

1            Mapping the context of sedentary behaviour (MAPS-B) using wearable sensors, indoor  
2            positioning systems, and diaries in older adults who are pre-frail and frail: A feasibility  
3            longitudinal study

4  
5 Isabel B. Rodrigues<sup>1\*</sup>, Rachel Swance<sup>2</sup>, Suleman Tariq<sup>3</sup>, Alexa Kouroukis<sup>3</sup>, Jonathan Adachi<sup>1</sup>,  
6 Steven Bray<sup>5</sup>, Alexander Rabinovich<sup>8</sup>, George Ioannidis<sup>1</sup>, Rong Zheng<sup>8</sup>, Dylan Kobsar<sup>5</sup>, Qiyin  
7 Fang<sup>7</sup>, Alexandra Papaioannou<sup>1,9</sup>

8 <sup>1</sup> McMaster University, Faculty of Health Sciences, Department of Medicine, Hamilton, ON

9 <sup>2</sup> McMaster University, Faculty of Science, Department of Life Sciences, Hamilton, ON

10 <sup>3</sup> University of Toronto, Faculty of Medicine, Toronto, ON

11 <sup>5</sup> McMaster University, Faculty of Science, Department of Kinesiology, Hamilton, ON

12 <sup>6</sup> McMaster University, Department of Surgery, Division of Orthopaedic Surgery, Hamilton,  
13 ON

14 <sup>7</sup> McMaster University, Faculty of Engineering, Department of Engineering Physics,  
15 Hamilton, ON

16 <sup>8</sup> McMaster University, Faculty of Engineering, Department of Computing and Software,

17 <sup>9</sup> McMaster University, Department of Health Research Methods, Evidence and Impact,  
18 Hamilton, ON

19

20 <sup>#a</sup>Department of Medicine, University of McMaster, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada

21

22 \*Corresponding author

23 Email: [rodrigib@mcmaster.ca](mailto:rodrigib@mcmaster.ca) (IBR)

24

25

## 26 **Abstract**

27 Older adults who are frail are likely to be sedentary. Prior interventions to reduce sedentary time  
28 in older adults have not been successful as there is little research about the context of sedentary  
29 behaviour (posture, location, purpose, social environment). Moreover, there is limited evidence on  
30 feasible measures to assess context of sedentary behaviour in older adults. The aim of our study  
31 was to determine the feasibility of measuring context of sedentary behaviour in older adults with  
32 pre-frailty or frailty using a combination of objective and self-report measures. We defined  
33 “*feasibility process*” using recruitment (20 participants within two-months), retention (85%), and  
34 refusal (20%) rates and “*feasibility resource*” if the measures capture context and can be linked  
35 (e.g., sitting-kitchen-eating-alone) and are all participants willing to use the measures. Context was  
36 assessed using a wearable sensor to assess posture, a smart home monitoring system for location,  
37 and an electronic or hard-copy diary for purpose and social context over three days in winter and  
38 spring. We approached 80 potential individuals, and 58 expressed interest; of the 58 individuals,  
39 37 did not enroll due to lack of interest or medical mistrust (64% refusal). We recruited 21 older  
40 adults (72±7.3 years, 13 females, 13 frail) within two months and experienced two dropouts due  
41 to medical mistrust or worsening health (90% retention). The wearable sensor, indoor positioning  
42 system, and electronic diary accurately captured one domain of context, but the hard copy was  
43 often not completed with enough detail, so it was challenging to link it to the other devices.  
44 Although not all participants were willing to use the wearable sensor, indoor positioning system,  
45 or electronic diary, we were able to triage the measures of those who did. Future studies will need  
46 to determine the most feasible and valid method to assess the context of sedentary behaviour,  
47 especially in diverse older adults.

## 48 **Introduction**

49 Older adults who are frail are more likely to be sedentary (1,2). Frailty is a  
50 multidimensional syndrome characterized by a decline in function across multiple physiological  
51 systems including the cardiovascular, musculoskeletal, neurological, and immunological systems  
52 (3,4). Sedentary behaviour is defined as any activity during awake hours in a seating, reclining, or  
53 laying posture that uses low energy expenditure (i.e.,  $\leq 1.5$  metabolic equivalent of task [MET])  
54 (5). Sedentary behaviour is not merely the absence of moderate or vigorous physical activity but

55 also a reduction in sit-to-stand transitions, stand time, and light physical activity (6). Most older  
56 adults who are frail spend 60% of their awake time in a seated or laid position (6). Prolonged  
57 periods of sedentary time can lead to muscle and bone unloading and are associated with declines  
58 in mobility and quality of life, and increased risk of falls, fractures, and death (1,6–9). In addition,  
59 prolonged screen-based sedentary activities are associated with both depressive and metabolic  
60 syndromes (2). The deleterious health effects of sedentary behaviour are different to those of  
61 physical inactivity and are partially independent of an individual’s physical activity levels (6).  
62 Even older adults who meet the recommended aerobic exercise guidelines of moderate to vigorous  
63 physical activity might experience adverse effects of sedentary behaviour (6). Thus, interventions  
64 to reduce periods of prolonged sedentary behaviour are necessary, especially among older adults  
65 who are living with frailty.

66 Prolonged sedentary behaviours are a recognised risk factor for many medical disorders,  
67 which makes it an urgent objective for preventative health interventions. To evaluate the  
68 effectiveness of such interventions, measures that are responsive to change are required (10).  
69 Although accelerometer-derived assessments indicate that older adults have the highest levels of  
70 sedentary time (11), these objective measures do not provide contextual information to identify  
71 interventions or public health messages to reduce sedentary time (10,12). Inclinometers are the  
72 most sensitive and valid measure of total sedentary time, but the limitation of such devices is its  
73 inability to accurately assess specific modalities of sedentary behaviour (13) Moreover, device-  
74 based measures have a high cost-to-utility ratio, which often limits their use in research (14). A  
75 recent meta-analysis reported that current tools for assessing context of sedentary behaviour or  
76 total sedentary time either over-report or under-report the amount of time adults and older adults  
77 spend sitting (12). For example, single item self-report questionnaires typically underestimate  
78 sedentary time when compared to device-based measures (accelerometers and inclinometers) (12).  
79 On the other hand, multi-item questionnaires, ecological momentary assessments, and diaries with  
80 a short recall period are more accurate at measuring sedentary time; however, there is also a high  
81 degree of variability between and within those tools (12). Currently, there is no gold standard to  
82 assess the context of sedentary behaviour, especially in older adults.

