

1 **Reference values for cut-point-free and traditional accelerometer metrics and**  
2 **associations with cardiorespiratory fitness: a cross-sectional study of healthy adults**  
3 **aged 20 to 89 years**

4 Schwendinger F.<sup>1\*</sup>, Wagner J.<sup>1</sup>, Knaier R.<sup>1</sup>, Infanger D.,<sup>1</sup> Rowlands A.V.<sup>2,3,4</sup>, Hinrichs T.<sup>1</sup>, &  
5 Schmidt-Trucksäss A.<sup>1\*</sup>

6 <sup>1</sup> Division of Sports and Exercise Medicine, Department of Sport, Exercise and Health,  
7 University of Basel, Basel, Switzerland

8 <sup>2</sup> Assessment of Movement Behaviours Group (AMBer), Diabetes Research Centre, Leicester  
9 General Hospital, University of Leicester, Gwendolen Rd, Leicester, UK

10 <sup>3</sup> National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Leicester Biomedical Research Centre  
11 (BRC), University Hospitals of Leicester NHS Trust and the University of Leicester,  
12 Leicester, UK

13 <sup>4</sup> Alliance for Research in Exercise, Nutrition and Activity (ARENA), Sansom Institute for  
14 Health Research, Division of Health Sciences, University of South Australia, Adelaide,  
15 Australia

16

17 Jonathan Wagner (JW), [jonathan.wagner@unibas.ch](mailto:jonathan.wagner@unibas.ch); ORCID: 0000-0002-3436-588X

18 Raphael Knaier (RK), [raphael.knaier@unibas.ch](mailto:raphael.knaier@unibas.ch); ORCID: 0000-0002-0244-7768

19 Denis Infanger (DI), [denis.infanger@unibas.ch](mailto:denis.infanger@unibas.ch); ORCID: 0000-0001-9028-7110

20 Alex V. Rowlands (AVR), [alex.rowlands@leicester.ac.uk](mailto:alex.rowlands@leicester.ac.uk); ORCID: 0000-0002-1463-697X

21 Timo Hinrichs (TH), [timo.hinrichs@unibas.ch](mailto:timo.hinrichs@unibas.ch); ORCID: 0000-0001-6200-307X

22 \* Correspondence:

23 Fabian Schwendinger (FS), [fabian.schwendinger@unibas.ch](mailto:fabian.schwendinger@unibas.ch); ORCID: 0000-0001-7795-1478

24 Arno Schmidt-Trucksäss (AST), [arno.schmidt-trucksass@unibas.ch](mailto:arno.schmidt-trucksass@unibas.ch); ORCID: 0000-0002-  
25 4662-3911

26

27 Abstract word count: 250

28

29 Manuscript word count: 2907

## ACCELEROMETRY REFERENCE VALUES

2

30 Abstract

31 **Objectives:** To compare the association between cardiorespiratory fitness (CRF) and cut-  
32 point-free accelerometer metrics (intensity gradient [IG] and average acceleration [AvAcc])  
33 to that with traditional metrics in healthy adults aged 20 to 89 years and patients with heart  
34 failure, and 2) provide age-, sex-, and CRF-related reference values for healthy adults.

35 **Methods:** In the COMplete study, 463 healthy adults and 67 patients with heart failure  
36 wore GENEActiv accelerometers on their non-dominant wrist and underwent  
37 cardiopulmonary exercise testing. Cut-point-free (IG: distribution of intensity of activity  
38 across the day; AvAcc: proxy of volume of activity) and traditional (moderate-to-vigorous  
39 and vigorous activity) metrics were generated. The ‘rawacceleration’ application was  
40 developed to translate findings into clinical practice.

41 **Results:** IG and AvAcc yield complementary information on PA with both IG ( $p=0.009$ ) and  
42 AvAcc ( $p<0.001$ ) independently associated with CRF in healthy individuals. Only IG was  
43 independently associated with CRF in patients with heart failure ( $p=0.043$ ). The best cut-  
44 point-free and cut-point-based model had similar predictive value for CRF in both cohorts.  
45 However, unlike traditional metrics, IG and AvAcc are comparable across populations and  
46 the most commonly used accelerometers. We produced age- and sex-specific reference values  
47 and percentile curves for IG, AvAcc, moderate-to-vigorous, and vigorous activity for healthy  
48 adults.

49 **Conclusions:** IG and AvAcc are strongly associated with CRF and, thus, indirectly with the  
50 risk of non-communicable diseases and mortality in healthy adults and patients with heart  
51 failure. Our reference values enhance the utility of cut-point-free metrics and facilitate their  
52 interpretation.

53 **Trial registration:** This study was registered on [clinicaltrials.gov](https://clinicaltrials.gov) (NCT03986892).

## ACCELEROMETRY REFERENCE VALUES

3

54            *Keywords:* accelerometry, physical activity, normative data, cardiorespiratory fitness,  
55 GGIR, activity monitors

56            • **What is already known on this topic** – Cut-point free accelerometer metrics are  
57 valuable to assess physical activity because of their comparability across populations  
58 and association with various health parameters (e.g. body fat content or physical  
59 functioning). Yet, their interpretation is not straightforward.

60            • **What this study adds** – This study found a strong and independent association of  
61 cut-point-free metrics with cardiorespiratory fitness, a vital sign, in healthy  
62 individuals aged between 20 to 89 years and patients with heart failure. We produced  
63 the first reference values based on healthy individuals across the age span.

64            • **How this study might affect research, practice or policy** – Our reference values  
65 together with the new open-source application may simplify the interpretation of cut-  
66 point-free accelerometer metrics and their use in clinical practice and research.

