



The Impact of Health Education Programs on Chronic Disease Prevention Among Adults

Mansour Nasser Alotaibi ⁽¹⁾, Faisal Turki Alroqi ⁽²⁾, Fawzia Haji Albahrani ⁽³⁾, Nouf Yahya Ahmad Habtare ⁽⁴⁾, Mosa Ahmed Mosa Hisheam ⁽⁵⁾, Abdullah Mohammed Salem Musawi ⁽⁶⁾, Khalid Ali Abutalib Sharahili ⁽⁶⁾, Habeeb Ahmed Ali Almutlaq ⁽⁷⁾, Mousa Yahya Mobaraki ⁽⁸⁾ Waleed saleh alharbi ⁽⁹⁾

(1) Dawadmi General Hospital, Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia,

(2) Medical Cities At The Ministry Of Interior, Saudi Arabia,

(3) MCH ,Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia,

(4) Ministry Of Health- Jizan, Saudi Arabia,

(5) Beish, Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia,

(6) Crisis And Disaster Management – Jazan Ministry Of Health Branch, Saudi Arabia,

(7) Aljabr Eye &ENT Hospital, Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia,

(8) Alaredha General Hospital, Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia.

(9) Medical Cities At The Ministry Of Interior, Saudi Arabia,

Abstract

Chronic diseases are a major public health concern in the world as they are the cause of most morbidity and mortality in adults all over the globe. Health education activities have become a high-priority measure to prevent chronic diseases, with the goal of enhancing the level of knowledge, attitudes, and healthier behaviors. The study investigates the effectiveness of health education program in preventing chronic diseases in adults, theoretical basis, models, as well as practical Interventions. Significant areas Involve principles of adult learning, community-based methods, digital health technologies, and lifestyle change methods. The obstacles to participation, socioeconomic determinants, gender discrepancy, and the involvement of healthcare providers in improving program effectiveness are also addressed in the research study.

Keywords

Prevention of chronic disease; health education; adult learning, community-based intervention, health literacy, lifestyle change, digital health, program evaluation, public health, behavior change.

Introduction

Chronic or non-communicable diseases (NCDs) cause a significant part of the morbidity and mortality in the world, especially in the adult population. Poor diet, lack of exercise, tobacco use, and alcoholism are some of the lifestyle factors that are associated with conditions like cardiovascular diseases, diabetes, chronic respiratory diseases, and cancers. The ever-increasing numbers of such conditions are an issue with serious social, economic, and healthcare problems across the globe. As a result, preventive measures have taken the center stage as a priority area of the health sector, and health education programs have taken a center stage in the reduction of risk factors and a promotion of healthier lifestyles.[1,2]Health education involves organized Interventions that are expected to enhance knowledge, modify attitudes, and promote behavior change. Its efficacy is based on a good theoretical framework, which integrates the principles of adult learning, behavior change models, and community-

based engagement strategies. New developments, such as digital health tools and risk-based interventions tailored to each person have increased outreach and flexibility of health education programs. Nevertheless, there are other factors that affect the program outcomes such as health literacy, socioeconomic status, sex differences, cultural factors and accessibility. The involvement of the healthcare providers and policy support is even more effective to improve the effect of such interventions.[3]

An Overview of Chronic Diseases and World Burden

The problem of chronic diseases, also referred to as non-communicable diseases (NCDs), is one of the most prominent issues in the field of public health of the twenty-first century. These illnesses include cardiovascular diseases, diabetes, chronic respiratory diseases, and cancers; these are long-term and usually develop gradually, in most cases, they are lifetime conditions. Compared to infectious diseases, chronic ones are highly associated with lifestyle and

environmental causes, such as unhealthy diet, lack of exercises, use of tobacco and harmful use of alcohol, and pollution. Consequently, they cause a high and increasing burden to individuals, health systems and national economies.[4,5] The World Health Organization estimates chronic diseases to be the cause of about 74 percent of all deaths in the world, with the greatest rates in low- and middle-income nations. This is an imbalanced load that is determined by the speed of urbanization, aging, and the widespread use of unhealthy lifestyles. The economic cost is also very frightening; chronic illness does not only raise the cost of health care but also makes people less productive because of disability, early mortality, and less quality life. The financial cost on households with chronic conditions is usually devastating particularly in areas where there is a limited health insurance coverage.[6] The medical treatment has failed to curb the increased burden of chronic diseases in the world today. This trend shows that preventive measures are urgently required that focus on mitigating the risk factors that are modifiable. Health education, community awareness campaign, screening at young age and policy interventions have been shown to be effective methods of prevention of occurrence and severity of chronic diseases. Additionally, long-term prevention requires a solution to the social determinants of health such as level of education, income, access to healthcare and the environment.[7] Chronic diseases are a significant burden to communities in the global society, in terms of social, economic and health. Knowing their effect on the global population is critical in the context of effective prevention measures, which in turn can be achieved through health education programs enabling adults to take more active roles in terms of having healthier lifestyles and minimizing their chances of developing chronic diseases.[8]

Health Education Role in Public Health Promotion

Health education is very important in enhancing the promotion of health in the population as it equips an individual as well as community with the knowledge, skills and motivation to make sound decisions about their health. Health education as a fundamental element of the practice of public health aims at raising awareness, positive attitudes, and behavioural changes that will help prevent diseases and improve the quality of life. Health education through organized programs, campaigns, and community-based programs serves to bridging the gap between health and real life action enabling people to assume responsibility over their health.[9] Health education plays a role in alleviating the number of preventable diseases in the area of health promotion by addressing or even modifying the factors that may cause them. These are poor nutrition, lack of physical exercises, smoking, alcohol use and poor health seeking behaviors. Health education programs assist

people in becoming aware about the long-term effects of their actions by providing them with evidence-based information and health promotion efforts to make them realize that they can make better health decisions. Also, culturally relevant communication strategies are usually employed in the health education programs to reach different populations so that the health messages should be accessible, relevant and effective.[10,11] Health education is also important in empowering health systems by enhancing health literacy, which is the capacity of individuals to access, interpret and implement health information. The increase in the level of health literacy is linked to improved self-management of chronic illnesses, enhanced compliance with the treatment plan, and enhanced consumption of health services. In addition, policy interventions are supported by health education through the engagement of the community and advocacy of the community in favor of the health policies like tobacco control and vaccinations, screening programs and others.[12] Health education is vital to promoting the health of the community since it does not only increase awareness but also enables the community to change their behaviors in a sustainable manner. Health education helps to have healthier communities, decreased healthcare expenses, and improved infrastructural capabilities in the sector by empowering people with knowledge and practical skills.[13]

Determinants of Adult Health Behavior Change

Nevertheless, it is necessary to understand the factors that contribute to adult health behavior change to develop effective health education and public health interventions. The psychological, social, cultural and environmental factors interact in a complex manner to influence the adult health behaviors. Knowledge and awareness is one of the main determinants; adults with knowledge about the risk of unhealthy habits and the advantages of making healthier choices tend to think of change. Nonetheless, knowledge does not suffice, motivation and self-efficacy or the belief in own ability to change are important factors influencing the intentions to actions.[14,15] Adult behavior is also greatly influenced by social influences. The encouraging and discouraging factors to healthy practices are family, peers, and social networks. The positive interpersonal relationships tend to increase the readiness of a person to develop new behavioral patterns, whereas the negative social environment tends to strengthen personal bad habits. The cultural norms also influence health behaviors as they determine what is acceptable and desirable in a given community. Indicatively, the nutritional practices, exercise status, and perceptions about preventive healthcare are usually ingrained in cultural practices.[16] The environmental and economic factors are also significant determinants. Availability

of healthy food, safe area to pursue physical activities, and affordable health services has direct effects on the capacity of an adult to adopt a healthier lifestyle. People in resource-poor environments might have serious obstacles, including extreme prices, poor transport, or a deficiency of social amenities that interfere with the change of behavior despite motivation.[17] More so, individual aspects like age, level of education, stress, and mental health conditions affect the preparedness and ability of an individual to change. Adults who are under high stress or have low mental health might find it difficult to be able to adopt and stick to healthy behaviors.[18] In general, the personal, social, cultural, and environmental determinants interact in the change of adult health behavior. It is important to be able to identify those factors in order to create specific and efficient health education programs that will provide assistance in relation to the change in behaviors that will be meaningful and long-lasting.[19]

