

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) .

Use it or lose it: A four-year follow-up to assess whether engagement with physical activity close to one's physical capacity may protect against decline in physical functioning among older adults

Antti Löppönen<sup>1</sup>, PhD

Katja Lindeman<sup>1</sup>, MSc

Lotta Palmberg<sup>1,2,3</sup>, PhD

Evelien Van Roie<sup>4,5</sup>, PhD

Christophe Delecluse<sup>4</sup>, PhD

Erja Portegijs<sup>6</sup>, PhD

Taina Rantanen<sup>1</sup>, PhD

Timo Rantalainen\*<sup>1</sup>, PhD

Laura Karavirta\*<sup>1</sup>, PhD

<sup>1</sup> Faculty of Sport and Health Sciences and Gerontology Research Center, University of Jyväskylä, Jyväskylä, Finland

<sup>2</sup> Department of Public Health, University of Turku, Finland

<sup>3</sup> Turku University Hospital, Turku, Finland, Centre for Population Health Research, University of Turku and Turku University Hospital, Turku, Finland

<sup>4</sup> Department of Movement Sciences, Physical Activity, Sports and Health Research Group, KU Leuven, Leuven, Belgium

<sup>5</sup> Faculty of Rehabilitation Sciences, REVAL-Rehabilitation Research Center, University of Hasselt, Diepenbeek, Belgium

<sup>6</sup> University of Groningen, University Medical Center Groningen, Center of Human Movement Sciences, Groningen, the Netherlands

\*TiR and LK contributed to this work equally.

### Corresponding author

Antti Löppönen, PO Box 35, FI-40014, Jyväskylä, Finland

+358406201771, [antti.ej.lopponen@jyu.fi](mailto:antti.ej.lopponen@jyu.fi)

1 **ABSTRACT**

2 **PURPOSE:** Physical activity (PA) is distinct from physical capacity (PC), even though they  
3 are correlated in old age. PC defines the limits for PA, while activities in daily life typically  
4 remain submaximal. Individuals whose intensity of daily activities is close to physical capacity  
5 may be better protected from future decline in physical function compared to those who do not,  
6 although prospective research to support this hypothesis is lacking. Therefore, this study  
7 compared changes in physical function over a four-year follow-up between community-  
8 dwelling older adults categorized based on their combined baseline PC and PA.

9  
10 **METHODS:** This was a four-year longitudinal follow-up study of older adults aged 75-85  
11 years at baseline (N = 312, 60% women). Baseline PC was determined based on 5-second Mean  
12 Amplitude Deviation (MAD) epoch value during the maximal 10-meter walking test, and PA  
13 was determined based on the peak 75-minutes MAD intensity threshold from thigh-worn  
14 accelerometer monitoring over 3-7 days. Baseline values of PA and PC were categorized into  
15 lowPC-lowPA, lowPC-highPA, highPC-lowPA, and highPC-highPA profiles. Physical  
16 function was evaluated using the Short Physical Performance Battery (SPPB) at baseline and  
17 at the follow-up, with total score and 5 x Sit-To-Stand (5xSTS) test time as the primary  
18 outcomes. Nonparametric tests and generalized estimating equations were used for analyses.

19  
20 **RESULTS:** From baseline to follow-up, statistically significant changes in the SPPB total  
21 score and 5xSTS test time were observed in all profiles ( $p < 0.05$ ) except the low PC-high PA  
22 profile. Over the follow-up period, the decrease was greater for low versus high PA profiles  
23 within both PC profiles for SPPB total score (high PC: B -0.61, SE 0.24, 95% CI -1.08, -0.15;  
24 low PC: B -0.96, SE 0.35, 95% CI -1.62, -0.32), but not for 5xSTS time. No statistically  
25 significant difference was observed in the change in 5xSTS test time between the low and high  
26 PA profiles for either PC profile.

27  
28 **CONCLUSIONS:** The findings suggest that engaging in demanding PA regardless of baseline  
29 PC may help to protect against a decline in physical functioning in old age. Consequently, older  
30 adults should be encouraged to engage in physically demanding activities that could potentially  
31 enhance their functional capacity.

32  
33 **Keywords:** device-based, mobility limitation, free-living activities, walking test

## 34 INTRODUCTION

35 Physical functioning has been identified as an important factor that enables independent living  
36 among older adults [1]. The most effective way to maintain physical functioning is through  
37 diverse and sufficiently challenging physical activity and exercise, which should also include  
38 activities tailored to the individual's capabilities [2]. However, multiple internal and external  
39 factors, such as ability to walk and social support, affect physical behaviour resulting in  
40 considerable variation in daily physical activity between older adults [3,4].

41  
42 Physical activity has been presented as a distinct construct from physical capacity [5–11].  
43 Although physical capacity correlates with physical activity, both entail a distinct construct.  
44 Physical capacity primarily defines the limits of physical activity rather than ensuring that  
45 individuals use their full capacity in daily life [10,11]. Based on locomotory system  
46 mechanobiology (i.e., disuse causes locomotory system atrophy, increased use hypertrophy  
47 [12]) one would expect functional capacity to be lost if full capacity is seldom utilised, i.e., the  
48 use it or lose it - principle. This demarcation between activity and capacity and the associated  
49 use-dependent adaptations have been operationalized in the physical capacity-physical activity  
50 (PC-PA) concept proposed by Koolen et al. and Orme et al. which categorizes individuals into  
51 four profiles: low PC - low PA ("cannot do – does not do"), low PC - high PA ("cannot do,  
52 does do"), high PC - low PA ("can do, does not do") and high PC - high PA ("can do, does  
53 do") [13,14].

