

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

Validation of physical activity levels from shank-placed Axivity AX6 accelerometers

Fatima Gafoor^{1*}, Matthew Ruder², Dylan Kobsar^{1,2}

¹School of Biomedical Engineering, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada

²Department of Kinesiology, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada

* Corresponding author

E-mail: gafoorf@mcmaster.ca (FG)

23 **Abstract**

24 This cross-sectional study aimed to identify and validate cut-points for measuring physical
25 activity using Axivity AX6 accelerometers positioned at the shank in older adults. Free-living
26 physical activity was assessed in 35 adults aged 55 and older, where each participant wore a shank
27 mounted Axivity and a waist mounted ActiGraph simultaneously for 72 hours. Optimized cut-
28 points for each participant's Axivity data were determined using an optimization algorithm to align
29 with ActiGraph results. To assess validity between the physical activity assessments from the
30 optimized Axivity cut-points, a leave-one-out cross validation was conducted. Bland-Altman plots
31 with 95% limits of agreement, intraclass correlation coefficients (ICC), and mean differences were
32 used for comparing the systems. The results indicated good agreement between the two
33 accelerometers when classifying sedentary behaviour (ICC = 0.85) and light physical activity (ICC
34 = 0.80), and moderate agreement when classifying moderate physical activity (ICC = 0.67) and
35 vigorous physical activity (ICC = 0.70). Upon removal of a significant outlier, the agreement was
36 slightly improved for sedentary behaviour (ICC = 0.86) and light physical activity (ICC = 0.82),
37 but substantially improved for moderate physical activity (ICC = 0.81) and vigorous physical
38 activity (ICC = 0.96). Overall, the study successfully demonstrated the capability of the resultant
39 cut-point model to accurately classify physical activity using Axivity AX6 sensors placed at the
40 shank.

41 **Introduction**

42 Physical activity (PA) for the aging population has been identified as a protective factor
43 for various musculoskeletal disorders and noncommunicable diseases [1]. Even with the well-
44 known benefits of PA, many older adults are representative of the most inactive portion of the

45 population [2]. Thus, an accurate assessment of PA can help to provide insight on the overall health
46 and rehabilitation of the aging population. Traditionally, PA data has been collected using self-
47 reported measures such as questionnaires, activity logs, interviews, and diaries [3]. Common PA
48 self-report tools include the Physical Activity Scale for the Elderly (PASE), the International
49 Physical Activity Questionnaire (IPAQ), and the Short Questionnaire to Assess Health-Enhancing
50 Physical Activity (SQUASH) [4, 5, 6]. However, these measures are subject to recall and social
51 desirability biases [7]. Furthermore, many have difficulties distinguishing between different PA
52 intensities in questionnaires [8, 9]. Consequently, these subjective measures lack accuracy, as they
53 often over- or underestimate the true levels of PA [10].

54 With the advent of wearable accelerometers, researchers can overcome these limitations
55 and obtain objective measures of PA. These accelerometers can be worn outside of the lab and
56 collect free-living data for multiple days, thereby providing a more comprehensive understanding
57 of an individual's PA levels [7]. Among these devices, ActiGraph devices are widely used as the
58 gold standard for clinical and research-based PA assessment, with over 20,000 papers published
59 on its use in the past two decades [11].

60 The quantification of PA levels using these devices typically involves assessing time spent
61 in different PA intensity ranges such as sedentary behaviour (SB), light physical activity (LPA),
62 moderate physical activity (MPA) and vigorous physical activity (VPA). This is achieved by
63 measuring the magnitude of three-dimensional acceleration signals, known as the resultant
64 acceleration. The resultant accelerations are then used to determine activity counts, with higher
65 accelerations resulting in greater the number of activity counts measured per minute [7].
66 Subsequently, cut-points are applied to these activity counts to classify the PA intensity,

67 delineating data into the different categories of SB, LPA, MPA, and VPA. These cut-points are
68 specific to the wear location of the device.