67 **INTRODUCTION**

68 Accelerometer data can yield many physical activity (PA) outcomes.[1] Recorded  
69 acceleration is often categorised using accelerometer cut-points and expressed as minutes  
70 spent in intensity categories, i.e. light, moderate, and vigorous PA.[2] Numerous studies have  
71 proposed such cut-points for different populations.[3, 4] Although this method makes  
72 accelerometer data interpretable, the multitude of available cut-points complicates the  
73 interpretation of PA data and comparison between studies. Moreover, using cut-points to  
74 quantify the absolute intensity of PA has been shown to induce bias if cardiorespiratory  
75 fitness (CRF) of the cohort of interest differs from the cohort the cut-points were derived  
76 from.[5]

77 To circumvent this problem, Rowlands et al. (6) proposed cut-point-free accelerometer  
78 metrics, namely intensity gradient (IG) and average acceleration (AvAcc) and demonstrated  
79 their use across diverse populations. They moreover demonstrated the added value of using  
80 IG by examining the relation to body fatness and physical function.[6] IG was inversely  
81 associated with body fatness in adolescent girls and positively associated with physical  
82 function in adults with type 2 diabetes, independent of AvAcc.[6] The authors concluded that  
83 IG and AvAcc are appropriate for reporting as standardised measures and suitable for  
84 comparison across studies using raw-acceleration accelerometers.[6] The independent  
85 association of IG with health indicators (BMI z-scores, waist-to-height ratio, estimated CRF,  
86 and metabolic syndrome score) was later confirmed in children.[7]

87 CRF, measured as peak oxygen uptake ( $VO_{2peak}$ ), is a strong, independent risk predictor for  
88 various non-communicable diseases and all-cause mortality.[8] Data on the relationship  
89 between cut-point-free accelerometer metrics and CRF in healthy adults or diseased  
90 populations e.g. patients with heart failure would therefore be relevant. Moreover, IG and

## ACCELEROMETRY REFERENCE VALUES

5

91 AvAcc are not readily interpretable.[6] Reference values providing a framework for judging  
92 the appropriateness of PA levels are required.[6]

93 Thus, we aimed to 1) examine the relationship between cut-point-free and traditional  
94 accelerometer metrics, 2) compare the association between  $VO_{2peak}$  and cut-point-free metrics  
95 to that with traditional metrics in healthy individuals and patients with heart failure, and 3)  
96 produce reference values for cut-point-free and traditional accelerometer parameters for  
97 healthy adults.

98

99

## 100 **METHODS**

### 101 **Study design**

102 Data were collected in the population-based, cross-sectional COMplete study at the  
103 Department of Sport, Exercise and Health at the University of Basel, Switzerland. The study  
104 protocol is available elsewhere.[9] All procedures were performed according to the  
105 Declaration of Helsinki. The study was registered on [clinicaltrials.gov](https://clinicaltrials.gov) (NCT03986892) and  
106 approved by the Ethics Committee of North-western and Central Switzerland (EKNZ 2017–  
107 01451).

108

### 109 **Study participants**

110 The COMplete study examined healthy adults (HEALTHY) and patients with chronic heart  
111 failure (HEART). HEALTHY were  $\geq 20$  years of age, non-smoking, and had a BMI  $< 30$   
112  $kg/m^2$ . [9] Exclusion criteria were the presence of chronic exercise-limiting disease, known  
113 pregnancy or breastfeeding, hypertonic blood pressure  $> 160/100$  mmHg, orthopaedic  
114 problems hindering the examinations, inability to follow the study procedures, and  
115 contraindications for all-out exercise.[9] Individuals aged  $\geq 20$  years and diagnosed with

116 stable chronic heart failure were eligible for HEART.[9] All exclusion criteria and a rationale  
117 for the study size are presented elsewhere.[9]

118

### 119 **Study procedures**

#### 120 *Accelerometry and data processing*

121 Participants were asked to wear a triaxial accelerometer (GENEActiv, Activinsights Ltd.,  
122 Kimbolton, UK) on their non-dominant wrist, for 24 hours/day over 14 days.[9] Data were  
123 sampled at 50 Hz. Days with wear time >14 hours were considered valid. Participants needed  
124 to have at least four valid weekdays (Monday to Friday) and one Saturday and Sunday  
125 each.[5] Raw-data processing using the GGIR package[10, 11] is described in detail in the  
126 Supplement.

127

#### 128 *Cardiopulmonary exercise testing*

129 Gas exchange was measured breath-by-breath during a graded exercise test on a cycle  
130 ergometer using the MetaMax 3B portable metabolic system (Cortex Biophysik GmbH,  
131 Leipzig, Germany). One of five ramp protocols was chosen depending on the participant's  
132 estimated CRF.[9]  $VO_{2peak}$  was recorded as the three highest consecutive values (30 s  
133 average) during the test. Detailed information are presented elsewhere.[12]

134

### 135 **Statistical analyses**

136 Statistical analyses and figures were done in R version 4.2.0.[13] Correlations between  
137 accelerometer parameters and  $VO_{2peak}$  were analysed using Spearman's Rank Correlation.  
138 Explorative principal component and partial least squares analyses were performed to  
139 examine the relationship between the abovementioned variables.[14, 15] Multiple linear  
140 regression models were used to examine between-cohort differences and the association

## ACCELEROMETRY REFERENCE VALUES

7

141 between  $VO_{2peak}$  and accelerometer parameters, i.e. IG, AvAcc, MVPA, VPA and time in PA  
142 (TPA=light PA+MVPA). For each cohort, we planned to create three models with cut-point-  
143 free metrics only (IG, AvAcc, and both parameters together), two models with cut-point-  
144 based metrics only (MVPA and VPA), and two models containing IG or VPA as a measure of  
145 PA intensity and TPA as a surrogate of time in PA. All models were adjusted for age and an  
146 interaction between BMI and sex. We used restricted cubic splines with four knots placed at  
147 appropriate percentiles of the data for age and BMI.[16] Fulfilment of model assumptions  
148 was verified using residual diagnostics. The best model fit was selected based on residual  
149 standard deviation and adjusted  $R^2$ . A Likelihood-Ratio-Test was used to compare models.  
150 Non-nested models were compared using the Vuong Test.[17] Percentile curves were created  
151 with Generalised Additive Models for Location, Scale, and Shape with the GAMLSS package  
152 (version 5.3-4).[18] Age or  $VO_{2peak}$  as the independent parameter was fitted using p-  
153 splines.[19, 20] We adopted the Bayesian information criterion to select the conditional  
154 distribution offering the best compromise between model complexity and goodness-of-fit.  
155 Model fits were inspected using diagnostic residual plots.[21] We developed the application  
156 ‘rawacceleration’ using ‘shiny’[22] to translate our findings into clinical practice. The level of  
157 statistical significance was set at 0.05. All tests were two-sided.

