Compliance to physical activity recommendations amongst type 2 diabetic patients at Thika Level 5 Hospital, Kiambu County, Kenya

Wanyoike, Peter Kamau¹*, Titus Kahiga², Albert Gachau³

¹Department of Community Health and Epidemiology, Kenyatta University, Kenya ²Department of Pharmacology and Clinical Pharmacy, Kenyatta University, Kenya ³Department of Pathology, Kenyatta University, Kenya

ABSTRACT

Abundant literature supports the beneficial effects of physical activity for improving and maintaining type 2 diabetic patient's glycaemic levels. Patient compliance to lifestyle modifications is difficult to initiate and sustain. Descriptive cross-sectional design was used to study 228 type 2 diabetic patients at Thika Level 5 Hospital. Systematic sampling technique was used. Data was collected using a researcher-administered structured questionnaire. Quantitative data analysis was conducted using SPSS version 25.0 and involved univariate and bivariate analysis. Chi- square were used to test the significance of the association between the dependent and independent variables (p < 0.05). The study findings revealed that SE=0.845) and a kurtosis of -0.546(SE=1.741), 55.8% complied with exercise lifestyle recommendations. Employment status (p value=0.045); age (p=0.019) and education (p=0.045) were significantly associated with compliance with exercise. Majority of respondents 207(86.3%) understood that both gentle aerobic exercise and health dietary habits play role in diabetic management. A significant number of female 111(88.1%) and 110(87.3%) and males 99(86.8%) and 99(86.8%) perceived gentle aerobic has role in management of type 2 diabetes and control of sugar respectively. Being/having too busy schedule 129(53.8%) and weather especially during cold seasons 127(52.9%) were cited as most common barriers to complying with exercise. All stakeholders including clinicians, dietitians, health educationists and policy makers should be made aware by providers about the alarmingly high proportion of non-compliance to physical activity advices among diabetic population in Thika. Physical activity advices should be tailored to individual with particular focus on gender, marital status, and socioeconomic status.

Keywords: Diabetes Mellitus, diabetic patients, dietary habits, physical activity lifestyle.

1. INTRODUCTION

Diabetes Mellitus is a disorder caused by the total (or relative) absence of insulin, which manifests clinically as an elevated blood glucose [1]. The incidence of diabetes, especially type 2, is rapidly growing in the world. In 1985, an estimated 30 million people suffered with this chronic disease, which, by the end of 2006, had increased to 230 million, representing 6% of the world population [2]. Of this number, 80% is found in the developing world [3]. Glucose is obtained from carbohydrates and its metabolism is controlled by a hormone called insulin which is produced by the beta cells of islets of langerhans of the pancreas and failure to its production leads to diabetes mellitus, [4]

For a long time, Africa was considered safe from many of the diseases that are called "diseases of affluence," which had high incidences in the developed countries. Similarly, there was a time when Africa was thought to be a continent, relatively free of diabetes mellitus illnesses. This has changed significantly in Africa with diabetes becoming a common disease in this continent, this situation remained virtually static till the 1990s [5].

Dietary habits and sedentary lifestyle (inactivity), residence, environmental factors, along with racial and ethnic puzzle of this disease have led experts in this field to posit that a common risk factor may be genetic

predisposition [6]. In Africa, diabetes is common across all the economic class but high among the powerful and wealthy, and therefore it is regarded as diseases of opulence; it remained most prevalent in urban due to sedentary lifestyle, thus they are physically inactive, having diets rich in saturated fats and high sugary beverages. Obesity plays a major role and is a significant contributor to high diabetes prevalence, hence "diabesity [1] in urban and rural areas. In comparison between the two territories, there is high prevalence of obesity in the urban setting.[7] In Africa, in general, the World Health Organization (WHO) estimates that more than one-third of the women are obese compared to one-fourth of the men, with the poor being as vulnerable as the rich.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

The lifestyle diseases have the potential of reducing the country's human resource key to propelling economic growth and therefore the WHO recommends exercise regularly and eat healthy foods; a diet limited in fats and sugars but rich in fruits, vegetables, legumes, whole grains and nuts [8]. Sedentary habits, especially watching TV, are associated with significantly higher risks for obesity and type 2 diabetes. Regular exercise, even of moderate intensity (such as brisk walking), improves insulin sensitivity and may play a significant role in preventing type 2 diabetes regardless of weight loss [9].

