

1 **Title:** Feasibility characteristics of wrist-worn fitness trackers in health status monitoring for
2 post-COVID patients in remote and rural areas

3
4 **Authors:**
5 Madeleine Wiebe¹
6 Marnie Mackay², PhD
7 Ragur Krishnan³
8 Julie Tian²
9 Jake Larsson¹
10 Setayesh Modanloo²
11 Christiane Job Mcintosh⁴
12 Melissa Sztym⁵
13 Gail Elton-Smith⁵
14 Alyssa Rose⁵
15 Chester Ho^{6,7} MD
16 Andrew Greenshaw² PhD
17 Bo Cao² PhD
18 Andrew Chan⁶ MD PhD PEng
19 Jake Hayward⁸ MD MPH

20
21 1. Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry, University of Alberta
22 2. Department of Psychiatry, Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry, University of Alberta
23 3. Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Faculty of Engineering University of
24 Alberta
25 4. Neurosciences, Rehabilitation and Vision Strategic Clinical Network, Alberta Health Services
26 5. Covenant Health Rural Health Services
27 6. Glenrose Rehabilitation Hospital
28 7. Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry,
29 University of Alberta
30 8. Department of Emergency Medicine, Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry, University of Alberta
31
32
33

34 **Abstract:**

35

36 **Introduction:** Common, consumer-grade biosensors mounted on fitness trackers and
37 smartwatches can measure an array of biometrics that have potential utility in post-discharge
38 medical monitoring, especially in remote/rural communities. The feasibility characteristics for
39 wrist-worn biosensors are poorly described for post-COVID conditions and rural populations.

40

41 **Methods:** We prospectively recruited patients in rural communities who were enrolled in an at-
42 home rehabilitation program for post-COVID conditions. They were asked to wear a FitBit
43 Charge 2 device and biosensor parameters were analyzed (e.g. heart rate, sleep, and activity).
44 Electronic patient reported outcome measures (E-PROMS) for mental (bi-weekly) and physical
45 (daily) symptoms were collected using SMS text or email (per patient preference). Exit surveys
46 and interviews evaluated the patient experience.

47

48 **Results:** Ten patients were observed for an average of 58 days and half (N=5) were monitored
49 for 8 weeks or more. Five patients (50%) had been hospitalized with COVID (mean stay = 41
50 days) and 4 (36%) had required mechanical ventilation. As baseline, patients had moderate to
51 severe levels of anxiety, depression, and stress; fatigue and shortness of breath were the most
52 prevalent physical symptoms. Four patients (40%) already owned a smartwatch. In total, 575
53 patient days of patient monitoring occurred across 10 patients. Biosensor data was usable for
54 91.3% of study hours and surveys were completed 82.1% and 78.7% of the time for physical and
55 mental symptoms, respectively. Positive correlations were observed between stress and resting
56 heart rate ($r=0.360$, $p<0.01$), stress and daily steps ($r=0.335$, $p<0.01$), and anxiety and daily steps
57 ($r=0.289$, $p<0.01$). There was a trend toward negative correlation between sleep time and

58 physical symptom burden ($r=-0.211$, $p=0.05$). Patients reported an overall positive experience
59 and identified the potential for wearable devices to improve medical safety and access to care.
60 Concerns around data privacy/security were infrequent.

61

62 **Conclusions:** We report excellent feasibility characteristics for wrist-worn biosensors and e-
63 PROMS as a possible substrate for multi-modal disease tracking in post-COVID conditions.
64 Adapting consumer-grade wearables for medical use and scalable remote patient monitoring
65 holds great potential.

66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80

81 **Introduction**

82

83 Recovery from COVID can be long and unpredictable. Some patients return to premorbid health
84 quickly while others endure a debilitating and poorly understood recovery path lasting months to
85 years, termed ‘long-COVID’, comprising both mental and physical symptoms (reviewed in
86 Davis et al., 2023 and Koc et al., 2022). Traditional, clinic-based methods of disease assessment
87 are episodic, limiting their utility in a complex and undulating disease course such as post-
88 COVID. New approaches are needed that can track longitudinal physiologic changes at the
89 individual patient level.

90

91 Wearable devices may be ideal tools for studying complex diseases and post-COVID conditions
92 (reviewed in Smuck et al., 2021). Biosensor metrics have been shown able to predict health
93 outcomes for a range of chronic diseases including congestive heart failure, COPD,
94 hypertension, diabetes, and more (Channa et al., 2021; Khondakar & Kaushik, 2022; Rodriguez-
95 León et al., 2021; Singhal & Cowie, 2020). More recently, smartwatches have been used to
96 detect pre-symptomatic COVID infections (Mishra et al., 2020). Common and affordable
97 smartwatches and fitness trackers might support remote patient monitoring (RPM) if the
98 emergent data is high-enough quality to inform safe decision making (Iqbal et al., 2021, Kwok et
99 al., 2021; Lu et al., 2020, Kang & Exworthy, 2022). Remote patient monitoring is particularly
100 important for patients living in remote and rural areas where in-person care can be limited
101 (Fraser et al., 2022; Liao et al., 2019; Canali et al., 2022).

102

103 Feasibility data for wearable devices varies with population, technology, and monitoring
104 protocol and little has been published for post-COVID conditions, especially in rural settings.
105 Our study describes the feasibility of using common, consumer-grade wrist-worn biosensors
106 (e.g., FitBit fitness trackers) for disease parameter tracking in post-COVID conditions in a rural
107 community, including both technical aspects (e.g. data quality/completeness) and the patient
108 experience.