54  
55 To our knowledge, no studies have focused on PC-PA profiles in older adults in a longitudinal  
56 setting, which allows prediction of future conditions based on the profiles. Additionally, the  
57 methods used to determine PC and PA have not been "apples-to-apples" comparisons. Rather,  
58 the operationalization has been, e.g., PC determined by walking distance or the Timed Up and  
59 Go (TUG) compared with PA estimated by daily step counts [13,15]. Orme and colleagues  
60 introduced in their technical note that PC-PA profiles can be created by instrumenting a  
61 walking test and free-living PA with an accelerometer [14], thereby ensuring a direct "apples-  
62 to-apples" comparison of the intensity of PC and PA using acceleration. We propose addressing  
63 PA and PC intensities from free-living and standardized testing, respectively, using 5-second  
64 Mean Amplitude Deviation (MAD) epochs [16]. This approach allows for the examination of  
65 the PA intensity distribution, which can be used to determine the vigorous MAD intensity  
66 threshold - the MAD value that corresponds to the 75 minutes per week of physical activity  
67 recommended by the World Health Organization (WHO) [17]. As such, it is well-suited for

68 defining 'does do, does not do' in PA. This is meaningfully comparable to PC, which was  
69 defined as the MAD during a 10-meter walking test [18].

70

71 So far, there are no prospective studies shedding light on whether older people who approach  
72 their capacity in free-living activities are better protected against future decline in physical  
73 function. Therefore, the aim of this study was to compare changes in physical function over  
74 four years between community-dwelling older adults categorized on the basis of their baseline  
75 PC and PA. We hypothesized that those older adults who were physically active close to their  
76 physical capacity would experience a slower decline in physical function.

77

## 78 **METHODS**

### 79 **Participants and design**

80 The data for this observational study were drawn from data collected in the AGNES study  
81 (Active Aging - Resilience and external support as modifiers of the disablement outcome;  
82  $n = 1\,021$ ), which was conducted at the Gerontology Research Center, University of Jyväskylä  
83 [19]. The AGNES study comprises three age cohorts (75, 80, and 85 years of age) of people  
84 living independently in the city of Jyväskylä, in Central Finland. The baseline data were  
85 collected in 2017-2018 and the 4-year follow-up measurements were carried out in 2021-2022.  
86 The Ethical Committee of the Central Finland Health Care District provided an ethical  
87 statement on the research plan and protocol of the AGNES baseline (August 23, 2017) and  
88 follow-up study (September 8, 2021). The study was executed in accordance with the principles  
89 of the Declaration of Helsinki and all participants gave written informed consent.

90

91 Baseline recruitment was drawn as a random sample from postcode areas in Jyväskylä, Finland,  
92 using the registers of the Digital and Population Data Services Agency in Finland. Baseline  
93 inclusion criteria were age and residence in the study area, willingness to participate and the  
94 ability to communicate [19]. After exclusions, 1021 individuals participated in the study, of  
95 whom 432 wore a tri-axial accelerometer for 3 to 7 consecutive days and participated in the  
96 10-meter walking test with an accelerometer, forming a baseline sample for this study. Of the  
97 older adults included in the baseline sample, 26 were deceased, 6 could not be reached, 77 were  
98 not interested or not applicable, and 11 had not completed the Short Physical Performance  
99 Battery (SPPB) at the time of the follow-up, resulting in a final follow-up sample of 312  
100 participants. All of these participants had at least 3 days of successful accelerometer recording

101 and completed the maximal 10-meter walking test at baseline, and also participated in the 4-  
102 year follow-up home interview with the SPPB test.

103


#### 104 **Determination of PC-PA profiles**

105 At baseline, a research assistant visited the participant's home, conducted a face-to-face  
106 interview, and placed an accelerometer on the participant's thigh using a waterproof film.  
107 Participants wore the accelerometer continuously (24 hours a day) for 3 to 7 consecutive days  
108 (Figure 1). Subsequently, participants arrived in the laboratory and participated in a  
109 comprehensive health and physical function assessment protocol, which included a maximal  
110 10-meter walking test.

111

112 The study employed a UKK RM42 tri-axial accelerometer (13-bit analog-to-digital conversion,  
113 acceleration range  $\pm 16$  g, UKK Terveyspalvelut Oy, Tampere, Finland). The accelerometer  
114 sampling rate was set at 100 samples per second, with acceleration recorded in gravity units.  
115 From the data collected by the accelerometer, the mean amplitude deviation ( $MAD = 1/n * \sum$   
116  $|r_k - r|$ ) of each 24-hour period was calculated based on the vector magnitude (Euclidian norm)  
117 of the resultant acceleration ( $\sqrt{x^2+y^2+z^2}$ ) in non-overlapping 5-second epochs, following the  
118 methodology outlined in previous reports [16,20].

119



120

121 Figure 1. Timeline of study protocol and typical occurrence of 5-second MAD epochs.

122

123 *Laboratory-based assessment of physical capacity (PC) and determination of 'Can do' and*  
124 *'Cannot do' groups.* Physical capacity (PC) was determined based on the mean amplitude  
125 deviation (MAD) epoch during the maximal 10-meter walking test [21,22] (Figure 2A). The  
126 test was conducted in a research laboratory walking track, with a total distance of 20 meters  
127 reserved for the test. The test area consisted of a 5-meter acceleration phase, a 10-meter test  
128 distance and a 5-meter deceleration phase. During the maximal 10-meter walking test,  
129 participants were instructed to walk safely from the starting point to the end point at their  
130 maximum walking speed. The MAD value during the test was manually extracted from the  
131 data by visually following the test protocol in the data. The MAD value during 10-meter

132 walking test was strongly correlated with maximum walking speed of same test in this dataset  
133 ( $n = 432$ ,  $r = 0.72$ ,  $p < .001$ ).