Theoretical baseline of Health Education Programs

The scientific background on the change of health behaviors by people is given by the theoretical principles of health education programs. These theories can be used in design, implementation, and evaluation of educational interventions because they help in explaining the cognitive, psychological, and social processes that facilitate decision-making. The Health Belief Model (HBM) is one of the most popular models, according to which people are more likely to respond to preventive behaviors when they believe the threat to their health to be serious, personally vulnerable, and when they feel that the perceived advantages of the action surpass the perceived barriers. The model assists teachers in the development of risk perception-inducing messages that would make them more motivated.[20] The other theory is the Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) which puts more emphasis on the intention in predicting a behavior. TPB states that attitudes to the behavior, perceived social norms, and perceived behavioral control are the determinants of the intention of an individual. This framework has been applied in health education programs to deal with misconceptions, establish supportive social environments and reinforce confidence in the ability to change. In the meantime, Social Cognitive Theory (SCT) emphasizes the significance of observational learning, self efficacy and environmental factors. It implies that people do not only learn directly but also by watching other people, so role modeling and community involvement are the main elements of successful programs.[21,22] Also, Transtheoretical Model (Stages of Change) acknowledges that the behavior change is gradual process. It recognizes the levels of precontemplation to maintenance and

empowers the educator to be able to make interventions based on the individual level of readiness to change. All these theories present distinct knowledge but when combined they provide a holistic knowledge of health behavior.[23] All in all, health education, being a structured intervention, should be based on theory to successfully alter the knowledge, attitudes and behavior leading to healthier populations and prevention of chronic conditions.[24]

Chronic Disease Prevention Models and Frameworks

Chronic disease prevention models and frameworks are critically important in leading the public health efforts that can help to mitigate the burden of chronic diseases all over the world like diabetes, cardiovascular disease, cancer, and chronic respiratory diseases. These are systematic methods of analyzing the risk factors, developing interventions and assessing the results. The model is the Social-Ecological Model which is one of the widely used and considers the prevention of chronic diseases as a multi-level intervention based on individual, interpersonal, community, and policy factors. It points out that sustainable prevention must have an integrated effort at various levels of the society, such as families, workplaces, schools, and governments.[25] The other impactful model is the Chronic Care Model (CCM), which aims at enhancing the management of chronic illnesses by having an effective interaction between the knowledgeable patients and the active healthcare teams. This model fosters self-management support, decision-making tools, coordinated care delivery, and information system utilisation. The CCM assists in the reduction of complications and thus the quality of life among patients who already have chronic conditions by strengthening health systems.[26] Another overall planning model that is applied in developing and appraising health promotion programs is the PRECEDE-PROCEED Model. PRECEDE assists in determining social, behavioral and environmental determinants of chronic disease whereas PROCEED assists in implementation and evaluation. This model will make sure that the interventions are based on the needs and evidence-based approaches of communities.[27,28] Also, the Health Promotion Model and Population Health Approach emphasize the need to deal with lifestyle behaviors, social determinants of health, and health inequities. Such models promote health-related interventions such as health education, screening, policy adjustments and community empowerment.[29] Together, these frameworks equip the public health professionals with practical instruments to plan, implement, and evaluate the strategies to prevent chronic diseases. Through combined efforts of individual behavior change and community and policy-level

interventions, these models will be useful in the long run in improving the population health and decreasing the rate of chronic diseases. [30]

Health Education Principle of Adult Learning

The principles of adult learning (also called andragogy) are fundamental to the factors that should guide the establishment of successful health education programs targeting adult audiences. As opposed to children, adults come in with the knowledge, personal experience and beliefs that are entrenched which have a powerful impact on adult learning and adoption of new health behaviors. It is one of the fundamental principles that adults are self-directed learners and they would like to be in control of their learning process. Thus, the health education programs should provide the possibility of autonomy, involvement and choice to improve involvement.[31] Adults are also goal oriented in that they are more motivated to learn when the information is pertinent to their short term needs or personal health issues. As an example, patients who are at risk of chronic diseases will find it easier to join the programs in which the mechanisms of prevention of complications by changing the style of life are explained clearly. This is also in line with the principle of relevance, where educators are supposed to relate the learning resources and real-life contexts.[32] Experience based learning is another concept. Adults find it easier to learn when the new information is connected with what they know or what they are facing in their daily life. Discussions, case studies and practical demonstrations can be used by health educators to make learners think about their habits, their risks and healthier options. Also, adults are more inclined to problem-based learning, in which emphasis is put on resolving a particular health problem instead of memorizing the theoretical material.[33] In adult learning motivation is an important factor. Adults also stand to be motivated by internal factors which may ensure that they are motivated by better health, by energy or by better life. Consequently, health education programs need to focus on personal gains of behavior change and at the same time focus on barriers and inculcating self confidence.[34] health education should be more effective when based on the principles of adult learning such as self-direction, relevance, experience, motivation, and problem-centered strategies. Through the acknowledgment of the peculiarities of adult learners, teachers may develop programs that will result in the effective behavior change and better chronic disease prevention outcomes.[35,36]

Planning and Development of Health Educations

Effective health education interventions need to be designed and implemented in a systematic, evidence-based manner so that the programs become relevant to the specific target population and could result in the measurable improvements in health levels. This usually starts with a needs assessment where educators determine the exact health issues, risk

factors and hindrances involved in a community. This stage assists in identification of priorities and is used to select the right strategies and learning material.[37] After identifying the needs, the other step would be planning and program design. This is to establish clear objectives, theory to be used, mode of delivery, and creation of culturally suitable material. The health education programs can take the form of lectures, discussions, workshops, online or community programs based on preferences and capabilities of the audience. The adaptability of the content to the level of literacy, cultural beliefs, and age-specific issues makes the program more acceptable and effective.[38] The aspect of implementation is where the plan is implemented in a systematic manner through organized sessions, campaigns or community outreach programs. At this stage, proper communication, involvement of learners and conducive environments that can promote behavior change must be taken care of. Health educators should also find ways of working with the stakeholders like the healthcare providers, the community leaders and other local organizations to ensure that the maximum number of people are reached and credibility.[39] Monitoring and evaluation is also a very important aspect of Implementation. Sequential review- in-program and post-program- assists in determining the achievement of the objectives and areas of development. These assessment tools can be surveys, interviews, behavioral tests or health check. Participant feedback is also a good source of information regarding the relevance and impact of the program.[40,41] Sustainability should also be factored in the process of incorporating interventions in the current structures of the community, training local facilitators, and ensuring that resources are long-term. To summarize, health education interventions can only be effective when they have been carefully planned and designed to fit the culture, implemented, and evaluated. These measures will make programs effective, efficient, and competent to enhance the prevention of chronic diseases among adults.[42]

Health Promotion through Community Based approaches

Health promotion through community based approaches are crucial to enhance the health of the population, decrease the health disparities, and empower individuals to make decisions on how to improve their health. Such strategies are based on active participation in the local communities in order to design, execute and maintain health activities that are sensitive to the unique needs, cultural values, and social environments of those communities. Community-based strategies, unlike top-down interventions, encourage involvement, ownership, and partnership of the community, healthcare providers and local organizations. The collaboration makes sure that health promotion efforts are both relevant and accessible and have a higher chance of

inducing behavior change in the long term.[43] Use of peer educators, community health workers and local volunteers is a central component of community based health promotion. These people usually have similar backgrounds, languages as well as experiences with the target population which makes them reliable sources of information. Their contribution improves communication, creates a stronger social support, and expands the coverage of preventive interventions. Interactive learning and collective action are also opportunities created through community events like health fairs, workshops and support groups.[44]Community-based interventions are likely to target social determinants of health, such as housing and education, employment and access to healthy foods. These strategies contribute to the creation of healthy lifestyles by allowing the inclusion of health promotion with the wider community development programs. Using the example of creation of safe recreational areas, creating community gardens, and implementing smoke-free places, it is possible to promote healthier behaviors at the population level.[45]Moreover, community engagement enhances cultural suitability of health communication, which becomes more effective in attitude and behavior modification. Feedback on a regular basis by members of the community makes programs responsive and sustainable.[46]Overall, one of the building blocks of effective health promotion is the community-based approach. They build trust, promote active involvement and constructive environments that can make individuals develop healthier behaviors. This will play a major role in the prevention of chronic diseases and the general well-being of the community by utilizing local resources and harnessing the cultural strengths.[47,48]

Online Health Education Resources and its Performance

The role of digital health education tools in contemporary practice of the field of public health has grown in significance and can provide novel and convenient ways of information dissemination, behavior change, and chronic disease prevention. Such tools will be mobile health (mHealth) applications, online learning websites, social media campaigns, telehealth, and interactive sites. Being available to a large number of people, health educators can reach people of various backgrounds irrespective of geographical, socioeconomic, and time factors. [49]Flexibility and convenience can be listed among the main benefits of digital tools. Adults have the opportunity to work with the health information at their own pace, revise the information when necessary, and use such interactive elements as videos, quizzes, and self-monitoring applications. This individual approach to learning improves the retention and motivation. Also, digital devices tend to provide such features as push notifications,

reminders, and monitoring of progress, which contribute to long-term compliance with health-related recommendations. [50]

Online platforms are also used to foster live communication between patients and medical practitioners. Users are able to consult with a specialist (telehealth), communicate (message), and exchange experiences through virtual support groups. This enhances involvement and promotes regular interest in health education processes.[51]It is believed that digital health tools are especially beneficial in the management and prevention of chronic diseases. Phone applications that monitor physical activity, nutrition, and adherence to medications will enable people to make more healthy decisions, whereas online smoking cessation or self-management diabetes programs have shown to achieve positive results.[52]Nevertheless, the digital health education is effective based on the aspects of digital literacy, access to technology, and content quality. The programs should be friendly, culture sensitive and scientifically precise in order to deliver significant influences.[53]the digital health education tools present the potent opportunities to promote the safety of the population. They are very effective in promoting healthy behaviors and preventing the risk of chronic diseases in adults because of their accessibility, interactivity, and the possibility to provide personalized support.[54]