109

110 **Materials and Methods**

111

112 **Patient Cohort:**

113 Patients were recruited from an early supported discharge (ESD) program in Camrose, Alberta,
114 Canada, which has a population of just under 21,000 residents. The ESD program was originally
115 designed to support patients recovering from acute stroke (Chouliara et al., 2023); however,
116 during the COVID-19 pandemic, it was adapted for COVID-19. Patients were referred to the
117 program either directly from hospital (at discharge) or through community clinics. The ESD
118 team is a rehabilitation team that delivers intensive rehabilitation programs in the home using
119 both in-person visits and telemedicine (video or phone). The team typically includes
120 occupational therapy, physical therapy, speech-language pathology, social work, nursing, therapy
121 assistants, recreation therapy and a psychologist. Patients were also recruited through a virtual
122 post-covid pilot program and were located throughout Alberta, primarily in rural settings.
123 Patients were referred to this program through the Rehabilitation Advice Line. Rehabilitation in
124 this program was provided solely via telemedicine.

125

126 All ESD patients were screened for eligibility at program start. Eligible patients were
127 ambulatory, with mild to moderate functional impairment and sufficient cognitive capacity to
128 participate in the program. Excluded patients were those without internet connectivity, who were
129 unable to complete surveys (ex. language and speech deficits, non-English-speaking), or for
130 whom device retrieval was deemed to be unlikely by the study investigators.

131

132 **Data Sources:**

133 Data sources included: 1) wearable devices, 2) health records, 3) digital surveys, and 4) patient
134 interviews. Health record data comprised diagnostic, medication, and procedure codes occurring
135 in the year before enrollment and during the observation period.

136

137 **Devices:**

138 FitBit Charge 2 devices were provided to each patient at enrollment. The FitBit Charge 2 is a
139 wrist-worn fitness tracker that includes a triaxial accelerometer, an altimeter, and an optical heart
140 rate tracker. Parameters collected included activity (steps per day), heart rate (beats per minute),
141 and duration (minutes) and quality (% deep) of sleep. Data was sent via Bluetooth to a patient-
142 owned smartphone, uploaded to the FitBit cloud database and then extracted through the third-
143 party platform (Fitabase; <https://www.fitabase.com/>).

144

145 **Monitoring Protocol:**

146 Patients received an orientation to the device on study enrollment and were instructed to wear it
147 as much as possible, up to 24 hrs a day (except when charging). There were no specific
148 instructions on how to use device data and patients were free to share data with the clinical team

149 if desired; however, data was not directly transmitted to the clinical team. If the patient had
150 questions about the device or technical issues, a research nurse was available for support by
151 phone during daytime hours.

152

153 **Surveys:**

154 Patients received digital surveys via SMS text or email (per patient preference) using the RedCap
155 (Harris et al., 2008) survey platform. Baseline health status surveys included measures of mental
156 and physical health and a technology experience survey (Comprising two sections: Tech comfort
157 (7-items, avg score [0-5]), Health Literacy (4-items, avg score [0-5]) adapted from the Telehealth
158 Usability Questionnaire (TUQ) (Parmanto et al., 2016). During the follow-up period physical
159 and mental symptom surveys were delivered daily and bi-weekly, respectively. English versions
160 of validated self-reported screening scales were used to measure severity of stress, anxiety, and
161 depression symptoms, including the Perceived Stress Scale (PSS), a 10-item questionnaire with a
162 Cronbach's alpha of >0.70 used to assess level of stress in the previous month (PSS; PSS score
163 ≥ 14 indicates moderate or high stress) (Cohen et al., 1983); the Generalized Anxiety Disorder 7-
164 item (GAD-7) scale, a 7-item questionnaire with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.92 and used to assess
165 the self-reported levels of anxiety in respondents in the two weeks prior to assessment (GAD-7
166 score ≥ 10 indicates likely generalized anxiety disorder [GAD]) (Spitzer et al., 2006); and the
167 Patient Health Questionnaire-9 (PHQ-9) a 9-item questionnaire with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.89
168 and used to assess the severity of depression symptoms (for PHQ-9; a score ≥ 10 indicates likely
169 major depressive disorder (MDD) (Kroenke et al., 2001).

170

171 Detailed description of physical symptom surveys and results can be found in the supplementary
172 materials, Table S1. In short, 18 total symptom scales (6-point scale, 'absent' [1] to 'very

173 severe' [6]) were grouped by body system (constitutional, gastrointestinal, neurologic,
174 respiratory, cardiovascular). At discharge, patients received an exit survey that included feedback
175 on the devices, also adapted from the TUQ.

176

177 **Interviews:**

178 At the conclusion of the study patients were approached for interview. Questions focused on
179 technology usability, acceptance, and perceived barriers to use, such as data privacy/security.
180 Author MW completed interviews virtually using Zoom and curated auto-generated
181 transcriptions.

182

183 **Study Outcomes:**

184

185 **Primary Outcome: Protocol Adherence**

186 Our primary outcome was protocol adherence, defined as device wear time (% of minutes with
187 analyzable heart rate data) and survey completion rates. Patient interviews and survey responses
188 added context for this outcome, exploring patient perceptions and experience.

189

190 **Secondary Outcomes: Biosensor Parameter Correlations**

191 Secondary outcomes were associations between 1) the primary outcome (adherence) and patient
192 characteristics (e.g., age, sex, symptom severity, technology readiness measures, and time under
193 observation), and 2) device biometrics (activity/HR/sleep) and disease outcomes (physical and
194 mental symptoms).

195

196 **Statistical Analysis:**

197 Descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation [SD]) were calculated for primary and
198 secondary outcomes. We used Pearson correlation coefficients and weekly aggregated data to
199 explore secondary outcomes. We performed a within-subject longitudinal analysis and paired t-
200 tests to evaluate for changes in symptom severity over time, comparing weeks 1-4 and weeks 8+
201 for those subjects observed for more than 8 weeks (N=5).