2. METHODS

The study design was descriptive cross-sectional. The study was carried out in Thika Level 5 Hospital Kiambu County. The study population was All type 2 diabetic adults on clinical care for more than three months at Thika Level 5 diabetes clinic. Thika Level 5 hospital has daily diabetic clinics for five days in a week that have approximately 60 patients per clinic. A formula was employed to derive a sample size of 228 respondents. The study used systematic sampling methods to achieve required minimum sample size. Data was collected by interviewing respondents using interviewer administered structured questionnaires and analyzed using SPSS version 25, Chi – square statistics and odds ratio were used to test hypothesis. Descriptive statistics was used mainly to summarize the data. SPSS was used for analysing complex data. Data presentation was through the use of pie charts, and frequency tables

3. RESULTS

3.1 Socio-Demographic Characteristics of study respondents

The participants aged less than 18 years were 4(1.7%), aged between 18-29 years 41(17.1%), married (65.4%), majority (38.3%) had secondary school education and a sizeable proportion of the diabetic respondents were self-employed (42.5%) (Table 1).

Variabla		Mala	Fomalo	Overall
v al lable		Wale	remate	Overall
	< 18 yrs.	3(75.0%)	1(25.0%)	4(1.7%)
	18-29 yrs.	16(39.0%)	25(61.0%)	41(17.1%)
Λa_{0} (vector)	30-39 yrs.	36(54.5%)	30(45.5%)	66(27.5%)
Age (years)	40-49 yrs.	29(58.0%)	21(42.0%)	50(20.8%)
	50-59 yrs.	12(37.5%)	20(62.5%)	32(13.3%)
	>60 yrs.	18(38.3%)	29(61.7%)	47(19.6%)
	Single	19(43.2%)	25(56.8%)	44(18.3%)
	Married	84(53.5%)	73(46.5%)	157(65.4%)
Marital Status	Divorced	5(62.5%)	3(37.5%)	8(3.3%)
	Separated	1(14.3%)	6(85.7%)	7(2.9%)
	Widowed	5(20.8%)	19(79.2%)	24(10.0%)
	No formal education	2(20.0%)	8(80.0%)	10(4.2%)
	Primary	20(41.7%)	28(58.3%)	48(20.0%)
Education Level	Secondary	43(46.7%)	49(53.3%)	92(38.3%)
	College	39(54.2%)	33(45.8%)	72(30.0%)
	University	10(55.6%)	8(44.4%)	18(7.5%)
E	Unemployed	28(60.9%)	18(39.1%)	46(19.2%)
Status	Employed	24(55.8%)	19(44.2%)	43(17.9%)
Status	Self Employed	53(52.0%)	49(48.0%)	102(42.5%)

Table 1:	Socio-Demographic	Characteristics	of study	respondents

Housewife	0(0.0%)	25(100.0%)	25(10.4%)
Pensioner	9(37.5%)	15(62.5%)	24(10.0%)

3.2 Compliance to Dietary and Physical Activity Modifications

The results indicate that 55.8%) complied with dietary and physical activity lifestyle recommendations as shown in figure 1.





NB: Yes - Depicts compliance to physical activity

No - Depicts non-compliance to physical activity

3.3 Preference of Physical Activity

Among the respondents complying with physical activity recommendations, 56.3% complied with brisk walking, 13.8% with cycling and 6.3% with sport activities as shown in figure 2.





3.3 Preference of Physical Activity with Outcome

Preference of physical activity and their associated with sugar level was investigated. Variables analysed were compliance to cycling, jogging, sport activities and brisk-walking. Normal level for sugar was 3.5-7.0 mmol/l. Respondents who complied with jogging as physical activity had significant association with controlling sugar level (χ^2 =3.013; p=0.045). All the other physical activity had no association with controlling sugar.