83 Almost all studies in older adults have assessed total sedentary time, which does not  
84 provide enough information to understand the context of sedentary behaviours (2,8). The main

85 reason to understand context is because not all sedentary behaviours need to be modified as some  
86 cognitively engaging sedentary behaviours (e.g., reading, socializing) appear to benefit health,  
87 while time spent in more passive activities may be detrimental. A sedentary behaviour research  
88 priorities international consensus statement suggests researchers should explore objective and self-  
89 report methods to assess context of sedentary behaviour among older adults (8). We used the  
90 Sedentary Behaviours International Taxonomy to guide our definition of context of sedentary  
91 behaviour (15). Context was defined as the purpose of the sedentary behaviours, the location where  
92 the behaviours occur, posture of the behaviours (e.g., lying, sitting), social context (e.g., alone or  
93 with others), and time of day the behaviours occur. To map the context of sedentary behaviour we  
94 used objective (i.e., accelerometer and home monitoring system with an indoor positioning  
95 system), and self-report (i.e., diary) measures; we chose three measures as one measure alone does  
96 not provide enough information about context. Our study is unique because it uses a combination  
97 of measures to assess context of sedentary behaviour; however, the feasibility of these combined  
98 measures in older adults is unknown. The primary purpose of our study was to determine the  
99 feasibility of using three measures to assess the context of sedentary behaviour in older adults who  
100 are pre-frail and frail. Our secondary objectives to quantify the context of sedentary behaviours  
101 and to understand perspectives of sedentary behaviour are reported elsewhere.

## 102 **Materials and Methods**

### 103 **Study Design**

104 We conducted a mixed-methods longitudinal study with older adults who are pre-frail and  
105 frail. We followed the STROBE 2007 guidelines for reporting of observational studies (S1 Table)  
106 (16). Ethics approval was obtained from the Hamilton Integrated Research Ethics Board. We  
107 registered our study with [clinicaltrials.gov](https://clinicaltrials.gov) (NCT05661058) on December 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2022. We assessed  
108 feasibility over three days (one weekend and two weekdays) in the winter and spring as sedentary  
109 behaviour may differ by the season.

### 110 **Setting**

111 We recruited participants from physicians' offices, the local newspaper, and a local radio  
112 station. We also posted advertisements on social media using Facebook and Twitter. To ensure

113 diversity in our recruitment process we partnered with CityHousing Hamilton Corporation, an  
114 organization that provides subsidized housing to low-income older adults, many of whom are of  
115 visible minorities, immigrants, and have visible disabilities (i.e., use a walker or cane). The results  
116 of our recruitment and retention strategy of diverse (members of racial and ethnic minorities,  
117 diverse genders, low socioeconomic status) are described elsewhere (17). We recruited participants  
118 between January to February 2023. We obtained written informed consent from each participant  
119 prior to enrolling them in the study. Participants attended two study visits (once in the winter and  
120 another in the spring) in a private room at St. Peter’s Hospital, which is part of the Hamilton Health  
121 Sciences. We provided free transportation for participants with limited mobility or free parking at  
122 the hospital. Participants were grouped into four cohorts of five participants. During the first week,  
123 we met with five participants at St. Peter’s where they completed a series of questionnaires and  
124 physical performance measures. We provided each participant with a wearable sensor, explained  
125 how to set up and calibrate the indoor positioning system, and complete the electronic or hard copy  
126 diary. During the second week, we collected the devices and diaries and transferred the data to a  
127 McMaster University cloud, and cleaned and charged the devices. We repeated the process with  
128 each cohort and the entire process was repeated in the spring. Participants with limited mobility or  
129 transportation were provided with pre-paid boxes to return study items. At the end of the study,  
130 participants received remuneration as a gift card to an easily accessible location on the bus route  
131 with versatile buying options (e.g., groceries, clothing, furniture, cleaning supplies).

## 132 **Participants**

133 We included participants if they: 1) spoke English or attended with a translator or  
134 caregiver; 2) were  $\geq 60$  years and older; and 3) had a Morley Frail Scale score  $\geq 3$  (i.e., a score of 0  
135 is robust, a score 1 or 2, pre-frail, and a score of 3 to 5, frail) (18). We excluded individuals who: 1)  
136 used a wheelchair for at least 55% of the awake day due to medical conditions; 2) were not  
137 independently mobile (i.e., require assistance from another individual to ambulate); and 3) had travel  
138 plans or other commitments that required missing  $>30\%$  of the rollout period. We sought to enroll  
139 both males and females as we anticipated that gender may influence sedentary behaviour through  
140 socially constructed norms and roles and can be affected by differential access to resources,  
141 opportunities, and power.

142

## 143 **Measures and Data Sources**

144 To map the context of sedentary behaviour we used objective (wearable sensor and indoor  
145 positioning system), and self-report (daily diary) measures. Participants were equipped with the  
146 wearable sensor and indoor positioning system, and completed a diary of daily activities over three  
147 days (one weekend and two weekdays) in the winter (February 1, 2023 to March 21<sup>st</sup>, 2023) and  
148 spring (April 10<sup>th</sup>, 2023 to May 27<sup>th</sup>, 2023). The three measures were linked using date and time  
149 (e.g., sitting-living room-watching TV-alone weekend, Winter 3:30 pm to 5:15 pm).