202

203 **Qualitative Analysis:**

204 We conducted thematic analysis of interview transcripts using a combined deductive and
205 inductive approach, aided with NVIVO software. Two team members (MW and JL) reviewed
206 original transcripts to identify themes of interest and compared results. Where there was
207 disagreement, consensus was obtained through discussion. Smaller themes were sequentially
208 grouped into larger categories until core themes were identified.

209

210 **Funding and Ethics**

211 This study was registered and approved by the University of Alberta Research Ethics Board
212 (Pro00113943).

213

214

215

216

217

218

219

220

221

222

223

224

225 **Results**


226

227 **Participant characteristics:**

228 Between November 2021 and May 2022, 18 patients were approached for enrollment; three
229 declined and one patient was ineligible due to lack of wireless connectivity. After enrollment, 3
230 of 14 patients withdrew consent, and 1 was removed due to technical issues with their device,
231 leaving 10 patients for the final analysis. Seven patients consented to an interview. The overall
232 recruitment rate was therefore 61.1%.

233

234 **Figure 1.** Flow diagram of study recruitment.



235

236

237 Table 1 shows baseline patient characteristics. Mean age was 53 years (SD 15.0) and 80% (8/10)
238 of patients were female. Five (50%) had been hospitalized with COVID (average length of stay =
239 41 days) and four (40%) had required ventilatory support in the ICU. The remaining 50% were
240 referred from community clinics. On average, patients had fewer than one documented medical
241 condition prior to their COVID-19 diagnosis and half (5/10) owned their own smartwatch. The
242 most common physical symptoms were ‘constitutional’ (ex. fatigue, poor sleep), followed by

243 ‘respiratory’ and ‘cardiovascular’. Average mental health symptoms scores were GAD-7 = 15.7
244 (severe anxiety), PHQ-9 = 14.8 (moderate depression) and PSS = 22.7 (moderate stress). Patients
245 had moderate to high levels of familiarity with technology (ex. comfort with technology = 3.6/5;
246 health literacy = 3.7/5). Detailed patient characteristics, including comorbidities and medications,
247 are shown in Supplementary Table S1 and Figures S1 and S2.

248
249

Table 1. Baseline patient characteristics (N=10)

Demographics	
Age (mean [SD])	53 [15]
Female Sex no. (%)	8 (80%)
Hospitalized no. (%)	5 (50%)
Days in hospital (mean [SD])*	41.0 [21.1]
ICU stay no. (%)	4 (40%)
Ventilator no. (%)	4 (40%)
Number of days in ESD (mean [SD])	58 [117]
Home oxygen (%)	1 (10%)
Comorbidities per patient (mean [SD])	0.8 [0.8]
Medications per patient (mean [SD])	4.4 [3.1]
Familiarity with Technology	
Already own a smartwatch (%)	4 (40%)
Technology comfort (7-items, mean score [0-5])	3.6 [1.4]

Health Literacy (4-items, mean score [0-5])	3.7 [1.1]
Physical symptoms (mean score [0-4])	
Constitutional (6 symptoms)	1.43 [0.83]
Gastrointestinal (3 symptoms)	0.31 [0.55]
Neurological (3 symptoms)	0.61 [0.62]
Respiratory (4 symptoms)	0.90 [0.55]
Cardiovascular (2 symptoms)	0.68 [0.90]
Mental health symptoms (mean score [SD])	
General Anxiety Disorder-7 (out of 21)	15.7 [1.3]
Patient Health Questionnaire-9 (out of 27)	14.8 [1.3]
Perceived Stress Scale (out of 40)	22.7 [1.4]

250 * hospitalized patients (N=5)

251

252

253 **Descriptive analysis:**

254 Table 2 summarizes descriptive statistics for primary adherence outcomes (group aggregate).

255 Overall, 575 patient days of patient monitoring occurred across 10 patients, patients were

256 observed for 58 days on average and half (N=5) were monitored for 8 weeks or more. For the

257 primary outcome (adherence), heart rate data was available for 91.3% of study hours and

258 physical and mental symptom surveys were completed 82.1% and 78.7% of the time,

259 respectively. Overall physical symptom burden was generally mild with an average overall rating

260 of 0.8/4; constitutional and respiratory symptoms being the most frequent. Average group

261 activity, sleep duration and quality (proportion time in deep sleep) were highest in weeks 4-8.
 262 Average resting heart rate was relatively constant over time. To test for within-subject effects,
 263 we compared weeks 1-4 and weeks 8+ for those patients staying longer than 8 weeks (Table S2).
 264 Except for respiratory symptoms (mean difference -0.23, $p=0.03$), temporal changes did not
 265 reach statistical significance.

266
 267 **Table 2.** Reported health parameters and survey outcomes across the clinical course.

Category	Weeks 1-4 (N= 10) Average [SD]	Weeks 4-8 (N= 9) Average [SD]	Weeks 8+ (N= 5) Average [SD]
% Wear time (minutes with heart rate data)	91.5 [5.4]	92.9 [4.4]	88.1 [5.7]
Sleep (hours)	5.7 [2.3]	7.0 [2.0]	5.6 [3.2]
Deep sleep (%)	13.3 [10.0]	17.4 [7.5]	15.9 [8.2]
Resting heart rate	68.7 [7.6]	66.1 [9.5]	66.7 [8.9]
% Completion for surveys			
Physical	82.8 [12.3]	81.1 [18.1]	82.5 [11.2]
Mental	92.1 [15.3]	81.0 [23.1]	47.9 [36.1]
Physical symptoms (mean [SD]; range 0-4)			
All	0.8 [0.6]	0.7 [0.5]	0.7 [0.4]
Constitutional	1.0 [0.8]	0.9 [0.8]	1.1 [0.7]
Neuro	0.6 [0.6]	0.6 [0.6]	0.8 [0.8]
Gastrointestinal	0.3 [0.6]	0.2 [0.5]	0.3 [0.5]