158

159

## 160 RESULTS

161 679 HEALTHY and 89 HEART were invited to this study. Of those, 585 HEALTHY and 70  
162 HEART fulfilled all criteria. After excluding participants with missing covariate data, 463  
163 HEALTHY and 67 HEART were analysed. Cohort characteristics are presented in Table 1.

164 \*\*\* insert Table 1 here \*\*\*

---

**Table 1.** Characteristics of healthy individuals and patients with heart failure stratified by sex.

---

Variable	HEALTHY (n=463)	HEART (n=67)
----------	-----------------	--------------

---

## ACCELEROMETRY REFERENCE VALUES

8

	Females	Males	Females	Males
<i>n</i> (%)	221 (47.7)	242 (52.3)	15 (22.4)	52 (77.6)
Age, years, [range]	55 (36, 71) [20 to 89]	55 (37, 71) [20 to 89]	74 (63, 79) [26 to 89]	65 (56, 75) [31 to 85]
Height, cm	165.3 (6.9)	177.4 (7.1)	160.5 (4.1)	175.4 (5.8)
Body mass, kg	62.0 (8.1)	77.4 (9.3)	71.2 (16.4)	87.4 (14.9)
Body mass index, kg·m <sup>-2</sup>	22.7 (2.7)	24.6 (2.4)	27.6 (6.1)	28.4 (4.2)
Smoking status, <i>n</i> (%)				
Smokers	0	0	0	5 (9.6)
Never smoked	177 (80.1)	191 (78.9)	9 (60)	24 (46.2)
Ex-smoker > 10 years	44 (19.9)	50 (20.7)	2 (13.3)	20 (38.5)
NYHA class, <i>n</i> (%)				
I	0	0	2 (13.3)	29 (55.8)
II	0	0	6 (40.0)	13 (25.0)
III	0	0	7 (46.7)	10 (19.2)
Non-wear time, % of day	0.3 (1.0)	0.4 (1.3)	0.1 (0.2)	0.5 (2.2)
Waking time, h per day	16.2 (0.8)	16.3 (0.9)	15.7 (1.4)	16.2 (1.2)
<i>Intensity regression line</i>				
Intensity gradient,	-2.549 (-2.644, -2.390)	-2.450 (-2.577, -2.301)	-2.745 (-2.801, -2.681)	-2.676 (-2.749, -2.544)
Intercept	14.7 (14.1, 15.1)	14.3 (14.7, 14.8)	15.4 (15.2, 15.5)	14.8 (13.4, 15.1)
Explained variance, R <sup>2</sup> , %	90.4 (88.3, 91.7)	90.8 (88.8, 92.1)	91.0 (89.6, 92.7)	92.1 (90.2, 93.4)
Average acceleration, mg	29.72 (25.79, 35.41)	30.38 (24.79, 36.96)	23.31 (11.06, 25.72)	21.38 (9.88, 24.43)
Sedentary, min·day <sup>-1</sup>	594 (542, 644)	622 (561, 673)	621 (566, 661)	692 (634, 739)
MVPA, min·day <sup>-1</sup>	111 (87, 139)	120 (87, 147)	79 (65, 86)	65 (46, 84)
Vigorous PA, min·day <sup>-1</sup>	3 (1, 8)	5 (2, 13)	1 (0, 1)	1 (0, 2)
Time in PA, min·day <sup>-1</sup>	377 (326, 422)	358 (299, 408)	333 (284, 387)	277 (226, 336)
VO <sub>2peak</sub> , mL·kg <sup>-1</sup> ·min <sup>-1</sup> , [range]	30.6 (24.2, 37.8) [13.5 to 53.5]	38.2 (29.8, 46.0) [16.4 to 65.1]	16.6 (13.2, 18.9) [10.1 to 29.9]	22.0 (18.5, 25.1) [13.4 to 39.5]
NT-proBNP, pg/mL	103.3 (69.8, 157.9)	54.0 (35.8, 113.6)	430.4 (304.0, 571.9)	291.2 (158.5, 795.5)

Data are presented as mean (SD) or median (25<sup>th</sup> percentile, 75<sup>th</sup> percentile) unless stated otherwise. Not available data for NT-proBNP in HEALTHY *n*=8 and HEART *n*=1; for smoking status in HEART *n*=7. Abbreviations: NYHA, New York Heart Association; PA, physical activity; MVPA, moderate-to-vigorous PA; VO<sub>2peak</sub>, peak oxygen uptake, NT-proBNP, N-terminal pro b-type natriuretic peptide.

165

166

### 167 **Between-cohort differences**

168 HEART had significantly lower IG (*p*<0.001, 95% CI: -0.185 to -0.079), AvAcc (*p*<0.001;

169 95% CI: -8.59 to -3.92 mg), MVPA (*p*<0.001; 95% CI: -45 to -20 min), VPA (*p*=0.002; 95%



## ACCELEROMETRY REFERENCE VALUES

9

170 CI: -6.1 to -1.3 min), and TPA ( $p < 0.001$ ; 95% CI: -80 to -33 min) than HEALTHY (see Table  
171 1). HEART were more sedentary than HEALTHY ( $p = 0.006$ ; 95% CI: 10 to 59 min).

172

173 **Interrelationship between accelerometer metrics and  $VO_{2peak}$  in HEALTHY and**  
174 **HEART**

175 Correlations of  $VO_{2peak}$ , IG, AvAcc, MVPA, VPA, TPA, and sedentary time are available in  
176 Figure 1.

177 \*\*\* insert Figure 1 here \*\*\*

178

179 Results of the explorative principal component and partial least squares analyses are  
180 presented and discussed in Supplement 2.