150 Wearable sensor: We used the activPAL4<sup>TM</sup> to collect data on posture. The activPAL4<sup>TM</sup> is a valid  
151 tool to use among older adults that generates totals for the time spent lying, sitting, standing, and  
152 stepping every second of the day (19). The wearable sensor was secured to participant's right upper  
153 thigh, midway between the iliac crest and the upper line of the patella, using a waterproof 3M  
154 Tegaderm Transparent bandage. Participants were asked to continue their normal daily activities as  
155 the wearable sensor would not interfere with their daily lives. Data was collected on the device's  
156 hard drive and exported manually to a secure McMaster University cloud.

157 Indoor Positioning System: We used a custom-designed and developed indoor positioning system  
158 to obtain room level positioning information. The system was designed and validated to be used by  
159 older adults in their own homes without the need for a floor plan and only minimal initial setup and  
160 calibration; the system can also be used in homes with multiple stories with multiple residents (20).  
161 The indoor positioning system consists of a smartwatch, a few beacons, and a data hub. The  
162 participants wore a commercially available, off-the-shelf smartwatch with customized software. The  
163 smartwatches were waterproof and could be used in the shower and pool. The location of the  
164 smartwatches is tracked by ambient (nonwearable) beacons plugged in regular wall outlets of  
165 different functional rooms of the participant's homes; we defined functional rooms as areas that  
166 participants used at least 25% of the day (e.g., kitchen, bedroom, living room). The system detected  
167 location and tracked the room-to-room movements of the participants at seconds intervals (20). The  
168 data was collected wirelessly by a data hub and stored on a secured McMaster cloud data server.

169 Diary: Each participant was asked to complete a diary of 24-hour daily activities using an electronic  
170 diary (Activities Collected over Time over 24-hours (ACT24)) or a hard copy version that asked  
171 participants to describe their activity, who they did the activity with, and the date and time. ACT24

172 was developed by the National Cancer Institute for research purposes (21,22). ACT24 is an internet-  
173 based previous-day recall designed to estimate total time (hours/day) spent sleeping in bed, in  
174 sedentary behaviours during awake hours, and in physical activity (21,22). ACT24 also provides  
175 estimates of energy expenditure associated with each behaviour (MET-hours/day) (21,22). We  
176 provided all participants with several sheets of the hard copy diary and participants who used the  
177 electronic diary inputted their activities the next day into ACT24. We sent daily email reminders to  
178 participants to complete their electronic diary.

179 Health outcomes: We collected baseline data on falls in the last 6-weeks, cognition score, frailty  
180 status, activities of daily living, health-related quality of life, depression, and anxiety in the winter  
181 and spring. Fall history was assessed by asking the following question: “*we would like to know about*  
182 *any falls you have had in the last 6-weeks. Have you had any fall including a slip or trip in which*  
183 *you lost your balance and part or all of your body landed on the floor or ground or lower level?”*  
184 (23). Cognitive status was assessed using the Montreal Cognitive Assessment (MoCA); we  
185 administered version 8.2 English in winter and MoCA Basic in spring (24). MoCA scores were  
186 adjusted for age and education level. Frailty scores were measured using the Fit-Frailty Assessment  
187 & Management Application (pre-frail scores 0.18 to 0.24 and frail >0.24) (25), activities of daily  
188 living with the Nottingham Extended Activities of Daily Living Scale (26), and health-related  
189 quality of life using the EuroQol 5-Dimension 5-Level (EQ-5D-5L) questionnaire (27). We assessed  
190 depression scores using the Geriatric Depression Scale (28) and anxiety using the Geriatric Anxiety  
191 Scale (GAS-10) (29). Demographic characteristics were collected using PROGRESS (Place of  
192 residence, Race/ethnicity, Occupation, Gender and sex, Religion, Education, Socioeconomic status,  
193 and Social capital) (30).

## 194 **Sample Size**

195 As the primary outcome is feasibility, we selected a sample size of 20, which was considered  
196 large enough to understand the practicability of using this novel approach to mapping sedentary  
197 behaviour. Sample sizes between 12 to 24 are considered reasonable for feasibility and pilot studies  
198 (31,32).

## 199 **Outcomes**

200 Our primary outcome was feasibility, which was defined using “feasibility process” and  
201 “feasibility resource” (33). Feasibility process included recruitment, retention, and refusal rates,  
202 while feasibility resource was determined using the following questions: 1) can each measure  
203 capture its intended domain of context (e.g., does the diary capture purpose and social context); 2)  
204 can data be triaged by date and time; and 3) are all participants willing to use or complete the  
205 measures. Our criteria for success for feasibility process were to recruit 20 participants within two-  
206 months with 85% retention and 20% refusal rates. Our recruitment criterion is based on previous  
207 frailty research in which 1-in-5 individuals who are approached in clinic are successfully recruited  
208 (23,34). We anticipated that the physicians could approach 10 potential participants per week for  
209 8 weeks (80 total participants). Our criteria for retention and refusal rates were based on a frailty  
210 systematic review where retention rates range from 70% to 90% and refusal rates from 10% to  
211 20% (35). Our criteria for success for feasibility resources were determined if each measure could  
212 capture a domain of context, where if “yes” than feasibility is achieved, while if “no” or  
213 “sometimes”, feasibility is not achieved (33). The same dichotomous methods were applied if the  
214 measures could be triaged using date and time (yes or no/sometimes), and if participants were  
215 willing to use activPAL4™, the indoor positioning system, and complete the ACT24 (yes or  
216 no/sometimes for each measure). We also conducted exit interviews with each participant to ask  
217 about experiences using each measure.

