

## **Validation of an innovative two-part algorithm for detecting self-propulsion in manual wheelchair users**

Rose Gagnon, MPT, M.Sc., PhD(c) <sup>1,2,3</sup>

Krista L. Best, PhD <sup>1,2</sup>

François Routhier, Eng., PhD <sup>1,2</sup>

1 School of Rehabilitation Sciences, Faculty of Medicine, Université Laval

2 Centre for Interdisciplinary Research in Rehabilitation and Social Integration (Cirris), Centre intégré universitaire de santé et de services sociaux de la Capitale-Nationale (CIUSSS-CN)

3 Population Health and Optimal Health Practices Axis, CHU de Québec – Université Laval Research Centre

**Corresponding author:** François Routhier, Eng., PhD

Centre for Interdisciplinary Research in Rehabilitation  
and Social Integration,

525 Wilfrid-Hamel Boulevard,

Quebec City, G1M 2S8, Canada

Email: [François.Routhier@rea.ulaval.ca](mailto:François.Routhier@rea.ulaval.ca)

Phone: 1-418-529-9141

## **Declarations**

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

**Funding:** No external funding was received for this study. Krista Best and Francois Routhier received salary support from the Quebec Health Research Funds (Junior 2 and Senior Scholar respectively)

**Ethics Approval:** This study was exempted from ethical approval by the Research Ethics Board in rehabilitation and social integration of the *Centre Intégré Universitaire de Santé et de Services Sociaux de la Capitale-Nationale* (#2025-32390).

**Author Contributions:** Conceptualization: KLB, FR; Funding acquisition: KLB, FR; Methodology: KLB, FR; Project administration: KLB, FR; Investigation: KLB, FR; Formal analysis: RG; Visualization: RG; Writing (original draft): RG; Writing (review & editing): RG, KLB, FR.

**Data Availability Statement:** All data produced in the present study are available upon reasonable request to the authors.

## **Abstract**

**Introduction:** Actimetry is increasingly used to measure physical activity (PA) for MWC users. However, conversion of raw data into interpretable PA outcomes remains imprecise, and the differentiation between propulsion and non-propulsion is challenging. Using a previously developed two-part algorithm, the objectives of this study were to 1) measure the accuracy of total distance collected, and 2) validate the algorithm's accuracy in differentiating between self-propulsion and non-propulsion.

**Methods:** Experimental study consisting of two data collection sessions. Actimetry data (Actigraph) were collected indoors (controlled conditions) during 100 repetitions (n=40 MWC propulsion, n=60 pushing the MWC) over three distances (10, 50 and 100 meters). Actimetry data (Actigraph) were also collected outdoors (uncontrolled condition) during self-propulsion over 1,000 meters (10 repetitions). Descriptive statistics (e.g., mean, standard deviation) with confidence intervals and accuracy measures (percentage of true value) were conducted for each trial.

**Results:** The algorithm measured total distance covered indoors with an excellent accuracy (98.9% to 99.8%). It differentiated between self-propulsion and non-propulsion with an accuracy between 96.2% and 99.2% under controlled condition, and between 91.3% and 100.0% under uncontrolled condition.

**Conclusions:** The algorithm tested allowed precise measurement of total distance covered, as well as an excellent discrimination between self-propulsion and non-propulsion.

**Abstract word count:** 198 words

**Manuscript word count:** 3015 words

## Introduction

Physical activity (PA) guidelines recommend at least 150 minutes of moderate to vigorous PA per week to maintain good health.<sup>1</sup> Although this recommendation applies to people who use manual wheelchairs (MWC), barriers such as time and energy, physical health, accessibility of sports facilities, and transportation restrict attainment of this goal.<sup>2, 3</sup> Furthermore, the variability of health conditions and disabilities among people who use MWC makes the development of a single PA measure very complex.<sup>4</sup> While more and more technologies are being developed to measure PA levels in ambulatory populations (e.g., cellphone applications, smartwatches), their adaptation to the reality of MWC use is still in its early stages.<sup>5</sup> However, recent studies (e.g.,<sup>6, 7</sup>) report that the use of accelerometers could be a promising avenue for measuring PA in MWC users.