134

135 To the best of the authors' knowledge, there are no thresholds for the MAD value during the  
136 maximal 10-meter walking test for this age group (75-85 years), based on which capacity can  
137 be classified as non-limited and limited physical functioning [23]. Therefore, in this study, the  
138 thresholds for the MAD value during 10-meter walking test were determined separately for  
139 men and women using Receiver Operating Characteristics (ROC) in classifying the dataset into  
140 high ( $SPPB \geq 10$ ) and low ( $SPPB < 10$ ) physical functioning [24]. For men, a cut-point of 0.73  
141 G was determined with moderate accuracy (specificity 70%, sensitivity 66%, AUC 0.76), and  
142 similarly, for women, the cut-point was 0.59 G (specificity 68%, sensitivity 76%, AUC 0.73).  
143 More detailed analysis can be found in Supplementary File 1.


144

145 *Physical activity (PA) assessment and the determination of 'Does do' and 'Does not do' groups.*  
146 The 'Does do' and 'Does not do' groups were defined throughout the entire free-living  
147 monitoring period (aggregating full 24-hour measurement days) using the 5-second MAD  
148 epoch distribution (intensity profile), which describes the dispersion of activity intensities. The  
149 highest part of the distribution represents the highest attained intensity [25] (Figure 2A). The  
150 peak 75-min MAD intensity threshold of the 5-second MAD epoch distribution was determined  
151 to represent the threshold for 75 minutes per week (10.7 minutes per day). This threshold  
152 represents the 99.3rd percentile of the activity intensity distribution. It indicates that the activity  
153 intensity exceeds this level only 0.7% of the time each day, which equates to 10.7 minutes out  
154 of the total 1440 minutes in a day. The 'Does do' and 'Does not do' groups were defined via a  
155 data-driven approach by dividing the vigorous MAD intensity threshold into two equally sized  
156 groups separately for men and women (Figure 2B).

157

158 *Generation of PC-PA profiles.* Finally, the PC and PA categories were combined to create four  
159 profiles: LL = low PC – low PA (“cannot do – does not do”); LH = low PC – high PA (“cannot  
160 do, does do”); HL = high PC – low PA (“can do, does not do”); and HH = high PC – high PA  
161 (“can do, does do”) following the approach presented by Koolen et al. and Orme et al. [13,14]  
162 (Figure 2B).

163



164

165

**Figure 2. A.** Specification of the variables used for PC-PA profiling. **B.** Generating PC-PA profiles using the MAD value during the 10-meter walking test and the peak 75-minutes MAD intensity threshold.

166

### 167 Lower extremity functioning as a follow-up outcome

168

169

For the longitudinal analyses, lower extremity functioning was assessed at baseline and follow-up in the participants' homes using the Short Physical Performance Battery (SPPB). The SPPB comprised tests of standing balance, walking speed over a 3-meter distance, and the five-times-sit-to-stand (5xSTS) test [26,27]. In this study, we used the SPPB total score (maximum of 12 points, with higher scores indicating better lower extremity functioning) and the time in seconds of the 5xSTS test as outcomes.

170

171

172

173

174

175

## 176 **Descriptive Characteristics and Other Measurements**

177 Age and sex were obtained from the population register and cognitive function was assessed  
178 using standardized procedures (Mini-Mental State Examination, MMSE [28]).

179 *Walking difficulties* over distances of 500 meters and 2 kilometres were  
180 investigated by asking the participants, "Do you have difficulty walking 2 kilometres / 500  
181 meters?" The response options included: 1) able to manage without difficulty, 2) able to  
182 manage with some difficulty, 3) able to manage with a great deal of difficulty, 4) able to  
183 manage only with the help of another person, and 5) unable to manage even with help. In this  
184 study, response options 2-5 were grouped into the category "I have walking difficulties," with  
185 response option 1 indicating "I do not have walking difficulties" [29,30].

186 *Self-reported health status* was assessed with the question: "How would you rate  
187 your current overall health?" The response options were: "1. excellent", "2. good", "3. fair", "4.  
188 poor", "5. very poor". For the analysis, response options 1 and 2 were categorized as "good  
189 perceived health" and response options 3-5 were combined into the category "limited perceived  
190 health". *The perceived ability to perform desired activities* from the perspective of health was  
191 assessed with the question: "To what extent has your health or physical ability prevented you  
192 from doing the things you wanted to do in the past 4 weeks?" The response options were: "1.  
193 not at all", "2. a little", "3. somewhat", "4. a lot", "5. extremely." For the analysis, response  
194 option 1 was categorized as "my health does not prevent me from doing things I want" and  
195 response options 2-5 were combined into the category "my health prevents me from doing  
196 things I want" [31].

197 *Maximal isometric knee extension strength* was assessed in the laboratory (at a  
198 knee angle of 60 degrees from the fully extended leg to flexion) of the dominant leg in a seated  
199 position using an adjustable dynamometer chair (Metitur LTD, Jyväskylä, Finland). At least  
200 three attempts were required, and the highest force (N) was chosen for the analysis [32].

201 *Maximal isometric handgrip strength* was measured on the dominant side with a hand-held  
202 adjustable dynamometer (Jamar Plus digital hand dynamometer, Patterson Medical, 6  
203 Cedarburg, WI, USA) and expressed in kg [33].

