

1 **Title:** Impact of automated data flow and reminders on adherence and resource utilization for
2 remotely monitoring physical activity in individuals with stroke or chronic obstructive
3 pulmonary disease

4 **Authors:** Margaret A. French¹, Aparna Balasubramanian², Nadia N. Hansel², Sharon K.
5 Penttinen³, Robert Wise³, Preeti Raghavan⁴, Stephen T Wegener⁴, Ryan T. Roemmich^{4,5}, Pablo
6 A. Celnik⁴

7 ¹Department of Physical Therapy and Athletic Training, University of Utah, Salt Lake City,
8 Utah, United States of America. □

9 ²Department of Pulmonary and Critical Care Medicine, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore,
10 Maryland, United States of America. □

11 ³inHealth Precision Medicine Program, Technology Innovation Center, Johns Hopkins
12 University School of Medicine, Baltimore, Maryland, United States of America. □

13 ⁴Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore,
14 Maryland, United States of America. □

15 ⁵Center for Movement Studies, Kennedy Krieger Institute, Baltimore, Maryland, United States
16 of America. □

17 **Corresponding Author:**

18 Margaret French, DPT, PhD

19 520 Wakara Way

20 Salt Lake City, UT 84108

21 maggie.french@utah.edu

22

23 **Short Title:** Automating remote monitoring of physical activity

24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

ABSTRACT

As rehabilitation advances into the era of digital health, remote monitoring of physical activity via wearable devices has the potential to change how we provide care. However, uncertainties about patient adherence and the significant resource requirements needed create challenges to adoption of remote monitoring into clinical care. Here we aim to determine the impact of a novel digital application to overcome these barriers. The Rehabilitation Remote Monitoring Application (RRMA) automatically extracts data about physical activity collected via a Fitbit device, screens the data for adherence, and contacts the participant if adherence is low. We compare adherence and estimate the resources required (i.e., time and financial) to perform remote monitoring of physical activity with and without the RRMA in two patient groups. Seventy-three individuals with stroke or chronic obstructive pulmonary disease completed 28 days of monitoring physical activity with the RRMA, while 62 individuals completed 28 days with the data flow processes being completed manually. Adherence (i.e., the average percentage of the day that the device was worn) was similar between groups ($p=0.85$). However, the RRMA saved an estimated 123.8 minutes or \$50.24 per participant month when compared to manual processes. These results demonstrate that automated technologies like the RRMA can maintain patient adherence to remote monitoring of physical activity while reducing the time and financial resources needed. Applications like the RRMA can facilitate the adoption of remote monitoring in rehabilitation by reducing barriers related to adherence and resource requirements.

48 INTRODUCTION

49 Remote monitoring is an expanding area of digital health that allows healthcare
50 professionals to obtain data about patients outside of the clinical environment, leading to reduced
51 health disparities(1, 2), personalized(3) and preventative(4) medicine, value-based care(2, 5), and
52 improved patient experiences(2) and outcome tracking(4). Remote monitoring is common in
53 some medical disciplines (e.g., monitoring of blood glucose(6) or heart rhythm(7)) but not in
54 rehabilitation, despite its potential to measure real-world function – the central target of
55 rehabilitation.

56 Physical activity is one important aspect of function targeted during rehabilitation due to
57 its association with hospital admission(8), risk of stroke(9), development of cardiovascular
58 diseases(10, 11), and mortality(12-14). Physical activity is easily measured using wearable
59 devices (e.g., Fitbits); however, clinical utility is limited by the time required to set up the
60 device, download and analyze data, and synthesize, document, and discuss the results(2, 5, 15-
61 17). These barriers are exacerbated by the lack of research demonstrating the value of remote
62 monitoring approaches(3, 15, 17-19) and concerns about patient adherence(20).

63 We developed a Rehabilitation Remote Monitoring Application (RRMA) to address these
64 barriers and advance remote monitoring approaches toward clinical implementation. Here we 1)
65 compare patient adherence to physical activity remote monitoring with and without the RRMA
66 and 2) estimate the resources saved when using the RRMA for physical activity remote
67 monitoring. We hypothesize that the RRMA will maintain participant adherence while reducing
68 the resources needed to collect data from wearable devices.