Accelerometers are discrete devices that accurately characterize movement,<sup>8, 9</sup> making them a method of choice for objectively and validly measuring PA levels and intensity. Since they are small and lightweight, wearing them does not impede body movements.<sup>10</sup> Accelerometers offer many benefits in ambulatory populations, including monitoring of PA and related goals, increased motivation to perform PA, and built-in feedback.<sup>11-13</sup> They also enable PA to be measured more easily and effectively in uncontrolled environments.<sup>14</sup> For all these reasons, recent years have seen the development and adaptation of several types of accelerometers for measuring PA in MWC users, such as SenseWear,<sup>15</sup> ReSense,<sup>16</sup> Apple Watch,<sup>17</sup> activPAL,<sup>18</sup> PAMS<sup>19, 20</sup> or Actiwatch<sup>21</sup>. The most widely used accelerometer, however, remains the actigraph, such as the Actigraph GT3X+, given its validated accuracy, reliability, comfort and ability to measure energy expenditure and different types of PA.<sup>6, 10, 22-24</sup> Actigraphs can be attached to the wheel or worn on the arm<sup>25</sup> to collect tri-axial data during the wheel revolutions, absolute angle and duration of movement, which can be transformed into objective measures of mobility (i.e., total distance travelled, number of bouts, speed and duration of movement).<sup>4, 6, 8</sup> Actigraphs can also provide estimates of PA frequency, intensity and duration of an activity.<sup>5</sup> However, the ability to distinguish between MWC propulsion and non-propulsion (i.e., being pushed by someone else) with actigraphs remains a challenge to this day.<sup>7, 26</sup> Furthermore, to date, actigraph validation has oftentimes been conducted in relatively controlled environments that are not representative of everyday life (e.g., laboratory setting, hard wooden surface such as a gymnasium).<sup>9, 27, 28</sup> Moreover, the algorithms used to convert raw actimetry data into PA

measurements are: 1) often unable to derive a distance traveled or a speed,<sup>10</sup> 2) have poor validity for measuring small-amplitude movements or speeds,<sup>27</sup> 3) are not very or not transparent at all,<sup>10, 27-30</sup> or 4) are unable to differentiate between self-propulsion and passive pushing of the MWC<sup>8, 10, 18, 21, 27</sup>.

In an attempt to address these challenges, our team has developed a two-part custom algorithm for calculating total distance travelled in a MWC, as well as discriminating between propulsion and non-propulsion. Using this two-part algorithm, the objectives of this study were to 1) measure the accuracy of total distance collected in a controlled setting (indoors), and 2) validate the algorithm's accuracy in differentiating between self-propulsion and non-propulsion in controlled (indoors) and uncontrolled settings (outdoors).

## Methods

### Study design

This study was an experimental study aimed at validating a two-part algorithm that will be used to quantify MWC users' activity level and overall mobility.<sup>31</sup> Data collection was completed during two, 1.5 hour sessions at a university campus and affiliated research centre. The *Centre Intégré Universitaire de Santé et de Services Sociaux de la Capitale-Nationale* Research Ethics Board in rehabilitation and social integration waived the ethical approval requirement for this study (#2025-32390).

### Data collection

An Actigraph wGT3X-BT was used for all data collections (see Table 1 for a summary of characteristics).

**Table 1.** Actigraph wGT3X-BT characteristics<sup>32</sup>

<b>Weight</b>	19 grams
<b>Dimensions</b>	Length: 4.6 cm, Width: 3.3 cm, Height: 1.5 cm
<b>Sample Rate</b>	30 to 100 Hertz
<b>Data Storage</b>	180 days
<b>Battery Life</b>	Greatly varies, but between 3 to 5 weeks for this application
<b>Data Transfer</b>	USB and Bluetooth
<b>Where to Wear</b>	Wrist, waist, ankle and thigh

The Actigraph was worn on the upper arm (and not on the wrist) to prevent interference with the natural movement of MWC propulsion and since the measurement accuracy is almost identical between the two locations.<sup>33</sup> Data was transferred onto a computer using the Actilife software

(ActiGraph, 2023)<sup>34</sup> and was processed using the two-part algorithm. The MWC used during the two data collections was a Quickie GPV.<sup>35</sup>

### Indoor controlled setting

The first data collection took place in the underground tunnels of a university campus by a study investigator. Actigraph data was collected over short (10 meters) and medium (50 and 100 meters) distances in two phases (propulsion, pushing the MWC). First, while sitting in the MWC, the study investigator propelled the MWC over each distance using two arms (n=40 repetitions). Actigraphs were worn on the upper arm and on one rear wheel of the MWC. Second, the study investigator pushed the MWC over each distance (n=60 repetitions), and an actigraph was placed only on the rear wheel of the MWC.

The Gold Standard used to measure the linear distance traveled during this first data collection was a DBV50 Core measuring wheel encoder.<sup>36</sup> The device can be placed at the back of a wheelchair and is connected to a tablet or computer that displays the distance. Table 2 summarizes its main characteristics.

