

Impact of Reduced Sampling Rate on Accelerometer-based Physical Activity Monitoring and Machine Learning Activity Classification

Scott R Small, MS¹ (Corresponding author) scott.small@ndorms.ox.ac.uk

Sara Khalid, DPhil^{1,2} sara.khalid@ndorms.ox.ac.uk

Paula Dhiman, PhD^{1,2,5} paula.dhiman@ndorms.ox.ac.uk

Shing Chan, PhD^{3,4} shing.chan@ndph.ox.ac.uk

Dan Jackson, MEng⁶ dan.jackson@ncl.ac.uk

Aiden R Doherty, PhD^{3,4,5} aiden.doherty@dph.ox.ac.uk

Andrew J Price, BA MBB (Ch), FRCS (Trauma & Orth), DPhil¹ andrew.price@ndorms.ox.ac.uk

¹ Nuffield Department of Orthopaedics, Rheumatology, and Musculoskeletal Sciences, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

² Centre for Statistics in Medicine, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

³ Big Data Institute, Li Ka Shing Centre for Health Information and Discovery, University of Oxford, Oxford, U.K.

⁴ Nuffield Department of Population Health, University of Oxford, Oxford, U.K.

⁵ National Institute of Health Research Oxford Biomedical Research Centre, Oxford University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, John Radcliffe Hospital, Oxford, U.K.

⁶ Open Lab, School of Computing, Newcastle University, Newcastle, UK

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

Key Words: Self-Reported, Ambulatory Monitoring, Sampling Frequency, Activities of Daily Living, Accelerometry

Author contributions: All authors contributed to this study and approved the final manuscript. SRS designed and conducted the search, analysed the data, and wrote the manuscript. SK supervised the study design, data analysis, and edited the manuscript. PD assisted with data collection, analysis and interpretation. SC and DJ assisted in data analysis and interpretation. AD supervised the data analysis and interpretation, and edited the manuscript. AJP supervised the study design and edited the manuscript.

1 **Abstract**

2 Purpose: Lowering the sampling rate of accelerometer devices can dramatically increase study
3 monitoring periods through longer battery life, however the validity of its output is poorly
4 documented. We therefore aimed to assess the effect of reduced sampling rate on measuring physical
5 activity both overall and by specific behaviour types.

6 Methods: Healthy adults wore two Axivity AX3 accelerometers on the dominant wrist and two on the
7 hip for 24 hours. At each location one accelerometer recorded at 25 Hz and the other at 100 Hz. Overall
8 acceleration magnitude, time in moderate-to-vigorous activity, and behavioural activities were
9 calculated using standard methods. Correlation between acceleration magnitude and activity
10 classifications at both sampling rates was calculated and linear regression was performed.

11 Results: 54 participants wore both hip and wrist monitors, with 45 of the participants contributing >20
12 hours of wear time at the hip and 51 contributing >20 hours of wear time at the wrist. Strong
13 correlation was observed between 25 Hz and 100 Hz sampling rates in overall activity measurement
14 ($r = 0.962$ to 0.991), yet consistently lower overall acceleration was observed in data collected at 25
15 Hz (12.3% to 12.8%). Excellent agreement between sampling rates was observed in all machine
16 learning classified activities ($r = 0.850$ to 0.952). Wrist-worn vector magnitude measured at 25 Hz
17 (Acc_{25}) can be compared to 100 Hz (Acc_{100}) data using the transformation, $Acc_{100} = 1.038 * Acc_{25} + 3.310$.

18 Conclusions: 25 Hz and 100 Hz accelerometer data are highly correlated with predictable differences
19 which can be accounted for in inter-study comparisons. Sampling rate should be consistently reported
20 in physical activity studies, carefully considered in study design, and tailored to the outcome of
21 interest.

22 Introduction

23 Accelerometers are increasingly used to obtain exposure measures in large observational physical
24 activity healthcare studies [1–3] and to obtain outcome measures in randomised controlled trials [4].
25 Seven days of physical activity measurement is a common measurement window across a variety of
26 accelerometer studies and provides a suitable representation of individual activity in most scenarios
27 [5–8]. However, in the case of activity monitoring in clinical populations recovering from trauma or a
28 surgical intervention, extended monitoring well beyond a standard seven day protocol may be desired
29 [9]. Extended longitudinal protocols incorporating measurement windows beyond a few weeks
30 requires frequent participant interaction for battery charging, which is burdensome and undesirable
31 [10]. In these cases, a reduction of sampling rate would offer the potential for longer continuous
32 physical activity measurement, while reducing patient and caregiver interactions with the monitoring
33 device.