69 The ActiGraph GT9X Link, equipped with an inertial measurement unit (IMU) including
70 accelerometer, gyroscope, and magnetometer sensors, is one device commonly used for collecting
71 PA data. These devices can be worn at the wrist, waist, and the ankle but require different cut-
72 point models for each site as the level of accelerations vary between segments [12]. Therefore,
73 deploying a sensor at any new location would require updating and validating a new set of cut-
74 points for that placement site. While wrist, waist, and ankle placements offer sufficient flexibility
75 for assessing PA, recent advancements in sensor capabilities, including improved data quality,
76 higher frequency measurements, and enhanced data storage and battery life, have opened up many
77 new possibilities for free-living PA assessments.

78 Most notably, wearable sensors are being increasingly used to assess free-living gait. Free-
79 living gait gives us the opportunity to gain insight into the motion of the limbs in an ecologically
80 valid, real-world setting, rather than a conventional gait lab. While conventional gait labs are
81 widely used in gait research, they are highly controlled settings and may be non-representative of
82 an individual's daily, functional gait [13]. Axivity sensors are an example of IMU sensors that
83 have been used in gait research surrounding physical function and disease state [14], but also
84 possess PA assessment capability given their potential for high frequency data collections with
85 enhanced data storage and battery life.

86 While there are a wide variety of placement sites used to acquire free-living gait data, a
87 common placement to assess movement and impact accelerations near the knee is the proximal
88 shank [15, 16, 17]. This placement site may offer insights into the progression of musculoskeletal
89 and neurological diseases, such as knee osteoarthritis and Parkinson's through gait assessments

90 [18, 19]. Although this sensor placement can be ideal in assessing free-living gait, there are no
91 methods or cut-points available to determine PA from sensors worn at this wear location. As such,
92 obtaining concurrent PA data while measuring free-living gait would inefficiently require another
93 sensor placed at one of the previously validated sites.

94 Therefore, the purpose of this study is to develop and validate cut-points for a free-living
95 gait-capable sensor, the Axivity AX6, placed at the proximal shank by comparing it to the gold
96 standard waist-mounted ActiGraph GT9X. It was hypothesized that the agreement of SB and LPA
97 would be higher than the agreement of MPA and VPA. The outcomes compared between the
98 sensors were the percentage of time spent in the different PA intensities: SB, LPA, MPA, and VPA
99 for a total wear time of 72 hours.

100 **Methods**

101 **Participants**

102 Thirty-five adults over the age of 55 years (18F, age: 71 ± 9 years, height: 167.28 ± 9.79
103 cm, mass: 76.50 ± 15.10 kg, BMI: 27.00 ± 3.62 kg/m²) were recruited in this cross-sectional
104 validation study. The inclusion criteria included anyone over the age of 55 years that could
105 ambulate without any walking aids. Participants were recruited from the Physical Activity Centre
106 of Excellence (PACE) at McMaster University, a centre which encourages community exercise
107 and rehabilitation for older adults, from January 12, 2023 to March 23, 2023. All participants
108 provided their written informed consent prior to enrolling in this study. This study was approved
109 by the McMaster Research Ethics Board, Hamilton, ON.

110

111 **Procedures**

112 Participants were asked to report their age, sex, height, mass. Each subject reported if they
113 had received any lower limb injuries in the past year, had been diagnosed with osteoarthritis, and
114 if they had received any lower limb replacement surgeries. Two wearable sensors were used to
115 concurrently collect free-living PA data for 72 consecutive hours. The first of which was the gold
116 standard ActiGraph GT9X (ActiGraph LLC, FL, United States) which was worn by each
117 participant above the right iliac crest with a waistband and pouch which held the
118 device. Participants were encouraged to ensure the pouch sat above their right hip for the full 72
119 hours. Participants were instructed to only take off the waistband to shower or bath, and if
120 necessary, while sleeping, and wear it immediately upon waking and after their shower or bath.
121 The ActiGraph was initialized to start collecting $\pm 8g$ accelerometer data at 100 Hz simultaneously
122 with the Axivity for 72 hours through the ActiLife v6.13.4 software. The ‘idle’ sleep mode in the
123 ActiLife software was disabled for the ActiGraph sensors.