**Table 2.** DBV50 Core measuring wheel encoder characteristics<sup>37</sup>

<b>Pulse per revolution</b>	2 500 (10 000 pulse per turn in quadrature)
<b>Resolution</b>	12.5 pulses per mm and 0.08 mm per pulse
<b>Measuring step deviation</b>	$\pm 18^\circ$ per pulses per revolution
<b>Error limits</b>	$\pm 4$ mm/m (influenced by the measuring wheel)
<b>Duty cycle</b>	$\leq 0.5 \pm 5\%$
<b>Initialization time</b>	Less than 3 ms

The wheel encoder was used as a standard measurement over all distances (10, 50 and 100m) to calibrate the algorithm. The USB interface used was a PhidgetEncoder HighSpeed.<sup>38</sup> This interface was used to keep track of MWC movement.


### Outdoor uncontrolled setting

Ten members of the research team participated in the second data collection (1 1,000-meter data collection per team member). To be part of the validation process, team members had to have had some experience in the use of a MWC before and to be able to propel themselves over 1,000 meters. Data collection took place on a winding bicycle path with a few slopes and varying terrain (e.g., grass, pavement) near the university affiliated research centre. To measure arm and MWC movement in a real-life context with the actigraphs, team members self-propelled a MWC at a self-selected pace over 1,000 meters. Two actigraphs were worn, one on the upper arm and

one on the rear wheel of the MWC. The high-resolution encoder could not be used as a standard measurement for the second data collection due to the irregular and rough surface of the path (i.e., the vibration created by the surface caused the measured distance to vary too much). Therefore, a measuring wheel similar to the Lufkin 12" Professional Metric Measuring Wheel<sup>39</sup> was used.

#### Data processing

Raw data were processed using a custom algorithm (MATLAB 2019b, MathWorks)<sup>40</sup> with two distinct parts: 1) analyze the distance traveled by the rear wheel of the MWC (wheelchair activity algorithm) and 2) differentiate between self-propulsion in the MWC and the MWC being pushed (autonomous propulsion detection algorithm) (Figure 1).



**Figure 1** Detail of the two-part algorithm for calculating the distance traveled by the MWC and the presence of propulsion



The two parts of the algorithm required the following information to analyze data correctly: 1) the wheelchair wheel diameter, 2) the sampling frequency, and 3) the three acceleration vectors from the actigraph (X, Y and Z) (Figure 1). To be considered as motion, the signal analyzed in the two parts of the algorithm passed through a series of filters acting on the frequency domain. Acceleration peaks that were too far apart or too close together were removed to retain only those representing continuous motion that can be achieved by a person propelling themselves in a MWC.

A series of two conditions were applied to the acceleration peaks in the self-propulsion detection algorithm to ensure that the amplitude was within the expected values (Figure 1). If a peak failed to meet the first condition, it was rejected and did not pass to the second, until all peaks were passed through the two conditions (Figure 1). Once the acceleration data was transformed into speed within the wheelchair activity algorithm, an optional function was called to remove from the distance vector the movement that occurred when the arm was motionless. If nothing was specified, the algorithm calculated the total distance traveled by the rear wheel regardless of how the distance was traveled. If necessary, the algorithm divided the analysis output in 24-hour windows as the code was written with long data collection sessions in mind (i.e., to facilitate data collection in real-world settings).

The MATLAB programming required for the wheelchair activity algorithm and the filters were based on the work of Sonenblum et al.<sup>41</sup> The minimal wheel movement to consider a movement as a bout (0.72 m) came from the work of Tolerico et al. who demonstrated that the average minimal speed of movement of MWC users with various health conditions in the home was 0.72 m/s.<sup>4</sup> All the parameters and filters of the autonomous propulsion detection algorithm were developed by our research team based on the characteristics of arm movements listed in the literature for a population of walkers in whom data were taken with an actigraph. Finally, the two conditions used were based on the work of Gu et al.<sup>42</sup>

### Data analysis

All accelerations from the actigraph data collections (10, 50, 100, and 1,000 meters) were processed using the two-part algorithm presented earlier and are presented as distances traveled in meters. Since our sample size was small (n=100 for all distances except the 1,000 meters where n=10), we bootstrapped (n=1,000) data obtained from the algorithm for each of the

measured distances to obtain robust descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation, 95% confidence interval) for each distance assessed.<sup>43</sup> Accuracy measures (percentage of true value) were also conducted for each trial. All statistical analyses were performed using Excel (Microsoft 365, 2011) and SPSS statistical software (Version 25; IBM, Armonk, NY, USA).