Respiratory	0.9 [0.6]	0.8 [0.6]	0.8 [0.5]
Cardiovascular	0.7 [0.9]	0.6 [0.9]	0.3 [0.6]
Mental health symptoms			
Mood (out of 27)	20.0 [8.0]	19.3 [9.0]	16.4 [7.8]
Anxiety (out of 21)	16.2 [6.8]	15.8 [6.8]	12.4 [6.4]
Stress (out of 40)	30.5 [6.1]	28.5 [4.9]	26.6 [5.5]
Activity: Steps			
Daily count	3042 [1606]	4330 [3338]	3284 [2249]
Activity: Intensity (minutes/day)			
Low	127.3 [30.2]	156.6 [71.7]	121.6 [74.3]
Moderate	6.4 [6.6]	12.6 [16.9]	12.4 [20.3]
High	4.8 [6.2]	5.2 [6.6]	5.6 [6.1]

268
 269 **Group-level associations:**
 270 Survey response rates were correlated with device wear time ($r=0.67$, $p=0.03$), however there
 271 were no statistically significant associations between wear-time and other patient characteristics
 272 (e.g. demographics, symptoms, previous technology experience or time under observation; Table
 273 S3). Table 3 shows group-level associations between biosensor metrics (weekly aggregate).
 274 Resting heart rate was positively correlated with stress ($r=0.360$, $p<0.01$); step count was
 275 correlated with anxiety ($r=0.289$, $p<0.01$) and stress ($r=0.335$, $p<0.01$). Correlations for sleep
 276 time were not statistically significant, however trends suggested negative correlations with

277 physical symptoms ($r=-0.211$, $p=0.05$) and anxiety ($r=-0.186$, $p=0.09$) and a positive
278 correlation with stress ($r=0.208$, $p=0.06$).

279
280

Table 3. Correlation coefficients between FitBit data outputs and patient symptoms.

Survey parameter	Resting Heart Rate	Steps	Sleep Time
Physical Symptoms	0.011 (P=0.920)	0.116 (P=0.30)	-0.211 (P=0.05)
Anxiety (GAD-7)	0.205 (P=0.070)	0.289 (P<0.01)	-0.186 (P=0.09)
Mood (PHQ-9)	0.148 (P=0.189)	0.183 (P=0.10)	0.004 (P=0.97)
Stress (PSS)	0.360 (P<0.01)	0.335 (P<0.01)	0.208 (P=0.06)

281
282
283

Individual sensor data: case examples

284 Figure 2 shows data for two patients, illustrating the complexity and heterogeneity of individual
285 data. At enrollment, Patient A experienced marked physical symptoms, a high resting heart rate
286 (79-83 bpm) and low daily step counts (approx. 1km). Over time, their physical symptoms
287 improved, resting heart rate decreased, and daily activity increased. In contrast, Patient B's
288 physical symptoms remained prominent throughout observation. Their resting heart rate was
289 lower than Patient A (46-54 bpm) and didn't significantly change over time. Their activity levels
290 didn't show a clear temporal change. Mental health symptoms were prominent in both patients.

291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302



303
304 **Figure 2.** Sample longitudinal data for Patient A (left) and B (right), including results from
305 symptom surveys, heart rate and total daily number of steps.
306

307
308 **Surveys results:**


309 Figures 2 and 3 display survey results; additional survey data is presented in supplementary

310 materials (Figure S1). Proportions herein represent overall levels of agreement (agree or strongly

311 agree) vs. disagreement (disagree or strongly disagree). Of those who responded, the majority
312 liked using the FitBit system (5/8 [63%]), found it easy to learn (6/8 [86%]) and simple to use
313 (7/7 [100%]); no patients found the device interfered with their lifestyle and only one (13%)
314 found the device uncomfortable. Three-quarters (6/8 [75%]) of the patients found that wearing a
315 device made them feel safer and 4/8 (50%) felt it helped them to better understand their disease.
316 A minority (2/8 [25%]) used the device to help decide when to seek medical care and no patients
317 (0/8) reported that the devices caused anxiety.

318

Device Acceptability




319
320 * 7 out of 10 participants responded
321 ** 8 out of 10 participants responded
322

323 **Figure 3.** Survey results for questions pertaining to device acceptability with answers ranging
324 from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

325
326
327

Psychological Impact and Clinical Use 8/10 Participants Responded



328
329 **Figure 4** Survey Results for questions pertaining to psychological impact and clinical use with
330 answers ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree.
331

332 **Theme analysis of interview transcripts:**

333 Two male and five female patients completed exit interviews. Key themes are summarized
334 below, and representative quotes are presented in Table 4.

335
336 **Support in isolated environments:** Most felt that wearable devices are likely to improve
337 medical safety for rural communities in the future, possibly through symptom, activity, and vital
338 sign data transmission to clinical teams, family members and caregivers.

339
340 **Gaining disease insights:** Some patients spontaneously use device data (mostly heart rate) to
341 help them interpret physical symptoms, even without medical guidance. The impacts of

342 biosensor data on mental health were varied. Some found that normal heart rate readings
343 reassured them while others found that elevated heart rates worsened anxiety about their disease.

344

345 **Concerns around privacy:** Few were concerned data privacy and security. One participant was
346 hesitant to share their data with for-profit device companies, specifically.

347

348 **Potential for research:** Almost universally, participants felt wearable devices held great promise
349 as tools for clinical research and expressed a willingness to contribute their data to the research
350 community. Participants were motivated by a desire to see advancements in understanding and
351 treatment of post-COVID conditions.

Table 4. Qualitative analysis of exit interviews with sample quotes from participants.