204

## 205 **Statistical analyses**

206 Baseline comparisons between the different profiles were made across the entire sample of 432  
207 older adults. Baseline descriptive data are presented as means and standard deviations (SD) for  
208 continuous variables and relative frequencies (%) for dichotomous variables. Differences in  
209 baseline characteristics between PC-PA profiles were tested by independent samples Kruskal-



210 Wallis test for continuous variables and by Chi-square test for dichotomous variables. Pairwise  
211 comparisons between profiles were Bonferroni-corrected.

212

213 Changes over four years in SPPB scores and 5xSTS test time were examined for a longitudinal  
214 sample (n = 312) who had data from both baseline and follow-up measurements. The Wilcoxon  
215 signed rank test for related samples was used to analyze changes within the different PC-PA  
216 profiles in the total SPPB score and in the 5xSTS test time. Generalized estimating equations  
217 (GEE) [34] with a linear link function and unstructured working correlation matrix were used  
218 to determine whether the SPPB total score and the 5xSTS test time (group effect) and their  
219 change over time (group by time interaction) differed between low and high PA profiles.  
220 Analyses were performed separately for low PC and high PC profiles. All GEE models were  
221 adjusted for sex, age cohort, perceived health status, days included in the accelerometry  
222 analysis and 10m MAD. Population-averaged coefficients (B), standard errors (SE), and 95%  
223 confidence intervals are reported. Statistical significance was set at  $p < 0.05$ , and statistical  
224 analyses were performed using the SPSS statistical software package (IBM Corp. Released  
225 2021. IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, version 28.0. Armonk, NY: IBM Corp.) [35]. Figures  
226 were generated in the “R” statistical environment (version 4.3.1) [36].

227

## 228 RESULTS

229 *Baseline characteristics of the generated PC-PA profiles.*

230 The descriptive baseline characteristics of the PC-PA profiles for the entire sample of 432 older  
231 adults are presented in Table 1. According to the baseline characteristics, the low PC profiles  
232 differed from each other in terms of 10-meter walking speed, SPPB total score, self-reported  
233 walking difficulty at 500 m and 2 km distances, self-reported health status and self-reported  
234 limited ability to perform desired activities. The high PC profiles differed from each other in  
235 terms of age and self-reported walking difficulty in 500 m and 2 km distances (Table 1).

236


237 Table 1. Baseline characteristics according to the PC-PA profiles (n = 432)

Group	LL low PC- low PA (n = 108)	LH low PC- high PA (n = 53)	HL high PC- low PA (n = 108)	HH high PC- high PA (n = 163)	p-value
Women	58 %	49 %	61 %	63 %	.321 ^
Age	79.1 (3.9)	77.6 (3.2)	78.9 (3.3)	77.6 (3.1)	.001 * LL-HH, HL-HH
MMSE	27.2 (2.6)	26.9 (2.6)	27.4 (2.2)	28.0 (1.9)	.005 * LH-HH
Leg strength [N]	302 (109)	345 (110)	348 (108)	372 (110)	<.001 * LL-HL, LL-HH

Grip strenght [kg]	30.3 (10.7)	34.2 (12.4)	32.4 (10.5)	33.3 (10.7)	.076 *
10-meter maximal walking speed [m/s]	1.44 (0.29)	1.75 (0.26)	1.90 (0.33)	2.00 (0.32)	<.001 * LL-LH, LL-HL, LL-HH, LH-HH
5xSTS time [s]	14.3 (4.3)	12.8 (3.6)	11.4 (3.2)	11.7 (2.9)	<.001 * LL-HL, LL-HH
SPPB total score	9.4 (2.1)	10.2 (1.8)	10.9 (1.3)	11.0 (1.2)	<.001 * LL-LH, LL-HL, LL-HH
SR walk difficulty 500 m	36 %	9 %	16 %	3 %	<.001 ^ LL-LH, LL-HL, LL-HH, HL-HH
SR walk difficulty 2 km	54 %	15 %	27 %	7 %	<.001 ^ LL-LH, LL-HL, LL-HH
SR health status is weak	71 %	40 %	42 %	37 %	<.001 ^ LL-LH, LL-HL, LL-HH
SR limited ability to perform desired activities	61 %	25 %	37 %	23 %	<.001 ^ LL-LH, LL-HL, LL-HH

238 *Note.* MMSE = Mini-Mental State Examination, STS = sit-to-stand transitions, SPPB= Short Physical  
 239 Performance Battery, SR = self-reported/rated, ^ Chi-square test and pairwise comparison with Bonferroni  
 240 correction, \* Independent-samples Kruskal-Wallis test and pairwise comparison with Bonferroni correction.  
 241

242 Figure 3 shows the baseline intensity distribution of PC-PA profiles together with their MAD  
 243 values during the laboratory-based 10-meter maximal walking test (highlighted in orange) and  
 244 the distribution of MAD values, including their vigorous MAD intensity threshold (shown in  
 245 black), for free-living 5-second MAD epochs. According to the figure, the capacity of the HL  
 246 (high PC-low PA) and HH (high PC-high PA) groups does not differ statistically (confidence  
 247 intervals do not overlap), whereas the physical activity differs significantly between these  
 248 groups.