Table 1: Preference of Physical Activity with Outcome

	FBS in n	nmo/l	Statistic
	Normal	Elevated	
Complied with cycling			
Yes	18(54.5%)	15(45.5%)	$\chi^2 = 0.474$
No	126(60.9%)	81(39.1%)	df 1 p=0.094
Complied with Jogging			
Yes	19(57.6%)	14(42.4%)	$\chi^2 = 3.013$
No	125(60.4%)	82(39.6%)	df 1 p=0.045
Complied with sport activities			-
Yes	10(66.7%)	5(33.3%)	$\chi^2 = 2.606$
No	132(58.9%)	92(41.1%)	df 1 p=0.087
Complied with brisk-walking			
Yes	76(56.3%)	59(43.7%)	$\chi^2 = 1.764$
No	68(64.8%)	37(35.2%)	df 1 p=0.116

3.4 Compliance Rates to Physical Activity among Socio-Demographic Characteristics

Table 3 shows that 45(39.5%) of male, 61(48.4%) of female and 45(50.0%) of respondents with tertiary education were not complying with physical activity. Respondents above 60 years 34(72.3%), married 84(53.5%), pensioner 19(79.2%) and 50(54.3%) of secondary educated respondents complied with physical activity recommendations. Employment status had significant association with compliance to physical activity as a lifestyle modification (p value=0.038); and therefore, fail to accept the null hypothesis and all the other demographic characteristics had no association with compliance to physical activity as a lifestyle modification (p>0.05) thus accept the null hypothesis.

Table 2: Rate of Compliance to Physical Activity among Socio-Demographic Characteristics