## 218 **Statistical Analysis**

219 Demographic data, feasibility process, and feasibility resources were reported using means  
220 and standard deviations or as a count and percentage. Descriptive analyses were performed using  
221 Microsoft Excel (version 16.71). Each exit interview was audio-recorded, transcribed verbatim,  
222 and analysed using content analysis (36). Missing values were reported as missing. Individuals  
223 who were loss to follow-up were included in the analysis if their data were available. Adverse  
224 events were reported using narrative description.



## 225 Results

### 226 Feasibility Process

227 We approached 80 individuals, and 58 expressed interest in the study (Fig 1). Of the 58  
228 individuals, 37 declined (64% refusal rate) to enroll citing lack of interest because they initially  
229 thought the study was an exercise trial or they changed their mind (57%), medical mistrust (27%),  
230 or worsening medical health (16%). Twenty-eight of the 37 individuals who declined to participate  
231 identified as female, 1 as transgender male, and all 37 individuals had a Morley frail score  $\geq 3$ . We  
232 enrolled 21 participants within two months. About 71% of participants were recruited from a  
233 physician's office, 19% from advertisements posted in CityHousing Hamilton, and the other 10%  
234 from community advertisements posted on social media or the radio. A day after the initial study  
235 visit, one participant withdrew citing medical mistrust in the study and another participant  
236 withdrew after completing the winter period citing worsening medical health (90% retention rate).  
237 Both individuals who were lost to follow up were over the age of 75 years and categorized as frail.  
238 Five participants required transportation and three utilized the pre-paid box option.

### 239 Fig 1. Flow diagram of recruitment and retention process

### 240 Participant Characteristics

241 Baseline characteristics are presented in Table 1. Participants who were frail had poorer  
242 scores on the Geriatric Depression Scale, Geriatric Anxiety Scale, gait speed, and 5x sit-to-stand  
243 compared to individuals who were pre-frail. There were no differences between the frail and pre-  
244 frail group on the MoCA, grip strength, EQ-5D-5L, and the Nottingham Activities of Daily Living.  
245 We also found no differences between physical performance measures and health outcomes  
246 between the winter and spring. One participant did not complete the MoCA in winter because they  
247 forgot their reading glasses, and another did not complete the Geriatric Depression Scale in spring  
248 for personal reasons.

249 **Table 1:** Demographic and other health characteristics of participants at baseline (n = 21)

Mean age (SD), years	73 $\pm$ 7.3
Mean height (SD), cm	166.7 $\pm$ 11.2
Mean weight (SD), kg	77.2 $\pm$ 20.6

Female sex, n (%)	13 (62%)
Ethnicity, n (%)	
Caucasian	18 (85%)
South Asian	2 (10%)
East Asian	1 (5%)
Highest Level of Education, n (%)	
Grade school	5 (24%)
High school	6 (28%)
Higher education (college or university)	10 (48%)
Employment, n (%)	
Retired	19 (10%)
Medical leave	1 (32%)
Full-time (40 hours/week)	1 (10%)
Annual income, 2023 CAD	
<20,000	2 (10%)
20,001 to 40,000	7 (32%)
40,001 to 60,000	2 (10%)
>60,000	10 (48%)
Place of Residence, n (%)	
In the community alone	8 (38%)
In the community with others	12 (57%)
Retirement home, alone	1 (5%)
Visit from friends and family, n (%)	
Daily	8 (38%)
Weekly	8 (38%)
Monthly	5 (24%)
Medical history, n (%)	
Cancer	6 (29%)
Cardiovascular	4 (19%)
Hearing impairment	8 (38%)
Joint disease	11 (52%)
Musculoskeletal condition	9 (42%)
Respiratory	5 (24%)
Frail Score mean (SD)	0.35 ± 0.08
Frail, n (%)	13 (62%), 0.4 ± 0.1
Pre-Frail, n (%)	8 (38%), 0.2 ± 0.03
EQ-5D-5L Utility Score	0.76 ± 0.16
EQ-5D-5L Visual Analogue Scale	70.00 ± 24.13
GAS-10	6.47 ± 6.74
Geriatric Depression Scale	3.67 ± 4.52
MoCA	21.33 ± 4.37, n = 20
Nottingham Activity of Daily Living	17.25 ± 4.18
Falls in the last 6 weeks, n (%)	
1 fall	3 (50%)
> 1 fall	3 (50%)
Sedentary behaviour over 24-hours:	

Laying (hours)	8.36 ± 1.56, n = 19
Sitting (hours)	10.10 ± 2.87, n = 19
Light physical activity over 24-hours:	
Standing (hours)	4.16 ± 2.10, n = 19
Walking (hours)	1.33 ± 0.77, n = 19
Step count	5699 ± 3557

250

## 251 Feasibility Resource

252 We found that each measure captured its domain of context except for the hard copy diary.  
253 The hard copy diary was not completed with sufficient information about the activity or time of  
254 day. We were able to link data from activPAL4™, the indoor positioning system, and ACT24, but  
255 not with the hard copy diary. All participants were willing to complete the hard copy diary while  
256 almost all participants were willing to use the wearable sensor. Only some participants opted to  
257 use the indoor positioning system and complete ACT24.

## 258 Wearable sensor

259 Twenty of the 21 participants felt comfortable using the activPAL4™ device to assess  
260 posture. One participant initially agreed to wear the device, and then removed it immediately after  
261 the study visit citing medical mistrust. All 20 participants found the device “comfortable to wear”  
262 and that they “did not really notice it”. Participants wore the devices continuously for three or four  
263 days to capture two weekdays and one weekend. Some participants were initially concerned the  
264 3M Tegaderm would cause skin irritation, but we experienced no adverse events. From a research  
265 perspective, the devices were easy to set up, extract data, and charge. During the winter session,  
266 the wearable sensor was not set up properly for one participant, and so data on posture was not  
267 collected.