Common themes of interviews	# Of quotes	# Of participants	Sample participant narratives	
			Examples of device use addressing needs of patient	Examples of device unable to address needs of patient
Support in isolated or rural environments	5	3	<p>“Well, it was good because I knew that if I was [inputting information], and somebody at the other end was seeing that something was really wrong they would have notified the girls in Camrose and would have notified medical assistance immediately. So, it was kind of another area of peace of mind...yeah, we don't have next door neighbors. We can't run for help. You know, we're sort of isolated out here, so like I say, we're on our own. You kind of just grasp at things, and you watch for signs. But you're not always fully aware, maybe, of what's happening until it's too late”</p> <p>[2/7 participants]</p>	<p>“I don't know, I didn't get a full view on what all [the device] could do, simply because it was kind of one-sided. I knew the information was going out, but I didn't necessarily know what was happening with it. I'm not having that feedback from a medical professional. I feel like it would be a really important piece if this is being used in the future.”</p> <p>[1/7 participants]</p>
Improved insight into symptoms	25	7	<p>“...I felt like I've gone crazy for a long time, and it just helps me, even if it's not my heart rate, and it's something else. It's just a peace of mind that it, you know, it's not my heart.”</p> <p>“I quite like the monitoring aspect from home, just because it gives me a bit more of an insight of what my heart rate is and what it's doing; just a better overall understanding.”</p> <p>[6/7 participants]</p>	<p>“I think, because I was having so many problems with my heart rate, and then I was tracking it so closely, it did make me hyper-aware of my heart rate a little bit...because now I was really closely monitoring, and it wasn't going well. So then, I was really concerned about that.</p> <p>[2/7 participants]</p>
Concern for privacy	7	7	<p>“None whatsoever. Like I said, I want to figure out what's going on, and I don't want somebody else to have to go through what I'm already dealing with. They might as well use me to figure out what we can do for others, right? So, I have no concerns with it whatsoever.”</p> <p>[6/7 participants]</p>	<p>“It would again come down to what the requirements were for [data sharing]. ... or at the very least had some transparency about what they were doing with it...my information is out and I don't know what it's taking off of my phone. What sort of data it's gathering on me. So that's something that I see as a limitation of health monitoring.”</p> <p>[1/7 participants]</p>
Research potential of devices	8	6	<p>“Well, I think it was helpful for whoever was tracking to get a better insight into what the aftereffects of COVID does, everybody's different. It's a very needed program and when you have somebody who went through what [my spouse] did, it's really helpful. Maybe it'll help someone else in [the ESD program]. I think the program is very much needed.”</p> <p>[5/7 participants]</p>	<p>“I've heard of studies where because of where the money is coming from, there's a risk of results in the data being made to fit the needs of the corporation or person or group or whatever. If the data is being used by people who are motivated financially rather than scientifically, and not with the goals of the health of individuals and people.”</p> <p>[1/7 participants]</p>

Discussion

We report excellent feasibility characteristics for wrist-worn fitness trackers in post-COVID disease monitoring in rural areas, including hypothesis generating associations suggesting that biosensor data can deliver disease insights at the individual level. Biosensor data was complex and heterogenous, highlighting the need for machine learning techniques to separate signal from noise. Our qualitative work illustrated a unique lived experience for rural patients with technology and unmet needs for remote monitoring tools that integrate with existing clinical care models to ease transitions from hospital to home.

Compared to existing studies, we observed high levels of protocol adherence. For common disease targets like COPD and CHF, RPM protocol adherence is typically low and decreases over time (Singhal & Cowie, 2020; Stehlik et al., 2020; Wu et al., 2021). Our post-COVID population was younger than most existing RPM cohorts, had relatively few comorbidities and were generally comfortable with technology, perhaps explaining our favorable result. Also, most existing studies RPM protocols use medical-grade devices, which are often unfamiliar to patients and challenging to operate. Consumer choice in technology is key driver of success for RPM and consumer-grade devices that offer non-medical applications present an opportunistic substrate for building scalable RPM platforms (Curry, 2023). The drawback of consumer-grade biosensors is that sensor accuracy is often unknown and cannot be assumed clinical grade (Bent et al., 2020). However, as sensor accuracy and signal detection algorithms improve for longitudinal patient data, we will be able to better compensate for imperfection in underlying discrete data. Learning to process data from consumer-grade biosensors is foundational for just-in-time

medical decision making, especially in relatively healthy patient populations who haven't been prescribed a medical grade device (Takahashi et al., 2022). Our study underscores the need to develop patient-centered technologies built with the non-medical consumer in mind.

Our group level associations and individual case examples highlight the potential for smartwatches to deliver novel disease insights in scientific studies. In our post-COVID patients, anxiety and stress correlated with activity and resting heart rate while physical symptom correlated with sleep. This granular, continuous data paints a rich picture of disease at the individual level, forming a foundation for precision medicine and improving on traditional forms of episodic measurement. Given our small sample size, our observed group-level associations are hypothesis generating only. Subjectively, the heterogeneity seen across individual data supports the hypothesis that post-COVID conditions comprise a range of distinct phenotypes rather than a single entity (Luszczek et al., 2021; Osuchowski et al., 2021), a possibility that will hopefully be further elucidated in ongoing clinical trials that utilize wearable devices (Moore Vogel, 2023). As more studies using wearable biosensors emerge it will be important to create and adhere to standards in metric derivation and validation so that results are clinically applicable.

Our patient interviews provided a rich context for interpreting quantitative data and brought to the fore a range of patient experiences that are key for understanding the future impacts of wearable devices in medicine. Continuous physiologic data can amplify or dampen anxiety around disease depending on the individual. In some instances, normal device data helped to reassure when symptoms were fluctuating unpredictably. For others, abnormal heart rate data worsened anxiety around mild or absent physical sensations. The potential impacts of

personalized biodata on mental health are poorly described in existing literature and for some it could contribute to excess healthcare utilization (Rosman et al., 2020). Our result highlights the need to better understand these impacts through further research and to improve medical support patients who choose to wear devices. Interestingly, concerns about data-sharing and privacy were infrequently raised by our patients but are known to be major determinants of success for wearable devices in healthcare, overall (Banerjee et al., 2018; Cilliers, 2020).