181

182 Multiple regression models with key accelerometer parameters as independent variables and  
183  $VO_{2peak}$  as the dependent variable are presented in Table 2. In HEALTHY, model 2 (AvAcc)  
184 had a better fit than model 1 (IG) ( $p = 0.022$ ). Model 7 (AvAcc+IG) performed better than  
185 model 1 (IG) ( $p < 0.001$ ) and model 2 (AvAcc) ( $p = 0.004$ ). The best cut-point-free model  
186 including AvAcc and IG (model 7) and the best cut-point-based model including VPA (model  
187 4) performed similarly.

188 When combining IG as a metric of PA intensity and TPA as a surrogate of PA time (Model 5),  
189 both metrics were independent predictors of  $VO_{2peak}$ . However, when including VPA and TPA  
190 (model 6), there was little evidence for the latter being an independent predictor of  $VO_{2peak}$ .

191 In HEART, there was little evidence for a difference in fit between model 1 (IG), 2 (AvAcc),  
192 or 7 (IG+AvAcc). Both IG and AvAcc were associated with  $VO_{2peak}$  with only IG being  
193 independent of AvAcc but not vice versa. Moreover, the best model with cut-point-based  
194 metric (model 3 with MVPA) performed equal to models 1 (IG) and 7 (AvAcc+IG), but was

ACCELEROMETRY REFERENCE VALUES

195 superior to model 2 (AvAcc) (p=0.012). Adding TPA to the model with IG or VPA did not  
 196 significantly improve model fits (models 5&6).

197

198 \*\*\* insert Table 2 here \*\*\*

199

**Table 2.** Regression models for HEALTHY and HEART with peak oxygen uptake as the dependent variable.

Independent variables	Estimate	95% CI	p-value	Residual standard deviation	Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>
<i>HEALTHY</i> (n=463)					
<u>Model 1</u>			<0.001	5.47	0.7153
IG	10.8	(7.9 to 13.8)	<0.001		
<u>Model 2</u>			<0.001	5.27	0.7361
AvAcc	0.3	(0.24 to 0.36)	<0.001		
<u>Model 3</u>			<0.001	5.44	0.7182
MVPA	0.05	(0.04 to 0.06)	<0.001		
<u>Model 4</u>			<0.001	5.21	0.7417
VPA	0.30	(0.24 to 0.36)	<0.001		
<u>Model 5</u>			<0.001	5.41	0.7215
IG	10.34	(7.44 to 13.25)	<0.001		
TPA	0.01	(0.005 to 0.018)	<0.001		
<u>Model 6</u>			<0.001	5.19	0.7431
VPA	0.29	(0.23 to 0.35)	<0.001		
TPA	0.01	(-0.00 to 0.01)	0.059		
<u>Model 7</u>			<0.001	5.24	0.7394
IG	4.49	(1.11 to 7.88)	0.009		
AvAcc	0.25	(0.17 to 0.32)	<0.001		
<i>HEART</i> (n=67)					
<u>Model 1</u>			<0.001	4.75	0.3802
IG	10.08	(3.49 to 16.67)	0.003		
<u>Model 2</u>			<0.001	4.87	0.3475
AvAcc	0.26	(0.05 to 0.48)	0.016		
<u>Model 3</u>			<0.001	4.73	0.3834
MVPA	0.05	(0.02 to 0.09)	0.003		
<u>Model 4</u>			<0.001	5.01	0.3082
VPA	0.43	(-0.09 to 0.95)	0.107		
<u>Model 5</u>			<0.001	4.76	0.3763
IG	9.33	(2.04 to 16.96)	0.009		
TPA	0.01	(-0.01 to 0.04)	0.422		
<u>Model 6</u>			<0.001	5.00	0.3120
VPA	0.35	(-0.19 to 0.89)	0.203		
TPA	0.01	(-7.08 to 0.03)	0.256		
<u>Model 7</u>			<0.001	4.73	0.3842
IG	7.85	(2.41 to 15.46)	0.043		
AvAcc	0.14	(-1.01 to 0.38)	0.249		

All models were adjusted for age \* sex + BMI (age and BMI were modelled using restricted cubic splines). Abbreviations: AvAcc, average acceleration; HEALTHY, healthy individuals; HEART, patients with heart failure; IG, intensity gradient; MVPA, moderate to vigorous physical activity; TPA, time in physical activity; VPA, vigorous physical activity.

201 **Reference values for healthy adults**

202 Sex-specific percentile curves were created for IG, AvAcc (see Figure 2), MVPA, and VPA

203 (see Supplementary Figure 3). Empirical data for IG and AvAcc per age decade are presented

204 in Table 3. Data for MVPA and VPA are shown in Supplementary Table 2.

205

206 \*\*\* insert Table 3 here \*\*\*

207

**Table 3.** Empirical data for IG and AvAcc in healthy individuals stratified by age decade and sex.

Age decade	P <sub>3</sub>	P <sub>15</sub>	P <sub>50</sub>	P <sub>85</sub>	P <sub>97</sub>
IG					
<i>Females</i>					
20 to 29	-2.662	-2.541	-2.392	-2.244	-2.123
30 to 39	-2.713	-2.581	-2.419	-2.256	-2.124
40 to 49	-2.769	-2.627	-2.454	-2.280	-2.138
50 to 59	-2.833	-2.686	-2.505	-2.324	-2.176
60 to 69	-2.902	-2.753	-2.569	-2.385	-2.235
70 to 79	-2.973	-2.822	-2.637	-2.452	-2.301
80 to 89	-3.043	-2.890	-2.702	-2.514	-2.361
<i>Males</i>					
20 to 29	-2.673	-2.526	-2.346	-2.167	-2.020
30 to 39	-2.682	-2.532	-2.349	-2.166	-2.016
40 to 49	-2.698	-2.546	-2.359	-2.173	-2.020
50 to 59	-2.740	-2.585	-2.394	-2.204	-2.049
60 to 69	-2.816	-2.658	-2.464	-2.270	-2.112
70 to 79	-2.921	-2.760	-2.563	-2.365	-2.204
80 to 89	-3.031	-2.867	-2.666	-2.465	-2.301
AvAcc, mg					
<i>Females</i>					
20 to 29	22.61	26.61	32.56	39.85	46.93
30 to 39	22.05	26.23	32.52	40.35	48.02
40 to 49	21.22	25.48	32.00	40.20	48.33
50 to 59	20.01	24.23	30.74	39.03	47.31
60 to 69	18.60	22.68	29.03	37.18	45.39
70 to 79	17.20	21.11	27.25	35.20	43.26
80 to 89	15.98	19.74	25.69	33.46	41.40