$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c } \hline Compliance with physical activity \\ \hline Yes No \\ \hline Statistic \\ \hline Yes No \\ \hline Yes N$						
VesNoStatisticGender χ^2 χ^2 =1.939Male $69(60.5\%)$ $45(39.5\%)$ χ^2 =1.939Female $65(51.6\%)$ $61(48.4\%)$ $gf1$ Age χ^2 χ^2 =0.193Age χ^2 χ^2 =0.193 χ^2 χ^2 =0.066 χ^2 χ^2 =0.066 χ^2 χ^2 =0.066 χ^2 =0.057 χ^2 Married χ^2 =0.057Employment Status χ^2 =0.057Employed χ^2 χ^2 =0.038Education Level χ^2 =0.038Education Level χ^2 =0.038Education Level χ^2 χ^2 =0.038Education Level χ^2 =0.038Education Level χ^2 =0.112		Compliance with pl	hysical activity	Statistic		
Gender $\chi^2 = 1.939$ Male 69(60.5%) 45(39.5%) $\chi^2 = 1.939$ Female 65(51.6%) 61(48.4%) p=0.193 Age 2 (48.4%) $\chi^2 = 8.821$ $\langle 30 \text{ years}$ 22(48.9%) 23(51.1%) $\chi^2 = 8.821$ $\langle 40.49 \text{ years}$ 27(54.0%) 23(46.0%) df 4 50.59 years 20(62.5%) 12(37.5%) p=0.066 >60 years 34(72.3%) 13(27.7%) Marital Status Single 50(60.2%) 33(39.8%) $\chi^2 = 9.172$ Married 84(53.5%) 73(46.5%) gf 1 p=0.057 Employment Status geno.057 Employed 20(46.5%) 23(53.5%) $\chi^2 = 8.414$ Self Employed 60(58.8%) 42(41.2%) df 3 Pensioner 19(79.2%) 5(20.8%) p=0.038 Education Level multiple $\chi^2 = 4.385$ $\chi^2 = 4.385$ Secondary 50(54.3%) 42(45.7%) df 2 Primary and below 39(67.2%)		Yes	No	Statistic		
Male $69(60.5\%)$ $45(39.5\%)$ $\chi^2 = 1.939$ df 1 p=0.193Age $female$ $65(51.6\%)$ $61(48.4\%)$ $p=0.193$ Age $\chi^2 = 3.821$ 40.49 years $22(48.9\%)$ $23(51.1\%)$ 30.39 years $\chi^2 = 8.821$ 40.49 years $\chi^2 = 9.172$ df 4Solo years $34(72.3\%)$ $13(27.7\%)$ $p=0.066$ > 60 years $34(72.3\%)$ $13(27.7\%)$ $Marital Status$ $gingle\chi^2 = 9.172df 1p=0.057Marited84(53.5\%)73(46.5\%)\chi^2 = 9.172df 1p=0.057Employment Status\chi^2 = 9.172df 1p=0.057Employed20(46.5\%)23(53.5\%)\chi^2 = 8.414df 3PensionerUnemployed35(49.3\%)36(50.7\%)2(20.8\%)p=0.038Education LevelWWWPrimary and below39(67.2\%)19(32.8\%)\chi^2 = 4.385Secondary\chi^2 = 4.385Secondary50(54.3\%)42(45.7\%)df 2Tertiary45(50.0\%)45(50.0\%)p=0.112$	Gender					
Female $65(51.6\%)$ $61(48.4\%)$ $df 1$ $p=0.193$ Age $(30.39 years)$ $22(48.9\%)$ $23(51.1\%)$ $30.39 years)31(47.0\%)35(53.0\%)\chi^2 = 8.82140.49 years)40.49 years27(54.0\%)23(46.0\%)df 450.59 years20(62.5\%)12(37.5\%)p=0.066>60 years34(72.3\%)13(27.7\%)marrialMarital Status\chi^2 = 9.172Marrieddf 1p=0.057Employment Status\chi^2 = 9.172df 1p=0.057df 1p=0.057Employed50(60.2\%)33(39.8\%)\chi^2 = 9.172df 1p=0.057Employment Status\chi\chi^2 = 9.172df 1p=0.057Employed50(60.2\%)33(39.8\%)\chi^2 = 9.172df 1p=0.057Employed50(60.2\%)33(39.8\%)\chi^2 = 9.172df 1p=0.057Employed50(60.2\%)33(39.8\%)\chi^2 = 9.172df 1p=0.057Employed50(60.2\%)33(39.8\%)\chi^2 = 9.172df 3p=0.038Education Level\chi^2Primary and below39(67.2\%)19(32.8\%)\chi^2 = 4.385Secondary\chi^2 = 4.385Secondary\chi^2 = 4.385Secondary\chi^2 = 4.385Secondary\chi^2 = 4.385Secondary\chi^2 = 0.112$	Male	69(60.5%)	45(39.5%)	$\chi^2 = 1.939$		