Obstacles to the attendance on Health Education Programs

Obstacles to health education advertising participation are a major problem that may act as a barrier to effective and equitable outcomes in the field of public health. These may be individual, social, cultural, structural and they tend to inhibit the accessibility to the health promotion programmes or total benefit of these programs by adults. Low health literacy is one of the most frequent barriers that restrict the capacity of people to comprehend information about health, to interpret instructions, or to participate actively in the educational processes. Where the materials are too complicated or culturally not suitable, adults might also be overwhelmed or have no desire to participate.[55]Time is also a significant aspect especially among the adults who are at work, have families and other obligations. Some of them might fail to attend programs that are held when they are at work or are too distant to their homes. The absence of childcare, transportation problems and other conflicting priorities are other hindering factors to participation. The challenges are further increased in rural or underserved localities where there is little access to healthcare centers and the communities.[56]Moreover, low-income populations may be discouraged by financial barriers,

including program charges, costs of transportation or lost wages, even in the case of low-cost or free programs. Participation may be deterred because of psychological reasons such as the fear of being judged, embarrassed, or distrusting the healthcare institutions, especially those who had negative experiences before.[57] Population barriers are also not negligible, cultural and linguistic barriers. Programs that lack cultural beliefs, values, or languages by the participants can be viewed as having no significance or being rejective. This is so more so in multicultural societies whereby different health beliefs are used in determining attitudes towards education and preventive care.[58] There are digital barriers, including inability to access the internet or low technological literacy, which restrict the participation in online or mobile-based health education programs.[59] Conclusively, participation challenges demand holistic management in the form of accessibility, cultural sensitivity, affordability, and trust. Community needs and easier access to programs can also greatly enhance adult participation and better health outcomes.[60]

Socioeconomic Factors that Affect Program Outcomes

The socioeconomic influences are significant in determining the success of health education program outcomes in that it affects access, involvement and capacity of effecting the suggested behavioral changes. Lower socioeconomic status individuals are usually disadvantaged by inadequate access to health care facilities, nutritious food, safe recreational facilities and decent homes among others, which affects their ability to acquire and sustain healthy behavior. These organizational drawbacks imply that despite people getting proper health education they can have a problem into implementing it because of the financial and environmental factors.[61] One of the best predictors of outcomes of the program is income level. The poor might not have the means at their disposal to act upon the health advice given to them like buying healthier foods, transportation to medical facilities, or access to drugs and health supplies. On the same note, education level also has a role in health literacy with regard to how one perceives health information and is able to make sound decisions. Individuals with lower education might need more specific interventions to gain an equivalent amount of benefit to individuals with higher education levels.[62] Outcomes have also been created by the employment conditions. Adults may also find it hard to go to health education classes or even follow up on lifestyle change programs like exercising regularly due to irregular working hours, work related stress, and the lack of sick leave. The surroundings of the neighborhood contribute another factor; high crime, poor infrastructure or lack of health promoting resources makes communities more challenging to maintain the behavior change.[63] Socioeconomic status is commonly

related to social support, which influences motivation and compliance with health-related recommendations. When the family and its surrounding are supportive, a person will perform better than when he or she is socially isolated.[64] Socioeconomic factors play an important role in the efficacy of health education programs. Interventions should be earmarked to maximize the impact by integrating equity-based interventions that would help curb the spread of chronic diseases by taking into consideration all the factors that may affect the population; that is, all people (with or without socioeconomic barriers) should be in a position to gain access to the intervention.[65]

Educational Interventions The Role of Healthcare Providers

The success of health education interventions is central to healthcare providers, which are reliable sources of information and key facilitators of behavior change. They are best placed to provide appropriate and customized health education because of their clinical knowledge, direct relationship with patients and their knowledge of community health requirements. Physicians, nurses, dietitians, health educators among other providers not only diagnose and treat diseases but also advise people to adopt preventive measures that will minimize chances of falling into chronic diseases.[66] Among the most vital tasks that healthcare providers perform is to explain complicated medical data in simple and implementable instructions. This makes the patient understand the value of lifestyle modifications including healthy dieting, exercise, quitting of smoking and taking medications. The providers also make the educational messages relevant and understandable by taking into consideration the cultural background of patients, their level of literacy and personal health objectives.[67] Healthcare providers can also be motivational through the establishment of good supportive relationships with patients. They build confidence in transforming themselves in patients through counseling, encouragement and reinforcement which is another important element in changing behavior sustainably. Some of the financial difficulties, emotional stress, or family support are also examined by providers who assist individuals to work out strategies to overcome them.[68] In health care that is multidisciplinary, the providers engage in a process of providing holistic educational intervention. As an illustration, a behavior change plan can be implemented by doctors, and sustained guidance and follow-up are ensued by nurses and dietitians. Such collaboration improves the continuity of care and makes sure that patients receive the same messages throughout all the points of contact.[69] Providers have a role to play in the improvement of the community health through community outreaches, screening programs, and online education. Their participation is more credible and motivates more.[70] Educational interventions

require the presence of healthcare professionals and their knowledge, communication abilities, and continuous assistance. Their contribution is crucial in influencing informed decision making, enhancing self-management in patients, and the prevention of chronic diseases in populations.[71]

Assessment of Change in Knowledge, Attitude, and Practice

The measurement of changes in knowledge, attitudes, and practices (KAP) is an important element of the effectiveness of health education programs appraisal. These three dimensions offer an exhaustive account of how these people process health information, how they perceive the prescribed actions and whether any changes to healthier practices are adopted in the long-term. KAP tests assist teachers in understanding the extent to which the interventions are producing the desired results and the areas that need to be improved or strengthened.[72] Measures of knowledge Health educators may use structured questionnaires, pre and post tests or digital testing which measure the knowledge of preventive measures and risk factors of disease and recommended behaviors. Gain in knowledge refers to the fact that the individuals have actually absorbed the new knowledge and this is usually the initial step to behavior change.[73] Attitude measurement is aimed at measuring beliefs, perceptions, and motivation of people concerning a given health behavior. The instruments that are commonly used in evaluating attitudes include Likert-scale surveys, interviews and focus groups. The changes received a positive response, including the growth of confidence in adopting healthy habits or the greater conviction about the value of prevention, indicate that the educational programs are affecting the psychological readiness of change.[74] The greatest indicator of program success is practice or behavior change. It also indicates whether people have practiced what they have learned in life. Surveys of self-reported behavior, observations, activity trackers, clinical screening, or mobile health applications can be used to measure changes in behavior. Some of them are higher engagement in physical activity, better nutrition, frequent attendance at screening or less smoking.[75] The longitudinal monitoring, which is the tracking of the participants throughout the time, is necessary to identify the sustainability of changes in behaviors. The use of both quantitative (e.g. test scores, logs of activities, etc.) and qualitative feedback (e.g. interviews) will give a more accurate and holistic picture.[76] On the whole, the KAP changes can be assessed in order to help health educators to measure the program impact, improve intervention strategies, and to make sure that educational activities are effective to prevent chronic diseases and sustain behavioral change.[77]

Effects of Health Literacy Level on the Success of the Program

Health literacy is also a key indicator of success of any health education program, particularly the one that focuses on the prevention of chronic diseases. Health literacy is the capacity of an individual to access, comprehend, appraise and utilize health information to make choices. In case of low levels of health literacy, the patient can experience a lack of understanding of educational resources and struggle to adhere to medical guidelines or identify risk factors and demonstrate poor behavioral patterns. This has a direct influence on the effectiveness of the interventions aimed at more healthy lifestyles or the promotion of preventive practices.[78] A health literate participant tends to be in a better position to know the causes and impact of the chronic diseases. They are able to use new knowledge more efficiently, interact with medical professionals more confidently, and use observed behavioral changes. Conversely, having poor literacy, a person can misunderstand information, become confused during the educational process, or be afraid to ask questions. This normally results in little participation and low long-term behavior change.[79] Health literacy does not only apply in individual learning, but also in program access and equity. When the content of the program is introduced with the complicated language or medical terminology, it can automatically isolate the vulnerable population (e.g., older adults, low income, and non-native speakers) accidentally. Consequently, the difference in health can be increased, and the less fortunate groups will not enjoy the interventions.[80] Health educators need to communicate in simple language, use visuals, interactive exercises, and culturally relevant examples in order to provide materials that meet the needs of different levels of literacy in order to ensure the program succeeds. The use of teach-back techniques, where the participants restate information using their own words, can be used to ensure comprehension. The low-literacy learners can also be assisted using digital tools, such as videos, animations, and voice-over instructions.[81] Health literacy plays a significant role in determining the result of the program through insights on understanding, action, and behavior. The solution to the problem of literacy is to enhance inclusivity, learning opportunities, and a health education program whereby maximum impact is realized by all categories of the adult population.[82]