## 268 Indoor Positioning System

269 Six of the 21 participants were willing to use the indoor positioning system. The other 15  
270 participants were not prepared to try the system as they anticipated challenges in the set up, which  
271 directly requires connection to their home WiFi router. These participants expressed concerns  
272 including not familiar with a home WiFi router, or difficulty accessing the router because it was  
273 in a hard-to-reach area. We also learned that four of the 15 participants used a cellular network

274 (Long-Term Evolution system), which was not compatible with our version of the hub design.  
275 Overall, the six participants found the indoor positioning system easy to use but provided  
276 suggestions to improve the functional design. All six participants reported that the watch was  
277 “bulky” and “uncomfortable”. The watch required daily charging and so we ask participants to  
278 charge the watch overnight in the room where they slept. Most participants reported few challenges  
279 with setting up the beacons or the hub but found the black box design could be improved to be a  
280 brighter colour to make the devices less intimidating. Participants were unsure if the beacons and  
281 hub were working as there was no indicator light. From a research perspective, linking the data  
282 was a little challenging as several participants forgot to calibrate the devices; however, we were  
283 able to link it to the other measures. In addition, we know of one participant who switched one  
284 beacon to another room mid-way through data collection.

## 285 **Diary**

286         Nine participants reported their daily activities using the ACT24 while the other 12 used a  
287 hard copy diary. Initially four participants agreed to use ACT24, but due to challenges in using the  
288 software, they decided to complete the hard copy instead. Challenges in using ACT24 included it  
289 being “difficult” and “complicated” at first because of the “5-min interval reporting”. Some  
290 participants found it challenging to navigate because there were so many options for activities;  
291 however, after some practice the majority of participants found ACT24 “fairly easy”. Participants  
292 who used the hard copy diary found it easy to complete; four participants had a caregiver complete  
293 their hard copy diary. From a research perspective, the hard copy diaries were not a feasible method  
294 to collect data as they were not completed with enough detail to extract time, purpose, and social  
295 context. The advantage of ACT24 is participants cannot submit an incomplete entry, which  
296 encouraged participants to provide enough details about their daily activities. Adherence to the  
297 diaries was good with all 20 participants completing either the electronic or hard copy diary  
298 probably because they received daily email reminders.

## 299 **Adverse Events**

300         We experienced three adverse events among two participants, which were not related to  
301 the study. One participant fell twice due to improper footwear or stepping out of the shower onto

302 a damp floor. Another participant with type II diabetes skipped breakfast and felt unwell during  
303 the study visit; after consuming orange juice, the person returned to baseline.

## 304 **Discussion**

305 We conducted a study in older adults who were pre-frail and frail to understand the  
306 feasibility to measure the context of sedentary behaviour in the winter and spring. Context was  
307 assessed using a wearable sensor (activPAL4™, posture), a McMaster engineering home  
308 monitoring system (indoor positioning system, functional location within the home), and a diary  
309 (ACT24 or hard copy diary, purpose and social environment). We met our criteria for recruitment  
310 and retention but experienced high refusal rates mainly due to lack of interest or medical mistrust.  
311 We found that each measure captured context of sedentary behaviour except for the hard copy  
312 diary. Since the hard copy diary was not completed with sufficient detail, we found it challenging  
313 to link it to the other two measures. We were able to link data from activPAL4™, the indoor  
314 positioning system, and ACT24. All participants were willing to complete the hard copy diary  
315 while almost all participants were willing to use the wearable sensor. Only some participants opted  
316 to use the indoor positioning system and complete ACT24. The use of wearable sensors, indoor  
317 positioning systems, and electronic diaries may be a feasible method to assess context of sedentary  
318 behaviour, but more research is needed with device-based measures in diverse groups.

319 It is unclear what are the best measures to assess context of sedentary behaviour, especially  
320 in older adults. Our study is the first study to use a combination of objective and self-report  
321 measures to assess context. A recent meta-analysis by Prince et al found that previous studies have  
322 used self-report measures (e.g., diaries, questionnaires, surveys) or objective devices (e.g.,  
323 accelerometers, wearable sensors, pedometers, wearable cameras), but not a combination of both,  
324 to assess total sedentary time (12). The most common methods were self-report physical activity  
325 and sedentary behaviour questionnaires (single or multi-item questionnaires) or devices including  
326 ActiGraph GT3X and activPAL (12). Prince et al found that self-report measures underestimate  
327 total sedentary time when compared to device measures by 1.74 hours/day (95% CI -2.11 to -1.38  
328 hours/day) and that single question measures such as the International Physical Activity  
329 Questionnaire significantly under-reported sedentary time (12). There is some evidence that multi-  
330 item surveys and diaries work reasonably well to assess total sedentary time, particularly when

331 compared to wearable sensors such as activPAL (12,13); however, the meta-analysis included  
332 studies mainly conducted in adults between the ages of 18 to 50 years (12). In our study, we found  
333 older adults experienced challenges with the hard copy diaries as the diaries were not completed  
334 with enough detail. On the other hand, we experienced almost no challenges with activPAL. A  
335 2017 narrative review reported that seven of the nine studies used either ActiGraph or Actiheart  
336 accelerometers to assess sedentary behaviour (37); however, accelerometers cannot provide  
337 information about posture (e.g., sitting, standing), which is important when defining the context  
338 of sedentary behaviour (38). Moreover, wrist-based accelerometers such as ActiGraph are poor  
339 estimators of assessing sedentary behaviours and demonstrate the greatest risk for misclassification  
340 error (38). For this reason, our study used an wearable sensor (activPAL4™) which can measure  
341 time spent sitting, lying, and standing. The advantage of using a thigh-based wearable sensor is it  
342 is more accurate at identifying standing postures and movement and can detect transitions from  
343 sitting/lying to standing compared to wrist worn devices (38). Although comparisons made with  
344 accelerometers show lower accuracy compared to inclinometers, both devices have a great degree  
345 of variability within and between studies (up to 6 hours/day of variability with accelerometers and  
346 up to 4.6 hours/day with inclinometers) (30). But sedentary behaviour may differ by the season,  
347 which was not accounted for in the meta-analysis by Prince and colleagues and may explain the  
348 variability between different types of device-based measures. Although our study found that sitting  
349 and walking were not different between winter and spring, we had a small sample size and larger  
350 studies are needed to determine if there is a difference between seasons. It is probable that one  
351 measure alone cannot provide enough information about the context of sedentary behaviour.  
352 Future studies need to determine the best combination of devices and self-report measures to assess  
353 context of sedentary behaviour specific to older adults, especially those who are frail.