Age< 30 years	Female	65(51.6%)	61(48.4%)	df 1 p=0.193		
< 30 years $22(48.9\%)$ $23(51.1\%)$ $30-39$ years $31(47.0\%)$ $35(53.0\%)$ $\chi^2 = 8.821$ $40-49$ years $27(54.0\%)$ $23(46.0\%)$ df 4 $50-59$ years $20(62.5\%)$ $12(37.5\%)$ $p=0.066$ >60 years $34(72.3\%)$ $13(27.7\%)$ $marital Status$ Marital Status $\chi^2 = 9.172$ Married $84(53.5\%)$ $73(46.5\%)$ $p=0.057$ Employment Status $df 1$ Unemployed $35(49.3\%)$ $36(50.7\%)$ $\chi^2 = 8.414$ Self Employed $60(58.8\%)$ $42(41.2\%)$ df 3Pensioner $19(79.2\%)$ $5(20.8\%)$ $p=0.038$ Education Level $\chi^2 = 4.385$ $\chi^2 = 4.385$ Primary and below $39(67.2\%)$ $19(32.8\%)$ $\chi^2 = 4.385$ Secondary $50(54.3\%)$ $42(45.7\%)$ df 2Tertiary $45(50.0\%)$ $45(50.0\%)$ $p=0.112$	Age					
$30-39$ years $31(47.0\%)$ $35(53.0\%)$ $\chi^2 = 8.821$ $40-49$ years $27(54.0\%)$ $23(46.0\%)$ df 4 $50-59$ years $20(62.5\%)$ $12(37.5\%)$ $p=0.066$ >60 years $34(72.3\%)$ $13(27.7\%)$ Marital Status $\chi^2 = 9.172$ Married $84(53.5\%)$ $73(46.5\%)$ Married $84(53.5\%)$ $73(46.5\%)$ Employment StatusUnemployed $35(49.3\%)$ $36(50.7\%)$ Employed $20(46.5\%)$ $23(53.5\%)$ $\chi^2 = 8.414$ Self Employed $60(58.8\%)$ $42(41.2\%)$ Pensioner $19(79.2\%)$ $5(20.8\%)$ Primary and below $39(67.2\%)$ $19(32.8\%)$ Secondary $50(54.3\%)$ $42(45.7\%)$ Mariary $45(50.0\%)$ $45(50.0\%)$ $p=0.112$	< 30 years	22(48.9%)	23(51.1%)	2		
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	30-39 years	31(47.0%)	35(53.0%)	$\chi^2 = 8.821$		
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	40-49 years	27(54.0%)	23(46.0%)	df 4		
>60 years $34(72.3\%)$ $13(27.7\%)$ Marital Status $\chi^2 = 9.172$ Single $50(60.2\%)$ $33(39.8\%)$ $\chi^2 = 9.172$ Married $84(53.5\%)$ $73(46.5\%)$ df 1p=0.057p=0.057Employment Status $\chi^2 = 8.414$ Unemployed $35(49.3\%)$ $36(50.7\%)$ Employed $20(46.5\%)$ $23(53.5\%)$ $\chi^2 = 8.414$ Self Employed $60(58.8\%)$ $42(41.2\%)$ df 3Pensioner $19(79.2\%)$ $5(20.8\%)$ $p=0.038$ Education Level χ^2 $\chi^2 = 4.385$ Secondary $50(54.3\%)$ $42(45.7\%)$ df 2Tertiary $45(50.0\%)$ $45(50.0\%)$ $p=0.112$	50-59 years	20(62.5%)	12(37.5%)	p=0.066		
Marital StatusSingle $50(60.2\%)$ $33(39.8\%)$ $\chi^2 = 9.172$ Married $84(53.5\%)$ $73(46.5\%)$ $df 1$ p=0.057Employment StatusUnemployed $35(49.3\%)$ $36(50.7\%)$ Employed $20(46.5\%)$ $23(53.5\%)$ $\chi^2 = 8.414$ Self Employed $60(58.8\%)$ $42(41.2\%)$ $df 3$ Pensioner $19(79.2\%)$ $5(20.8\%)$ $p=0.038$ Education LevelPrimary and below $39(67.2\%)$ $19(32.8\%)$ $\chi^2 = 4.385$ Secondary $50(54.3\%)$ $42(45.7\%)$ $df 2$ Tertiary $45(50.0\%)$ $45(50.0\%)$ $p=0.112$	>60 years	34(72.3%)	13(27.7%)			
Single $50(60.2\%)$ $33(39.8\%)$ $\chi^2 = 9.172$ Married $84(53.5\%)$ $73(46.5\%)$ $df 1$ p=0.057Employment Status $y = 0.057$ Unemployed $35(49.3\%)$ $36(50.7\%)$ Employed $20(46.5\%)$ $23(53.5\%)$ $\chi^2 = 8.414$ Self Employed $60(58.8\%)$ $42(41.2\%)$ df 3Pensioner $19(79.2\%)$ $5(20.8\%)$ $p=0.038$ Education Level χ^2 $\chi^2 = 4.385$ Secondary $50(54.3\%)$ $42(45.7\%)$ df 2Tertiary $45(50.0\%)$ $45(50.0\%)$ $p=0.112$	Marital Status					