249  
 250 **Figure 3.** Distribution of the different PC-PA profiles according to the MAD value during the  
 251 10-meter walking test (highlighted in orange) and the peak 75-minutes MAD intensity  
 252 threshold (99.3rd percentile) (shown in black).  
 253

254 *Changes in the SPPB total score and the 5xSTS time in a four-year follow-up*

255 A longitudinal sample (n = 312) of those who participated in both baseline and follow-up  
 256 measurements was used to examine the difference in change in the SPPB total score and the  
 257 5xSTS time within and between the different profiles over four years of follow-up. During  
 258 follow-up, the total SPPB score decreased by at least 2 points in 43% of participants in the low  
 259 PC - low PA profile, 18% of participants in the low PC - high PA profile, 29% of participants  
 260 in the high PC - low PA profile, and 15% of participants in the high PC – high PA profile. The  
 261 change in the SPPB total score and the 5xSTS test time within the different PC-PA profiles is  
 262 shown in Table 2. From baseline to follow-up, statistically significant changes in SPPB total  
 263 score and 5xSTS test time were observed in all other profile than in the low PC – high PA  
 264 profile.

265

266 Table 2. Changes within the different PC-PA profiles in SPPB total score and 5xSTS test  
 267 time over four years of follow-up (n = 312)

	<b>LL</b> <b>low PC-</b> <b>low PA</b> <b>(n = 65)</b>	<b>LH</b> <b>low PC-</b> <b>high PA</b> <b>(n = 39)</b>	<b>HL</b> <b>high PC-</b> <b>low PA</b> <b>(n = 86)</b>	<b>HH</b> <b>high PC-</b> <b>high PA</b> <b>(n = 122)</b>
	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)
BL SPPB total score	9.7 (2.0)	10.5 (1.7)	11.0 (1.3)	10.9 (1.2)
FU SPPB total score	8.3 (2.7)	10.1 (1.7)	10.1 (2.2)	10.6 (1.5)
SPPB total score difference	-1.4 (2.0)	-0.4 (1.6)	-0.9 (1.9)	-0.3 (1.4)
<i>*p-value</i>	<b>&lt;.001</b>	.059	<b>&lt;.001</b>	<b>.013</b>
	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)
BL 5xSTS test time [s]	13.6 (3.8)	12.3 (3.3)	11.2 (2.8)	11.7 (3.0)
FU 5xSTS test time [s]	15.7 (4.8)	13.1 (3.3)	12.8 (4.3)	12.3 (3.4)
5xSTS test time difference [s]	+2.0 (5.0)	+0.7 (3.2)	+1.6 (4.1)	+0.6 (3.2)
<i>*p-value</i>	<b>.002</b>	.137	<b>.005</b>	<b>.033</b>

268 *Note.* BL = baseline 2017-2018; FU = follow-up 2021-2022; SPPB = Short Physical Performance Battery;  
 269 5xSTS = five-times-sit-to-stand test. \* Wilcoxon signed rank test for related samples

270

271 The results of the covariate-adjusted GEE models between high and low PA profiles,  
 272 separately for low and high PC profiles, are presented in Table 3. Baseline level of the SPPB  
 273 total score or 5xSTS test time did not differ between low and high PA profiles in either PC  
 274 profile. Over the follow-up, the decrease in SPPB total score was greater for low PA profiles  
 275 compared to high PA profiles in both PC profiles (high PC: p = 0.010, low PC: p = 0.006). For  
 276 the 5xSTS test, the difference in change in test time between the low and high PA profiles did  
 277 not reach statistical significance for either PC profile (high PC: p = 0.058, low PC: p = 0.107).

278

279 Table 3. GEE model estimates for group effect and group-by-time interactions for SPPB total  
280 score and 5xSTS test time (n = 312).

	SPPB total score				5xSTS test time			
	Group effect		Group * Time		Group effect		Group * Time	
	B (SE)	95% CI	B (SE)	95% CI	B (SE)	95% CI	B (SE)	95% CI
<b>HH</b>	Ref.				Ref.			
<b>HL</b>	-0.07 (0.17)	-0.41, 0.27	<b>-0.61 (0.24)</b>	<b>-1.08, -0.15</b>	-0.30 (0.38)	-1.03, 0.43	1.0 (0.53)	-0.04, 2.03
<b>LH</b>	Ref.				Ref.			
<b>LL</b>	-0.17 (0.35)	-0.87, 0.52	<b>-0.96 (0.35)</b>	<b>-1.62, -0.32</b>	0.10 (0.65)	-1.18, 1.38	1.30 (0.81)	-0.28, 2.88

281 *Note.* SPPB = Short Physical Performance Battery; 5xSTS test = five-times-sit-to-stand test; B = the population-  
282 averaged coefficient; SE = standard error; 95% CI = 95% confidence interval; HH = high PC - high PA; HL =  
283 high PC - low PA; LH = low PC - high PA; LL = low PC - low PA. All GEE models are adjusted for sex, age,  
284 self-reported health status, 10m MAD and days included in accelerometer analysis. Bold font indicates statistical  
285 significance (p < 0.05).  
286

## 287 DISCUSSION

288 To increase our understanding of the effects of challenging one's abilities for maintaining  
289 physical functioning in old age, this study compared changes in physical function over 4-year  
290 follow-up among community-dwelling older adults categorized based on their baseline  
291 physical capacity and physical activity. The changes observed from the baseline to the follow-  
292 up within the different profiles demonstrated a statistically significant change in the SPPB total  
293 score and 5xSTS test time in all profiles, with the exception of the low PC-high PA profile.  
294 Over the follow-up period, the decrease in the SPPB total score was deeper for low compared  
295 to high PA profiles in both PC profiles. However, no statistically significant difference was  
296 observed in the change in 5xSTS test time between the low and high PA profiles for either PC  
297 profile. Based on the changes within the profiles, our results suggest that ageing reduces lower  
298 extremity function in older adults regardless of their physical capacity or intensity of physical  
299 activity, but by challenging themselves to be active close to their capacity, it is possible to slow  
300 the decline in lower extremity function. Our results also suggest that older adults who already  
301 have limitations in physical function can maintain their level of functioning through physical  
302 activity.