## ACCELEROMETRY REFERENCE VALUES

12

<i>Males</i>					
20 to 29	18.87	23.85	31.98	42.94	54.40
30 to 39	19.61	24.79	33.24	44.63	56.54
40 to 49	20.11	25.37	33.93	45.42	57.41
50 to 59	19.98	25.03	33.18	44.03	55.27
60 to 69	18.95	23.44	30.56	39.87	49.39
70 to 79	17.11	20.78	26.48	33.75	41.05
80 to 89	15.19	18.12	22.56	28.10	33.55

Abbreviations: IG, intensity gradient; AvAcc, average acceleration per day.

208

209

210 \*\*\* insert Figure 2 here \*\*\*

211

212

213 CRF-specific percentile curves for IG and AvAcc are available in Figure 3.

214 \*\*\* insert Figure 3 here \*\*\*

215

216 We developed the application ‘rawacceleration’ using these reference data. It is freely

217 available on GitHub (<https://github.com/FSchwendinger/rawacceleration>). Further insights

218 into ‘rawacceleration’ are given in the Supplement and discussion section.

219

220

## 221 **DISCUSSION**

222 The major novel findings are IG and AvAcc yield complementary information on PA,

223 particularly intensity, with both being important predictors of  $VO_{2peak}$  in healthy individuals

224 and patients with heart failure. Both metrics together had similar predictive value for  $VO_{2peak}$

225 as the best cut-point-based metric in healthy adults. In patients with heart failure, both IG

226 alone and IG+AvAcc together had similar predictive value as the best cut-point-based metric

227 with IG being independent of AvAcc. Cut-point-free metrics also have the advantage of being

228 comparable across cohorts and the most commonly used accelerometers.[6, 24] Importantly,  
229 this population-based study produced percentile curves and reference values for both cut-  
230 point-free and traditional accelerometer metrics for healthy adults aged 20 to 89 years. This  
231 addresses the limited interpretability of the AvAcc and IG metrics by placing them into  
232 context. Our results provide generalised support for policy making.

233

234 **Inter-relationship between accelerometer metrics and  $VO_{2peak}$  in HEALTHY and**  
235 **HEART**

236 We confirmed previous findings in children and adults with type 2 diabetes suggesting AvAcc  
237 and IG provide a complementary picture of PA.[6, 7] Our study demonstrated this in healthy  
238 adults and patients with heart failure by examining correlations between accelerometer  
239 metrics. These findings are strengthened by our explorative principle component analysis.  
240 Lower communalities were seen for IG than for AvAcc or MVPA indicating IG may yield a  
241 perspective on PA not covered by other metrics. AvAcc and IG may thus provide a more  
242 complete impression of an individual's PA profile without having to rely on accelerometer  
243 cut-points.

244 AvAcc and IG have been described to reflect PA volume and intensity, respectively.[6] Yet,  
245 correlations between TPA, VPA, IG, and AvAcc indicate that AvAcc conveys information on  
246 both PA intensity and volume. It should therefore be noted that cut-point-free metrics allow  
247 the further investigation of intensity/volume, despite their overlap, as IG captures the  
248 distribution as well as quantity of intensity. This is more difficult with cut-point-based  
249 metrics because of their categorical and population-dependent nature. Thus AvAcc and IG  
250 may be particularly appropriate when attempting to differentiate between the contribution of  
251 PA intensity and volume to CRF as well as other health parameters (e.g. body fatness, BMI,  
252 physical function).[6, 7]

## ACCELEROMETRY REFERENCE VALUES

14

253 IG and AvAcc together had the greatest predictive value for  $VO_{2peak}$  in healthy adults and  
254 both were independently associated, explaining a unique fraction of the variance. This is  
255 partly compliant with a study in children that estimated CRF from a shuttle-run-test.[7] IG or  
256 AvAcc as the only independent variable in the adjusted regression models was significantly  
257 associated with estimated CRF.[7] Yet, only IG remained significantly associated with CRF  
258 when AvAcc was added to the model.[7] AvAcc may consequently be more relevant in adults  
259 than in children. This is possibly due to different activity patterns with higher IG and AvAcc  
260 together with less sedentary time in children.[7] This highlights the utility of combining these  
261 two metrics to gain insight into the relative importance of volume and intensity of the PA  
262 profile which differs across populations.[6]

263 Interestingly, TPA significantly added to model 5 also containing IG. Both intensity  
264 distribution (IG) and time spent in PA (TPA) may thus be relevant for  $VO_{2peak}$ . Notably,  
265 AvAcc captures both time and intensity of PA, thus reflecting activity volume, while IG  
266 captures the distribution of the intensity of activity. Combining IG and AvAcc thus yields  
267 complementary perspectives on PA intensity.

268 In patients with heart failure, cut-point-free metrics had similar predictive value for  $VO_{2peak}$   
269 as the best cut-point-based metric, MVPA. Yet, unlike in healthy adults, only IG was  
270 independent of AvAcc but not vice versa. This may reflect relatively little activity of higher  
271 intensity in these patients; it is in contrast with findings of Dawkins et al. (25) and suggests  
272 that a focus on intensity of activity, i.e. increasing the breadth of the intensity distribution,  
273 may be more important than volume if intervening in this population.