69 METHODS

70 *Participants*

71 One hundred thirty-five individuals (chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD)=58;
72 stroke=77) participated. They were in the MANUAL (n=62) or APP (n=73) group based on
73 whether they enrolled before or after the launch of the RRMA (i.e., participants were not
74 randomized; Figure 1). Inclusion criteria were smartphone ownership and in-home Wi-Fi;
75 exclusion criteria included wheelchair use for mobility. Participants provided oral or written
76 consent as approved by the Johns Hopkins University Institutional Review Board.

77 *Procedures*

78 We used Fitbit Inspire 2 (Fitbit Inc., San Francisco, California, USA) devices to measure
79 minute-level step count and heart rate because they are widely accepted by patient
80 populations(21-25) and data can be easily obtained through an Application Programming
81 Interface (API). Participants were instructed to wear the devices at all times (except when
82 showering or charging) on their non-dominant wrist (COPD) or their unimpaired wrist (stroke).
83 Participants with stroke wore the device on their impaired wrist if hemiparesis limited their
84 ability to place it on their unimpaired wrist. We asked participants to synchronize their Fitbit
85 with their smartphone at least once/day.

86 *Data Management*

87 The three components of data management included: 1) data extraction, 2) screening for
88 participant adherence, and 3) providing reminders to synchronize devices. In the MANUAL
89 group, we extracted Fitbit data using a custom-built Python script run every two weeks (Figure
90 S1). We monitored participant adherence daily by logging into participants' Fitbit accounts and

91 documenting the last date of synchronization. If the participant had not synchronized their device
92 in 5, 12, or 19 days, we attempted to contact them.

93 In the APP group, the RRMA (a Spring Boot application with an angular front end that
94 runs on AKS Cluster) executed these three components automatically (Figure S1). The RRMA
95 used study management information (e.g., date of enrollment, enrollment status) from Research
96 Electronic Data Capture (REDCap)(26, 27) to ensure that it performed tasks for actively enrolled
97 participants. The study team created and linked a unique, de-identified Fitbit account to the
98 RRMA for each participant. This one-time linkage authorized the Fitbit API to share data with
99 the RRMA. Once linked, the RRMA extracted minute-level data from the Fitbit API three
100 times/day until the participant completed the study or withdrew. The RRMA then identified the
101 most recent date that data was received. If data was not received in the past 5 or 12 days, the
102 RRMA sent the participant a reminder to synchronize their device. If the device still was not
103 synchronized after 19 days, the RRMA notified the study team to prompt human contact with the
104 participant. The RRMA logged all reminders.

105 *Adherence*

106 Adherence was defined by Wear Time, or the average percentage of the day during which
107 a heart rate was detected. We used the accelerometry package(28) in R(29) to label each minute
108 as worn or not worn and then calculated the percentage of each day that the device was worn.
109 We calculated Wear Time for each participant over 28-days and during each week individually.
110 We used an independent t-test to compare Wear Time during the entire time period between
111 groups (MANUAL vs. APP) and a 4 (week) x 2 (group) mixed effects ANOVA to compare
112 across weeks and between groups. We used $\alpha \leq 0.05$ for all analyses.

113 *Resource Utilization*

114 Total Cost related to time - the sum of resources required to complete the three data
115 management steps outlined above - quantified resource utilization. We conservatively estimate
116 that manual data extraction and adherence screening each takes 2 minutes/day/participant. The
117 RRMA automated data extraction and adherence screening, but the time needed to manually link
118 the RRMA and Fitbit accounts was included as time required for data extraction.

119 To estimate the time needed to provide synchronizing reminders, we used the RRMA's
120 reminder log to calculate the average number of reminders/participant month. We used the
121 average number of all reminders (i.e., 5-, 12-, and 19-day) to determine the time needed to
122 provide reminders manually at each time point. The RRMA automated the 5- and 12-day
123 reminders; thus, we used the number of 19-day reminders/participant month to determine the
124 time needed to provide reminders with the RRMA. This resulted in the use of 0.98 and 0.1
125 reminders/participant month in the Total Cost calculations without and with the application,
126 respectively. We conservatively estimated that each manual reminder takes 10 minutes.

127 We used the Total Cost of time to calculate a secondary metric of Total Cost related to
128 money. To convert the resources related to time to money, we assumed a \$50,000 annual salary
129 for a study coordinator working 40 hours/week to complete these tasks. We present Total Cost
130 related to time and money per participant month and the resources saved by using the RRMA,
131 calculated as the difference between Total Cost with and without the RRMA.