124 The sensor to be validated was the Axivity AX6 (Axivity Ltd, Newcastle upon Tyne,
125 United Kingdom) which was placed below the right knee, medial and inferior to the right tibial
126 tuberosity, of each participant using SIMPATCH adhesive patches. The Axivity accelerometer
127 was initialized through the Open Movement software (OMGui, version 1.0.0.44) and recorded $\pm 8g$
128 accelerometer data at 100Hz, as well as $\pm 1000^\circ/s$ gyroscope data that was not analyzed in the
129 current study. Participants were shaved with an electric razor (Philips OneBlade, Amsterdam,
130 Netherlands) before the sensors were placed to ensure the sensors were both comfortable and
131 adhered to the skin well for the entirety of the 72 hours.

132

133 **Data analysis**

134 Following the retrieval of the sensors after 72 hours of wear, the data from the ActiGraphs
135 were downloaded and processed through the ActiLife software. Each participants' data was
136 categorized into SB, LPA, MPA, and VPA using the Freedson cut-points and 60-second epochs
137 [20] which are available through the ActiLife software. The percentage of time spent in the
138 different intensities was computed by the ActiLife software, based on the activity counts per
139 minute. The time totalled to 72 hours for each participant.

140 Raw from the Axivity sensor were downloaded through the OpenMovement software
141 (OMGui) and saved in a binary CWA file. An open-source MATLAB (MathWorks, Natick, MA,
142 USA) script by Felix Liu [21], which uses methods published by Brønd, Andersen, and Arvidsson
143 [22] was used to generate ActiGraph equivalent activity counts per minute from Axivity
144 accelerometers. The activity counts for each participant were categorized into PA intensities using
145 optimized cut-points for each participant. However, using the same cut-point values applied to the
146 waist data would results in invalid data given the difference in acceleration signals across these
147 sites [23]. Therefore, to optimize a new set of cut-points for the shank-placed Axivity sensor, an
148 optimization algorithm in MATLAB was created, using the Global Optimization Toolbox [24].
149 Fig 1 outlines the optimization algorithm and resulting cross validation. In short, this optimization
150 algorithm was given raw Axivity acceleration data, an initial starting set of cut-points based on
151 pilot testing of data collected prior to this study, and the gold-standard results obtained from the
152 ActiGraph (i.e., time spent in SB, LPA, MPA, VPA). It then sequentially optimized the cut-points
153 for the Axivity data by first evaluating SB, then LPA, MPA, and finally VPA, resulting in three
154 values to distinguish SB, LPA, MPA, and VPA. In other words, the optimization algorithm was
155 given the raw data from the Axivity at the shank and asked to find the cut-points that best
156 approximated the results from the waist-mounted ActiGraph. This optimization occurred at the

157 individual level, resulting in 35 distinct sets of cut-points (i.e., one set for each participant). To
158 generate a cross-validated set of cut-points that were blinded from each individual's result, a leave-
159 one-out cross validation (LOOCV) was applied. This involved averaging the cut-points from 34
160 participants (i.e. all other participants) into a single set of cut-points that could then be applied to
161 the data of the left-out subject. Consequently, the PA data generated for each subject was solely
162 based on the optimized results from the other 34 subjects, ensuring complete blinding to the
163 information of the excluded subject.

164

165 **Fig 1. Flowchart of Leave-one-out cross validation analysis.**

166 **Statistical analysis**

167 The agreement between the ActiGraph and the LOOCV Axivity results for each PA
168 intensity: SB, LPA, MPA, and VPA, were assessed using Bland-Altman plots with 95% limits of
169 agreement (LOA; mean difference of methods ± 1.96 SD) [25]. Additionally, intraclass correlation
170 coefficients (ICC; single measure, absolute agreement) with 95% confidence intervals (CIs) were
171 computed for each intensity to measure reliability of the Axivity. The ICC values were interpreted
172 as poor ($ICC < 0.5$), moderate ($0.5 < ICC < 0.75$), good ($0.75 < ICC < 0.9$), and excellent ($ICC >$
173 0.9) [26]. The agreement between the ActiGraph and individually optimized Axivity results were
174 also computed, to serve as a comparison of the training data (i.e., individually optimized) versus
175 the generalizable, cross-validated results.