Married $84(53.5\%)$ $73(46.5\%)$ $df 1$ $p=0.057$ Employment Status $y=0.057$ Unemployed $35(49.3\%)$ $36(50.7\%)$ Employed $20(46.5\%)$ $23(53.5\%)$ $\chi^2 = 8.414$ Self Employed $60(58.8\%)$ $42(41.2\%)$ df 3Pensioner $19(79.2\%)$ $5(20.8\%)$ $p=0.038$ Education Level χ^2 $\chi^2 = 4.385$ Primary and below $39(67.2\%)$ $19(32.8\%)$ $\chi^2 = 4.385$ Secondary $50(54.3\%)$ $42(45.7\%)$ df 2Tertiary $45(50.0\%)$ $45(50.0\%)$ $p=0.112$	Single	50(60.2%)	33(39.8%)	$\chi^2 = 9.172$		
Employment StatusUnemployed $35(49.3\%)$ $36(50.7\%)$ Employed $20(46.5\%)$ $23(53.5\%)$ $\chi^2 = 8.414$ Self Employed $60(58.8\%)$ $42(41.2\%)$ df 3Pensioner $19(79.2\%)$ $5(20.8\%)$ $p=0.038$ Education LevelPrimary and below $39(67.2\%)$ $19(32.8\%)$ $\chi^2 = 4.385$ Secondary $50(54.3\%)$ $42(45.7\%)$ df 2Tertiary $45(50.0\%)$ $45(50.0\%)$ $p=0.112$	Married	84(53.5%)	73(46.5%)	df 1 p=0.057		
Unemployed $35(49.3\%)$ $36(50.7\%)$ Employed $20(46.5\%)$ $23(53.5\%)$ $\chi^2 = 8.414$ Self Employed $60(58.8\%)$ $42(41.2\%)$ df 3Pensioner $19(79.2\%)$ $5(20.8\%)$ $p=0.038$ Education LevelPrimary and below $39(67.2\%)$ $19(32.8\%)$ $\chi^2 = 4.385$ Secondary $50(54.3\%)$ $42(45.7\%)$ df 2Tertiary $45(50.0\%)$ $45(50.0\%)$ $p=0.112$	Employment Status					
Employed $20(46.5\%)$ $23(53.5\%)$ $\chi^2 = 8.414$ Self Employed $60(58.8\%)$ $42(41.2\%)$ df 3Pensioner $19(79.2\%)$ $5(20.8\%)$ $p=0.038$ Education LevelVPrimary and below $39(67.2\%)$ $19(32.8\%)$ $\chi^2 = 4.385$ Secondary $50(54.3\%)$ $42(45.7\%)$ df 2Tertiary $45(50.0\%)$ $45(50.0\%)$ $p=0.112$	Unemployed	35(49.3%)	36(50.7%)			
Self Employed $60(58.8\%)$ $42(41.2\%)$ df 3Pensioner $19(79.2\%)$ $5(20.8\%)$ $p=0.038$ Education Level $x^2 = 4.385$ Primary and below $39(67.2\%)$ $19(32.8\%)$ $\chi^2 = 4.385$ Secondary $50(54.3\%)$ $42(45.7\%)$ df 2Tertiary $45(50.0\%)$ $45(50.0\%)$ $p=0.112$	Employed	20(46.5%)	23(53.5%)	$\chi^2 = 8.414$		
Pensioner $19(79.2\%)$ $5(20.8\%)$ $p=0.038$ Education Level x^2 x^2 x^2 Primary and below $39(67.2\%)$ $19(32.8\%)$ x^2 Secondary $50(54.3\%)$ $42(45.7\%)$ df 2Tertiary $45(50.0\%)$ $45(50.0\%)$ $p=0.112$	Self Employed	60(58.8%)	42(41.2%)	df 3		
Education LevelPrimary and below $39(67.2\%)$ $19(32.8\%)$ $\chi^2 = 4.385$ Secondary $50(54.3\%)$ $42(45.7\%)$ df 2Tertiary $45(50.0\%)$ $45(50.0\%)$ $p=0.112$	Pensioner	19(79.2%)	5(20.8%)	p=0.038		
Primary and below $39(67.2\%)$ $19(32.8\%)$ $\chi^2 = 4.385$ Secondary $50(54.3\%)$ $42(45.7\%)$ df 2Tertiary $45(50.0\%)$ $45(50.0\%)$ $p=0.112$	Education Level					
Secondary50(54.3%)42(45.7%)df 2Tertiary45(50.0%)45(50.0%)p=0.112	Primary and below	39(67.2%)	19(32.8%)	$\chi^2 = 4.385$		
Tertiary 45(50.0%) 45(50.0%) p=0.112	Secondary	50(54.3%)	42(45.7%)	df 2		
	Tertiary	45(50.0%)	45(50.0%)	p=0.112		