Patients unfamiliar with wrist-worn devices in our study required a significant amount of time and support during device set-up. For those who owned a device already, changing to a new one was unpopular, and some patients refused enrollment or withdrew consent as a result. Human factors like this are critical determinants of success for RPM platforms. Shin et al. (2019) found that wearables are best accepted by patients who are motivated to monitor a chronic condition. Yin et al. (2022) reported that convenience, social influence, and expectation of improved health are important for uptake, while cost and perceived risk are less so. In rural settings, such as ours, perceived benefits for wearable technologies might be elevated as in-person services are often inaccessible (reviewed in Brahmabhatt et al., 2022). In future work using smartwatches rather than fitness trackers would likely yield even stronger feasibility data given the attractiveness of their non-medical applications like text messaging, music, and social networking, all of which encourage wear-time. Indeed, many patients in our study were particularly reluctant to use a fitness tracker if they already owned a smartwatch.

Limitations:

Our study has several limitations. Most notably, our sample size was small, and it is unclear if our findings can be replicated a larger population. As conditions changed during our study

(vaccines emerged and prevalent viral strains shifted) we observed that the post-COVID phenotype also changed. In the early stages of our work, we observed more severe respiratory symptoms and most patients had been hospitalized, often recovering from a period of mechanical ventilation. In the later stages, patients were often referred from community clinics with more mild respiratory disease but more severe constitutional symptoms (ex. fatigue or poor sleep). The shifting disease phenotype makes it challenging to infer similar results for future endemic states for COVID. Importantly, in this setting our patients were visited near-daily in their homes or via telemedicine by therapists, which could have artificially increased protocol adherence, and critically, a relatively low recruitment rate (60 percent) suggests that population-level impacts for wearable technologies remains uncertain.

Conclusions:

We find promising feasible characteristics for wrist-worn devices in remote disease tracking for post-COVID conditions in rural communities. Our data are foundational for future testing of consumer-grade devices in the medical sphere, highlighting the need for co-created RPM platforms designed with patient/consumer technology preference in mind. Such innovations have great potential to improve healthcare access and safety for otherwise isolated populations.

Acknowledgements

We acknowledge the extensive efforts of the Camrose Early Supported Discharge team (Dana Norton, Alyssa Rose, Sharene Lamson) in providing clinical and administrative support. We also acknowledge the contributions of the Glenrose research team (Elton Lam, Tod Vandenberg, Stephan Pham) for their provision of analytic support. Funding for this work was generously

provided by Covenant Health and Alberta Health Services. No direct funding was received from FitBit.

References:

- Banerjee, S. (Sy), Hemphill, T., & Longstreet, P. (2018). Wearable devices and healthcare: Data sharing and privacy. *The Information Society*, 34(1), 49–57. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01972243.2017.1391912>
- Bent, B., Goldstein, B. A., Kibbe, W. A., & Dunn, J. P. (2020). Investigating sources of inaccuracy in wearable optical heart rate sensors. *Npj Digital Medicine*, 3(1), 18. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-020-0226-6>
- Brahmbhatt, D. H., Ross, H. J., & Moayedi, Y. (2022). Digital Technology Application for Improved Responses to Health Care Challenges: Lessons Learned From COVID-19. *The Canadian Journal of Cardiology*, 38(2), 279–291. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cjca.2021.11.014>
- Canali, S., Schiaffonati, V., & Aliverti, A. (2022). Challenges and recommendations for wearable devices in digital health: Data quality, interoperability, health equity, fairness. *PLOS Digital Health*, 1(10), e0000104. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pdig.0000104>
- Channa, A., Popescu, N., Skibinska, J., & Burget, R. (2021). The Rise of Wearable Devices during the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Systematic Review. *Sensors*, 21(17), 5787. <https://doi.org/10.3390/s21175787>
- Chouliara, N., Cameron, T., Byrne, A., Lewis, S., Langhorne, P., Robinson, T., Waring, J., Walker, M., & Fisher, R. (2023). How do stroke early supported discharge services achieve intensive and responsive service provision? Findings from a realist evaluation study (WISE). *BMC Health Services Research*, 23(1), 299. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-023-09290-1>
- Cilliers, L. (2020). Wearable devices in healthcare: Privacy and information security issues. *Health Information Management Journal*, 49(2–3), 150–156. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1833358319851684>
- Cohen, S., Kamarck, T., & Mermelstein, R. (1983). A Global Measure of Perceived Stress. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 24(4), 385. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2136404>
- Davis, H. E., McCorkell, L., Vogel, J. M., & Topol, E. J. (2023). Long COVID: Major findings, mechanisms and recommendations. *Nature Reviews Microbiology*, 21(3), 133–146. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41579-022-00846-2>
- Fraser, M. J., Gorely, T., O'Malley, C., Muggeridge, D. J., Giggins, O. M., & Crabtree, D. R. (2022). Does Connected Health Technology Improve Health-Related Outcomes in Rural Cardiac Populations? Systematic Review Narrative Synthesis. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(4), 2302. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19042302>
- Harris, P. A., Taylor, R., Thielke, R., Payne, J., Gonzalez, N., & Conde, J. G. (2009). Research electronic data capture (REDCap)—a metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing translational research informatics support. *Journal of biomedical informatics*, 42(2), 377–381.
- Iqbal, S. M. A., Mahgoub, I., Du, E., Leavitt, M. A., & Asghar, W. (2021). Advances in healthcare wearable devices. *Npj Flexible Electronics*, 5(1), 9. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41528-021-00107-x>
- Kang, H. S., & Exworthy, M. (2022). Wearing the Future-Wearables to Empower Users to Take Greater Responsibility for Their Health and Care: Scoping Review. *JMIR mHealth and uHealth*, 10(7), e35684. <https://doi.org/10.2196/35684>