132 **RESULTS**

133 There were no significant differences in demographic characteristics between the
134 MANUAL and APP groups with the exception of race (Table 1). Demographic information

135 based on diagnosis is in Table S1. Diagnosis-specific clinical characteristics are shown in Table
136 2.

137 *Adherence*

138 Wear Time during the entire 28-day period was not significantly different between the
139 MANUAL and APP groups (MANUAL=75.8±26.0%, APP=76.7±23.5%, p=0.85; Figure 2A).
140 As a sensitivity analysis, we performed the same analysis with the seven individuals who
141 withdrew during their first 28 days, showing no significant difference between groups (p=0.78).
142 There was no significant main effect of week ($F_{(2.3,303.8)}=2.1$, p=0.12) or group ($F_{(1,132)}=0.04$,
143 p=0.8) on Wear Time and no significant week x group interaction ($F_{(2.3,303.8)}=0.81$, p=0.46;
144 Figure 2B), indicating that overall adherence and adherence over time were not impacted by the
145 RRMA. The impact of diagnosis was beyond the scope of this study; however, we show these
146 data in Figure S2.

147 *Resource Utilization*

148 Total Cost of time without and with the RRMA was 125.8 and 2 minutes/participant
149 month, respectively (Table 3). We estimate that this process costs \$50.32/participant month
150 without the RRMA and \$0.08/participant month with the RRMA, resulting in a savings of
151 \$50.32/participant month with the RRMA (Table 3). This would have resulted in \$81,518.4
152 savings if our population would have completed a yearlong study.

153 **DISCUSSION**

154 Wearable devices can improve how we measure physical activity clinically, but barriers
155 such as patient adherence and time and resource requirements impede our use of these
156 approaches. Here we demonstrate that technology (in the form of the RRMA) can address these

157 barriers by maintaining patient adherence while drastically reducing the resources needed to
158 obtain quality data from remote monitoring.

159 Adherence to remote monitoring is critical for scalability into clinical care. We found
160 high adherence to monitoring physical activity, which is consistent with past work in several
161 patient groups (30-34). Importantly, our findings demonstrate that adherence is similar when
162 reminders are placed manually or automatically. This shows that automated technologies like the
163 RRMA can manage adherence, drastically improving the scalability of remote monitoring.

164 The time and money needed to extract data from Fitbit devices, screen this data for
165 adherence, and remind participants to synchronize their devices was markedly reduced by the
166 RRMA. The resources needed to manually perform these tasks are likely not feasible in a clinical
167 setting (15). Our work suggests that adherence is maintained when utilizing a less resource
168 intensive and automated process, providing an avenue for improved feasibility of remote
169 monitoring in clinical care.

170 We acknowledge some limitations. The duration of clinical care in rehabilitation is often
171 longer than 28 days as studied here, and we only used one reminder schedule. There is likely a
172 tradeoff between the frequency of reminders, resource utilization, and adherence that should be
173 explored. Lastly, studies with prospective randomization would provide valuable insight into
174 how adherence is impacted by automated reminders.

175 **DECLARATIONS**

176 Conflicting interests: The Authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

177 Funding: This work was supported by the Sheikh Khalifa Stroke Institute; the Johns Hopkins'
178 inHealth Precision Medicine Initiative; and the National Institutes of Health [grant number
179 1F32HD108835-01].

180 Ethical approval: The Institutional Review Board of Johns Hopkins University approved this
181 study (IRB00247292 and IRB00236214).

182 Guarantor: RR

183 Contributorship: MF, RR, NH, SW, and PC conceived the study and participated in protocol
184 development. MF, PR, BW, SP, and NH were involved in gaining approval from the Institutional
185 Review Board. MF, AB, BW, and NH were involved in participant recruitment. MF and RR
186 performed data analysis and data interpretation. All authors contributed to the interpretation of
187 the data. MF wrote the first draft of the manuscript. All authors reviewed and edited the
188 manuscript and approved the final version of the manuscript.

189 Acknowledgements: The authors acknowledge the Johns Hopkins Technology Innovation Center
190 for the development of the application described in this work.

191 **REFERENCES**

192 1. WHO Guidelines Approved by the Guidelines Review Committee. WHO guideline
193 Recommendations on Digital Interventions for Health System Strengthening. Geneva: World
194 Health Organization

195 © World Health Organization 2019.; 2019.