## Results

The distances measured at the wheel and arm when the MWC was propelled in a controlled environment are shown in Table 3:

**Table 3** Measurements of the distance covered by the wheel of the wheelchair and the arm when propelling obtained using the algorithm

Trial type	Number of included trials	Mean	Standard deviation	Accuracy	Sample's 95% confidence interval		95% bootstrapped confidence interval	
		m	m	%	m		m	
<b>10 meters – Wheel</b>	30	9.7363	0.45605	97.36	9.5660	9.9066	9.5787	9.8833
<b>10 meters – Arm</b>	30	9.6193	0.51276	96.19	9.4279	9.8108	9.4237	9.7980
<b>50 meters – Wheel</b>	40	50.3809	0.43354	99.24	50.2422	50.5195	50.2377	50.5113
<b>50 meters – Arm</b>	40	49.5758	1.09675	99.15	49.2250	49.9265	49.2063	49.8859
<b>100 meters – Wheel</b>	40	101.6318	1.16632	98.37	101.2587	102.0048	101.2998	101.9912
<b>100 meters – Arm</b>	40	98.6595	7.74597	98.66	96.1822	101.1368	96.0182	100.7193

m: meters, %: percentage

The distance measurements obtained at the rear wheel are lower than the reference distance for the 10-meter propulsion trials, whereas they are higher for the 50-meter and 100-meter propulsion trials. Furthermore, although the observed and calculated confidence intervals oscillate close to the reference values, they do not contain any of the expected distance values (10, 50 and 100 meters). The same applies to distance measurements derived via the arm's actigraph. The observed and calculated confidence intervals of the 10- and 50-meter tests are close to, but do not overlap, the reference distance. The two confidence intervals for the 100-meter tests nevertheless include the reference value. Despite the variability observed in the confidence intervals, the observed accuracy remains over 96%, for both arm and rear wheel measurements.

Distances measured at the rear wheel when the MWC was pushed in a controlled environment and calculated using the two-part algorithm are presented in Table 4:

**Table 4** Measurements of the distance covered by the wheel of the wheelchair when pushed obtained using the algorithm

Trial type	Number of included trials	Mean	Standard deviation	Accuracy	Sample's 95% confidence interval		95% bootstrapped confidence interval	
		m	m	%	m		m	
<b>10 meters</b>	40	9.8931	0.68601	98.93	9.6737	10.1125	9.6934	10.1222
<b>50 meters</b>	60	50.104	0.35536	99.79	50.0122	50.1958	50.0142	50.1875
<b>100 meters</b>	60	100.7849	0.26581	99.22	100.7162	100.8536	100.7085	100.8488

m: meters, %: percentage

Although the mean of the 10-meter trials is slightly less than 10 meters, the 95% confidence interval of the sample and that obtained from the Bootstrap analyses include the target measurement. Conversely, the mean distances calculated by the algorithm for the 50- and 100-meter trials are higher than the reference distances and are not included in either the samples' confidence intervals or those obtained by bootstrapping. Nevertheless, the accuracy of the algorithm remains close to 100% for all trial types.

Table 5 shows data from the 10 team members who propelled themselves in the MWC over 1,000 meters in a real-life setting:

**Table 5** Distance travelled and measured by the algorithm during propulsion over one kilometer in uncontrolled conditions

<b>Participant</b>	<b>Travelled distance</b> m	<b>Measured distance</b> m	<b>Accuracy</b> %
<b>False positive 1</b>	709.0	0.0	100.00
<b>False positive 2</b>	615.0	40.0	93.49
<b>False positive 3</b>	669.0	0.0	100.00
<b>Team member 1</b>	1022.2	1022.2	100.00
<b>Team member 2</b>	1021.7	1020.6	99.89
<b>Team member 3</b>	1017.0	1007.3	99.05
<b>Team member 4</b>	1026.0	1013.2	98.75
<b>Team member 5</b>	1027.0	1006.8	98.03
<b>Team member 6</b>	1023.0	934.3	91.33
<b>Team member 7</b>	1017.0	979.9	96.35
<b>Team member 8</b>	1022.9	1017.4	99.46
<b>Team member 9</b>	1023.0	1020.8	99.78
<b>Team member 10</b>	1016.0	988.8	97.33
<b>Mean accuracy</b>			<b>97.96</b>

m: meters, %: percentage

The distance data calculated with the algorithm are very close to the expected values, except in the case of False Positive 2 and Team member 6, where a larger difference was observed. Despite this variability, the accuracy of the algorithm remains over 91%, with several distance measurements approaching an accuracy of 100% (mean: 97.96%).