34 Currently, Brønd and Ardivsson offer the only side-by-side comparison of accelerometers recording at
35 different sampling rates, recording laboratory-based activities with hip-mounted Actigraph GTX3+
36 devices [11]. Other studies generate downsampled data from a single accelerometer to assess the
37 effects of varying sampling rates, while relying on the untested assumption that this postprocessing
38 accurately reproduces the recording behaviour of the underlying hardware [12,13]. In addition,
39 studies of this nature have been limited to the ActiGraph GTX3+ and GENEa triaxial accelerometers
40 [11–14], and not the Axivity AX3 which has been used in the UK Biobank study of 100,000 participants
41 [1]. This dataset is a valuable resource and can serve as a reference for physical activity within a wide
42 range of clinical populations. Therefore, the ability to compare physical activity data between studies
43 integrating non-standard sampling rates remains unverified.

44 The aim of this study was to validate data collected at a reduced sampling rate (25 Hz) in comparison
45 to that collected at the commonly used rate of 100 Hz within the AX3 accelerometer. The objectives
46 were to: 1) identify any effect of sampling rate on vector magnitude both overall and for specific free-

47 living activities; 2) characterise the effect of reduced sampling rate on machine learning activity
48 classification; 3) develop a transformation so that data collected at standard and reduced sampling
49 rates can be directly compared.

50 **Methods**

51 *Study design*

52 Ethical approval for participant recruitment was obtained from the Central University Research Ethics
53 Committee of the University of Oxford (Ref: R63137/RE001). Written informed consent was obtained
54 from adult volunteers (aged 18 and above) with no lower limb injury within the previous 6 months
55 and who were able to walk without an assistive device. Participants were recruited through advertising
56 within Oxford University, the local community and in senior citizen groups.

57 Participants were instructed to wear four triaxial accelerometers (AX3, Axivity, Newcastle, UK) for
58 24 hours, except during bathing or swimming activities. Participants could remove sensors at night if
59 they disrupted sleep. Two accelerometers were placed side-by-side on the dominant wrist using a
60 wristband, and two on the dominant-side hip, waist level at the anterior-posterior midline via a belt
61 clip (Figure 1).

62 Accelerometers were synchronised and programmed via the Open Movement software (v1.0.0.42)
63 (<https://openmovement.dev>). At each body location, one sensor was programmed to collect data at
64 a sampling rate of 25 Hz while the other collected data at 100 Hz, both with a dynamic range of $\pm 8 g$.
65 The same four unique sensors were used in all participants. Accelerometer orientation and axis
66 alignment within the hip and wrist straps were consistent with manufacturer guidance and verified
67 prior to the start of each recording session. The assignment of hip or wrist body location and sampling
68 rate of each specific accelerometer was randomized by serial number so that the four accelerometers
69 contributed to measurements at both body locations and sampling rates. Participants additionally
70 filled out an activity diary (Supplement Note 1) to log the times during which they slept, cycled, walked

71 more than 100 meters, ate a meal, participated in self-defined exercise, or removed the
72 accelerometer.

73 *Acceleration Magnitude*

74 A schematic of our study design is presented in Figure 2. Following the monitoring period, triaxial
75 acceleration data was processed using the open source Biobank Accelerometer Analysis Tool
76 (<https://github.com/activityMonitoring/biobankAccelerometerAnalysis>) [1]. Acceleration data was
77 automatically calibrated by identifying stationary points within the data to reduce sensor-based
78 measurement bias and offset error [1,15]. Overall wear time was calculated and stationary non-wear
79 episodes of 60 minutes or greater wherein all three axes had a standard deviation of less than 13 mg
80 were automatically removed from analysis [1]. Data nominally collected at 25 Hz and 100 Hz were
81 resampled using linear interpolation to generate datasets with precisely 25 and 100 samples per
82 second. A duplicate dataset from the 100 Hz recording was downsampled to 25 Hz for an additional
83 comparison, as implemented in previous studies [13,14]. Vector magnitude of acceleration was
84 calculated as the Euclidean norm of the three accelerometer axes with 1g subtracted to account for
85 gravity and negative values truncated to zero. Vector magnitude was collected into 30-second epochs
86 for analysis and overall 24-hour activity was calculated with data reported in milli gravitational units
87 (mg) [1].