303

304 In this study, the groups were formed based on the profiling presented by Koolen and  
305 colleagues [13]. The lower capacity groups showed statistically significant differences in terms  
306 of walking speed, 5xSTS test time, and maximum knee extension strength in the descriptive

307 data. However, in the two higher capacity groups, no statistical differences were observed in  
308 functional ability and capacity variables. The descriptive profiles are consistent with the  
309 findings of Adams and colleagues [15], where the timed “up and go” (TUG) test, used as a  
310 basis for capacity assessment, showed differences among the lower capacity groups, unlike in  
311 the higher capacity groups. To better understand the decline in functional capacity from the  
312 perspective of the "use it or lose it" principle [37], this study focused particularly on the  
313 intensity profile of daily activities. The 5-second MAD epochs provided a valuable method for  
314 capturing wide variety of intensities intensity, although the epoch length may not fully account  
315 for the most intense activities, such as jumps. Nonetheless, they offer sufficient representation,  
316 and compared to 1-second epochs, they avoid capturing brief impacts that do not reflect actual  
317 activity patterns. Significant changes in detecting higher intensities are observed with epochs  
318 of 10 seconds or longer [38,39].

319

320 This study was not specifically designed to investigate why some individuals utilize their  
321 capacity while others do not. However, previous research suggests that walking is one of the  
322 most popular forms of physical activity among older adults [40]. Brisk walking and other  
323 hobbies including high-intensity activities (ball games, jogging, aerobic exercise), may help  
324 explain why participants in the high physical activity (PA) profiles accumulated more activity  
325 closer to their capacity compared to those in the low PA profiles. It can therefore be assumed  
326 that sports activities play a significant role in explaining why some people consistently engage  
327 in activities that approach in terms of intensity their physical capacity. However, this is  
328 undoubtedly related to psychological and environmental factors and personal preferences [41–  
329 44]. Investigating these factors in the future is crucial for targeting interventions to increase  
330 physical activity. Additionally, based on this study, it can be inferred that even if physical  
331 capacity is already reduced, it is important to approach it habitually in order to maintain or at  
332 least slow down the decline in physical function. Obviously, safety should be considered to  
333 prevent adverse events, such as falls, or other medical emergencies potentially associated with  
334 vigorous activity.

335

336 When evaluating the results of the study, several limitations and strengths need to be  
337 considered. In this study, PC-PA profiles were constructed based on previously proposed  
338 categorization methods using a data-driven approach. A weakness of this approach is the  
339 potential loss of information due to grouping, as grouping inherently involves some loss of  
340 detail. However, characterizing the data within PC-PA classes can offer useful insights for

341 more tailored and individualized physical activity promotion within this population. This study  
342 aims to address the well-known limitation that accelerometers cannot detect activities like  
343 swimming, cycling, carrying a child, walking uphill, or carrying a load [45] by examining the  
344 intensity distribution across all 5-second MAD bouts (Figure 2), which provides a broader  
345 understanding of activity patterns. The strength of the study lies in sufficient sample size of  
346 independently living older adults and its longitudinal design. Furthermore, the study benefits  
347 from the continuous device-based measurement of physical behaviour for multiple days [46,47]  
348 and employing a like-for-like capacity and free-living physical behaviour assessment.

349

## 350 **CONCLUSIONS**

351 The findings suggest that engaging in PA close to one's PC may help to protect against decline  
352 in physical functioning in older adults. Therefore, older adults should be encouraged to  
353 participate in physically demanding activities that could potentially maintain physical function.

## **Conflict of interest statement**

None declared.

## **Acknowledgements**

We thank the whole AGNES research team, especially Eeva-Maija Palonen and Niina Kajan and, all research assistants for their work in the data collection and analyses and all participants of the AGNES study for their time and effort. The authors wish to acknowledge CSC—IT Center for Science, Finland, for computational re-sources. The Gerontology Research Center is a joint effort between the University of Jyväskylä and the University of Tampere. The content of this article does not reflect the official opinion of the European Union. Responsibility for the information and views expressed in the article lies entirely with the author(s).

## **Author Contributions**

Conceptualization, A.L., K.L., L.P., E.P., T.R., Ti.R., L.K.; methodology, A.L., K.L., L.P., E.P., T.R., Ti.R., L.K.; formal analysis, A.L. and Ti.R.; writing—original draft preparation, A.L, K.L.; writing—review and editing, A.L., L.K., L.P., E.P., T.R., C.D., E.V.R. and Ti.R.; supervision, C.D., E.V.R. and Ti.R., L.K.; All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

## **Funding**

This study was funded by the Juho Vainio Foundation in Finland (Grant to A.L.) and Finnish Cultural Foundation (Grant to A.L.). The AGNES-study was financially supported by an Advanced Grant from the European Research Council (Grant 693045 to T.R.), the Academy of Finland (Grant 310526 to T.R.). This work was furthermore supported by the Academy Research Fellow (The Academy of Finland grant numbers 321336, 328818 and 352653 to Ti.R.) and Academy of Finland (The Academy of Finland grant numbers 339391 and 346462 to L.K.), the Finnish Ministry of Education and Culture (Grant to E.P.).

## **Data Availability Statement**

After completion of the study, data will be stored at the Finnish Social Science Data Archive without potential identifiers (open access). Until then, pseudonymized datasets are available to external collaborators subject to agreement on the terms of data use and publication of results. To request the data, please contact Professor Taina Rantanen ([taina.rantanen@jyu.fi](mailto:taina.rantanen@jyu.fi)).