176

177 **Results**

178 Participant demographics are reported in Table 1. While 35 individuals were recruited for
179 the study, one participants' data was omitted from the analysis due to early removal of the Axivity

180 sensor. Results from the training model and the LOOCV analysis are shown in Table 2. Individual
 181 results from the LOOCV analysis are shown in the Bland-Altman plots in Fig 2. The results from
 182 the optimized cut-points training model matched closely with the ActiGraph results and all
 183 intensities had excellent agreement, as expected given they are individually optimized. When
 184 performing the LOOCV analysis, results showed the SB and LPA have good reliability, with mean
 185 differences of 2.40% and 2.37%, respectively. Whereas the MPA and VPA have moderate
 186 reliability and mean differences of 0.51% and 0.10% respectively.

187 **Table 1. Participant Demographics.**

Age	71 ± 9 years
Male	48.6 %
Height	167.3 ± 9.8 cm
Mass	76.5 ± 15.1 kg
BMI	27.0 ± 3.6 kg/m ²
Previous Lower Limb Surgeries	5.7%
Previous Lower Limb Replacements	11.4%
Diagnosed Osteoarthritis	31.4%
Mean Oxford Knee Score ^a	37.3 ± 7.1

188 ^aThe Oxford Knee Score measures an individual’s daily level of function, and how they have been
 189 impacted by pain in their knees. Participants only filled out the OKS questionnaire if they indicated
 190 they had osteoarthritis in either or both of their knees. Scores range from 0 to 48, with 48
 191 representing maximal functioning knees [27]. A score ranging from 30 to 39 may indicate mild to
 192 moderate knee osteoarthritis [28].

194 **Table 2. Results.**

PA Intensity	Training Model			LOOCV Analysis		
	ICC	Mean Difference (%)	95% Limits of Agreement	ICC	Mean Difference (%)	95% Limits of Agreement
Sedentary	0.99 (0.99, 1.0)	0.01 ± 0.01	-0.02, 0.02	0.85 (0.73, 0.92)	2.40 ± 1.84	-6.11, 5.85
Light	0.99 (0.99, 1.0)	0.01 ± 0.01	-0.02, 0.02	0.80 (0.65, 0.9)	2.37 ± 1.97	-5.93, 6.25

Moderate	0.98 (0.96, 0.99)	0.05 ± 0.22	-0.03, 0.03	0.67 (0.44, 0.82)	0.51 ± 0.70	-1.96, 1.82
Vigorous	0.96 (0.93, 0.98)	0.04 ± 0.22	-0.02, 0.02	0.70 (0.48, 0.84)	0.10 ± 0.73	-1.96, 1.30

195

196 **Fig 2. Bland-Altman plot of the time spent in different PA intensities in minutes, for**
 197 **agreement between the Axivity and the ActiGraph in the LOOCV analysis.**

198

199 After initial data analysis, a significant outlier was identified in the LOOCV analysis.

200 Outliers were defined as data points that deviated significantly from the remaining values of the

201 dataset, using a criterion of falling outside three standard deviations from the mean value. Based

202 on this criterion, one participant was considered an outlier in the LOOCV dataset. In order to

203 ensure the integrity of the results and subsequent cut-point models, a careful decision was made to

204 exclude this outlier from the analysis. By removing this outlier from the dataset, we aimed to

205 achieve a more representative dataset for further analysis. Following the outlier's removal, ICCs

206 for SB, LPA, and MPA showed good agreement, while the ICC for VPA showed excellent

207 agreement, as depicted in Table 3. Individual results from the LOOCV analysis with the outlier

208 removed are shown in the Bland-Altman plots in Fig 3.