196 2. Houlding E, Mate KKV, Engler K, Ortiz-Paredes D, Pomey M-P, Cox J, et al. Barriers to
197 Use of Remote Monitoring Technologies Used to Support Patients With COVID-19: Rapid
198 Review. JMIR Mhealth Uhealth. 2021;9(4):e24743.

- 199 3. French MA, Roemmich RT, Daley K, Beier M, Penttinen S, Raghavan P, et al. Precision
200 Rehabilitation: Optimizing Function, Adding Value to Health Care. *Archives of physical*
201 *medicine and rehabilitation*. 2022;103(6):1233-9.
- 202 4. Swan M. Health 2050: The Realization of Personalized Medicine through
203 Crowdsourcing, the Quantified Self, and the Participatory Biocitizen. *J Pers Med*. 2012;2(3):93-
204 118.
- 205 5. Meskó B, Drobni Z, Béneyi É, Gergely B, Gyórfy Z. Digital health is a cultural
206 transformation of traditional healthcare. *Mhealth*. 2017;3:38.
- 207 6. Greenwood DA, Young HM, Quinn CC. Telehealth Remote Monitoring Systematic
208 Review: Structured Self-monitoring of Blood Glucose and Impact on A1C. *J Diabetes Sci*
209 *Technol*. 2014;8(2):378-89.
- 210 7. Sana F, Isselbacher EM, Singh JP, Heist EK, Pathik B, Aroundas AA. Wearable
211 Devices for Ambulatory Cardiac Monitoring: JACC State-of-the-Art Review. *J Am Coll Cardiol*.
212 2020;75(13):1582-92.
- 213 8. Watts EL, Saint-Maurice PF, Doherty A, Fensom GK, Freeman JR, Gorzelitz JS, et al.
214 Association of Accelerometer-Measured Physical Activity Level With Risks of Hospitalization
215 for 25 Common Health Conditions in UK Adults. *JAMA Network Open*. 2023;6(2):e2256186-e.
- 216 9. Hooker SP, Diaz KM, Blair SN, Colabianchi N, Hutto B, McDonnell MN, et al.
217 Association of Accelerometer-Measured Sedentary Time and Physical Activity With Risk of
218 Stroke Among US Adults. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2022;5(6):e2215385.
- 219 10. Koolhaas CM, Dhana K, Golubic R, Schoufour JD, Hofman A, van Rooij FJ, et al.
220 Physical Activity Types and Coronary Heart Disease Risk in Middle-Aged and Elderly Persons:
221 The Rotterdam Study. *Am J Epidemiol*. 2016;183(8):729-38.

- 222 11. Lachman S, Boekholdt SM, Luben RN, Sharp SJ, Brage S, Khaw KT, et al. Impact of
223 physical activity on the risk of cardiovascular disease in middle-aged and older adults: EPIC
224 Norfolk prospective population study. *Eur J Prev Cardiol.* 2018;25(2):200-8.
- 225 12. Kraus WE, Janz KF, Powell KE, Campbell WW, Jakicic JM, Troiano RP, et al. Daily
226 Step Counts for Measuring Physical Activity Exposure and Its Relation to Health. *Med Sci*
227 *Sports Exerc.* 2019;51(6):1206-12.
- 228 13. Smirnova E, Leroux A, Cao Q, Tabacu L, Zipunnikov V, Crainiceanu C, et al. The
229 Predictive Performance of Objective Measures of Physical Activity Derived From
230 Accelerometry Data for 5-Year All-Cause Mortality in Older Adults: National Health and
231 Nutritional Examination Survey 2003-2006. *The journals of gerontology Series A, Biological*
232 *sciences and medical sciences.* 2020;75(9):1779-85.
- 233 14. Zhao M, Veeranki SP, Magnussen CG, Xi B. Recommended physical activity and all
234 cause and cause specific mortality in US adults: prospective cohort study. *BMJ (Clinical research*
235 *ed).* 2020;370:m2031.
- 236 15. Lang CE, Barth J, Holleran CL, Konrad JD, Bland MD. Implementation of Wearable
237 Sensing Technology for Movement: Pushing Forward into the Routine Physical Rehabilitation
238 Care Field. *Sensors (Basel).* 2020;20(20).
- 239 16. Chalupsky MR, Craddock KM, Schivo M, Kuhn BT. Remote patient monitoring in the
240 management of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. *J Investig Med.* 2022;70(8):1681-9.
- 241 17. Singh H, Musselman K, Colella TJF, McGilton KS, Iaboni A, Bayley M, et al. Exploring
242 the perspectives of outpatient rehabilitation clinicians on the challenges with monitoring patient
243 health, function and activity in the community. *Disability and rehabilitation.* 2022;44(12):2858-
244 67.