- Khondakar, K. R., & Kaushik, A. (2022). Role of Wearable Sensing Technology to Manage Long COVID. *Biosensors*, *13*(1), 62. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bios13010062>
- Koc, H. C., Xiao, J., Liu, W., Li, Y., & Chen, G. (2022). Long COVID and its Management. *International Journal of Biological Sciences*, *18*(12), 4768–4780. <https://doi.org/10.7150/ijbs.75056>
- Kroenke, K., Spitzer, R. L., & Williams, J. B. W. (2001). The PHQ-9: Validity of a brief depression severity measure. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, *16*(9), 606–613. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1525-1497.2001.016009606.x>
- Kwok, E. S. H., Clapham, G., & Calder-Sprackman, S. (2021). The Impact of COVID-19 Pandemic on Emergency Department Visits at a Canadian Academic Tertiary Care Center. *The Western Journal of Emergency Medicine*, *22*(4), 851–859. <https://doi.org/10.5811/westjem.2021.2.49626>
- Liao, Y., Thompson, C., Peterson, S., Mandrola, J., & Beg, M. S. (2019). The Future of Wearable Technologies and Remote Monitoring in Health Care. *American Society of Clinical Oncology Educational Book. American Society of Clinical Oncology. Annual Meeting*, *39*, 115–121. https://doi.org/10.1200/EDBK_238919
- Lu, L., Zhang, J., Xie, Y., Gao, F., Xu, S., Wu, X., & Ye, Z. (2020). Wearable Health Devices in Health Care: Narrative Systematic Review. *JMIR mHealth and uHealth*, *8*(11), e18907. <https://doi.org/10.2196/18907>
- Luszczek, E. R., Ingraham, N. E., Karam, B. S., Proper, J., Siegel, L., Helgeson, E. S., Lotfi-Emran, S., Zolfaghari, E. J., Jones, E., Usher, M. G., Chipman, J. G., Dudley, R. A., Benson, B., Melton, G. B., Charles, A., Lupei, M. I., & Tignanelli, C. J. (2021). Characterizing COVID-19 clinical phenotypes and associated comorbidities and complication profiles. *PLOS ONE*, *16*(3), e0248956. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0248956>
- Mishra, T., Wang, M., Metwally, A. A., Bogu, G. K., Brooks, A. W., Bahmani, A., Alavi, A., Celli, A., Higgs, E., Dagan-Rosenfeld, O., Fay, B., Kirkpatrick, S., Kellogg, R., Gibson, M., Wang, T., Hunting, E. M., Mamie, P., Ganz, A. B., Rolnik, B., ... Snyder, M. P. (2020). Pre-symptomatic detection of COVID-19 from smartwatch data. *Nature Biomedical Engineering*, *4*(12), 1208–1220. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41551-020-00640-6>
- Osuchowski, M. F., Winkler, M. S., Skirecki, T., Cajander, S., Shankar-Hari, M., Lachmann, G., Monneret, G., Venet, F., Bauer, M., Brunkhorst, F. M., Weis, S., Garcia-Salido, A., Kox, M., Cavaillon, J.-M., Uhle, F., Weigand, M. A., Flohé, S. B., Wiersinga, W. J., Almansa, R., ... Rubio, I. (2021). The COVID-19 puzzle: Deciphering pathophysiology and phenotypes of a new disease entity. *The Lancet. Respiratory Medicine*, *9*(6), 622–642. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2213-2600\(21\)00218-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2213-2600(21)00218-6)
- Parmanto, B., Lewis, A. N., Graham, K. M., & Bertolet, M. H. (2016). Development of the Telehealth Usability Questionnaire (TUQ). *International Journal of Telerehabilitation*, *8*(1), 3–10. <https://doi.org/10.5195/ijt.2016.6196>
- Rodriguez-León, C., Villalonga, C., Munoz-Torres, M., Ruiz, J. R., & Banos, O. (2021). Mobile and Wearable Technology for the Monitoring of Diabetes-Related Parameters: Systematic Review. *JMIR mHealth and uHealth*, *9*(6), e25138. <https://doi.org/10.2196/25138>
- Rosman, L., Gehi, A., & Lampert, R. (2020). When smartwatches contribute to health anxiety in patients with atrial fibrillation. *Cardiovascular Digital Health Journal*, *1*(1), 9–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cvdhj.2020.06.004>