209 **Table 3. Results with outlier removed.**

PA Intensity	Training Model			LOOCV Analysis		
	ICC	Mean Difference (%)	95% Limits of Agreement	ICC	Mean Difference (%)	95% Limits of Agreement
Sedentary	0.99 (0.99, 1.0)	0.01 ± 0.01	-0.03, 0.02	0.86 (0.74, 0.93)	2.34 ± 1.83	-5.88, 5.88
Light	0.99 (0.99, 1.0)	0.01 ± 0.01	-0.03, 0.03	0.82 (0.66, 0.91)	2.28 ± 1.94	-5.92, 5.94
Moderate	0.98 (0.96, 0.99)	0.01 ± 0.01	-0.03, 0.03	0.81 (0.64, 0.90)	0.42 ± 0.46	-1.20, 1.27

Vigorous	0.96 (0.93, 0.98)	0.004 ± 0.01	-0.02, 0.02	0.96 (0.92, 0.98)	0.10 ± 0.23	-0.53, 0.45
----------	-------------------	--------------	-------------	-------------------	-------------	-------------

210

211
212 **Fig 3. Bland-Altman plot of the time spent in different PA intensities in minutes, for**
213 **agreement between the Axivity and the ActiGraph in the LOOCV analysis, with the outlier**
214 **removed.**

215
216 Based on these results, the resultant cut-points developed for the Axivity accelerometer,
217 when placed below the knee, were computed as the average of the 34 participants and are shown
218 in Table 4. Also shown in Table 4 are the cut-points after the outlier was removed, which is the
219 more representative set of cut-points to use for accelerometers worn at the shank.

220 **Table 4. Resultant Cut-points.**

	Counts per Minute	
Intensity	Complete Dataset	Outlier Removed
Sedentary	0 - 777	0 - 792
Light	778 - 8415	793 - 8356
Moderate	8416 - 18731	8357 - 18437
Vigorous	18732 <	18438 <

221

222 Discussion

223 The purpose of this study was to determine and validate cut-points to measure PA with
224 Axivity sensors placed at the shank in older adults. Overall, the Axivity demonstrated good
225 agreement with the gold standard for PA assessment, the ActiGraph, when assessing SB and LPA.
226 When classifying MPA and VPA, the Axivity showed moderate agreement with the ActiGraph.
227 However, with outliers accounted for, MPA and VPA showed good and excellent agreement,
228 respectively. These data demonstrated that accelerometers placed just below the knee can
229 effectively measure an older adult's PA. Overall, the resultant cut-points determined in this study

230 enable the assessment of PA in older adults at the proximal shank, either independently or in
231 conjunction with research focused on free-living gait data from this site.

232 Our results supported our original hypothesis which predicted that SB and LPA would have
233 greater agreement than MPA and VPA with the ActiGraph, as the SB and LPA demonstrated ICCs
234 of 0.85 and 0.80, respectively. Whereas the MPA and VPA intensities demonstrated ICCs of 0.67
235 and 0.70, respectively. This may be because participants, being older adults, did not all perform
236 large amounts of MPA and VPA. The average percentage of time spent in VPA was 1.04 %, with
237 26 participants having no VPA. This likely reduced the samples of MPA and VPA collected and
238 could have affected the average of the resultant cut-points to identify MPA and VPA. These results
239 are consistent with previous studies that assessed PA between ActiGraph and other devices,
240 including the Axivity, which also found greatest agreement when classifying SB and LPA over
241 MPA, and VPA, such as the study done by Rowlands et al. [29], due to the relatively small amount
242 of time spent in moderate and vigorous PA levels [30].

243 With one outlier removed, these ICCs improved to 0.86, 0.82, 0.81, and 0.96 for SB, LPA,
244 MPA, and VPA, respectively. Upon evaluation, the recorded Axivity accelerations and
245 subsequently derived activity counts of the outlier were substantially higher in magnitude
246 compared to those of the remaining participants, despite the ActiGraph data of the outlier aligning
247 with that of the other participants. Consequently, the outlier's optimized cut-points were
248 significantly greater than the average cut-points of all subjects. Thus, when conducting the
249 LOOCV including the outlier's optimized cut-points, the model overestimated the time spent in
250 Specifically, the resultant cut-points including the outlier are higher for MPA and VPA intensities
251 when compared to the cut-points with the outlier removed. Higher recorded or erroneous
252 accelerations from one subject's Axivity can be due to many potential reasons, which can include

253 sensor movement as a result of being loosely attached and the introduction of artifacts and noise
254 into the accelerometer readings. Nevertheless, we cannot pin-point the exact cause as to why one
255 subject's Axivity sensor collected greater accelerations than others' Axivity sensors. The
256 optimized cut-points of the outlier affected all PA intensities, however, it had a limited impact on
257 SB and LPA data, which further highlights the quality of these outcomes in older adults compared
258 to MPA and VPA. Despite the outlier's removal improving the results to excellent validity, we
259 still caution the use of VPA data in older adults moving forward, given the limited amount of data
260 in these intensity levels.