- 245 18. World Health O. Monitoring and evaluating digital health interventions: a practical guide
246 to conducting research and assessment. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2016 2016.
- 247 19. Manteghinejad A, Javanmard SH. Challenges and opportunities of digital health in a
248 post-COVID19 world. *J Res Med Sci*. 2021;26:11.
- 249 20. Simblett S, Greer B, Matcham F, Curtis H, Polhemus A, Ferrão J, et al. Barriers to and
250 Facilitators of Engagement With Remote Measurement Technology for Managing Health:
251 Systematic Review and Content Analysis of Findings. *J Med Internet Res*. 2018;20(7):e10480.
- 252 21. McMahon SK, Lewis B, Oakes M, Guan W, Wyman JF, Rothman AJ. Older Adults'
253 Experiences Using a Commercially Available Monitor to Self-Track Their Physical Activity.
254 *JMIR Mhealth Uhealth*. 2016;4(2):e35.
- 255 22. Mercer K, Giangregorio L, Schneider E, Chilana P, Li M, Grindrod K. Acceptance of
256 Commercially Available Wearable Activity Trackers Among Adults Aged Over 50 and With
257 Chronic Illness: A Mixed-Methods Evaluation. *JMIR Mhealth Uhealth*. 2016;4(1):e7.
- 258 23. Morgan-Jones P, Jones A, Busse M, Mills L, Pallmann P, Drew C, et al. Monitoring and
259 Managing Lifestyle Behaviors Using Wearable Activity Trackers: Mixed Methods Study of
260 Views From the Huntington Disease Community. *JMIR Form Res*. 2022;6(6):e36870.
- 261 24. O'Brien T, Troutman-Jordan M, Hathaway D, Armstrong S, Moore M. Acceptability of
262 wristband activity trackers among community dwelling older adults. *Geriatr Nurs*. 2015;36(2
263 Suppl):S21-5.
- 264 25. Schmidt LI, Jansen CP, Depenbusch J, Gabrian M, Sieverding M, Wahl HW. Using
265 wearables to promote physical activity in old age : Feasibility, benefits, and user friendliness. *Z
266 Gerontol Geriatr*. 2022.

- 267 26. Harris PA, Taylor R, Minor BL, Elliott V, Fernandez M, O'Neal L, et al. The REDCap
268 consortium: Building an international community of software platform partners. *Journal of*
269 *Biomedical Informatics*. 2019;95:103208.
- 270 27. Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, Payne J, Gonzalez N, Conde JG. Research electronic
271 data capture (REDCap)—A metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing
272 translational research informatics support. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics*. 2009;42(2):377-
273 81.
- 274 28. Van Domelen D. *Accelerometry: Functions for Processing Accelerometer Data*. 2018.
- 275 29. Team RC. *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. R Foundation for
276 *Statistical Computing*, Vienna, Austria. 2022.
- 277 30. Alharbi M, Straiton N, Smith S, Neubeck L, Gallagher R. Data management and
278 wearables in older adults: A systematic review. *Maturitas*. 2019;124:100-10.
- 279 31. Block VJ, Lizée A, Crabtree-Hartman E, Bevan CJ, Graves JS, Bove R, et al. Continuous
280 daily assessment of multiple sclerosis disability using remote step count monitoring. *J Neurol*.
281 2017;264(2):316-26.
- 282 32. Hardcastle SJ, Jiménez-Castuera R, Maxwell-Smith C, Bulsara MK, Hince D. Fitbit
283 wear-time and patterns of activity in cancer survivors throughout a physical activity intervention
284 and follow-up: Exploratory analysis from a randomised controlled trial. *PloS one*.
285 2020;15(10):e0240967.
- 286 33. Katzan I, Schuster A, Kinzy T. Physical Activity Monitoring Using a Fitbit Device in
287 Ischemic Stroke Patients: Prospective Cohort Feasibility Study. *JMIR Mhealth Uhealth*.
288 2021;9(1):e14494.