Review on ways to evaluate the effectiveness of health education

Measuring the effectiveness of the health education programs is necessary to understand the impact of health education programs, modify the intervention in the future, and make efficient use of resources. Evaluation is the process of gathering and analysing data systematically in order to establish whether the program goals that include increasing knowledge, improving attitudes or changing behaviours have

been met. There are various assessment techniques which depend on the objectives of a program, population to be targeted and resources.[83] Quantitative evaluation is one of the most important approaches, and its tools are structured, i.e., surveys, pre-tests and post-tests, and questionnaires. These tools assess change in knowledge, attitude and practice by evaluating the response of the participants prior to the intervention and after the intervention. Quantitative techniques can be used to make objective measurements, statistical comparison, and cross-group or cross-tempor comparisons.[84] Qualitative assessment offers more information about the experiences, motivation, and barriers of the participants. The interview, focus groups and open-ended surveys are the methods that assist in the discovery of how the participants view the program, which of their aspects proved to be the most helpful, and which ones need to be improved. Qualitative data can be used to supplement quantitative findings and provide an entertaining background to the interpretation.[85] The other significant approach is process evaluation that looks at the effectiveness of the program implementation. It also evaluates the aspects of attendance, the interest of the participant, the performance of the educators, and the faithfulness to the program design. This allows determination of strengths and weaknesses in operations.[86] Outcome evaluation deals with short-term results, e.g. better knowledge or attitude, whereas impact evaluation deals with long-term behavioral or health-related changes, e.g. decreased risk factors of chronic diseases.[87] Tracking user engagement, app usage or completion rates are some of the metrics commonly employed by digital health programs to measure effectiveness. Biometric or clinical information (e.g., blood pressure, BMI, glucose levels) can also be added to chronic disease-related intervention. Quantitative and qualitative methods should be combined to give a complete assessment of the effectiveness of the health education. This is an evidence-based, participant-led, and mix-method approach that will help to implement meaningful changes to the overall health of communities.[88]

Successful Prevention Programs Case Studies

Successful prevention programs are analyzed as case studies, which give important information concerning approaches to be used to minimize the occurrence and the prevalence of chronic diseases. Through real-world examples, professionals working in the field of public health will be able to see the best practices, compare the results, and alter the interventions to fit other populations and contexts. A well-known one is a Diabetes Prevention Program (DPP) in the United States, which aimed at reaching the adults who were high risk of developing type 2 diabetes. The intervention was focused on lifestyle modification, such as physical activity, dietary interventions, and weight loss. The respondents who adhered to these

interventions showed a great decrease in the incidence of diabetes as opposed to the control group, which suggests the efficacy of well-structured and evidence-based education programs.[89] Its other example is the North Karelia Project in Finland, which aimed at the reduction of cardiovascular disease by means of the interventions at a community level. The program involved a mixture of community awareness campaigns, diet interventions, smoking quitting programs, and policy interventions, including controls on the salt content in processed food. The project resulted in a significant reduction of cardiovascular morbidity and mortality over a number of decades, which proved the efficacy of multi-level strategies.[90] The Global Initiative of Tobacco Control by the WHO gives another testimony of effective prevention. Countries have been able to reduce smoking rates significantly, with policy interventions such as taxation, smoking bans in the community, and health education campaigns, which has led to lower incidences of lung cancer and other chronic illnesses. These case studies have some key factors that support their effectiveness, including evidence-based interventions, community engagement, multi-sector collaboration, continuous monitoring and evaluation, and culturally relevant communication. They also focus on the need to be sustainable, and programs are aimed at generating long term behavioral change as opposed to short-term outcomes.[91] Case studies of effective prevention programs indicate that proper planning, evidence-based, and community-based interventions can achieve much in decreasing the risk of chronic diseases. They offer viable examples of efficient health education program models across the globe.[92]

Lifestyle Modification to Reduce the risk of chronic diseases

A key concept in the prevention of chronic diseases is lifestyle modification, as most of the non-communicable diseases, such as diabetes, cardiovascular disease, obesity, and some types of cancer, are directly associated with modifiable behaviors. The promotions of good diet, exercise, quitting of tobacco, moderation of alcohol, and alleviation of stress are established techniques that diminish the potential of disease occurrence and advances health-related outcomes in general.[93] The dietary change is a necessity to manage the risk factors, including obesity, hypertension, and increased cholesterol. Dietary interventions that promote the intake of more fruits, vegetables, whole grains, and lean proteins and discourage the intake of saturated fats, sugar, and processed food have shown significant decreases in the incidence of cardiovascular and metabolic diseases. Likewise, moderate exercise can enhance heart strength, weight control, bone and muscle strength as well as improve mental health. More often than not, the recommendations will contain at least 150 minutes of

moderate-intensity exercise per week, depending on the abilities of the adults.[94] The reduction of tobacco and alcohol is crucial to lifestyle interventions. Nicotine replacement therapies, counseling and smoking cessation programs are found to reduce greatly the risk of lung cancer, heart diseases and chronic respiratory diseases. The consumption of alcohol in excess leads to liver diseases, high blood pressure and some cancers, which can be prevented by reducing alcohol consumption. Stress management interventions (including mindfulness, meditation, and sleep) also underpin the long-term health and enhance compliance with other lifestyle shifts.[95] The goal-setting, self-monitoring and behavior reinforcement are often practiced in the health education programs which emphasize lifestyle change as a way of empowering the participants. Mobile applications, group sessions, and support groups increase motivation and maintain the changes in the long run. Interventions that are designed according to cultural preferences, socioeconomic status and readiness of individuals to change are more effective.[96] lifestyle change is a very powerful measure of risk reduction of chronic diseases. Through systematic changes in learning and support, adults can remarkably reduce the risk of non-communicable diseases, increase the quality of life, and have an overall effect on the wider population health.[97]

Gender difference in Health Education outcomes
 Gender is a major variable that defines the results of health education programs, knowledge acquisition, attitude change, and behavior change. Men and women have biological, social and cultural differences which influence their perception of health risks, their response to interventions as well as their adoption of recommended behaviors. Such differences should be understood to come up with effective programs that would bring equitable health outcomes.[98] In most cases women show greater participation in health education compared to their male counterparts. Research has shown that women tend to use more preventive care, attend workshops and engage in discussions. This could be explained by the increased health awareness, patterns of socialization, which promote active health behaviors and the caregiving duty that raises the family health awareness. Therefore, when women are addressed in terms of educational interventions, higher knowledge retention and better lifestyle changes are often achieved.[99] On the contrary, men might be less participative and slow to acquire preventive behaviors. Conventional gender norms, invulnerability and reluctance to seek assistance can diminish participation in the health education programs. Men-specific programs may need certain approaches, including the focus on practical benefits, competition or goal-centered strategies, and interventions in the workplace, in order to make them

more highly attended and effective. Additionally, the nature of the chronic diseases that vary between men and women requires the use of gender sensitive contents. As an example, female-specific risk factors and manifestations of cardiovascular diseases can be different than those in men, and these issues need to be taught individually. Equally, reproductive health, maternal health, and caregiving issues affect the women health priorities and responsiveness based on interventions.[100] To conclude, there are gender disparities that have a great influence on health education outcomes. Such programs which identify and respond to these differences, by means of specifically designed messages, culturally competent strategies and gender-specific strategies, have a higher chance of achieving desired effects in terms of enhancing knowledge, attitudes and health behaviors in adults. The gender consideration will enable everyone to benefit equally in the benefits of the chronic disease prevention programs.[101]

Community Health Education Initiatives Policy Support

The success and sustainability of the community health education initiatives depend on policy support. The policies that are effective offer the structural, financial and regulatory context that is needed to undertake, oversee, and expand interventions aimed at enhancing health literacy and averting chronic illnesses. Devoid of proper policy support, programs might have resource constraints, diffuse provision, and poor involvement of the community, and their societal contribution to health will be constrained.[102] The community health education process can be supported by the government policies in terms of financing the sphere, creating national health priorities, and incorporating the programs in the existing health and social systems. Indicatively, policies such as those that require preventive screening, tobacco control or nutritional labeling will provide an enabling environment that supports educational messages that are received at the community level. It guarantees that the population receives the services offered through the programs, which otherwise serve only the underserved groups; and, incentives provided to the healthcare providers encourage them to engage in the outreach and educating programs.[103] The legislation is also critical in program accessibility and equity. Such policies can mandate the use of culturally suitable health education resources, language accessible, and those that are vulnerable specific. Also, the regulatory systems may facilitate interactions between governmental institutions, non-governmental organizations, and local groups and enable them to collaborate and share resources.[104] There is policy support to development of workforce. Funding policies including training and certification of community health workers, educators and volunteers in

promoting and standardizing interventions of health education. Correspondingly, the policies facilitating data collection, monitoring, and evaluation will make sure that the programs are evidence-based and can be ameliorated with time.[105] In a nutshell, the policy support reinforces health education programs in communities by availing financial resources, regulatory policies, and institutional support. This support will make a sustainable, scalable, and equitable intervention that will enhance the health outcomes of the population and minimize the burden of chronic illnesses on the population.[106]