## **Discussion**

Using a publicly available software (MATLAB), we previously developed a two-part algorithm for measuring total distance covered and differentiating between MWC propulsion and non-propulsion. The algorithm was designed to be used to derive a range of movement data, such as total distance travelled, average and maximum speeds, and number of bouts made, while offering the possibility of separating the output into 24-hour windows to facilitate the interpretation of data collected over long periods. The results of our study demonstrated that the developed two-

part algorithm offers excellent accuracy, ranging from 96.2% to 99.8% for indoor movement measurements, and close to 98% in uncontrolled condition (outdoors).

Several other authors, such as Popp et al.<sup>16</sup> and Callupe Luna et al.<sup>44</sup> have also worked on algorithms to discriminate between propulsion and non-propulsion in the context of MWC use. Although they achieved an accuracy similar to our own (93% and 94%, respectively), this was achieved using four sensors (Popp et al.) and an invasive measurement system (Callupe Luna et al.), which had the potential to impede and even modify the natural propulsive motion.<sup>45</sup> The trials used to validate their algorithms were also carried out in a controlled environment. Our study addresses these limitations, in that our algorithm enables precise measurement using just two sensors. We also carried out trials in an uncontrolled environment to test the algorithm in real-life conditions. Recent years have also seen the emergence of algorithms based on deep machine learning to categorize movements performed while using a MWC. Unlike other algorithms, these automatically generate the most optimal parameters for processing actimetry data.<sup>46</sup> Although interesting levels of accuracy have been obtained in these studies (Van Der Slikke et al.: 83-89%,<sup>47</sup> Fortune et al.: 88-100%,<sup>48</sup> Garcia-Masso et al.: 61-94%,<sup>49</sup> Hiremath et al.: 93-94%,<sup>15</sup> De Vries et al.: >98%<sup>46</sup>), much remains to be done to democratize the use of this technology. Indeed, all these studies were carried out under controlled conditions (e.g., laboratory), with participants who had been trained to perform the MWC's tasks. In addition, one of these studies used a large number of accelerometers,<sup>49</sup> which could hinder natural propulsion movement, and another used an off-the-shelf activity measurement monitor.<sup>15</sup> The integration of deep machine learning into our two-part algorithm could be of interest to optimize the selection of parameters to be considered when sorting actimetry data. Nevertheless, we believe that our algorithm in its present form makes an important contribution to the current actimetry literature, in that it uses data from a readily available accelerometer (Actigraph wGT3X-BT) and has excellent accuracy even under uncontrolled conditions.

The validation tests carried out in this study were performed by able-bodied team members with no particular disability. While these preliminary tests are important to ensure the algorithm's reliability, subsequent validation tests should include both inexperienced and experienced MWC users, as they do not propel themselves in the same way.<sup>26</sup> Similarly, it will be important to test the algorithm on populations with a diversity of health conditions to ensure its external validity.<sup>7</sup>

Moreover, the present two-part algorithm has been tested with actigraphs worn on the wheel of the wheelchair and on the upper limb. This configuration may not be suitable for all existing propulsion patterns (e.g., one foot and one arm, two feet). Further studies will be needed to adapt the data collection method to the reality of users propelling themselves without their upper limbs.<sup>26, 47, 50</sup> As MWC users are at greater risk of developing various comorbidities given their generally greater physical inactivity,<sup>51</sup> data collection using actigraphs has the potential to provide important objective clinical data when planning interventions to increase their PA practice.<sup>26</sup> Greater use of actimetry data could also enable MWC users to monitor their health goals more closely, in addition to democratizing access to their PA data.<sup>26</sup> Actimetry could also offer MWC users living in remote locations the possibility of having easier access to evidence-based health interventions.<sup>51</sup>

This study has a number of limitations. Firstly, the data for the 10-, 50- and 100-meter trials were collected in succession. Thus, all the 10-meter trials were carried out subsequently; the same method was used for all the 50- and 100-meter trials. This data collection method may have had two effects on collected data. Firstly, it may predispose to the presence of a learning effect throughout data collection. This method is also less representative of everyday movements, where wheelchair bouts' duration and length are not necessarily predicted. In a second validation phase, it will be important to alternate the trials' distance, as well as to validate the algorithm's accuracy with data from trials where movements are initiated spontaneously. Furthermore, the same MWC was used for all trials. Subsequent studies should ensure that the algorithm's reliability does not vary regardless of the MWC's dimensions. Despite these limitations, this study has several strengths that are worth mentioning. The parameters used to create the conversion algorithm, and the functioning of the algorithm itself, are transparently reported. Distance data collected during all the trials were compared with distance measurements obtained using recognized standard measurements. The accuracy of the two-part algorithm was also evaluated both under controlled laboratory conditions and in an uncontrolled environment more representative of everyday activities. Finally, the algorithm presented can be used to calculate the total distance travelled in a MWC, as well as the total distance travelled using propulsion alone, in addition to deriving several other data characterizing wheelchair movements (i.e., number of bouts, average bout length, average and maximum speed).