88 Vector magnitude was also calculated for all diary-logged bouts of extended walking, cycling, sleeping,
89 exercising, and eating. Time and duration of these activities were extracted from participant activity
90 diaries. Beginning and ending times for diary labels were manually verified by inspecting and cross-
91 referencing raw accelerometer data. If no end time was given for eating activities, a conservative
92 estimate of 15 minutes was designated per meal. Overall moderate-to-vigorous physical activity
93 (MVPA) was additionally quantified, defined as time spent at an acceleration vector magnitude ≥ 100
94 mg at the wrist and ≥ 70 mg at the hip [16].

95

96 *Activity Classification*

97 Machine learning methods for activity classification of wrist-worn accelerometer data were
98 performed using a two-stage machine learning model of balanced random forests and hidden Markov
99 models [17]. Activities were classified as time spent cycling, mixed activity, sit/stand, sleep, vehicle,
100 and walking. The classification model used in the current study is an open-source model implemented
101 within the Biobank Accelerometer Analysis Tool, having been previously developed and validated for
102 activity classification of the UK Biobank physical activity cohort [17]. The model was trained by Willetts
103 et al., [17] using data from Axivity AX3 accelerometer recording at 100 Hz (± 8 g) on the dominant wrist,
104 with concurrent ground truth images recorded every 20 seconds for a total of 160,000 minutes in 134
105 participants.

106 *Statistical Analysis*

107 A minimum sample size of 30 participants was calculated to detect a conservative correlation
108 coefficient estimate of 0.6 between sampling rate and body location measurements with 80% power
109 and alpha set at 0.05. This minimum sample size allowed for 30% data loss for dropout, protocol non-
110 compliance, or poor data quality. Participants with less than 20 hours of wear were excluded from
111 analysis. Summary and descriptive statistics were calculated for participant demographics, overall
112 activity levels, and activity levels performed during self-reported activity designations. Two-sided
113 Spearman's rank correlation was calculated to compare activity levels, time in MVPA, and time in
114 classified activities between accelerometer sampling rates and body locations. Mean difference and
115 relative percentage difference in activity level between sampling rates was calculated with reference
116 to 100Hz measurements. Bland-Altman plots were used to assess fixed or proportional bias and limits
117 of agreement between sampling rates across the full range of participant activity levels. Mean
118 participant activity was plotted in 1-hour increments over a 24-hour day to visualise differences in
119 activity patterns recorded at either sampling rate. Linear regression was used to determine the
120 association between sampling rates and to estimate a conversion factor between acceleration vector

121 magnitude and activity classification recorded at the two sampling rates, with 25 Hz measurements
122 modelled as the predictor, 100 Hz measurements as the regression outcome. Leave-one-subject-out
123 cross validation ($n-1$) was repeated n times across each dataset to assess linear model generalisability,
124 with the corresponding root mean square error (RMSE) and R^2 reported. Statistical analysis was
125 performed in R (v.4.0.0) and RStudio (v1.2.5042).

126 **Results**

127 *Participant Demographics*

128 Fifty-four healthy adults (33 female, 21 male) with a mean age of 43.4 years (SD 17.6; range 19.5 - 81.2
129 years) participated in free-living physical activity analysis (Table 1). Acceleration measurement error
130 following self-calibration was less than 2.6 mg across all recordings, with no instances of calibration
131 failure or device malfunction. Median hip and wrist accelerometer wear time was 23.7 hours (IQR 0.6
132 and 24.0 hours (IQR 0.5), respectively. Three sets of wrist-worn and nine sets of hip-worn sensors were
133 removed from analysis as they were worn for less than 20 hours. Participants self-reported an overall
134 mean of 7.4 hours of sleep (SD 1.0), 46.8 minutes of eating (SD 37.8), 28.4 minutes of general exercise
135 (SD 56.7), 58.2 minutes of extended walking (SD 64.0), and 34.1 minutes of cycling (SD 27.8) over the
136 24-hour assessment period as calculated in participants who logged non-zero time in those activities.