Future Projections on the way to improve Adult Chronic Disease Prevention

Chronic disease prevention in the adults has been a continuous issue of popular health and in future, the strategies should consider new challenges, technological changes, and population demands. Although the conventional programs of health education and lifestyle modification have been found to be effective, future efforts can be made more innovative, integrated as well as personalized to achieve the greatest effect.[107] Digitization of health technologies is one of the key directions. Mobile apps, wearable devices, telehealth systems, and social media provide unprecedented opportunities to provide personalized education, real-time monitoring and behavior reinforcement. The tools are able to offer personalized health messages, monitor progress of lifestyle change, as well as offer interactive feedback, which increases engagement and behavioral change in the long term.[108] The other area of interest is to incorporate social determinants of health into the prevention strategies. Socioeconomic status, education, housing, and access to healthcare are closely related factors that indicate chronic disease risk. The programs to be implemented in the future should be holistic to incorporate environmental and structural barriers with individual behaviour change so that the interventions are fair and effective to all populations.[109] There is also a need to have interdisciplinary cooperation. Collaborations among healthcare providers, community organizations, policymakers and researchers should be used to develop joint and holistic interventions on health education. This partnership will be able to share their resources, expand the reach of their programs, and make sure that they do not oppose the national health priorities.[110] Risk-based interventions tailored to the individual are becoming more popular. Innovations in the field of genomics, precision medicine, and predictive analytics enable the implementation of targeted approaches that are based on the assumption of a person being at a greater risk of contracting a chronic illnesses. Preventive support and individualized preventive advice may enhance compliance and health care outcomes.[111] the programs in the future must focus on sustainability and ongoing assessment by relying on data-driven

methods to track the effect, change the strategy, and expand the effective measures. The focus on the idea of lifelong learning, the empowerment of communities, and culturally suitable messaging will also contribute to the increased success of the prevention of chronic diseases. Sustainability in the future of adult chronic disease prevention encompasses the use of technology, targeting social determinants, building collaborations and offering individualized and sustainable interventions. Such strategies portend better and more efficient, fair and sustainable change in population health. The following is a conclusion to your study on the effect of health education programs to prevent chronic disease in adults[112]

Conclusion

Chronic illness is a critical societal problem in all developed nations that impacts greatly on the health, life quality, and health systems of adults. The study shows that health education programs are very critical in the prevention of chronic diseases through enhanced knowledge, attitudes, and long-term behavior change. Competent programs are based on evidence-based theoretical frameworks, adult education, and behavior change theories, and utilize culturally aware, community-oriented, and online models to access diverse groups of people. The research shows that various variables affect the effectiveness of health education interventions such as health literacy, socioeconomic status, gender differences, among other factors of accessibility. Participation of healthcare providers and policy backing serve as an added advantage to the program effectiveness whereby interventions are relevant, practical and sustainable. Successful examples of programs detail the advantages of customized, interactive, and active delivery of programs that result in significant changes in lifestyle habits and reduce risk factors related to chronic diseases. Program outcomes should be evaluated by determining changes in knowledge, attitudes, and practices, which are vital in determining the effectiveness of the program and amending the interventions. Besides, a combination of social determinants of health, the exploitation of technology, and individualized guidance are also areas of future prospects of adult chronic disease prevention.

References

1. **United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division.** *World Population Ageing 2019 (ST/ESA/SER.A/444)*. 2020.
2. **Schumacher B., Pothof J., Vijg J., Hoeijmakers J.H.J.** The central role of DNA damage in the ageing process. *Nature*. 2021;592(7856):695–703.

3. **Kuo P.L., Schrack J.A., Levine M.E., Shardell M.D., Simonsick E.M., Chia C.W., et al.** Longitudinal phenotypic aging metrics in the Baltimore Longitudinal Study of Aging. *Nat Aging.* 2022;2(7):635–643.
4. **Lopez-Otin C., Blasco M.A., Partridge L., Serrano M., Kroemer G.** Hallmarks of aging: An expanding universe. *Cell.* 2023;186(2):243–278.
5. **Izquierdo M., Fatarone Singh M.** Promoting resilience in the face of ageing and disease: The central role of exercise and physical activity. *Ageing Res Rev.* 2023;88.
6. **Izquierdo M., Fatarone Singh M.** Urgent need for integrating physical exercise into geriatric medicine: a call to action. *Br J Sports Med.* 2023;57(15):953–954.
7. **Harridge S.D., Lazarus N.R.** Physical Activity, Aging, and Physiological Function. *Physiology (Bethesda).* 2017;32(2):152–161.
8. **Lazarus N.R., Izquierdo M., Higginson I.J., Harridge S.D.R.** Exercise Deficiency Diseases of Ageing: The Primacy of Exercise and Muscle Strengthening as First-Line Therapeutic Agents to Combat Frailty. *J Am Med Dir Assoc.* 2018;19(9):741–743.
9. **Izquierdo M., Merchant R.A., Morley J.E., Anker S.D., Aprahamian I., Arai H., et al.** International Exercise Recommendations in Older Adults (ICFSR): Expert Consensus Guidelines. *J Nutr Health Aging.* 2021;25(7):824–853.
10. **Lazarus N.R., Harridge S.D.R.** Declining performance of master athletes: silhouettes of the trajectory of healthy human ageing? *J Physiol.* 2017;595(9):2941–2948.
11. **Franceschi C., Garagnani P., Morsiani C., Conte M., Santoro A., Grignolio A., et al.** The Continuum of Aging and Age-Related Diseases: Common Mechanisms but Different Rates. *Front Med (Lausanne).* 2018;5:61.
12. **Chhetri J.K., Xue Q.L., Ma L., Chan P., Varadhan R.** Intrinsic Capacity as a Determinant of Physical Resilience in Older Adults. *J Nutr Health Aging.* 2021;25(8):1006–1011.
13. **Cesari M., Araujo de Carvalho I., Amuthavalli Thiagarajan J., Cooper C., Martin F.C., Reginster J.Y., et al.** Evidence for the Domains Supporting the Construct of Intrinsic Capacity. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci.* 2018;73(12):1653–1660.
14. **World Health Organization.** *Global action plan on physical activity 2018–2030: more active people for a healthier world.* 2018.
15. **Zhou M., Kuang L., Hu N.** The Association between Physical Activity and Intrinsic Capacity in Chinese Older Adults and Its Connection to Primary Care: China Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study (CHARLS). *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2023;20(7).
16. **Ramirez-Velez R., Iriarte-Fernandez M., Santafe G., Malanda A., Beard J.R., Garcia-Hermoso A., et al.** Association of intrinsic capacity with incidence and mortality of cardiovascular disease: Prospective study in UK Biobank. *J Cachexia Sarcopenia Muscle.* 2023;14(5):2054–2063.
17. **Sánchez-Sánchez J.L., Lu W.H., Gallardo-Gómez D., Del Pozo Cruz B., de Souto Barreto P., Lucia A., et al.** Association of intrinsic capacity with functional decline and mortality in older adults: a systematic review and meta-analysis of longitudinal studies. *Lancet Healthy Longev.* 2024;5(7):e480–e492.
18. **Ekelund U., Tarp J., Steene-Johannessen J., Hansen B.H., Jefferis B., Fagerland M.W., et al.** Dose-response associations between accelerometry measured physical activity and sedentary time and all cause mortality: systematic review and harmonised meta-analysis. *BMJ.* 2019;366:l4570.
19. **Fragala M.S., Cadore E.L., Dorgo S., Izquierdo M., Kraemer W.J., Peterson M.D., et al.** Resistance Training for Older Adults: Position Statement From the National Strength and Conditioning Association. *J Strength Cond Res.* 2019;33(8):2019–2052.
20. **Duarte Junior M.A., Martínez-Gómez D., Pintos-Carrillo S., Sotos-Prieto M., Ortolá R., Rodríguez-Artalejo F., et al.** Associations of physical activity type, volume, intensity, and changes over time with all-cause mortality in older adults: The Seniors-ENRICA cohorts. *Scand J Med Sci Sports.* 2024;34(1).
21. **Lieberman D.E., Kistner T.M., Richard D., Lee I.M., Baggish A.L.** The active grandparent hypothesis: Physical activity and the evolution of extended human healthspans and lifespans. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 2021;118(50).
22. **Kokkinos P., Faselis C., Samuel I.B.H., Pittaras A., Doumas M., Murphy R., et al.** Cardiorespiratory Fitness and Mortality Risk Across the Spectra of Age, Race, and Sex. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2022;80(6):598–609.
23. **Celis-Morales C.A., Welsh P., Lyall D.M., Steell L., Petermann F., Anderson J., et al.** Associations of grip strength with cardiovascular, respiratory, and cancer outcomes and all cause mortality: prospective cohort study of half a million UK Biobank participants. *BMJ.* 2018;361:k1651.
24. **Ramirez-Velez R., Correa-Bautista J.E., Garcia-Hermoso A., Cano C.A., Izquierdo M.** Reference values for handgrip strength and their association with intrinsic capacity domains among older adults. *J Cachexia Sarcopenia Muscle.* 2019;10(2):278–286.