354 In addition to the wearable sensor and diary, our study utilized a smart home monitoring  
355 system with an indoor positioning system to assess functional location of sedentary behaviour  
356 within the home. Understanding where older adults spend time sitting during awake hours may be  
357 an important factor to consider when developing lifestyle interventions that are unique to that  
358 setting or location. Although wearables do not pose any threat to privacy, prolonged use  
359 throughout the day may not be practical (39). A 2021 systematic review found barriers to wearables  
360 include a relatively short battery life, require maintenance, and cause discomfort over long usage  
361 if required to wear consistently throughout the day (39). Participants in our study experienced

362 similar barriers including the smart watch being bulky and uncomfortable to use for long periods  
363 and the need to charge the watch daily. Several participants were not willing to configure the smart  
364 home system because they were intimidated with the system and set-up process; however, through  
365 co-designing processes with end-users, such challenges can easily be overcome. Smart home  
366 monitoring systems have several advantages that can be used to monitor health, assess activities  
367 of daily living, analyse gait, etc. In addition, smart home systems could be used as a solution to  
368 understand context of sedentary behaviour. For example, artificial intelligence, machine learning,  
369 and fuzzy logic can be automatically rendered within smart home monitoring systems and be used  
370 to identify activities that older adults engage in (e.g., watching TV in the living room). One study  
371 developed a robot-integrated smart home (RiSH) for older adults, which used a sensor network to  
372 monitor body activities. The RiSH was able to recognize 37 distinct individual activities through  
373 sound actions with 88% accuracy and identify falling sounds with 80% accuracy (40). Moreover,  
374 smart home systems could also be used to target and decrease certain sedentary behaviours. For  
375 example, Rudzicz and colleagues developed a mobile robot to assist older adults with Alzheimer's  
376 disease with their activities of daily living (41); such systems could be used to promote safe  
377 mobility among this group. There is a clear advantage to using smart home monitoring systems  
378 that utilize artificial intelligence, machine learning, and fuzzy logic that should be piloted with  
379 older adults to understand context of sedentary behaviour. However, introducing such technologies  
380 also requires educating certain groups that may be mistrustful of the devices. Educational outreach  
381 programs and involving diverse groups as patient partners during the co-design process should be  
382 conducted in parallel with pilot studies of smart home monitoring systems.

## 383 **Strengths and Limitations**

384 Our study had several strengths. We recruited a diverse group of older adults who were  
385 mainly frail and had cognitive impairments with diverse demographic characteristics including  
386 individuals who only completed grade school or high school. We also used a unique combination  
387 of objective and subjective measures to assess context of sedentary behaviour. While our study  
388 conformed to the highest standards, our study is not without its limitations. The disadvantage of  
389 using only one wearable sensor can result in device failure or corrupt data; we experienced one  
390 instance where the data was not captured during the winter period. Although we attempted to  
391 recruit diverse individuals (e.g., ethnic minorities, individuals of different genders), we  
392 experienced barriers including medical mistrust. Thus, the generalizability of the results may not

393 be feasible in other groups. As this was a feasibility study, we only collected data over three days  
394 (two weekdays and one weekend) in the winter and spring, which may not be representative of the  
395 season or other time periods (i.e., summer and fall).

## 396 **Conclusion**

397 We met our criteria for recruitment and retention but experienced high refusal rates. We  
398 recruited 21 older adults who were pre-frail or frail within two months and experienced two  
399 dropouts due to medical mistrust or worsening health. We experienced high refusal rates as several  
400 participants who initially agreed to participate decided not to enroll. The wearable sensor, indoor  
401 positioning system, and ACT24 accurately captured one domain of context but participants  
402 experienced challenges completing the hard copy diary. The hard copy was not completed with  
403 enough details making it difficult to link it to the other devices. We also found some participants  
404 were not willing to utilize the wearable sensor, indoor positioning system, and electronic diary.  
405 However, we were able to triage the measures of participants who utilized the wearable sensor,  
406 indoor positioning system, and ACT24. Nevertheless, there is some merit to using such devices to  
407 capture the context of sedentary behaviour. Future studies will need to determine the most feasible  
408 and valid methods to assess the context of sedentary behaviour, especially in diverse older adults.

## 409 **Acknowledgements and funding**

410 The authors would like to thank the following funding agents for their support with the  
411 project including McMaster Institute for Research on Aging (MIRA), AGE-WELL, the Hamilton  
412 Health Sciences New Investigator Fund, and the Canadian Institutes of Health Research. The  
413 corresponding author, who is also the principal investigator, is funded by the 2022 MIRA-AGE-  
414 WELL Award and the 2022 CIHR Fellowship Award. We would also like to thank our patient  
415 partners, Margaret Denton and Anne Pizzacalla from the Hamilton Council on Aging, and Priscilla  
416 Ching from Osteoporosis Canada for their input during the study.

## 417 **Author Contributions**

418 IBR conceptualized and designed the study. IBR, RS, ST, AK, JA, and AR assisted with  
419 recruitment and IBR, RS, ST, and AK with data collection. QF developed and provided the smart  
420 home monitoring system and analyzed and interpreted the data from the system. IBR analyzed,



421 interpreted, and wrote the first draft. All co-authors reviewed the final analysis and revised the  
422 original manuscript.