261 With respect to the cut-points used for MPA and VPA, they are similar to cut-points found
262 in a study done by Rhudy et. al. [31] which identified cut-points for the ActiGraph GT9X at
263 varying wear-locations proximal to the shank, such as the ankle, foot, along with the wrist and hip
264 to measure moderate and vigorous PA. These cut-points are shown in Table 5 along with the cut-
265 points from the shank developed from the results of the current study. These wear locations offer
266 some opportunity for comparing cut-points at proximal locations, such as the ankle and foot.
267 Theoretically, the cut-points for the ankle and foot should be greater, as the impact accelerations
268 experienced would be greater than those at the shank. It is also expected that the cut-points for the
269 shank for both MPA and VPA are greater than those of the hip. This is mostly reflected in the
270 results from Rhudy et al. and the current study, as the cut-points for MPA and VPA measured at
271 the ankle are 14767 and 17818 counts per minute, respectively, and the cut-points for MPA and
272 VPA measured at the foot are 20575 and 22629 counts per minute, respectively. For the current
273 study, the cut-points for MPA and VPA measured at the shank are 8357 and 18438. As expected,
274 these shank cut-points are greater than the cut-points for the hip for MPA and VPA, which are
275 4978 and 6227 counts per minute. Furthermore, the cut-point for MPA at the shank is less than the

276 cut-points at the ankle and foot, as predicted. While the cut-point for VPA at the shank is less than
277 the cut-point for the foot, it is greater than the cut-point at the ankle. This could be since the cut-
278 points for the foot and ankle in the aforementioned study were identified through a young, healthy
279 population in a controlled setting, whereas the current study's population consisted solely of older
280 adults in free-living conditions.

281
282 **Table 5. Cut-points for MPA and VPA at foot, ankle, and hip wear locations from Rhudy et**
283 **al. [31].**

Wear Location	MPA cut-point	VPA cut-point
Foot	20575	22629
Ankle	14767	17818
Shank	8357	18438
Hip	4978	6227

284
285 This study has some limitations to be discussed. Firstly, participants removing the
286 ActiGraph sensor when showering may have influenced the results, as the Axivity was worn for
287 the full 72 hours. This likely would have minimal influence over the results with both
288 accelerometers likely resulting in a SB classification, as showers are typically short in duration
289 and most people won't move a significant amount while showering. However, if participants forgot
290 to wear, or delayed, the placement of the ActiGraph after their shower, this could adversely affect
291 agreement between two sensors.

292 Secondly, it is possible that individuals could have performed movement with their lower
293 limbs, without moving their trunk, such as leg raises, which could have recorded more
294 accelerations in the Axivity than the ActiGraph, if the hip-worn accelerometer was not
295 experiencing movement. This would have impacted the final cut-points that were developed.
296 Nevertheless, the current findings present a first step at classifying PA from shank-placed

297 accelerometers and identifying cut-points for this wear location, which can be widely used in gait
298 research in the elderly.

299

300 **Conclusion**

301 These results displayed a good agreement between the gold standard ActiGraph sensors
302 and the Axivity sensors to classify PA and SB when worn at the shank. The resultant cut-points
303 can be used for accelerometers, including the Axivity and ActiGraph, worn specifically just below
304 the knee at the shank. The introduction of shank cut-points are a novel contribution that will aid in
305 simplifying concurrent PA assessments that occur in older adults also completing gait assessments.

306

307 **Acknowledgements**

308 I would like to thank the Physical Activity Centre of Excellence at McMaster University for
309 supporting this study, as well as all the participants for their time and efforts, that made this study
310 possible.