25. Lopez-Lopez J.P., Cohen D.D., Ney-Salazar D., Martinez D., Otero J., Gomez-Arbelaez D., et al. The prediction of Metabolic Syndrome alterations is improved by combining waist circumference and handgrip strength measurements compared to either alone. *Cardiovasc Diabetol.* 2021;20(1):68.

26. Garcia-Hermoso A., Cavero-Redondo I., Ramirez-Velez R., Ruiz J.R., Ortega F.B., Lee D.C., et al. Muscular Strength as A Predictor of All-Cause Mortality in an Apparently Healthy Population: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Data From Approximately 2 Million Men and Women. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* 2018;99(10):2100–2113.e5.

27. Vaishya R., Misra A., Vaish A., Ursino N., D'Ambrosi R. Hand grip strength as a proposed new vital sign of health: a narrative review of evidences. *J Health Popul Nutr.* 2024;43(1):7.

28. Cruz-Jentoft A.J., Bahat G., Bauer J., Boirie Y., Bruyère O., Cederholm T., et al. Sarcopenia: revised European consensus on definition and diagnosis. *Age Ageing.* 2019;48(4):601.

29. Chen L.K., Woo J., Assantachai P., Auyeung T.W., Chou M.Y., Iijima K., et al. Asian Working Group for Sarcopenia: 2019 Consensus Update on Sarcopenia Diagnosis and Treatment. *J Am Med Dir Assoc.* 2020;21(3):300–307.e2.

30. Raichlen D.A., Lieberman D.E. The evolution of human step counts and its association with the risk of chronic disease. *Curr Biol.* 2022;32(21):R1206–R1214.

31. Lee I.M., Shiroma E.J., Kamada M., Bassett D.R., Matthews C.E., Buring J.E. Association of Step Volume and Intensity With All-Cause Mortality in Older Women. *JAMA Intern Med.* 2019;179(8):1105–1112.

32. Saint-Maurice P.F., Troiano R.P., Bassett D.R., Jr, Graubard B.I., Carlson S.A., Shiroma E.J., et al. Association of Daily Step Count and Step Intensity With Mortality Among US Adults. *JAMA.* 2020;323(12):1151–1160.

33. Paluch A.E., Bajpai S., Bassett D.R., Carnethon M.R., Ekelund U., Evenson K.R., et al. Daily steps and all-cause mortality: a meta-analysis of 15 international cohorts. *Lancet Public Health.* 2022;7(3):e219–e228.

34. Stamatakis E., Ahmadi M.N., Gill J.M.R., Thogersen-Ntoumani C., Gibala M.J., Doherty A., et al. Association of wearable device-measured vigorous intermittent lifestyle physical activity with mortality. *Nat Med.* 2022;28(12):2521–2529.

35. Aarden J.J., Reijntierse E.M., van der Schaaf M., van der Esch M., Reichardt L.A., van Seben R., et al. Longitudinal Changes in Muscle Mass, Muscle Strength, and Physical Performance in Acutely Hospitalized Older Adults. *J Am Med Dir Assoc.* 2021;22(4):839–845.e1.

36. Izquierdo M., Morley J.E., Lucia A. Exercise in people over 85. *BMJ.* 2020;368.

37. Bull F.C., Al-Ansari S.S., Biddle S., Borodulin K., Buman M.P., Cardon G., et al. World Health Organization 2020 guidelines on physical activity and sedentary behaviour. *Br J Sports Med.* 2020;54(24):1451–1462.

38. Valenzuela P.L., Castillo-Garcia A., Morales J.S., Izquierdo M., Serra-Rexach J.A., Santos-Lozano A., et al. Physical Exercise in the Oldest Old. *Compr Physiol.* 2019;9(4):1281–1304.

39. El Assar M., Carnicero J.A., Angulo J., Camara-Hernandez V., Garcia-Garcia F.J., Rodriguez-Manas L. Fat Mass Accounts for Insulin Resistance Impact on Functional Decline and Mortality in Nondiabetic Older Adults. *J Am Med Dir Assoc.* 2024;25(3):448–453.

40. Fielding R.A., Atkinson E.J., Aversa Z., White T.A., Heeren A.A., Mielke M.M., et al. Biomarkers of Cellular Senescence Predict the Onset of Mobility Disability and Are Reduced by Physical Activity in Older Adults. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci.* 2024;79(3).

41. Englund D.A., Sakamoto A.E., Fritsche C.M., Heeren A.A., Zhang X., Kotajarvi B.R., et al. Exercise reduces circulating biomarkers of cellular senescence in humans. *Aging Cell.* 2021;20(7).

42. Stensvold D., Viken H., Steinshamn S.L., Dalen H., Stoylen A., Loennechen J.P., et al. Effect of exercise training for five years on all cause mortality in older adults—the Generation 100 study: randomised controlled trial. *BMJ.* 2020;371.

43. Zhao M., Veeranki S.P., Magnussen C.G., Xi B. Recommended physical activity and all cause and cause specific mortality in US adults: prospective cohort study. *BMJ.* 2020;370.

44. Batouli S.A.H., Saba V. At least eighty percent of brain grey matter is modifiable by physical activity: A review study. *Behav Brain Res.* 2017;332:204–217.

45. Bae S., Harada K., Lee S., Harada K., Makino K., Chiba I., et al. The Effect of A Multicomponent Dual-Task Exercise on Cortical Thickness in Older Adults with Cognitive Decline: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *J Clin Med.* 2020;9(5).

46. Kleinloog J.P.D., Mensink R.P., Ivanov D., Adam J.J., Uludag K., Joris P.J. Aerobic Exercise Training Improves Cerebral Blood Flow and Executive Function: A Randomized, Controlled Cross-Over Trial in Sedentary Older Men. *Front Aging Neurosci.* 2019;11:333.

47. Rossi P.G., Carnavale B.F., Farche A.C.S., Ansai J.H., de Andrade L.P., Takahashi A.C.M. Effects of physical exercise on the cognition of older adults with frailty syndrome:

A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized trials. *Arch Gerontol Geriatr*. 2021;93.

48. **Cadore E.L., Saez de Asteasu M.L., Izquierdo M.** Multicomponent exercise and the hallmarks of frailty: Considerations on cognitive impairment and acute hospitalization. *Exp Gerontol*. 2019;122:10–14.

49. **Merchant R.A., Chan Y.H., Hui R.J.Y., Tsoi C.T., Kwek S.C., Tan W.M., et al.** Motoric cognitive risk syndrome, physio-cognitive decline syndrome, cognitive frailty and reversibility with dual-task exercise. *Exp Gerontol*. 2021;150.

50. **Bahat G., Kilic C., Eris S., Karan M.A.** Power Versus Sarcopenia: Associations with Functionality and Physical Performance Measures. *J Nutr Health Aging*. 2021;25(1):13–17.

51. **Cadore E.L., Izquierdo M.** Muscle Power Training: A Hallmark for Muscle Function Retaining in Frail Clinical Setting. *J Am Med Dir Assoc*. 2018;19(3):190–192.

52. **Noone J., Mucinski J.M., DeLany J.P., Sparks L.M., Goodpaster B.H.** Understanding the variation in exercise responses to guide personalized physical activity prescriptions. *Cell Metab*. 2024;36(4):702–724.

53. **Gronwald T., Torpel A., Herold F., Budde H.** Perspective of Dose and Response for Individualized Physical Exercise and Training Prescription. *J Funct Morphol Kinesiol*. 2020;5(3).

54. **Izquierdo M., Duque G., Morley J.E.** Physical activity guidelines for older people: knowledge gaps and future directions. *Lancet Healthy Longev*. 2021;2(6):e380–e383.

55. **Bennie J.A., De Cocker K., Teychenne M.J., Brown W.J., Biddle S.J.H.** The epidemiology of aerobic physical activity and muscle-strengthening activity guideline adherence among 383,928 U.S. adults. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act*. 2019;16(1):34.

56. **Garcia-Hermoso A., Lopez-Gil J.F., Ramirez-Velez R., Alonso-Martinez A.M., Izquierdo M., Ezzatvar Y.** Adherence to aerobic and muscle-strengthening activities guidelines: a systematic review and meta-analysis of 3.3 million participants across 32 countries. *Br J Sports Med*. 2023;57(4):225–229.

57. **Dent E., Morley J.E., Cruz-Jentoft A.J., Woodhouse L., Rodriguez-Manas L., Fried L.P., et al.** Physical Frailty: ICFSR International Clinical Practice Guidelines for Identification and Management. *J Nutr Health Aging*. 2019;23(9):771–787.

58. **Booth F.W., Roberts C.K., Thyfault J.P., Ruegsegger G.N., Toedebusch R.G.** Role of Inactivity in Chronic Diseases: Evolutionary Insight and Pathophysiological Mechanisms. *Physiol Rev*. 2017;97(4):1351–1402.