## Conclusion

The present work represents a further step towards a better understanding and characterization of the PA performed by MWC users. Our algorithm was able to derive measures of total distance travelled, as well as distance travelled solely by propulsion. It proved accurate over a variety of distances (i.e., 10, 50, 100 and 1,000 meters), both in controlled and uncontrolled conditions. Further studies will be needed, however, to validate the algorithm in the context of spontaneous movements, which are more representative of everyday life. It will also be important to ensure that the algorithm remains valid for MWC users presenting a variety of health conditions and propulsion patterns. Better-quality PA measures have the potential to enhance the tailoring of clinical interventions recommended to MWC users.

## References

1. Bull FC, Al-Ansari SS, Biddle S, et al. World Health Organization 2020 guidelines on physical activity and sedentary behaviour. *Br J Sports Med* 2020; 54: 1451-1462. DOI: 10.1136/bjsports-2020-102955.
2. Best KL, Routhier F, Sweet SN, et al. Smartphone-Delivered Peer Physical Activity Counseling Program for Individuals With Spinal Cord Injury: Protocol for Development and Pilot Evaluation. *JMIR Res Protoc* 2019; 8: e10798. 20190322. DOI: 10.2196/10798.
3. Van Den Akker LE, Holla JFM, Dadema T, et al. Determinants of physical activity in wheelchair users with spinal cord injury or lower limb amputation: perspectives of rehabilitation professionals and wheelchair users. *Disability and Rehabilitation* 2020; 42: 1934-1941. DOI: 10.1080/09638288.2019.1577503.
4. Tolerico ML, Ding D, Cooper RA, et al. Assessing mobility characteristics and activity levels of manual wheelchair users. *The Journal of Rehabilitation Research and Development* 2007; 44: 561. DOI: 10.1682/jrrd.2006.02.0017.
5. Fjeldstad C, Fjeldstad AS and Pardo G. Use of Accelerometers to Measure Real-Life Physical Activity in Ambulatory Individuals with Multiple Sclerosis: A Pilot Study. *Int J MS Care* 2015; 17: 215-220. DOI: 10.7224/1537-2073.2014-037.
6. Bourassa S, Best KL, Racine M, et al. Use of actigraphy to measure real-world physical activities in manual wheelchair users. *J Rehabil Assist Technol Eng* 2020; 7: 2055668320907814. 20200408. DOI: 10.1177/2055668320907814.
7. Tsang K, Hiremath SV, Crytzer TM, et al. Validity of activity monitors in wheelchair users: A systematic review. *J Rehabil Res Dev* 2016; 53: 641-658. DOI: 10.1682/JRRD.2016.01.0006.
8. Wilson SK, Hasler JP, Dall PM, et al. Objective assessment of mobility of the spinal cord injured in a free-living environment. *Spinal Cord* 2008; 46: 352-357. 20071211. DOI: 10.1038/sj.sc.3102153.