3.5 Duration of Physical Activity

Majority of respondents (29.2%) exercised for more than 40 minutes, 25.4% between 10-19 minutes and 20.8% between 30-39 minutes.



Figure 3: Duration of Physical Activity

3.6 Duration of Physical activity with Sugar Level Outcome

Duration of physical activity was categorized as low intensity (physical activity below 30 minutes per day), moderate intensity (30-39 minutes per day) and vigorous intensity (above 40 minutes per day) as per WHO (2016) guidelines and FBS 3.5-7.0 mmol/l as normal and above 7.0 mmol/l as elevated. All the variables analysed had no significant association with controlling sugar level (χ^2 =4.091; p=0.129).

		FBS in n	FBS in mmo/l		
		Normal	Normal Elevated		
				Statistic	
Dunation	Low intensity	74(61.7%)	46(38.3%)	$\chi^2 = 4.091$	
Duration	^{OI} Moderate intensity	24(48.0%)	26(52.0%)	df 2	
physical activit	^y Vigorous intensity	46(65.7%)	24(34.3%)	p=0.129	

Table 3: Duration of Physical Activity with Sugar Level Outcome

3.7 Duration of Physical Activity amongst Different Socio-Demographic Characteristics

Duration of physical activity was categorized as low intensity (physical activity below 30 minutes per day), moderate intensity (30-39 minutes per day) and vigorous intensity (above 40 minutes per day) as per WHO (2016) guidelines. Majority of males 50(43.9%), females 70(55.6%), 30-39 years 37(56.1%), married 84(53.5%), tertiary educated 49(54.4%) and employed 27(62.8%) had low intensity physical activity (below recommended 30 minutes for 5 days per week). None of socio-demographic characteristic is significantly associated with how long a physical activity lasted amongst the respondents.

Table 4: Duration of Physical Activity among Socio-Demographic Characteristics

	Duratio	Statistic		
	Low Intensity	Moderate Intensity	Vigorous Intensity	Staustic
Gender				
Male	50(43.9%)	25(21.9%)	39(34.2%)	$\chi^2 = 3.657$
Female	70(55.6%)	25(19.8%)	31(24.6%)	df 2 p=0.161
Respondents Age				
< 30 years	23(51.1%)	13(28.9%)	9(20.0%)	$\chi^2 = 6.948$

30-39 years	37(56.1%)	11(16.7%)	18(27.3%)	4f 4
40-49 years	26(52.0%)	10(20.0%)	14(28.0%)	p=0.542
50-59 years	15(46.9%)	5(15.6%)	12(37.5%)	
>60 years	19(40.4%)	11(23.4%)	17(36.2%)	
Marital Status				
Single	36(43.4%)	19(22.9%)	28(33.7%)	$\chi^2 = 2.280$
Married	84(53.5%)	31(19.7%)	42(26.8%)	df 1 p=0.320
Education Level				
Primary and below	25(43.1%)	9(15.5%)	24(41.4%)	$\chi^2 = 6.480$
Secondary	46(50.0%)	20(21.7%)	26(28.3%)	df 2
Tertiary	49(54.4%)	21(23.3%)	20(22.2%)	p=0.166
Employment Status				
Unemployed	38(53.5%)	13(18.3%)	20(28.2%)	x^{2} (704
Employed	27(62.8%)	7(16.3%)	9(20.9%)	$\chi = 0.794$
Self Employed	47(46.1%)	24(23.5%)	31(30.4%)	
Pensioner	8(33.3%)	6(25.0%)	10(41.7%)	p=0.067
	and the second sec			

3.8 Compliance to Physical Activity Logistic Regression

Investigation of socio-demographic characteristics and association with compliance to physical activity were analysed. Logistic regression results showed there is a significant association between age and education with compliance to physical activity (OR: 0.542; 95% CI: 0.323-0.907; 75 P=0.019) and (OR: 1.88; 95% CI: 1.011-3.497; P=0.045) respectively. There was no significant association marital status (OR: 1.317; 95% CI: 0.767-2.260; P=0.317), employment (OR: 1.070; 95% CI: 0.635-1.803; P=0.799) and gender (OR: 1.439; 95% CI: 0.862-2.403; P=0.164) with compliance to physical activity but singles/separated, unemployed/housewife and males were more likely to comply with physical activity as shown by odds ratio.