59. **Fluiza-Luces C., Santos-Lozano A., Joyner M., Carrera-Bastos P., Picazo O., Zugaza J.L., et al.** Exercise benefits in cardiovascular disease: beyond attenuation of traditional risk factors. *Nat Rev Cardiol*. 2018;15(12):731–743.

60. **Sherrington C., Michaleff Z.A., Fairhall N., Paul S.S., Tiedemann A., Whitney J., et al.** Exercise to prevent falls in older adults: an updated systematic review and meta-analysis. *Br J Sports Med*. 2017;51(24):1750–1758. Doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2016-096547. – DOI – PubMed

61. **Guirguis-Blake J.M., Michael Y.L., Perdue L.A., Coppola E.L., Beil T.L.** Interventions to Prevent Falls in Older Adults: Updated Evidence Report and Systematic Review for the US Preventive Services Task Force. *JAMA*. 2018;319(16):1705–1716. Doi: 10.1001/jama.2017.21962. – DOI – PubMed

62. **Rooks D., Swan T., Goswami B., Filosa L.A., Bunte O., Panchaud N., et al.** Bimagrumab vs Optimized Standard of Care for Treatment of Sarcopenia in Community-Dwelling Older Adults: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2020;3(10) doi: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.20836. – DOI – PMC – PubMed

63. **Westaway K., Blacker N., Shute R., Allin R., Elgebaly Z., Frank O., et al.** Combination psychotropic medicine use in older adults and risk of hip fracture. *Aust Prescr*. 2019;42(3):93–96. Doi: 10.18773/austprescr.2019.011. – DOI – PMC – PubMed

64. **Fiatarone Singh M.A., Izquierdo M., Morley J.E.** Physical Fitness and Exercise, in *Pathy's Principles and Practice of Geriatric Medicine*; 2022; pp. 77–107.

65. **Marteau T.M., Rutter H., Marmot M.** Changing behaviour: an essential component of tackling health inequalities. *BMJ*. 2021;372 doi: 10.1136/bmj.n332. – DOI – PMC – PubMed

66. **Robinson M.M., Dasari S., Konopka A.R., Johnson M.L., Manjunatha S., Esponda R.R., et al.** Enhanced Protein Translation Underlies Improved Metabolic and Physical Adaptations to Different Exercise Training Modes in Young and Old Humans. *Cell Metab*. 2017;25(3):581–592. Doi: 10.1016/j.cmet.2017.02.009. – DOI – PMC – PubMed

67. **Mavros Y., Gates N., Wilson G.C., Jain N., Meiklejohn J., Brodaty H., et al.** Mediation of Cognitive Function Improvements by Strength Gains After Resistance Training in Older Adults with Mild Cognitive Impairment: Outcomes of the Study of Mental and Resistance Training. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. 2017;65(3):550–559. Doi: 10.1111/jgs.14542. – DOI – PubMed

68. Sherrington C., Fairhall N., Kwok W., Wallbank G., Tiedemann A., Michaleff Z.A., et al. Evidence on physical activity and falls prevention for people aged 65+ years: systematic review to inform the WHO guidelines on physical activity and sedentary behaviour. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act.* 2020;17(1):144. Doi: 10.1186/s12966-020-01041-3. – DOI – PMC – PubMed

69. Barbosa G.M., Trajano G.S., Dantas G.A.F., Silva B.R., Vieira W.H.B. Chronic Effects of Static and Dynamic Stretching on Hamstrings Eccentric Strength and Functional Performance: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *J Strength Cond Res.* 2020;34(7):2031–2039. Doi: 10.1519/jsc.00000000000003080. – DOI – PubMed

70. Brusco C.M., Blazevich A.J., Radaelli R., Botton C.E., Cadore E.L., Baroni B.M., et al. The effects of flexibility training on exercise-induced muscle damage in young men with limited hamstrings flexibility. *Scand J Med Sci Sports.* 2018;28(6):1671–1680. Doi: 10.1111/sms.13068. – DOI – PubMed

71. Arntz F., Markov A., Behm D.G., Behrens M., Negra Y., Nakamura M., et al. Chronic Effects of Static Stretching Exercises on Muscle Strength and Power in Healthy Individuals Across the Lifespan: A Systematic Review with Multi-level Meta-analysis. *Sports Med.* 2023;53(3):723–745. Doi: 10.1007/s40279-022-01806-9. – DOI – PMC – PubMed

72. Warneke K., Ploschberger G., Lohmann L.H., Lichtenstein E., Jochum D., Siegel S.D., et al. Foam rolling and stretching do not provide superior acute flexibility and stiffness improvements compared to any other warm-up intervention: A systematic review with meta-analysis. *J Sport Health Sci.* 2024;13(4):509–520. Doi: 10.1016/j.jshs.2024.01.006. – DOI – PMC – PubMed

73. Siu P.M., Yu A.P., Chin E.C., Yu D.S., Hui S.S., Woo J., et al. Effects of Tai Chi or Conventional Exercise on Central Obesity in Middle-Aged and Older Adults: A Three-Group Randomized Controlled Trial. *Ann Intern Med.* 2021;174(8):1050–1057. Doi: 10.7326/M20-7014. – DOI – PubMed

74. Reichert T., Costa R.R., Barroso B.M., da Rocha V.M.B., Delevatti R.S., Kruel L.F.M. Aquatic Training in Upright Position as an Alternative to Improve Blood Pressure in Adults and Elderly: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Sports Med.* 2018;48(7):1727–1737. Doi: 10.1007/s40279-018-0918-0. – DOI – PubMed

75. Costa R.R., Buttelli A.C.K., Coconcelli L., Pereira L.F., Vieira A.F., Fagundes A.O., et al. Water-Based Aerobic and Resistance Training as A Treatment to Improve the Lipid Profile of Women With Dyslipidemia: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *J Phys Act Health.* 2019;16(5):348–354. Doi: 10.1123/jpah.2018-0602. – DOI – PubMed

76. Freiberger E., Haberl L., Spirduso W.W., Zijlstra G.A. Long-term effects of three multicomponent exercise interventions on physical performance and fall-related psychological outcomes in community-dwelling older adults: a randomized controlled trial. *J Am Geriatr Soc.* 2012;60(3):437–446. Doi: 10.1111/j.1532-5415.2011.03859.x. – DOI – PubMed

77. Kim H.K., Suzuki T., Saito K., Yoshida H., Kobayashi H., Kato H., et al. Effects of exercise and amino acid supplementation on body composition and physical function in community-dwelling elderly Japanese sarcopenic women: a randomized controlled trial. *J Am Geriatr Soc.* 2012;60(1):16–23. Doi: 10.1111/j.1532-5415.2011.03776.x. – DOI – PubMed

78. Villareal D.T., Smith G.I., Sinacore D.R., Shah K., Mittendorfer B. Regular multicomponent exercise increases physical fitness and muscle protein anabolism in frail, obese, older adults. *Obesity (Silver Spring)* 2011;19(2):312–318. Doi: 10.1038/oby.2010.110. – DOI – PMC – PubMed

79. Serra-Rexach J.A., Bustamante-Ara N., Hierro Villaran M., Gonzalez Gil P., Sanz Ibanez M.J., Blanco Sanz N., et al. Short-term, light- to moderate-intensity exercise training improves leg muscle strength in the oldest old: a randomized controlled trial. *J Am Geriatr Soc.* 2011;59(4):594–602. Doi: 10.1111/j.1532-5415.2011.03356.x. – DOI – PubMed

80. Kenny A.M., Boxer R.S., Kleppinger A., Brindisi J., Feinn R., Burleson J.A. Dehydroepiandrosterone combined with exercise improves muscle strength and physical function in frail older women. *J Am Geriatr Soc.* 2010;58(9):1707–1714. Doi: 10.1111/j.1532-5415.2010.03019.x. – DOI – PubMed

81. Veronese N., Stubbs B., Volpato S., Zuliani G., Maggi S., Cesari M., et al. Association Between Gait Speed With Mortality, Cardiovascular Disease and Cancer: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of Prospective Cohort Studies. *J Am Med Dir Assoc.* 2018;19(11):981–988.e7. doi: 10.1016/j.jamda.2018.06.007. – DOI – PubMed

82. Hausdorff J.M., Lowenthal J., Herman T., Gruendlinger L., Peretz C., Giladi N. Rhythmic auditory stimulation modulates gait variability in Parkinson's disease. *Eur J Neurosci.* 2007;26(8):2369–2375. Doi: 10.1111/j.1460-9568.2007.05810.x. – DOI – PubMed

83. Amboni M., Barone P., Hausdorff J.M. Cognitive contributions to gait and falls: evidence and

implications. *Mov Disord.* 2013;28(11):1520–1533. Doi: 10.1002/mds.25674. – DOI – PMC – PubMed

84. Rennie L., Opheim A., Dietrichs E., Löfgren N., Franzén E. Highly challenging balance and gait training for individuals with Parkinson's disease improves pace, rhythm and variability domains of gait – A secondary analysis from A randomized controlled trial. *Clin Rehabil.* 2021;35(2):200–212. Doi: 10.1177/0269215520956503. – DOI – PubMed