311

312 **References**

- 313 1. Langhammer B, Bergland A, Rydwik E. The importance of physical activity exercise among
314 older people. *BioMed Res Int.* 2018;2018: 7856823. doi:10.1155/2018/7856823
- 315 2. Watson KB, Carlson SA, Gunn JP, Galuska DA, O'Connor A, Greenlund KJ, et al. Physical
316 inactivity among adults aged 50 years and older - United States, 2014. *MMWR Morb*
317 *Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2016;65: 954–958. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6536a3
- 318 3. Martins JC, Aguiar LT, Nadeau S, Scianni AA, Teixeira-Salmela LF, Faria CDC de M.
319 Measurement properties of self-report physical activity assessment tools in stroke: a
320 protocol for a systematic review. *BMJ Open.* 2017;7: e012655. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2016-
321 012655

- 322 4. Washburn RA, McAuley E, Katula J, Mihalko SL, Boileau RA. The physical activity scale
323 for the elderly (PASE): evidence for validity. *J Clin Epidemiol.* 1999;52: 643–651.
324 doi:10.1016/s0895-4356(99)00049-9
- 325 5. Craig CL, Marshall AL, Sjöström M, Bauman AE, Booth ML, Ainsworth BE, et al.
326 International physical activity questionnaire: 12-country reliability and validity. *Med Sci*
327 *Sports Exerc.* 2003;35: 1381–1395. doi:10.1249/01.MSS.0000078924.61453.FB
- 328 6. Wendel-Vos GCW, Schuit AJ, Saris WHM, Kromhout D. Reproducibility and relative
329 validity of the short questionnaire to assess health-enhancing physical activity. *J Clin*
330 *Epidemiol.* 2003;56: 1163–1169. doi:10.1016/s0895-4356(03)00220-8
- 331 7. Sylvia LG, Bernstein EE, Hubbard JL, Keating L, Anderson EJ. A practical guide to
332 measuring physical activity. *J Acad Nutr Diet.* 2014;114: 199–208.
333 doi:10.1016/j.jand.2013.09.018
- 334 8. Sallis JF, Saelens BE. Assessment of physical activity by self-report: status, limitations, and
335 future directions. *Res Q Exerc Sport.* 2000;71: 1–14.
336 doi:10.1080/02701367.2000.11082780
- 337 9. Timperio A, Salmon J, Crawford D. Validity and reliability of a physical activity recall
338 instrument among overweight and non-overweight men and women. *J Sci Med Sport.*
339 2003;6: 477–491. doi:10.1016/S1440-2440(03)80273-6
- 340 10. Prince SA, Adamo KB, Hamel ME, Hardt J, Gorber SC, Tremblay M. A comparison of
341 direct versus self-report measures for assessing physical activity in adults: a systematic
342 review. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act.* 2008;5: 56. doi:10.1186/1479-5868-5-56
- 343 11. Neishabouri A, Nguyen J, Samuelsson J, Guthrie T, Biggs M, Wyatt J, et al. Quantification
344 of acceleration as activity counts in ActiGraph wearable. *Sci Rep.* 2022;12: 11958.
345 doi:10.1038/s41598-022-16003-x
- 346 12. Romero E, Neuman M, Warrington R. Kinetic energy harvester for body motion. 2009.
- 347 13. Shah VV, McNames J, Mancini M, Carlson-Kuhta P, Spain RI, Nutt JG, et al. Laboratory
348 versus daily life gait characteristics in patients with multiple sclerosis, Parkinson’s disease,
349 and matched controls. *J NeuroEngineering Rehabil.* 2020;17: 159. doi:10.1186/s12984-020-
350 00781-4
- 351 14. Powell D, Nouredanesh M, Stuart S, Godfrey A. Investigating the AX6 inertial-based
352 wearable for instrumented physical capability assessment of young adults in a low-resource
353 setting. *Smart Health.* 2021;22: 100220. doi:10.1016/j.smhl.2021.100220
- 354 15. Li Y, Wang L. Human activity recognition based on residual network and BiLSTM.
355 sensors. 2022;22: 635. doi:10.3390/s22020635
356