	Compliance w	OR	95% CI	p-value	
	activity		<u>on</u>		r 'uiuc
	Yes	No			
Age groups					
< 40 years	53(47.7%)	58(52.3%)	0 5 4 2	0 222 0 007	0.010
\geq 40 years	81(62.8%)	48(37.2%)	0.342	0.525-0.907	0.019
Education level					
Primary and below	39(67.2%)	19(32.8%)	1.880	1.011-3.497	0.045
Secondary and above	95(52.2%)	87(47.8%)			
Marital Status	· · ·	· · · ·			
Single	50(60.2%)	33(39.8%)	1 217	0 7 (7 0 0 (0	0.217
Married	84(53.5%)	73(46.5%)	1.317	0.767-2.260	0.317
Employment					
Unemployed/Pensioner	54(56.8%)	41(43.2%)	1.070	0 625 1 002	0.700
Employed/Self Employed	80(55.2%)	65(44.8%)	1.070	0.635-1.803	0.799
Gender					
Male	69(60.5%)	45(39.5%)	1 420	0.000 0.402	0.164
Female	65(51.6%)	61(48.4%)	1.439	0.862-2.403	0.164

Table 5: Compliance to Physical Activity Logistic Regression

4. CONCLUSION

Compliance to recommended physical activities is important for diabetes management and control of glucose in type 2 diabetic individuals. In this study, majority of the respondents were females, married and aged between 30-39 years. More than three-quarter and slightly above the half of the participants were complying with physical activity recommendations. Respondents who knowledgeable that gentle aerobic control of sugar and gentle aerobic plays role in management of T2DM had strong significant association and were 8 times more likely to comply with exercise recommendations. There was a significant association between age and education on compliance to physical activity. Therefore, there is need to put more effort in exploring patient's background moral, knowledge, behaviour, and emotional supports (from friends, spouse and family), barriers, ability, and readiness to initiate and wiliness in sustaining recommended lifestyle change that influences patient's compliance to recommended lifestyle modifications. Promoting healthy regular exercises for at least 150 minutes per week and diet can reduces direct health care costs dramatically, improve productivity, prevent burden of the disease and improve type 2 diabetic individual's quality of life. Management of the diabetes mellitus disorders can create a great physical, psychological and socioeconomic burden on the country, society and family; therefore, priority should be given on the preventive aspects of disorders with exercise lifestyle modifications.

5. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Special gratitude goes to school of public health for guidance and support. Sincere gratitude to all university administration, Thika Level 5 staff especially in diabetic clinic, medical superintendent and diabetic patients who took part to make this study successful.

6. REFERENCES

- [1] A. D. Evaristo-Neto, M. C. Foss-Freitas, and M. C. Foss, "Prevalence of diabetes mellitus and impaired glucose tolerance in a rural community of Angola.," *Diabetol. Metab. Syndr.*, vol. 2, no. 1, p. 63, Jan. 2010.
- [2] O. Ajala, P. English, and J. Pinkney, "Systematic review and meta-analysis of different dietary approaches to the management of type 2 diabetes," *Am. J. Clin. Nutr.*, vol. 97, pp. 505–516, 2013.
- [3] Diabetes UK, "Key statistics on diabetes," *Diabetes*, vol. 692, no. March, pp. 1–21, 2010.
- [4] G. Roglic *et al.*, "The Burden of Mortality Attributable to Diabetes: Realistic estimates for the year 2000," *Diabetes Care*, vol. 28, no. 9, pp. 2130–2135, Sep. 2012.
- [5] M. W. Mwangi, G. G. Githinji, and F. W. Githinji, "Knowledge and Awareness of Diabetic Retinopathy amongst Diabetic Patients in Kenyatta National Hospital, Kenya," *ijhssnet.com*, vol. 1, no. 21, pp. 140–146, 2011.
- [6] N. M. Taha, D. N. Sc, M. A. B. D. El-azeaz, D. N. Sc, B. G. A. B. D. El-razik, and M. Sc, "Factors Affecting Compliance of Diabetic Patients toward Therapeutic Management," *Med. J. Cairo Univ.*, vol. 79, no. 1, pp. 1–8, 2011.
- [7] A. Klisiewicz and F. Raal, "Sub-Optimal Management of Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus–A Local Audit," *J. Endocrinol. Metab. Diabetes South Africa*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 13–16, 2010.
- [8] CDC & Prevention, "National Diabetes Fact Sheet," *Centers Dis. Control Prev. U.S. Dep. Heal. Hum. Serv.*, vol. CS217080A, no. Division of Diabetes Translation, pp. 1–12, 2011.
- [9] T. Ansari *et al.*, "Assessment of Knowledge, attitude, and practice of dietary pattern in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus: a locality-based perspective study," *Int. J. Med. Dev. Ctries.*, vol. 3, no. January, pp. 581–585, 2019.