274 This study demonstrated that IG and AvAcc are not only potentially more robust  
275 accelerometer metrics than MVPA, VPA, or TPA, as they do not rely on cut-points, but also  
276 have similar predictive value for  $VO_{2peak}$  and, in turn, indirectly for the risk of mortality and  
277 longevity.[8, 26] Indeed, Dempsey et al. (23) recently demonstrated that AvAcc and IG were

278 independently associated with incident cardiovascular disease in participants from UK  
279 Biobank. These results and those of previous studies[6, 7] provide an evidence-based  
280 rationale that cut-point-free accelerometer metrics facilitate capture of the volume and  
281 intensity distribution of the PA profile across populations, and thus may be a viable  
282 alternative to cut-point-based outcomes in the measurement of PA.

283

#### 284 **Reference values for healthy adults**

285 Our reference values and percentile curves may be pivotal to assessing the appropriateness of  
286 PA on population- or individual-level and to determining the level of PA necessary for a  
287 healthy lifestyle.[6]

288 IG and AvAcc at the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile are higher than in participants of the UK Biobank Study  
289 aged 40 to 69 years, despite them wearing the accelerometer on their dominant hand which  
290 typically elicits accelerations approximately 10% higher.[1, 27] This seems reasonable in  
291 light of the good health condition (see inclusion/exclusion criteria) and the likely higher  
292 CRF[12] of the COMplete cohort compared to the aforementioned study. Hence, our  
293 reference values might be desirable benchmarks for healthy PA patterns in adults.

294 Age trajectories of IG and AvAcc were curvilinear and inverse for both sexes (see Figure 2).

295 This is in line with the accelerometer data of another Swiss adult cohort.[28] Interestingly, the  
296 decline in IG and AvAcc with age seems to resemble that of CRF and muscular strength in  
297 the COMplete cohort.[12, 29] With age, less time is spent at higher absolute intensities

298 which might be due to reduced physical functioning as apparent by lower CRF and muscular  
299 strength. However, when expressed in relative terms (as % of an individual's  $VO_{2peak}$ ),

300 intensity may still be high. This explanation is underpinned by questionnaire data, which may  
301 also reflect the rate of perceived exertion, showing more moderate and vigorous PA in

302 individuals aged > 59 years than in 40 to 59-year-olds.[28] Moreover, the inverse relationship

303 seen between accelerometer-based VPA and age seems not to be apparent in questionnaire  
304 data.[28]

305 The proposed reference values may also be useful when PA is measured with other raw-  
306 acceleration, wrist-worn accelerometers. Migueles et al. (24) found high inter-instrument  
307 reliability for four common accelerometers (GENEActiv, Movisens Move 4, ActiGraph  
308 GT3X+, and Axivity AX3) provided that raw data are processed identically. The between-  
309 device difference ranged between 1 (95% CI: -6 to 7) and 8 (95% CI: 1 to 15) min per  
310 day.[24] Our reference values may thus be applicable for at least the examined  
311 accelerometers (i.e. GENEActiv, Movisens Move 4, ActiGraph GT3X+, and Axivity  
312 AX3).[24]

313 Reference values and percentile curves for cut-point-based metrics (VPA and MVPA, see  
314 Supplement: Figure 3 and Table 2) were also created. These are still commonly used and  
315 directly interpretable. Comparison to these data is however only possible when using the cut-  
316 points by Hildebrand et al. (3) (MVPA=0.1 g and VPA=0.4 g) and processing data  
317 identically.[24] Due to the aforementioned disadvantages of cut-point-based accelerometer  
318 metrics (also discussed elsewhere[5]), cut-point-free metrics should be reported in future  
319 studies examining PA with raw-acceleration accelerometers.

320 Importantly, the reference values for traditional metrics are specific to accelerometer data and  
321 examine the whole activity profile. They are not comparable to e.g. the PA guidelines by the  
322 WHO which focus on MVPA and were developed predominantly from self-reported data.[2,  
323 30] This is supported by numerous studies.[31, 32]

324 Our reference values facilitate interpretation of accelerometer-assessed PA data relative to a  
325 'healthy norm', and may thus be an important complement to the current PA guidelines by the  
326 WHO.[30]

327



328 **Limitations**

329 PA levels differ between countries.[33] Nonetheless, it seems to be desirable to promote the  
330 present reference values also in countries other than Switzerland considering the good general  
331 health of our cohort in combination with their high CRF.[12] Importantly, the present  
332 reference values are only applicable if the data are processed similarly (see Methods section  
333 and configuration file). The R-package GGIR will facilitate this process.[10] Large  
334 differences in sampling frequency of accelerometer data may impact outcomes. In a study  
335 comparing 25 Hz with 100 Hz, the lower sampling frequency led to 3.1%–13.9% lower  
336 overall acceleration values.[34] The difference may however be smaller at 50 Hz, as used in  
337 our study. Yet, sampling frequency should be considered when comparing PA metrics to the  
338 present reference values. Available algorithms may help transform PA metrics to match those  
339 obtained from higher sampling frequencies.[34] Lastly, no causation between PA and  $VO_{2peak}$   
340 can be implied from the present study.

341

342

343 **CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS**

344 IG and AvAcc provide complementary information on PA, particularly the intensity  
345 distribution of the PA profile. IG and AvAcc were strongly associated with  $VO_{2peak}$  in healthy  
346 adults and patients with heart failure. These metrics are independent of accelerometer cut-  
347 points, facilitate investigation of the relative contribution of intensity and volume of PA for a  
348 given health marker, and thus may be important parameters with regard to general health and  
349 risk for mortality and non-communicable diseases. To the best of our knowledge, this is the  
350 first study to produce reference values for IG and AvAcc for healthy adults. These reference  
351 values may be valuable to judge an individual's or a population's level of PA and facilitate  
352 cross-study comparison. The 'rawacceleration' application may be helpful for to compare

353 individual- or cohort-level data to healthy age- and sex-matched adults and translate results  
354 into meaningful outcomes in research settings and clinical practice.

355

356

### 357 **Declarations**

#### 358 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

359 This study was approved by the Ethics Committee of North-western and Central Switzerland  
360 (EKNZ 2017–01451). All participants in this study provided informed written consent.

#### 361 **Consent for publication**

362 Not applicable.

#### 363 **Availability of data and materials**

364 The datasets used and/or analysed during the current study are available from the  
365 corresponding author on reasonable request.