- 357 16. Li Q, Young M, Naing V, Donelan JM. Walking speed estimation using a shank-mounted
358 inertial measurement unit. *J Biomech.* 2010;43: 1640–1643.
359 doi:10.1016/j.jbiomech.2010.01.031
- 360 17. Celik Y, Stuart S, Woo WL, Godfrey A. Wearable inertial gait algorithms: impact of wear
361 location and environment in healthy and Parkinson’s populations. *Sensors.* 2021;21: 6476.
362 doi:10.3390/s21196476
- 363 18. Tsukamoto H, Saito K, Saito H, Kijima H, Akagawa M, Komatsu A, et al. A novel
364 classification of coronal plane knee joint instability using nine-axis inertial measurement
365 units in patients with medial knee osteoarthritis. *Sensors.* 2023;23: 2797.
366 doi:10.3390/s23052797
- 367 19. Morris R, Hickey A, Del Din S, Godfrey A, Lord S, Rochester L. A model of free-living
368 gait: A factor analysis in Parkinson’s disease. *Gait Posture.* 2017;52: 68–71.
369 doi:10.1016/j.gaitpost.2016.11.024
- 370 20. Freedson PS, Melanson E, Sirard J. Calibration of the Computer Science and Applications,
371 Inc. accelerometer. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 1998;30: 777.
- 372 21. Liu F. Axivity_AX3. 2022. Available: https://github.com/FelixLiu-SF/Axivity_AX3
- 373 22. Brønd JC, Andersen LB, Arvidsson D. Generating ActiGraph counts from raw acceleration
374 recorded by an alternative monitor. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 2017;49: 2351–2360.
375 doi:10.1249/MSS.0000000000001344
- 376 23. LaMunion SR, Bassett DRJ, Toth LP, Crouter SE. Effect of wear location on ActiGraph
377 activity counts: 2286 Board #299 June 1 2: 00 PM - 3: 30 PM. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.*
378 2017;49: 643. doi:10.1249/01.mss.0000518693.36595.09
- 379 24. Optimization Toolbox version: 9.4 (R2022b), Natick, Massachusetts: The MathWorks Inc.;
380 2022.
- 381 25. Martin Bland J, Altman Douglas G. Statistical methods for assessing agreement between two
382 methods of clinical measurement. *The Lancet.* 1986;327: 307–310. doi:10.1016/S0140-
383 6736(86)90837-8
- 384 26. Koo TK, Li MY. A guideline of selecting and reporting intraclass correlation coefficients for
385 reliability research. *J Chiropr Med.* 2016;15: 155–163. doi:10.1016/j.jcm.2016.02.012
- 386 27. Murray DW, Fitzpatrick R, Rogers K, Pandit H, Beard DJ, Carr AJ, et al. The use of the
387 Oxford hip and knee scores. *J Bone Joint Surg Br.* 2007;89-B: 1010–1014.
388 doi:10.1302/0301-620X.89B8.19424
- 389 28. Oxford Knee Score | Auckland Surgery. [cited 13 Jul 2023]. Available:
390 <https://www.aucklandsurgery.co.uk/navigator/oxford-knee-score/>

- 391 29. Rowlands AV, Mirkes EM, Yates T, Cledes S, Davies M, Khunti K, et al. Accelerometer-
392 assessed physical activity in epidemiology: are monitors equivalent? *Med Sci Sports Exerc.*
393 2018;50: 257. doi:10.1249/MSS.0000000000001435
- 394 30. Pfister T, Matthews CE, Wang Q, Kopciuk KA, Courneya K, Friedenreich C. Comparison of
395 two accelerometers for measuring physical activity and sedentary behaviour. *BMJ Open*
396 *Sport Exerc Med.* 2017;3: e000227. doi:10.1136/bmjsem-2017-000227
- 397 31. Rhudy MB, Dreisbach SB, Moran MD, Ruggiero MJ, Veerabhadrapa P. Cut points of the
398 Actigraph GT9X for moderate and vigorous intensity physical activity at four different
399 wear locations. *J Sports Sci.* 2020;38: 503–510. doi:10.1080/02640414.2019.1707956

400


401 **Supporting Information**

402 **S1 Table. Participant Activity and ActiGraph Data.** Activity Data is missing from Participant
403 21 due to early removal of the Activity AX6 sensor.


404

405

Individual Optimization Process



LOOCV (shown for participant 1)



Repeated for all 35 participants

Results




Fig1







Fig2







Fig3