9. Postma K, van den Berg-Emons HJ, Bussmann JB, et al. Validity of the detection of wheelchair propulsion as measured with an Activity Monitor in patients with spinal cord injury. *Spinal Cord* 2005; 43: 550-557. DOI: 10.1038/sj.sc.3101759.
10. Warms CA and Belza BL. Actigraphy as a measure of physical activity for wheelchair users with spinal cord injury. *Nurs Res* 2004; 53: 136-143. DOI: 10.1097/00006199-200403000-00010.
11. Andre D and Wolf DL. Recent Advances in Free-Living Physical Activity Monitoring: A Review. *Journal of Diabetes Science and Technology* 2007; 1: 760-767. DOI: 10.1177/193229680700100522.
12. WELK GJ, BLAIR SN, WOOD K, et al. A comparative evaluation of three accelerometry-based physical activity monitors. *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise* 2000; 32: S489-S497.
13. Lyons EJ, Lewis ZH, Mayrsohn BG, et al. Behavior Change Techniques Implemented in Electronic Lifestyle Activity Monitors: A Systematic Content Analysis. *Journal of Medical Internet Research* 2014; 16: e192. DOI: 10.2196/jmir.3469.
14. Fini NA, Holland AE, Keating J, et al. How is physical activity monitored in people following stroke? *Disability and Rehabilitation* 2015; 37: 1717-1731. DOI: 10.3109/09638288.2014.978508.
15. Hiremath SV, Ding D, Farrington J, et al. Physical activity classification utilizing SenseWear activity monitor in manual wheelchair users with spinal cord injury. *Spinal Cord* 2013; 51: 705-709. DOI: 10.1038/sc.2013.39.
16. Popp WL, Brogioli M, Leuenberger K, et al. A novel algorithm for detecting active propulsion in wheelchair users following spinal cord injury. *Medical Engineering & Physics* 2016; 38: 267-274. DOI: 10.1016/j.medengphy.2015.12.011.
17. Karinharju KS, Boughey AM, Tweedy SM, et al. Validity of the Apple Watch<sup>®</sup> for monitoring push counts in people using manual wheelchairs. *The Journal of Spinal Cord Medicine* 2021; 44: 212-220. DOI: 10.1080/10790268.2019.1576444.
18. Coulter EH, Dall PM, Rochester L, et al. Development and validation of a physical activity monitor for use on a wheelchair. *Spinal Cord* 2011; 49: 445-450. 20100921. DOI: 10.1038/sc.2010.126.
19. Hiremath SV, Intille SS, Kelleher A, et al. Estimation of Energy Expenditure for Wheelchair Users Using a Physical Activity Monitoring System. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 2016; 97: 1146-1153 e1141. 20160311. DOI: 10.1016/j.apmr.2016.02.016.
20. Grillon A, Perez-Urbe A, Satizabal H, et al. A Wireless Sensor-Based System for Self-tracking Activity Levels Among Manual Wheelchair Users. *Lecture Notes of the Institute for Computer Sciences, Social Informatics and Telecommunications Engineering*. Springer International Publishing, 2017, pp.229-240.
21. Warms CA, Whitney JD and Belza B. Measurement and description of physical activity in adult manual wheelchair users. *Disabil Health J* 2008; 1: 236-244. DOI: 10.1016/j.dhjo.2008.07.002.
22. Lankhorst K, Oerbekke M, van den Berg-Emons R, et al. Instruments Measuring Physical Activity in Individuals Who Use a Wheelchair: A Systematic Review of Measurement Properties. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 2020; 101: 535-552. 20191010. DOI: 10.1016/j.apmr.2019.09.006.



23. Veerubhotla A, Hong E, Knezevic S, et al. Estimation of Physical Activity Intensity in Spinal Cord Injury Using a Wrist-Worn ActiGraph Monitor. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 2020; 101: 1563-1569. 20200602. DOI: 10.1016/j.apmr.2020.05.014.
24. Nightingale TE, Walhim JP, Thompson D, et al. Predicting physical activity energy expenditure in manual wheelchair users. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2014; 46: 1849-1858. DOI: 10.1249/MSS.0000000000000291.
25. García-Massó X, Serra-Añó P, García-Raffi LM, et al. Validation of the use of Actigraph GT3X accelerometers to estimate energy expenditure in full time manual wheelchair users with spinal cord injury. *Spinal Cord* 2013; 51: 898-903. DOI: 10.1038/sc.2013.85.
26. Macduff H, Armstrong E and Ferguson-Pell M. Technologies measuring manual wheelchair propulsion metrics: a scoping review. *Assistive Technology* 2022: 1-9. DOI: 10.1080/10400435.2022.2075488.
27. Karinharju KS, Gomersall SR, Clanchy KM, et al. Validity of Two Wheelchair-Mounted Devices for Estimating Wheelchair Speed and Distance Traveled. *Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly* 2020; 38: 435-451. DOI: 10.1123/apaq.2020-0122.
28. Gendle SC, Richardson M, Leeper J, et al. Wheelchair-mounted accelerometers for measurement of physical activity. *Disabil Rehabil Assist Technol* 2012; 7: 139-148. 20111004. DOI: 10.3109/17483107.2011.613521.
29. Nooijen C, De Groot JF, Stam HJ, et al. Validation of an activity monitor for children who are partly or completely wheelchair-dependent. *Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation* 2015; 12: 11. DOI: 10.1186/s12984-015-0004-x.
30. Migueles JH, Cadenas-Sanchez C, Ekelund U, et al. Accelerometer Data Collection and Processing Criteria to Assess Physical Activity and Other Outcomes: A Systematic Review and Practical Considerations. *Sports Medicine* 2017; 47: 1821-1845. DOI: 10.1007/s40279-017-0716-0.
31. Escudero-Mancebo D, Fernández-Villalobos N, Martín-Llorente Ó, et al. Research methods in engineering design: a synthesis of recent studies using a systematic literature review. *Research in Engineering Design* 2023; 34: 221-256. DOI: 10.1007/s00163-022-00406-y.
32. ActiGraph wGT3X-BT: Wearable Devices | ActiGraph Pioneering the Digital Transformation of Clinical Research, <https://theactigraph.com/actigraph-wgt3x-bt> (2023).
33. Hiremath SV, Intille SS, Kelleher A, et al. Detection of physical activities using a physical activity monitor system for wheelchair users. *Medical Engineering & Physics* 2015; 37: 68-76. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.medengphy.2014.10.009>.
34. Academic Research, <https://theactigraph.com/academic-research> (2023).
35. Quickie GP and GPV Ultralight Wheelchair - The Original | Ultralight Rigid Wheelchairs, <https://www.quickie-wheelchairs.com/Ultra-Light-Wheelchairs/Ultralight-Rigid-Wheelchairs/Quickie-GP-and-GPV-Ultralight-Wheelchair-The-Original/2420p> (2023).
36. Measuring wheel encoders | DBV50 | SICK, <https://www.sick.com/at/en/encoders/measuring-wheel-encoders/dbv50/c/g365751> (2023).
37. DBV50 Core - Compact Measuring Wheel System that Is Highly Flexible and Easy to Mount, [https://cdn.sick.com/media/docs/2/32/332/product\\_information\\_dbv50\\_core\\_measuring\\_wheel\\_encoder\\_en\\_im0063332.pdf](https://cdn.sick.com/media/docs/2/32/332/product_information_dbv50_core_measuring_wheel_encoder_en_im0063332.pdf) (2015).
38. PhidgetEncoder HighSpeed - 1057\_2 at Phidgets, <https://www.phidgets.com/?tier=3&catid=4&pcid=2&prodid=51> (2023).