#### 366 **Competing interests**

367 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

#### 368 **Funding**

369 The COMpLETE study was funded by the Swiss National Science Foundation (Grant no.  
370 182815). AVR is supported by the Lifestyle Theme of the Leicester NHR Leicester Biomedical  
371 Research Centre and NIHR Applied Research Collaborations East Midlands (ARC-EM).

#### 372 **Authors contributions**

373 FS conceptualised the manuscript and wrote the original draft. FS and DI analysed and  
374 interpreted the data. JW, AST, TH, and RK conceptualised the study and defined the methods.

375 JW and RK collected the data. FS, JW, and RK were responsible for data curation. JW, DI,

376 RK, AVR, TH, and AST revised the manuscript. AST obtained funding for the project. All

377 authors approved the final version of the manuscript.

378 **Acknowledgements**

379 We are grateful for the valuable contributions of all study participants in the COMplete  
380 study.

381

382 **List of abbreviations**

383	AvAcc	Average acceleration
384	CRF	Cardiorespiratory fitness
385	ENMO	Euclidean norm minus one
386	HEALTHY	Healthy adults
387	HEART	Patients with heart failure
388	IG	Intensity gradient
389	MVPA	Moderate-to-vigorous physical activity
390	NT-proBNP	N-terminal pro b-type natriuretic peptide
391	NYHA	New York Heart Association
392	PA	Physical activity
393	SD	Standard deviation
394	SED	Sedentary time
395	TPA	Total physical activity
396	VO <sub>2peak</sub>	Peak oxygen uptake
397	VPA	Vigorous physical activity

398

399

400 **REFERENCES**

- 401 1. Rowlands AV, Fairclough SJ, Yates TOM, Edwardson CL, Davies M, Munir F, et al.  
402 Activity Intensity, Volume, and Norms: Utility and Interpretation of Accelerometer Metrics.  
403 Med Sci Sports Exerc. 2019;51(11):2410-22.  
404 2. Troiano RP, McClain JJ, Brychta RJ, Chen KY. Evolution of accelerometer methods  
405 for physical activity research. Br J Sports Med. 2014;48(13):1019-23.

- 406 3. Hildebrand M, van Hees VT, Hansen BH, Ekelund U. Age Group Comparability of  
407 Raw Accelerometer Output from Wrist- and Hip-Worn Monitors. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.*  
408 2014;46(9):1816-24.
- 409 4. Esliger DW, Rowlands AV, Hurst TL, Catt M, Murray P, Eston RG. Validation of the  
410 GENE Accelerometer. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 2011;43(6):1085-93.
- 411 5. Schwendinger F, Wagner J, Infanger D, Schmidt-Trucksäss A, Knaier R.  
412 Methodological aspects for accelerometer-based assessment of physical activity in heart  
413 failure and health. *BMC Med Res Methodol.* 2021;21(1):251.
- 414 6. Rowlands AV, Edwardson CL, Davies MJ, Khunti K, Harrington DM, Yates T.  
415 Beyond Cut Points: Accelerometer Metrics that Capture the Physical Activity Profile. *Med*  
416 *Sci Sports Exerc.* 2018;50(6):1323-32.
- 417 7. Fairclough SJ, Taylor S, Rowlands AV, Boddy LM, Noonan RJ. Average acceleration  
418 and intensity gradient of primary school children and associations with indicators of health  
419 and well-being. *J Sports Sci.* 2019;37(18):2159-67.
- 420 8. Kodama S, Saito K, Tanaka S, Maki M, Yachi Y, Asumi M, et al. Cardiorespiratory  
421 Fitness as a Quantitative Predictor of All-Cause Mortality and Cardiovascular Events in  
422 Healthy Men and Women: A Meta-analysis. *JAMA.* 2009;301(19):2024-35.
- 423 9. Wagner J, Knaier R, Infanger D, Arbeev K, Briel M, Dieterle T, et al. Functional  
424 aging in health and heart failure: the COMLETE Study. *BMC Cardiovasc Disord.*  
425 2019;19(1):180.
- 426 10. Migueles JH, Rowlands AV, Huber F, Sabia S, van Hees VT. GGIR: A Research  
427 Community-Driven Open Source R Package for Generating Physical Activity and Sleep  
428 Outcomes From Multi-Day Raw Accelerometer Data. *J Meas Phys Behav.* 2019;2(3):188-96.
- 429 11. van Hees VT, Gorzelniak L, Dean León EC, Eder M, Pias M, Taherian S, et al.  
430 Separating Movement and Gravity Components in an Acceleration Signal and Implications  
431 for the Assessment of Human Daily Physical Activity. *PloS ONE.* 2013;8(4):e61691.  
432 10.1371/journal.pone.0061691.
- 433 12. Wagner J, Knaier R, Infanger D, Königstein K, Klenk C, Carrard J, et al. Novel CPET  
434 Reference Values in Healthy Adults: Associations with Physical Activity. *Med Sci Sports*  
435 *Exerc.* 2020;53(1):26-37.
- 436 13. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing Vienna,  
437 Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2021 [Available from: [https://www.R-](https://www.R-project.org/)  
438 [project.org/](https://www.R-project.org/)].
- 439 14. Kassambara A, Mundt F. Factoextra: Extract and Visualize the Results of Multivariate  
440 Data Analyses. R Package Version 1.0.7. 2020.
- 441 15. Mevik B-H, Wehrens R. The pls Package: Principal Component and Partial Least  
442 Squares Regression in R. *J Stat Softw.* 2007;18(2):1-23.
- 443 16. Harrell FE, Jr. Regression modeling strategies. 2 ed: Springer International  
444 Publishing; 2015.
- 445 17. Vuong QH. Likelihood Ratio Tests for Model Selection and Non-Nested Hypotheses.  
446 *Econometrica.* 1989;57(2):307-33.
- 447 18. Stasinopoulos DM, Rigby RA. Generalized Additive Models for Location Scale and  
448 Shape (GAMLSS) in R. *J Stat Softw.* 2007;23(7):1-46.
- 449 19. Stasinopoulos MD, Rigby, R.A., Heller, G.Z., Voudouris, V., De Bastiani, F. . Flexible  
450 Regression and Smoothing: Using GAMLSS in R. 1 ed: Chapman and Hall/CRC; 2017.
- 451 20. Eilers PHC, Marx, B. D. Practical smoothing. The joys of P-splines: Cambridge  
452 University Press; 2021.
- 453 21. van Buuren S, Fredriks M. Worm plot: a simple diagnostic device for modelling  
454 growth reference curves. *Stat Med.* 2001;20(8):1259-77.