289 34. Kelly R, Jones S, Price B, Katz D, McCormick C, Pearce O. Measuring Daily
290 Compliance With Physical Activity Tracking in Ambulatory Surgery Patients: Comparative
291 Analysis of Five Compliance Criteria. JMIR Mhealth Uhealth. 2021;9(1):e22846.

292

293

294 **Figure Legends**

295

296 **Figure 1.** Consort diagram for the MANUAL and APP groups. Group assignment was based on
297 time of enrollment.

298

299 **Figure 2.** Adherence as measured by Wear Time in the MANUAL and APP groups during the
300 full 28-day period (A) and during each week of the 28-day period (B).

301 **Table 1. Demographic information.**

Characteristic	Excluded^a N = 41	Included^a N = 135	p-value^b	Manual^a N = 62	App^a N = 73	p-value^b
Age	63 (13)	64 (11)	0.7	66 (9)	63 (12)	0.12
Race			0.8			<0.001
White	23 (56.1%)	80 (59%)		48 (77.4%)	32 (43.8%)	
Black	16 (39%)	45 (33%)		13 (21%)	32 (43.8%)	
Other	2 (4.9%)	10 (7.4%)		1 (1.6%)	9 (12.3%)	
Sex: Female	28 (68.3%)	64 (47.4%)	0.019	31 (50%)	33 (45.2%)	0.6
Ethnicity			0.3			0.2
Hispanic	2 (4.9%)	2 (1.5%)		0 (0%)	2 (2.7%)	
Not Hispanic	39 (95.1%)	133 (98.5%)		62 (100%)	71 (97.3%)	

^a Mean (SD); n (%)

^b Wilcoxon rank sum test; Fisher's exact test; Pearson's Chi-squared test

303 **Table 2. Diagnosis specific clinical information.**

Characteristic	Excluded^a	Included^a	p-value^b	Manual^a	App^a	p-value^b
Stroke						
N	20	77		9	68	
Time since stroke (mo)	8 (16)	30 (51)	0.02	42 (74)	28 (48)	0.5
Affected side: Left	6 (30%)	45 (58.4%)	0.02	5 (56%)	40 (59%)	>0.9
Assistive Device			>0.9			>0.9
None	12 (60%)	44 (57%)		5 (56%)	39 (57%)	
Cane	6 (30%)	24 (31%)		3 (33%)	21 (31%)	
Walker	2 (10%)	9 (12%)		1 (11%)	8 (12%)	
COPD						
N	21	58		53	5	
History of Smoking: Yes	20 (95%)	55 (95%)	>0.99	50 (94%)	5 (100%)	>0.99
FEV1 % predicted	61 (21)	52 (20)	0.2	52 (20)	55 (48)	0.9
FEV1/FVC ratio	63 (15)	57 (14)	0.12	58 (13)	48 (12)	0.12
Hospitalization during year prior to enrollment: Yes	17 (81%)	46 (79%)	>0.99	41 (77%)	5 (100%)	0.6

^aMean (SD); n (%)

^bWilcoxon rank sum test; Fisher's exact test; Pearson's Chi-squared test

305 **Table 3.** Resource utilization without and with the RRMA.

	Time (minutes per participant month) ^a			Money (US dollars per participant month) ^a		
	Without RRMA	With RRMA	Resources saved	Without RRMA	With RRMA	Resources saved
Data Extraction	58	1 ^b	57	23.20	0.04 ^b	23.16
Adherence Screens	58	0	58	23.20	0	23.40
Synchronization Reminders^c	9.8	1	8.8	3.92	0.04	3.88
Total Cost	125.8	2	123.8	50.32	0.08	50.24



306 Abbreviations: RRMA- Rehabilitation remote monitoring application.

307 ^a 28 days was considered one month

308 ^b Reflects the need to manually link the participant's Fitbit account to the RRMA. This time is
309 only needed during the first month of enrollment.

310 ^c Estimates of time and money needed to provide reminders without the RRMA are based on the
311 average number of all reminders (i.e., 5-, 12-, and 19-day) needed per participant month. With
312 the RRMA, the 5- and 12-day reminders are provided via email or text; thus, only the 19-day
313 reminders are considered in the condition with the RRMA.

314

A**Wear Time by Group****B****Wear Time by Week and Group**

■ MANUAL (n= 62) ■ APP (n= 73)