## REFERENCES

1. Landi F, Calvani R, Tosato M, Martone AM, Fusco D, Sisto A, et al. Age-Related Variations of Muscle Mass, Strength, and Physical Performance in Community-Dwellers: Results From the Milan EXPO Survey. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2021;18:88.e17-88.e24.
2. Valenzuela PL, Saco-Ledo G, Morales JS, Gallardo-Gómez D, Morales-Palomo F, López-Ortiz S, et al. Effects of physical exercise on physical function in older adults in residential care: a systematic review and network meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials. *The Lancet Healthy Longevity*. 2023;4:e247–56.
3. Koeneman MA, Verheijden MW, Chinapaw MJM, Hopman-Rock M. Determinants of physical activity and exercise in healthy older adults: A systematic review. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*. 2011;8:142.
4. D'Amore C, Saunders S, Bhatnagar N, Griffith LE, Richardson J, Beauchamp MK. Determinants of physical activity in community-dwelling older adults: an umbrella review. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*. 2023;20:135.
5. Richards EA, Christ SL, Rietdyk S, Teas E, Franks MM. Association of Physical Activity and Gait Speed: Does Context Matter? *American Journal of Lifestyle Medicine*. 2023;15598276231157311.
6. Leblanc A, Pescatello LS, Taylor BA, Capizzi JA, Clarkson PM, Michael White C, et al. Relationships between physical activity and muscular strength among healthy adults across the lifespan. *Springerplus*. 2015;4:557.
7. Rostron ZP, Green RA, Kingsley M, Zacharias A. Associations Between Measures of Physical Activity and Muscle Size and Strength: A Systematic Review. *Arch Rehabil Res Clin Transl*. 2021;3:100124.
8. Reijnierse EM, Geelen SJG, van der Schaaf M, Visser B, Wüst RCI, Pijnappels M, et al. Towards a core-set of mobility measures in ageing research: The need to define mobility and its constructs. *BMC Geriatrics*. 2023;23:220.
9. Maetzler W, Correia Guedes L, Emmert KN, Kudelka J, Hildesheim HL, Paulides E, et al. Fatigue-Related Changes of Daily Function: Most Promising Measures for the Digital Age. *Digit Biomark*. 2024;8:30–9.
10. Van Ancum JM, van Schooten KS, Jonkman NH, Huijben B, van Lummel RC, Meskers CGM, et al. Gait speed assessed by a 4-m walk test is not representative of daily-life gait speed in community-dwelling adults. *Maturitas*. 2019;121:28–34.
11. van Lummel RC, Walgaard S, Pijnappels M, Elders PJM, Garcia-Aymerich J, van Dieën JH, et al. Physical Performance and Physical Activity in Older Adults: Associated but Separate Domains of Physical Function in Old Age. *PLoS One*. 2015;10:e0144048.
12. Sievänen H. Impact loading—nature's way to strengthen bone. *Nat Rev Endocrinol*. 2012;8:391–3.



13. Koolen EH, van Hees HW, van Lummel RC, Dekhuijzen R, Djamin RS, Spruit MA, et al. “Can do” versus “do do”: A Novel Concept to Better Understand Physical Functioning in Patients with Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease. *J Clin Med*. 2019;8:340.
14. Orme MW, Lloyd-Evans PHI, Jayamaha AR, Katagira W, Kirenga B, Pina I, et al. A Case for Unifying Accelerometry-Derived Movement Behaviors and Tests of Exercise Capacity for the Assessment of Relative Physical Activity Intensity. *Journal of Physical Activity and Health*. 2023;20:303–10.
15. Adams M, Carrascosa L, Jansen C-P, Ritter Y, Schwenk M. “Can Do” vs. “Do Do” in Older Adults: A Cross-Sectional Analysis of Sensor-Derived Physical Activity Patterns. *Sensors*. 2023;23:1879.
16. Vähä-Ypyä H, Vasankari T, Husu P, Suni J, Sievänen H. A universal, accurate intensity-based classification of different physical activities using raw data of accelerometer. *Clin Physiol Funct Imaging*. 2015;35:64–70.
17. Bull FC, Al-Ansari SS, Biddle S, Borodulin K, Buman MP, Cardon G, et al. World Health Organization 2020 guidelines on physical activity and sedentary behaviour. *Br J Sports Med*. 2020;54:1451–62.
18. Sakari-Rantala R, Era P, Rantanen T, Heikkinen E. Associations of sensory-motor functions with poor mobility in 75- and 80-year-old people. *Scand J Rehabil Med*. 1998;30:121–7.
19. Rantanen T, Pynnönen K, Saajanaho M, Siltanen S, Karavirta L, Kokko K, et al. Individualized counselling for active aging: protocol of a single-blinded, randomized controlled trial among older people (the AGNES intervention study). *BMC Geriatr*. 2019;19:5.
20. Vähä-Ypyä H, Vasankari T, Husu P, Mänttari A, Vuorimaa T, Suni J, et al. Validation of Cut-Points for Evaluating the Intensity of Physical Activity with Accelerometry-Based Mean Amplitude Deviation (MAD). *PLoS One*. 2015;10:e0134813.
21. Perera S, Mody S, Woodman R, Studenski S. Meaningful Change and Responsiveness in Common Physical Performance Measures in Older Adults. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*. 2006;54:743–9.
22. Bohannon RW. Comfortable and maximum walking speed of adults aged 20-79 years: reference values and determinants. *Age Ageing*. 1997;26:15–9.
23. Guralnik JM, Ferrucci L, Pieper CF, Leveille SG, Markides KS, Ostir GV, et al. Lower Extremity Function and Subsequent Disability: Consistency Across Studies, Predictive Models, and Value of Gait Speed Alone Compared With the Short Physical Performance Battery. *The Journals of Gerontology Series A: Biological Sciences and Medical Sciences*. 2000;55:M221–31.
24. Akobeng AK. Understanding diagnostic tests 3: Receiver operating characteristic curves. *Acta Paediatr*. 2007;96:644–7.