## 423 **References**

- 424 1. Petruszewski C, Choo S, Wilson M, MacDermid J, Richardson J. Interventions to address  
425 sedentary behaviour for older adults: a scoping review. Vol. 43, *Disability and*  
426 *Rehabilitation*. Taylor and Francis Ltd.; 2021. p. 3090–101.
- 427 2. Chastin S, Gardiner PA, Harvey JA, Leask CF, Jerez-Roig J, Rosenberg D, et al.  
428 Interventions for reducing sedentary behaviour in community-dwelling older adults.  
429 *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. 2021 Jun 25;2021(6).
- 430 3. Walston J, Hadley E, Ferrucci L, Guralnik J, Newman A, Studenski S, et al. Research  
431 agenda for frailty in older adults: toward a better understanding of physiology and  
432 etiology: summary from the American Geriatrics Society/National Institute on Aging  
433 Research Conference on Frailty in Older Adults. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. 2006;54(6):991–1001.
- 434 4. Abellan van Kan G, Rolland YM, Morley JE, Vellas B. Frailty: toward a clinical  
435 definition. Vol. 9, *Journal of the American Medical Directors Association*. United States;  
436 2008. p. 71–2.
- 437 5. Owen N, Healy GN, Matthews CE, Dunstan DW. Too much sitting: The population health  
438 science of sedentary behavior. *Exerc Sport Sci Rev*. 2010 Jul;38(3):105–13.
- 439 6. Blodgett J, Theou O, Kirkland S, Andreou P, Rockwood K. The association between  
440 sedentary behaviour, moderate-vigorous physical activity and frailty in NHANES cohorts.  
441 *Maturitas*. 2015;80(2):187–91.
- 442 7. Katzmarzyk PT, Church TS, Craig CL, Bouchard C. Sitting time and mortality from all  
443 causes, cardiovascular disease, and cancer. *Med Sci Sports Exerc*. 2009 May;41(5):998–  
444 1005.
- 445 8. Dogra S, Ashe MC, Biddle SJH, Brown WJ, Buman MP, Chastin S, et al. Sedentary time  
446 in older men and women: An international consensus statement and research priorities. *Br*  
447 *J Sports Med*. 2017 Nov 1;51(21):1526–32.
- 448 9. Rawlings GH, Williams RK, Clarke DJ, English C, Fitzsimons C, Holloway I, et al.  
449 Exploring adults' experiences of sedentary behaviour and participation in non-workplace  
450 interventions designed to reduce sedentary behaviour: A thematic synthesis of qualitative  
451 studies. *BMC Public Health*. 2019 Aug 13;19(1).
- 452 10. Gardiner PA, Clark BK, Healy GN, Eakin EG, Winkler EAH, Owen N. Measuring older  
453 adults' sedentary time: Reliability, validity, and responsiveness. *Med Sci Sports Exerc*.  
454 2011 Nov;43(11):2127–33.

- 455 11. Matthews CE, Chen KY, Freedson PS, Buchowski MS, Beech BM, Pate RR, et al.  
456 Amount of time spent in sedentary behaviors in the United States, 2003-2004. *Am J*  
457 *Epidemiol.* 2008 Apr;167(7):875–81.
- 458 12. Prince SA, Cardilli L, Reed JL, Saunders TJ, Kite C, Douillette K, et al. A comparison of  
459 self-reported and device measured sedentary behaviour in adults: A systematic review and  
460 meta-analysis. Vol. 17, *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical*  
461 *Activity*. BioMed Central Ltd.; 2020.
- 462 13. Prince SA, LeBlanc AG, Colley RC, Saunders TJ. Measurement of sedentary behaviour in  
463 population health surveys: A review and recommendations. *PeerJ.* 2017;2017(12).
- 464 14. Prince S, LeBlanc A, Colley R, Saunders T. Measurement of sedentary behaviour in  
465 population health surveys: a review and recommendations. *PeerJ.* 2017;5(e4130):5.
- 466 15. Chastin S, Schwarz U, Skelton D. Development of a Consensus Taxonomy of Sedentary  
467 Behaviors (SIT): Report of Delphi Round 1. *PLoS One.* 2013;8(12):e82313.
- 468 16. Vandembroucke JP, von Elm E, Altman DG, Gotzsche PC, Mulrow CD, Pocock SJ, et al.  
469 Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE):  
470 Explanation and Elaboration. *PLOS Med.* 20017;16(4).
- 471 17. Tariq S, Kouroukis A, Swance R, Adachi J, Leckie C, Papaioannou A, et al. Recruitment  
472 and retention strategies of older adults who are frail for a mobility study . *Journal of*  
473 *Clinical Epidemiology* .
- 474 18. Morley JE, Malmstrom TK, Miller DK. A simple frailty questionnaire (FRAIL) predicts  
475 outcomes in middle aged African Americans. *J Nutr Health Aging.* 2012 Jul;16(7):601–8.
- 476 19. Chan CS, Slaughter SE, Allyson Jones C, Ickert C, Wagg AS. Measuring activity  
477 performance of older adults using the activpal: A rapid review. Vol. 5, *Healthcare*  
478 (Switzerland). MDPI; 2017.
- 479 20. Ianovski A, Fang Q. A Smart Home Platform and Hybrid Indoor Positioning Systems for  
480 Enabling Aging in Place [Master’s thesis ]. [Hamilton]: McMaster; 2018.
- 481 21. Matthews CE, Keadle SK, Moore SC, Schoeller DS, Carroll RJ, Troiano RP, et al.  
482 Measurement of active and sedentary behavior in context of large epidemiologic studies.  
483 *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 2018;50(2):266–76.
- 484 22. Matthews CE, Keadle SK, Saint-Maurice PF, Moore SC, Willis EA, Sampson JN, et al.  
485 Use of time and energy on exercise, prolonged TV viewing, and work days. *Am J Prev*  
486 *Med.* 2018;55(3):61–9.
- 487 23. Rodrigues IB, Wang E, Keller H, Thabane L, Ashe MC, Brien S, et al. The MoveStrong  
488 program for promoting balance and functional strength training and adequate protein  
489 intake in pre-frail older adults: A pilot randomized controlled trial. *PLoS One.* 2021 Sep  
490 1;16(9 September).