- Shin, G., Jarrahi, M. H., Fei, Y., Karami, A., Gafinowitz, N., Byun, A., & Lu, X. (2019). Wearable activity trackers, accuracy, adoption, acceptance and health impact: A systematic literature review. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics*, *93*, 103153. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbi.2019.103153>
- Singhal, A., & Cowie, M. R. (2020). The Role of Wearables in Heart Failure. *Current Heart Failure Reports*, *17*(4), 125–132. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11897-020-00467-x>
- Smuck, M., Odonkor, C. A., Wilt, J. K., Schmidt, N., & Swiernik, M. A. (2021). The emerging clinical role of wearables: Factors for successful implementation in healthcare. *Npj Digital Medicine*, *4*(1), 45. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-021-00418-3>
- Spitzer, R. L., Kroenke, K., Williams, J. B. W., & Löwe, B. (2006). A Brief Measure for Assessing Generalized Anxiety Disorder: The GAD-7. *Archives of Internal Medicine*, *166*(10), 1092. <https://doi.org/10.1001/archinte.166.10.1092>
- Stehlik, J., Schmalfluss, C., Bozkurt, B., Nativi-Nicolau, J., Wohlfahrt, P., Wegerich, S., Rose, K., Ray, R., Schofield, R., Deswal, A., Sekaric, J., Anand, S., Richards, D., Hanson, H., Pipke, M., & Pham, M. (2020). Continuous Wearable Monitoring Analytics Predict Heart Failure Hospitalization: The LINK-HF Multicenter Study. *Circulation: Heart Failure*, *13*(3), e006513. <https://doi.org/10.1161/CIRCHEARTFAILURE.119.006513>
- Takahashi, S., Nakazawa, E., Ichinohe, S., Akabayashi, A., & Akabayashi, A. (2022). Wearable Technology for Monitoring Respiratory Rate and SpO₂ of COVID-19 Patients: A Systematic Review. *Diagnostics*, *12*(10), 2563. <https://doi.org/10.3390/diagnostics12102563>
- Wu, C.-T., Li, G.-H., Huang, C.-T., Cheng, Y.-C., Chen, C.-H., Chien, J.-Y., Kuo, P.-H., Kuo, L.-C., & Lai, F. (2021). Acute Exacerbation of a Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease Prediction System Using Wearable Device Data, Machine Learning, and Deep Learning: Development and Cohort Study. *JMIR mHealth and uHealth*, *9*(5), e22591. <https://doi.org/10.2196/22591>
- Yin, Z., Yan, J., Fang, S., Wang, D., & Han, D. (2022). User acceptance of wearable intelligent medical devices through a modified unified theory of acceptance and use of technology. *Annals of Translational Medicine*, *10*(11), 629. <https://doi.org/10.21037/atm-21-5510>

Supplementary Materials

Table S1. Patient characteristics – complications for hospitalized patients (N=5), comorbid conditions captured with administrative data diagnostic codes (N=10), medications in the year prior to COVID-19 diagnosis generated by WHO ATC coding system, and symptom scores by body system.

Complications for Hospitalized Patients	Frequency
Cardiovascular (ex. acute MI, atrial fibrillation, pulmonary embolism)	5
Infectious (non-respiratory) (ex. urinary tract infection, sepsis)	3
Excretory (ex. acute kidney injury)	2
Metabolic (alkalosis, hypokalemia)	2
Hematologic (ex. bleeding)	2
Medical comorbidities	Frequency
Arrhythmia	1
Pulmonary Circulation Disease	2
Hypertension	2
Chronic Pulmonary Disease	1
Peptic Ulcer Disease	1
Fluid and Electrolyte Diseases	1
Medications	Frequency
Number of Medications	4.3 [SD=3.1]
Alimentary Tract	3
Blood and blood forming	0
Cardiovascular	4

Dermatologic	0
Genitourinary	3
Hormonal	5
Anti-Infective	6
Antineoplastic	0
Musculoskeletal	2
Nervous system	8
Antiparasitic	0
Respiratory	5
Sensory	0
Various (i.e. others)	0
Physical Symptoms (Score 0-4, [SD])	
<i>Constitutional (6 symptoms)</i>	1.43[0.83]
Fatigue	2.46 [1.18]
Aches and pains	1.45 [1.32]
Muscle weakness	1.32 [1.02]
Poor sleep	1.72 [0.98]
Fever	0.04 [0.09]
Feeling Generally Unwell	1.60 [1.52]
<i>Gastrointestinal (3 symptoms)</i>	0.31[0.55]
Nausea and Vomiting	0.34 [0.62]
Diarrhea	0.12 [0.28]
Abdominal Pain	0.47 [0.88]
<i>Neurological (3 symptoms)</i>	0.61[0.62]
Headache	1.50 [1.37]
Loss of taste	0.17 [0.47]
Loss of smell	0.16 [0.51]

<i>Respiratory (4 symptoms)</i>	0.90[0.55]
Cough	0.92 [0.96]
Shortness of Breath	1.70 [1.12]
Runny Nose	0.54 [0.54]
Sore Throat	0.47 [0.69]
<i>Cardiovascular (2 symptoms)</i>	0.68[0.90]
Chest Pain	0.83 [1.12]
Palpitations	0.54 [0.75]
Mental health Symptoms	
General Anxiety Disorder-7 (out of 21)	16.3 [7.0]
Patient Health Questionnaire-9 (out of 27)	20.2 [8.2]
Perceived Stress Scale (out of 40)	29.7 [5.3]
Baseline technology and health literacy scores	
Tech comfort (7-items, avg score [0-5])	3.59
Health Literacy (4-items, avg score [0-5])	3.68

Table S2. Mean difference in average symptoms scores for weeks 1-4 vs. 8+ for patients participating for more than 8 weeks (N=5).

Symptom	Mean difference after 8 weeks	P-value
Constitutional	0.18	0.63
Neuro	0.20	0.37
Gastrointestinal	-0.03	0.17
Respiratory	-0.23	0.03
Cardiovascular	-0.39	0.09
Mood	-2.81	0.66
Anxiety	-2.96	0.86
Stress	-4.36	0.45
Total Steps	-108.4	0.18

Resting Heart Rate (bpm)	-4.31	0.32
Average Heart Rate (bpm)	-5.99	0.10

Table S3: Correlation coefficients between device wear-time (pooled weekly) and patient characteristics, symptom severity, technology acceptance and time under observation (N=10).

Factor	Correlation	P-value
Age	-0.27	0.46
Admission Length	-0.38	0.28
Symptoms Survey Response Rate	0.67	0.03
Mental Health Survey Response Rate	0.53	0.11
Tech Readiness Scores	0.38	0.28
All Symptoms	-0.43	0.21
Generalized Anxiety Disorder-7	-0.59	0.07
Patient Health Questionnaire 9	-0.52	0.13
Perceived Stress Scale	-0.61	0.06




Figure S1. Baseline technology comfort survey responses (N=10).

Health Literacy




Figure S2. Baseline health literacy survey responses (N=10)