137 *24-Hour Physical Activity Assessment*

138 Mean physical activity across all valid measurements according to time of day is presented in Figure 3
139 and acceleration data for wrist and hip accelerometers are presented in Table 2. Strong correlation
140 was observed between 25 Hz and 100 Hz recorded data in overall vector magnitude and time spent in
141 MVPA at both the hip ($r = 0.988$) and the wrist ($r = 0.960$ to 0.971). At the hip, vector magnitude
142 collected at 25 Hz resulted in consistently lower overall activity compared to the 100 Hz data, with an
143 absolute mean difference in vector magnitude (95% CI) of 2.0 (1.6, 2.4) mg and 9.7 (7.9, 11.5) minutes
144 of MVPA per 24 hours. This represents a -12.4% relative difference in vector acceleration magnitude

145 and -11.2% difference in MVPA time when 25 Hz measurements when compared to 100 Hz
146 measurements at the hip. At the wrist, 25 Hz data collection also resulted in consistently lower overall
147 activity compared to the 100 Hz data, with an absolute mean difference (95% CI) of 4.4 (3.8, 5.0) mg
148 in vector magnitude and 25.9 (21.5, 30.3) minutes of MVPA, a -13.3% and -23.1% relative difference
149 in 25 Hz measurements at the wrist, respectively. Bland-Altman plots exhibiting the difference
150 between 25 Hz and 100 Hz 24-hour activity measurements are presented for hip and wrist
151 measurements in Figure 4.

152 At both measurement locations, effectively perfect correlation ($r = 1.000$) was observed for overall
153 activity between the recorded 100 Hz and the downsampled measurements from the same sensor
154 (Table S1). Comparison of sampling rate via the downsampling of 100 Hz data to 25 Hz in the same
155 sensor resulted in less than 0.1% difference in overall activity and MVPA across both the hip and wrist
156 (Table S1, Figure S1).

157 *Intensity of Self-Reported Activities*

158 Correlation between acceleration vector magnitude measured at 25 Hz and 100 Hz sampling rates was
159 high during all self-reported non-sleeping activities at the wrist ($r = 0.956$ to 0.997) and hip ($r = 0.977$
160 to 1.000). When recording at the hip, the 25 Hz sampling rate resulted in a mean relative difference in
161 vector magnitude of -12.9% to -16.7% when compared to the 100 Hz sampling rate across all non-
162 sleeping activities. The greatest difference in 25 Hz and 100 Hz data at the wrist was observed during
163 cycling activity, where the 25 Hz accelerometer recorded relative difference of -38.6% when compared
164 to the 100 Hz recording. Other non-sleeping activities resulted in a -7.4% to -15.1% relative difference
165 when recorded at 25 Hz at the wrist. Acceleration during sleep was predictably low, with lower
166 correlation between sampling rates when compared to other activities ($r = 0.476$ to 0.899). The actual
167 differences are small due to the very activity measured during sleep intervals.

168 *Machine Learning Activity Classification*

169 Results of the machine learning activity classification are presented in Table 3. Periods of walking,
170 sleep, sit/stand activities, and mixed activities were identified in all participants, whereas periods of
171 cycling and vehicle activities were identified in 13 and 41 participants, respectively. In all participants
172 who had cycling or vehicle activities classified within the 100 Hz 24-hour recording, that activity was
173 also identified within the 25 Hz data. Reduced sampling rate did not produce consistent trends in
174 underreporting of activity across machine learning activity classification as was observed in the
175 quantification of vector magnitude. Activity classification between 25 Hz and 100 Hz measured data
176 was highly correlated ($r = 0.855$ to 0.967) in all activity categories. The reduced sampling rate resulted
177 in classification of 12.4% (95% CI: 7.5%, 17.4%) more of walking time, 12.8% (95% CI: 6.7%, 18.9%) less
178 time in mixed activities, and 19.2% (95% CI: 8.2%, 30.3%) less vehicle time per participant when
179 compared to 100 Hz collected data in this machine learning model. Cycling, sleep, and sit/stand
180 showed close agreement between sampling rates, with percent differences in time spent in these
181 activities ranging between 0.2% to 4.6%.