- 455 22. Chang W, Cheng J, Allaire J, Xie Y, McPherson J. Shiny: web application framework  
456 for R. R package version. 2017;1(5):2017.
- 457 23. Dempsey PC, Rowlands AV, Strain T, Zaccardi F, Dawkins NP, Razieh C, et al.  
458 Physical activity volume, intensity and incident cardiovascular disease. *Eur Heart J*.  
459 2022;43(46):4789-4800.
- 460 24. Migueles JH, Molina-Garcia P, Torres-Lopez LV, Cadenas-Sanchez C, Rowlands AV,  
461 Ebner-Priemer UW, et al. Equivalency of four research-grade movement sensors to assess  
462 movement behaviors and its implications for population surveillance. *Sci Rep*.  
463 2022;12(1):5525. 10.1038/s41598-022-09469-2.
- 464 25. Dawkins NP, Yates T, Edwardson CL, Maylor B, Henson J, Hall AP, et al. Importance  
465 of Overall Activity and Intensity of Activity for Cardiometabolic Risk in Those with and  
466 Without a Chronic Disease. *Med Sci Sports Exerc*. 2022;54(9):1582-90.
- 467 26. Mok A, Khaw K-T, Luben R, Wareham N, Brage S. Physical activity trajectories and  
468 mortality: population based cohort study. *BMJ*. 2019;365:l2323. 10.1136/bmj.l2323.
- 469 27. Buchan DS, Boddy LM, McLellan G. Comparison of Free-Living and Laboratory  
470 Activity Outcomes from ActiGraph Accelerometers Worn on the Dominant and Non-  
471 Dominant Wrists. *Meas Phys Edu Exerc Sci*. 2020;24(4):247-57.
- 472 28. Wanner M, Hartmann C, Pestoni G, Martin BW, Siegrist M, Martin-Diener E.  
473 Validation of the Global Physical Activity Questionnaire for self-administration in a  
474 European context. *BMJ Open Sport Exerc Med*. 2017;3(1):e000206. 10.1136/bmjsem-2016-  
475 000206.
- 476 29. Lichtenstein E, Wagner J, Knaier R, Infanger D, Roth R, Hinrichs T, et al. Norm  
477 Values of Muscular Strength Across the Life Span in a Healthy Swiss Population: The  
478 COMpLETE Study. *Sports Health*. 2022. 10.1177/19417381221116345.
- 479 30. Bull FC, Al-Ansari SS, Biddle S, Borodulin K, Buman MP, Cardon G, et al. World  
480 Health Organization 2020 guidelines on physical activity and sedentary behaviour. *Br J*  
481 *Sports Med*. 2020;54(24):1451-62.
- 482 31. Tucker JM, Welk GJ, Beyler NK. Physical activity in U.S.: adults compliance with the  
483 Physical Activity Guidelines for Americans. *Am J Prev Med*. 2011;40(4):454-61.
- 484 32. Schuna JM, Jr., Johnson WD, Tudor-Locke C. Adult self-reported and objectively  
485 monitored physical activity and sedentary behavior: NHANES 2005-2006. *Int J Behav Nutr*  
486 *Phys Act*. 2013;10:126. 10.1186/1479-5868-10-126.
- 487 33. Bauman A, Ainsworth BE, Sallis JF, Hagströmer M, Craig CL, Bull FC, et al. The  
488 Descriptive Epidemiology of Sitting: A 20-Country Comparison Using the International  
489 Physical Activity Questionnaire (IPAQ). *Am J Prev Med*. 2011;41(2):228-35.
- 490 34. Small S, Khalid S, Dhiman P, Chan S, Jackson D, Doherty A, et al. Impact of  
491 Reduced Sampling Rate on Accelerometer-Based Physical Activity Monitoring and Machine  
492 Learning Activity Classification. *J Meas Phys Behav*. 2021;4(4):298-310.

494

## 495 **Figure legends**

496 **Figure 1.** Spearman correlations of average acceleration (AvAcc), intensity gradient (IG), moderate-to-vigorous  
497 physical activity (MVPA), sedentary time (SED), time in physical activity (TPA), peak oxygen uptake  
498 (VO<sub>2</sub>peak), and vigorous physical activity (VPA) for healthy individuals (HEALTHY) and patients with heart  
499 failure (HEART), respectively. Non-significant correlations are crossed.

## ACCELEROMETRY REFERENCE VALUES

22

500

501 **Figure 2.** Percentile curves for intensity gradient (A & B) and average acceleration (C & D) in relation to age in  
502 healthy adults. The left column shows data for females and the right column for males. Mean values of IG and  
503 AvAcc of other cohorts were plotted to highlight the potential of the reference curves for comparability across  
504 studies and between devices. Data by Rowlands et al. (1): pre- and post-menopausal women ( $n_{pre}=1218$ ,  
505  $n_{post}=1316$ ; device: Axivity). Dempsey et al. (23): participants of the UK Biobank study (females,  $n = 51,509$ ;  
506 males,  $n=36,903$ , device: Axivity, dominant wrist). Our data of patients with heart failure (HEART; device:  
507 GENEActiv) were also plotted.

508

509 **Figure 3.** Percentile curves for intensity gradient (A & B) and average acceleration (C & D) in relation to  
510  $VO_{2peak}$  in healthy adults stratified by sex. The left column shows data for females and the right column for  
511 males. Abbreviations:  $VO_{2peak}$ , peak oxygen uptake.

512