25. Wang DXM, Yao J, Zirek Y, Reijnierse EM, Maier AB. Type and intensity distribution of structured and incidental lifestyle physical activity of students and office workers: a retrospective content analysis. *Journal of Cachexia, Sarcopenia and Muscle*. 2022;11:3–25.
26. Guralnik JM, Simonsick EM, Ferrucci L, Glynn RJ, Berkman LF, Blazer DG, et al. A Short Physical Performance Battery Assessing Lower Extremity Function: Association With Self-Reported Disability and Prediction of Mortality and Nursing Home Admission. *Journal of Gerontology*. 1994;49:M85–94.
27. Guralnik JM, Ferrucci L, Simonsick EM, Salive ME, Wallace RB. Lower-Extremity Function in Persons over the Age of 70 Years as a Predictor of Subsequent Disability. *N Engl J Med*. 1995;332:556–62.
28. Folstein MF, Folstein SE, McHugh PR. “Mini-mental state”. A practical method for grading the cognitive state of patients for the clinician. *Journal of Psychiatric Research*. 1975;12:189–98.
29. Mänty M, Heinonen A, Leinonen R, Törmäkangas T, Sakari-Rantala R, Hirvensalo M, et al. Construct and predictive validity of a self-reported measure of preclinical mobility limitation. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 2007;88:1108–13.
30. Rantakokko M, Portegijs E, Viljanen A, Iwarsson S, Rantanen T. Task Modifications in Walking Postpone Decline in Life-Space Mobility Among Community-Dwelling Older People: A 2-year Follow-up Study. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci*. 2017;72:1252–6.
31. Heikkinen E, Kauppinen M, Rantanen T, Leinonen R, Lyyra T-M, Suutama T, et al. Cohort differences in health, functioning and physical activity in the young-old Finnish population. *Aging Clin Exp Res*. 2011;23:126–34.
32. Rantanen T, Avela J. Leg Extension Power and Walking Speed in Very Old People Living Independently. *The Journals of Gerontology: Series A*. 1997;52A:M225–31.
33. Rantanen T, Guralnik JM, Foley D, Masaki K, Leveille S, Curb JD, et al. Midlife Hand Grip Strength as a Predictor of Old Age Disability. *JAMA*. 1999;281:558–60.
34. LIANG K-Y, ZEGER SL. Longitudinal data analysis using generalized linear models. *Biometrika*. 1986;73:13–22.
35. SPSS. IBM Corp. released 2021. IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, version 28.0. Armonk, NY: IBM Corp. 2021;
36. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL <https://www.R-project.org/>. 2021; Available from: <https://www.R-project.org/>
37. Maula A, LaFond N, Orton E, Iliffe S, Audsley S, Vedhara K, et al. Use it or lose it: a qualitative study of the maintenance of physical activity in older adults. *BMC Geriatr*. 2019;19:349.
38. Burchartz A, Kolb S, Klos L, Schmidt SCE, von Haaren-Mack B, Niessner C, et al. How specific combinations of epoch length, non-wear time and cut-points influence physical activity. *Ger J Exerc Sport Res*. 2024;54:169–78.

39. Aibar A, Chanal J. Physical Education: The Effect of Epoch Lengths on Children's Physical Activity in a Structured Context. *PLoS One*. 2015;10:e0121238.
40. Chodzko-Zajko WJ, Proctor DN, Fiatarone Singh MA, Minson CT, Nigg CR, Salem GJ, et al. Exercise and Physical Activity for Older Adults. *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise*. 2009;41:1510.
41. Kaspar R, Oswald F, Wahl H-W, Voss E, Wettstein M. Daily Mood and Out-of-Home Mobility in Older Adults: Does Cognitive Impairment Matter? *J Appl Gerontol*. 2015;34:26–47.
42. Feltz DL, Payment CA. Self-Efficacy Beliefs Related to Movement and Mobility. *Quest*. 2005;57:24–36.
43. Hirvensalo M, Sakari-Rantala R, Kallinen M, Leinonen R, Lintunen T, Rantanen T. Underlying Factors in the Association between Depressed Mood and Mobility Limitation in Older People. *Gerontology*. 2007;53:173–8.
44. Klenk J, Büchele G, Rapp K, Franke S, Peter R, the ActiFE Study Group. Walking on sunshine: effect of weather conditions on physical activity in older people: Figure 1. *J Epidemiol Community Health*. 2012;66:474–6.
45. Lee I-M, Shiroma EJ. Using accelerometers to measure physical activity in large-scale epidemiological studies: issues and challenges. *Br J Sports Med*. 2014;48:197–201.
46. Löppönen A, Karavirta L, Portegijs E, Koivunen K, Rantanen T, Finni T, et al. Day-to-Day Variability and Year-to-Year Reproducibility of Accelerometer-Measured Free-Living Sit-to-Stand Transitions Volume and Intensity among Community-Dwelling Older Adults. *Sensors*. 2021;21:6068.
47. Pedersen ESL, Danquah IH, Petersen CB, Tolstrup JS. Intra-individual variability in day-to-day and month-to-month measurements of physical activity and sedentary behaviour at work and in leisure-time among Danish adults. *BMC Public Health*. 2016;16:1222.