85. Borg G.A. Perceived exertion. *Exerc Sport Sci Rev.* 1974;2:131–153. – PubMed

86. Gibala M.J., Gillen J.B., Percival M.E. Physiological and health-related adaptations to low-volume interval training: influences of nutrition and sex. *Sports Med.* 2014;44(Suppl 2):S127–137. Doi: 10.1007/s40279-014-0259-6. – DOI – PMC – PubMed

87. Callahan M.J., Parr E.B., Hawley J.A., Camera D.M. Can High-Intensity Interval Training Promote Skeletal Muscle Anabolism? *Sports Med.* 2021;51(3):405–421. Doi: 10.1007/s40279-020-01397-3. – DOI – PubMed

88. Blackmore D.G., Schaumberg M.A., Ziae M., Belford S., To X.V., O'Keefe I., et al. Long-Term Improvement in Hippocampal-Dependent Learning Ability in Healthy, Aged Individuals Following High Intensity Interval Training. *Aging Dis.* 2024 doi: 10.14336/ad.2024.0642. – DOI – PMC – PubMed

89. Simonsson E., Levik Sandström S., Hedlund M., Holmberg H., Johansson B., Lindelöf N., et al. Effects of Controlled Supramaximal High-Intensity Interval Training on Cardiorespiratory Fitness and Global Cognitive Function in Older Adults: The Umeå HIT Study-A Randomized Controlled Trial. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci.* 2023;78(9):1581–1590. Doi: 10.1093/gerona/glad070. – DOI – PMC – PubMed

90. Marriott C.F.S., Petrella A.F.M., Marriott E.C.S., Boa Sorte Silva N.C., Petrella R.J. High-Intensity Interval Training in Older Adults: a Scoping Review. *Sports Med Open.* 2021;7(1):49. Doi: 10.1186/s40798-021-00344-4. – DOI – PMC – PubMed

91. DiPietro L. Interval Walking Training for Older People: No Pain and Lots of Gain. *Exerc Sport Sci Rev.* 2017;45(3):126. Doi: 10.1249/jes.0000000000000110. – DOI – PubMed

92. Alzar-Teruel M., Aibar-Almazán A., Hita-Contreras F., Carcelén-Fraile M.D.C., Martínez-Amat A., Jiménez-García J.D., et al. High-intensity interval training among middle-aged and older adults for body composition and muscle strength: A systematic review. *Front Public Health.* 2022;10:992706. doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2022.992706. – DOI – PMC – PubMed

93. Poon E.T., Li H.Y., Gibala M.J., Wong S.H., Ho R.S. High-intensity interval training And cardiorespiratory fitness in adults: An umbrella review of systematic reviews And meta-Analyses. *Scand J Med Sci Sports.* 2024;34(5) doi: 10.1111/sms.14652. – DOI – PubMed

94. Yang C., Zhang L., Cheng Y., Zhang M., Zhao Y., Zhang T., et al. High intensity interval training vs. moderate intensity continuous training on aerobic capacity and functional capacity in patients with heart failure: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Front Cardiovasc Med.* 2024;11 doi: 10.3389/fcvm.2024.1302109. – DOI – PMC – PubMed

95. Wewege M.A., Ahn D., Yu J., Liou K., Keech A. High-Intensity Interval Training for Patients With Cardiovascular Disease-Is It Safe? A Systematic Review. *J Am Heart Assoc.* 2018;7(21) doi: 10.1161/jaha.118.009305. – DOI – PMC – PubMed

96. Dun Y., Smith J.R., Liu S., Olson T.P. High-Intensity Interval Training in Cardiac Rehabilitation. *Clin Geriatr Med.* 2019;35(4):469–487. Doi: 10.1016/j.cger.2019.07.011. – DOI – PMC – PubMed

97. Warburton D.E., McKenzie D.C., Haykowsky M.J., Taylor A., Shoemaker P., Ignaszewski A.P., et al. Effectiveness of high-intensity interval training for the rehabilitation of patients with coronary artery disease. *Am J Cardiol.* 2005;95(9):1080–1084. Doi: 10.1016/j.amjcard.2004.12.063. – DOI – PubMed

98. Hedlund M., Lindelöf N., Johansson B., Boraxbekk C.J., Rosendahl E. Development and Feasibility of a Regulated, Supramaximal High-Intensity Training Program Adapted for Older Individuals. *Front Physiol.* 2019;10:590. Doi: 10.3389/fphys.2019.00590. – DOI – PMC – PubMed

99. Keteyian S.J., Hibner B.A., Bronsteen K., Kerrigan D., Aldred H.A., Reasons L.M., et al. Greater improvement in cardiorespiratory fitness using higher-intensity interval training in the standard cardiac rehabilitation setting. *J Cardiopulm Rehabil Prev.* 2014;34(2):98–105. Doi: 10.1097/hcr.0000000000000049. – DOI – PubMed

100. Moholdt T.T., Amundsen B.H., Rustad L.A., Wahba A., Løvø K.T., Gullikstad L.R., et al. Aerobic interval training versus continuous moderate exercise after coronary artery bypass surgery: a randomized study of cardiovascular

effects and quality of life. *Am Heart J.* 2009;158(6):1031–1037. Doi: 10.1016/j.ahj.2009.10.003. – DOI – PubMed

101. Ellingsen Ø, Halle M., Conraads V., Støylen A., Dalen H., Delagardelle C., et al. High-Intensity Interval Training in Patients With Heart Failure With Reduced Ejection Fraction. *Circulation.* 2017;135(9):839–849. Doi: 10.1161/circulationaha.116.022924. – DOI – PMC – PubMed

102. Letnes J.M., Berglund I., Johnson K.E., Dalen H., Nes B.M., Lydersen S., et al. Effect of 5 years of exercise training on the cardiovascular risk profile of older adults: the Generation 100 randomized trial. *Eur Heart J.* 2022;43(21):2065–2075. Doi: 10.1093/eurheartj/ehab721. – DOI – PMC – PubMed

103. Rognmo Ø, Moholdt T., Bakken H., Hole T., Mølstad P., Myhr N.E., et al. Cardiovascular risk of high- versus moderate-intensity aerobic exercise in coronary heart disease patients. *Circulation.* 2012;126(12):1436–1440. Doi: 10.1161/circulationaha.112.123117. – DOI – PubMed

104. Meredith S.J., Cox N.J., Ibrahim K., Higson J., McNiff J., Mitchell S., et al. Factors that influence older adults' participation in physical activity: a systematic review of qualitative studies. *Age Ageing.* 2023;52(8) doi: 10.1093/ageing/afad145. – DOI – PMC – PubMed

105. Ekkekakis P., Parfitt G., Petruzzello S.J. The pleasure and displeasure people feel when they exercise at different intensities: decennial update and progress towards a tripartite rationale for exercise intensity prescription. *Sports Med.* 2011;41(8):641–671. Doi: 10.2165/11590680-00000000-00000. – DOI – PubMed

106. De Geus E.J.C. Genetic Pathways Underlying Individual Differences in Regular Physical Activity. **Exerc Sport Sci Rev.** 2023;51(1):2–18. Doi: 10.1249/jes.0000000000000305. – PMC – PubMed

107. Cheval B., Boisgontier M.P. The Theory of Effort Minimization in Physical Activity. **Exerc Sport Sci Rev.** 2021;49(3):168–178. Doi: 10.1249/jes.0000000000000252. – PMC – PubMed

108. Siebers M., Biedermann S.V., Fuss J. Do Endocannabinoids Cause the Runner's High? Evidence and Open Questions. **Neuroscientist.** 2023;29(3):352–369. Doi: 10.1177/10738584211069981. – PMC – PubMed

109. Hureau T.J., Broxterman R.M., Weavil J.C., Lewis M.T., Layec G., Amann M. On the role of skeletal muscle acidosis and inorganic phosphates as determinants of central and peripheral fatigue: A (31) P-MRS study. **J Physiol.** 2022;600(13):3069–3081. Doi: 10.1113/jp283036. – PMC – PubMed

110. Hargreaves M., Spriet L.L. Skeletal muscle energy metabolism during exercise. **Nat Metab.** 2020;2(9):817–828. Doi: 10.1038/s42255-020-0251-4. – PubMed

111. Tavoian D., Russ D.W., Law T.D., Simon J.E., Chase P.J., Guseman E.H., et al. A Randomized Clinical Trial Comparing Three Different Exercise Strategies for Optimizing Aerobic Capacity and Skeletal Muscle Performance in Older Adults: Protocol for the DART Study. **Front Med (Lausanne)** 2019;6:236. Doi: 10.3389/fmed.2019.00236. – PMC – PubMed

112. Morcillo-Losa J.A., Díaz-Martínez M.D.P., Ceylan H., Moreno-Vecino B., Bragazzi N.L., Párraga Montilla J. Effects of High-Intensity Interval Training on Muscle Strength for the Prevention and Treatment of Sarcopenia in Older Adults: A Systematic Review of the Literature. **J Clin Med.** 2024;13(5) doi: 10.3390/jcm13051299. – PMC – PubMed