. Our study also shows that sports participation improves life expectancy and the odds for prediabetes incidence significantly more for persons with a healthy weight than those with obesity. These results, as well as additional analysis with an interaction model (see “Interactions between BMI type and sport participation” in Data S1), demonstrate that the association between sport participation and health outcomes can differ significantly between BMI types. This somewhat contradicts the findings of Lee et al.\textsuperscript{34} who report HRs on the association of running with all-cause mortality for persons with a BMI below 25.0 to be similar to those with a higher BMI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Prediabetes</th>
<th>T2DM\textsuperscript{a}</th>
<th>All-cause mortality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HR (95% CI)\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>HR (95% CI)\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>HR (95% CI)\textsuperscript{b}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport participation</td>
<td>0.86 (0.81-0.92)\textsuperscript{**}</td>
<td>0.88 (0.78-1.00)\textsuperscript{*}</td>
<td>0.91 (0.81-1.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (Female)</td>
<td>0.52 (0.49-0.56)\textsuperscript{**}</td>
<td>0.85 (0.75-0.97)\textsuperscript{*}</td>
<td>0.73 (0.65-0.82)\textsuperscript{**}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1.03 (1.03-1.03)\textsuperscript{**}</td>
<td>1.05 (1.04-1.05)\textsuperscript{**}</td>
<td>1.10 (1.10-1.11)\textsuperscript{**}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current smoker</td>
<td>1.28 (1.17-1.41)</td>
<td>1.32 (1.12-1.57)\textsuperscript{**}</td>
<td>1.94 (1.65-2.27)\textsuperscript{**}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former smoker</td>
<td>1.05 (0.97-1.13)</td>
<td>1.16 (1.01-1.33)\textsuperscript{*}</td>
<td>1.24 (1.09-1.41)\textsuperscript{**}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No/little alcohol</td>
<td>1.05 (0.95-1.16)</td>
<td>1.22 (1.05-1.43)\textsuperscript{*}</td>
<td>1.19 (1.03-1.37)\textsuperscript{*}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High alcohol</td>
<td>1.02 (0.93-1.12)</td>
<td>0.99 (0.83-1.18)</td>
<td>1.12 (0.98-1.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LifeLines diet score</td>
<td>1.00 (0.99-1.00)</td>
<td>0.98 (0.97-0.99)\textsuperscript{**}</td>
<td>0.97 (0.96-0.98)\textsuperscript{**}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVD\textsuperscript{c}</td>
<td>1.21 (1.09-1.35)\textsuperscript{**}</td>
<td>1.36 (1.15-1.92)\textsuperscript{**}</td>
<td>1.36 (1.19-1.56)\textsuperscript{**}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancer</td>
<td>1.03 (0.89-1.20)</td>
<td>0.81 (0.62-1.06)</td>
<td>2.25 (1.96-2.57)\textsuperscript{**}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective well-being</td>
<td>1.05 (1.00-1.10)</td>
<td>1.35 (1.23-1.47)\textsuperscript{**}</td>
<td>1.24 (1.15-1.34)\textsuperscript{**}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>1.25 (1.08-1.43)\textsuperscript{**}</td>
<td>1.17 (0.92-1.49)</td>
<td>1.38 (1.11-1.71)\textsuperscript{**}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education low</td>
<td>1.02 (0.94-1.10)</td>
<td>1.13 (0.98-1.30)</td>
<td>0.81 (0.72-0.93)\textsuperscript{**}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education high</td>
<td>0.81 (0.74-0.89)\textsuperscript{**}</td>
<td>0.98 (0.83-1.16)</td>
<td>0.90 (0.78-1.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low income</td>
<td>1.04 (0.95-1.13)</td>
<td>1.08 (0.94-1.25)</td>
<td>1.17 (1.03-1.33)\textsuperscript{*}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High income</td>
<td>1.05 (0.97-1.14)</td>
<td>1.06 (0.91-1.24)</td>
<td>0.93 (0.81-1.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overweight (BMI\textsuperscript{d} type)</td>
<td>1.90 (1.81-1.99)\textsuperscript{**}</td>
<td>2.49 (2.28-2.72)\textsuperscript{**}</td>
<td>1.04 (0.97-1.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obese (BMI\textsuperscript{d} type)</td>
<td>3.60 (3.22-4.01)\textsuperscript{**}</td>
<td>3.89 (3.26-4.71)\textsuperscript{**}</td>
<td>1.09 (1.01-1.19)\textsuperscript{*}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a}Type 2 diabetes mellitus.
\textsuperscript{b}HR, hazard ratio; CI, confidence interval.
\textsuperscript{c}Cardiovascular disease.
\textsuperscript{d}Body mass index.
\textsuperscript{*}P < 0.05.
\textsuperscript{**}P < 0.01.
However, the type of sport activity may be a factor that could explain differences in the BMI-level-specific associations with health outcomes. Further analysis for sport disciplines should clarify this.