- 491 24. Nasreddine ZS, Phillips NA, Bédirian V, Charbonneau S, Whitehead V, Collin I, et al.  
492 The Montreal Cognitive Assessment, MoCA: A Brief Screening Tool For Mild Cognitive  
493 Impairment [Internet]. 2005. Available from: [www.mocatest](http://www.mocatest.com).
- 494 25. Kennedy C, Opammodos G, Rockwood K, Thabane L, Adachi J, Kirkland S, et al. A  
495 Frailty Index predicts 10-year fracture risk in adults age 25 years and older: results from  
496 the Canadian Multicentre Osteoporosis Study (CaMos). *Osteoporos Int*.  
497 2014;25(12):2825–32.
- 498 26. Coventry PA, McMillan D, Clegg A, Brown L, Van Der Feltz-Cornelis C, Gilbody S, et  
499 al. Frailty and depression predict instrumental activities of daily living in older adults: A  
500 population-based longitudinal study using the CARE75+ cohort. *PLoS One*. 2020 Dec  
501 1;15(12 December).
- 502 27. Xie F, Pullenayegum E, Gaebel K, Bansback N, Bryan S, Ohinmaa A, et al. A Time  
503 Trade-off-derived Value Set of the EQ-5D-5L for Canada [Internet]. 2015. Available  
504 from: [www.lww-medicalcare.com](http://www.lww-medicalcare.com)
- 505 28. Wancata J, Alexandrowicz R, Marquart B, Weiss M, Friedrich F. The criterion validity of  
506 the geriatric depression scale: A systematic review. Vol. 114, *Acta Psychiatrica*  
507 *Scandinavica*. 2006. p. 398–410.
- 508 29. Carlucci L, Balestrieri M, Maso E, Marini A, Conte N, Balsamo M. Psychometric  
509 properties and diagnostic accuracy of the short form of the geriatric anxiety scale (GAS-  
510 10). *BMC Geriatr*. 2021 Dec 1;21(1).
- 511 30. O'Neill J, Tabish H, Welch V, Petticrew M, Pottie K, Clarke M, et al. Applying an equity  
512 lens to interventions: using PROGRESS ensures consideration of socially stratifying  
513 factors to illuminate inequities in health. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2014;67(1):56–64.
- 514 31. Sim J, Lewis M. The size of a pilot study for a clinical trial should be calculated in  
515 relation to considerations of precision and efficiency. *J Clin Epidemiol* [Internet].  
516 2012;65(3):301–8. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2011.07.011>
- 517 32. Julious SA. Sample size of 12 per group rule of thumb for a pilot study. *Pharm Stat*.  
518 2005;4:287–91.
- 519 33. Eldridge SM, Lancaster GA, Campbell MJ, Thabane L, Hopewell S, Coleman CL, et al.  
520 Defining feasibility and pilot studies in preparation for randomised controlled trials:  
521 development of a conceptual framework. *PLoS One*. 2016;11(3).
- 522 34. Clegg A, Barber S, Young J, Iliffe S, Forster A. The Home-based Older People's Exercise  
523 (HOPE) trial: A pilot randomised controlled trial of a home-based exercise intervention  
524 for older people with frailty. *Age Ageing*. 2014;43(5):687–95.
- 525 35. Provencher V, Mortenson W Ben, Tanguay-Garneau L, Bélanger K, Dagenais M.  
526 Challenges and strategies pertaining to recruitment and retention of frail elderly in

- 527 research studies: A systematic review. Vol. 59, Archives of Gerontology and Geriatrics.  
528 Elsevier Ireland Ltd; 2014. p. 18–24.
- 529 36. White MD, Marsh EE, White MD, Marsh EE. Content Analysis : A Flexible Methodology  
530 Content Analysis : A Flexible Methodology. 2017;55(1):22–45.
- 531 37. Copeland JL, Ashe MC, Biddle SJ, Brown WJ, Buman MP, Chastin S, et al. Sedentary  
532 time in older adults: A critical review of measurement, associations with health, and  
533 interventions. Vol. 51, British Journal of Sports Medicine. BMJ Publishing Group; 2017.
- 534 38. Fortune E, Lugade VA, Kaufman KR. Posture and Movement Classification: The  
535 Comparison of Tri-Axial Accelerometer Numbers and Anatomical Placement. J Biomech  
536 Eng. 2014 May;136(5).
- 537 39. Gochoo M, Alnajjar F, Tan TH, Khalid S. Towards privacy-preserved aging in place: A  
538 systematic review. Vol. 21, Sensors. MDPI AG; 2021.
- 539 40. Do HM, Pham M, Sheng W, Yang D, Liu M. RiSH: A Robot-integrated Smart Home for  
540 Elderly Care [Internet]. 2017. Available from:  
541 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0921889017300477>
- 542 41. Rudzicz F, Wang R, Begum M, Mihailidis A. Speech interaction with personal assistive  
543 robots supporting aging at home for individuals with Alzheimer’s disease. ACM Trans  
544 Access Comput. 2015;7(2):1–22.

545

## 546 **Other information**

547 This review was registered on [clinicaltrials.gov](https://clinicaltrials.gov) (NCT05661058).

548 The authors have no competing interests.

549 Data is publicly available upon request for research purposes only.

## 550 **Supporting information**


551 **S1 Table. 2007 Strobe Checklist for Cohort Studies.**

552 **S1 File. Human Participants Research Checklist.**

553 **S2 File. Ethics Approval Document.**

554 **S3 File. TREND Checklist.**

555 **S4 File. Protocol MAPS-B.**



**Figure 1:** Flow diagram of recruitment and retention process