39. PSMW48NM 12" Professional Metric Measuring Wheel - Crescent Tools, <https://www.crescenttool.com/products/measuring/measuring-wheels/psmw48nm-12-professional-metric-measuring-wheel> (2021).
40. MATLAB - MathWorks, <https://www.mathworks.com/products/matlab.html> (2023).
41. Sonenblum SE, Sprigle S, Caspall J, et al. Validation of an accelerometer-based method to measure the use of manual wheelchairs. *Med Eng Phys* 2012; 34: 781-786. 20120612. DOI: 10.1016/j.medengphy.2012.05.009.
42. Gu F, Khoshelham K, Shang J, et al. Robust and Accurate Smartphone-Based Step Counting for Indoor Localization. *IEEE Sensors Journal* 2017; 17: 3453-3460. DOI: 10.1109/jsen.2017.2685999.
43. Efron B and Tibshirani R. The Bootstrap Method for Assessing Statistical Accuracy. *Behaviormetrika* 1985; 12: 1-35. DOI: 10.2333/bhmk.12.17\_1.
44. Callupe Luna J, Martinez Rocha J, Monacelli E, et al. WISP, Wearable Inertial Sensor for Online Wheelchair Propulsion Detection. *Sensors* 2022; 22: 4221. DOI: 10.3390/s22114221.
45. Chen P-W, Klaesner J, Zwir I, et al. Detecting clinical practice guideline-recommended wheelchair propulsion patterns with wearable devices following a wheelchair propulsion intervention. *Assistive Technology* 2023; 35: 193-201. DOI: 10.1080/10400435.2021.2010146.
46. De Vries WHK, Amrein S, Arnet U, et al. Classification of Wheelchair Related Shoulder Loading Activities from Wearable Sensor Data: A Machine Learning Approach. *Sensors* 2022; 22: 7404. DOI: 10.3390/s22197404.
47. Van Der Slikke R, De Leeuw A-W, De Rooij A, et al. The Push Forward in Rehabilitation: Validation of a Machine Learning Method for Detection of Wheelchair Propulsion Type. *Sensors* 2024; 24: 657. DOI: 10.3390/s24020657.
48. Fortune E, Cloud-Biebl BA, Madansingh SI, et al. Estimation of manual wheelchair-based activities in the free-living environment using a neural network model with inertial body-worn sensors. *Journal of Electromyography and Kinesiology* 2022; 62. DOI: 10.1016/j.jelekin.2019.07.007.
49. García-Massó X, Serra-Añó P, Gonzalez LM, et al. Identifying physical activity type in manual wheelchair users with spinal cord injury by means of accelerometers. *Spinal Cord* 2015; 53: 772-777. DOI: 10.1038/sc.2015.81.
50. Leving MT, Horemans HLD, Vegter RJK, et al. Validity of consumer-grade activity monitor to identify manual wheelchair propulsion in standardized activities of daily living. *PLOS ONE* 2018; 13: e0194864. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0194864.
51. Willingham TB, Stowell J, Collier G, et al. Leveraging Emerging Technologies to Expand Accessibility and Improve Precision in Rehabilitation and Exercise for People with Disabilities. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 2024; 21: 79. DOI: 10.3390/ijerph21010079.