The population size and design (including actual health outcome measurements) of LifeLines and the amount of information on PA types and covariates were important strengths of our study. Although our research followed the concepts of other studies, we added several new covariates in our analysis, including a diet quality score, subjective well-being (both significant), and the amount of leisure-time (not significant).

In our study, sport participation was associated with lower all-cause mortality, which is in agreement with the findings of several other studies. However, this finding was not statistically significant. We also compared sport participation with other PA types. Our findings suggest that sport participation may be more effective in reducing health risks than other PAs, with the exception of cycling. Cycling was associated with significant and large reductions of between 18% and 27% in all-cause mortality risk. This is somewhat higher than the 10% found in the systematic review of Kelly et al. In contrast to other research, we found no evidence for a health impact of walking.

Our research has several limitations. First of all, the relatively low number of incidence, especially when stratifying for BMI types, leads to a somewhat weak statistical power of the outcomes. With more observations or a longer follow-up period, outcomes are likely to include more significant results. Second, we must take into account that BMI, sport participation, and health are not independent. For instance, a high BMI can lead to reduced opportunities to participate in (specific) sports, but also be the result of (previous) sport behavior. Therefore, sport participation is not independent from the health outcomes, and—although we control for various health indicators at baseline—conclusions about causality cannot be drawn. In addition, although BMI is a frequently used measure for assessing overweight and obesity, it does not distinguish between lean and fat mass, which is also relevant for studies examining the effect of PA. Third, the cross-sectional nature of baseline and follow-up measurement cannot account for changes in sport behavior between measurements. Given the data, we are only able to estimate the effects of doing PA at baseline and cannot estimate the effects of changes in sport or PA status. The estimated health effects may in part be affected by changes in PA.
find that becoming active in sports reduces risks of cardio-
metabolic diseases, while stopping increases those risks. 
Since decreases in PA may lead to increased risks for all-
cause mortality and sport participation generally declines 
with age, it is plausible that our findings are likely to be 
an underestimation of the health effects of sport participa-
tion for persons that keep participating, but may overes-
timate the health effects for “quitters.” Fourth, we do not 
take the number of hours or intensity of sport participation 
into account, which may lead to over- or underestimation 
of its association with health risks. However, regarding the 
dose-effect relationship of sport participation, research has 
been ambiguous. While some studies find positive 
dose-response associations for PA in general, others show 
no dose effects or even negative effects for very high 
volumes of PA.

Fifth, we do not control for several un-
available potential confounding variables, such as DNA or 
diseases that may influence the health outcomes (mortality 
in particular). This may lead to research outcomes that are 
an over- or underestimation the actual association between 
PA and health outcomes. However, the findings presented 
here do seem to be robust. Models for several age-specific 
subgroups (such as 30+, 40+, and 50- to 75-year-olds) 
showed very similar outcomes. This is also true for when 
replacing the current time-specific hazard model with an 
age-specific hazard model (following the approach of, eg, 
Lamarca et al). Finally, we are aware that sport participa-
tion is very heterogeneous concept, in terms of volume, in-
tensity, type, and context, and many other aspects. For BMI 
types, there could be a selection bias, that is, persons with 


**SUPPORTING INFORMATION**

Additional supporting information may be found online in the Supporting Information section.
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