182 *Converting data collected at lower sample rates to enable comparison with other studies*

183 Results from the linear regression and cross-validation relating sampling rates based on overall 24-
184 hour vector magnitude and activity classification models are presented in Table 4. At the hip and wrist,
185 the linear model of sampling rate accounted for between 97% and 99% of the adjusted variability in
186 the vector magnitude as described by R^2 . Cross-validation across 51 folds at the wrist and 45 folds at
187 the hip resulted in RSME values of 6.5% and 4.7% of the mean wrist and hip vector magnitude,
188 respectively. For each unit of increase in activity of 1 mg at the 25 Hz sampling rate, epoch-based
189 vector magnitude at the 100 Hz sample rate increased by 1.158 mg (95% CI: 1.120, 1.195) in
190 hip-mounted accelerometers and 1.038 mg (95% CI: 0.986, 1.090) in wrist-mounted accelerometers.
191 Acceleration magnitude collected at 25 Hz with a wrist-mounted AX3 accelerometer, Acc_{25} , can be
192 adjusted for comparison to a more standard 100 Hz dataset. Acc_{100} , (Box 1) using the relationship:

193 $Acc_{100} = 1.038(Acc_{25}) + 3.310$. Transformations from 25 Hz to 100 Hz data were generated for
194 mixed, sit/stand, vehicle, and walking activities. In wrist-based activity classification, 69.5% to 92.1%
195 of the variability between sampling rates was accounted for in the models, with cross-validation RMSE
196 representing 7.5% of the mean time in the sit/stand classification and up to 50.5% the mean time
197 spent walking. Due to the small difference in classification of sleep and cycling, no transformation for
198 these activities is recommended.

199

200 **Discussion**

201 Outcome measures based on acceleration magnitude, cutpoint thresholds, and activity classification
202 are commonly used in clinical and population studies of physical activity [1,10,18]. To validate the use
203 of reduced sampling rate during physical activity measurement, acceleration magnitude and activity
204 classification was assessed across body location and self-reported activity types. Reduction in
205 recorded sampling rate from 100 Hz to 25 Hz resulted in consistently lower measured overall activity
206 at both hip and wrist body locations using a 30 second epoch mean vector magnitude. Conversely, no
207 consistent pattern in under or overreporting of machine learned activity classification was identified
208 between differing sampling rates. While both acceleration magnitude and activity classification are
209 highly correlated between sampling rates, subtle, yet real differences in outcome measures were
210 observed. Transformation of 25 Hz data can enable extended activity monitoring protocols while
211 retaining comparability to data collected at 100 Hz.

212 In the current study of healthy adults in the free-living environment, we found a repeatable difference
213 in measured acceleration magnitude and MVPA in a side-by-side comparison of data collection at 25
214 Hz and 100 Hz. When using a reduced sampling rate a 12% to 13% lower 24-hour activity and 11% to
215 23% lower time in MVPA was observed, compared to 100 Hz data collection at the hip and wrist.
216 Consistently lower acceleration magnitude was also observed in the 25 Hz recording across diary-
217 logged free-living activities. Similar to the current study, Brønd and Ardivsson [11] found ActiGraph

218 GT3x counts demonstrated small differences between sampling rates (30 Hz, 40 Hz, and 100 Hz) during
219 walking, yet large differences between sampling rates during running, with up to 3000 counts per
220 minute greater intensity recorded in the faster sampling rates. Two other prior investigations of
221 accelerometer sampling rate relied on downsampling accelerometer data from a single sensor, with
222 mixed results and frequently little difference between sampling rates when using raw acceleration-
223 based metrics[13,14]. In this study we conducted a secondary analysis by downsampling data initially
224 collected at 100 Hz, which also resulted in no difference in acceleration magnitude and MVPA at a
225 lower sampling rate, even while raw data collection at 25 Hz demonstrated a reduction in the activity
226 intensity captured during acceleration analysis. Subsequently, basic downsampling of data from a
227 single accelerometer is probably insufficient to determine the full effect of different sampling rates.

228 When using machine learning models of activity classification, we found high correlation between
229 different sampling rates across all classified activities. No repeatable pattern in under or over reporting
230 was observed in the reduced sampling rate, however, higher walking time and lower vehicle travel
231 time classified in the 25 Hz data. This finding is contrary to a study published by Zhang et al. [12] which
232 reported no significant reduction in activity classification accuracy when comparing downsampled
233 data to the original 80 Hz sequence. It is likely the use of downsampling versus a side-by-side
234 comparison has contributed to the opposing findings. Compared to overall vector magnitude and the
235 sit/stand classification, higher RMSE relative to mean values were observed in transformation model
236 for classified time in mixed activity, vehicle, and walking. This may be the result of fewer participants
237 and less time spent in these activities within the current dataset relative to low vector-magnitude
238 sit/stand activities.

239 Most recent physical activity studies include protocols where acceleration data is collected at a
240 sampling frequency between 20 and 100 Hz [10,18,19]. It is important to note that reporting of
241 sampling rate used in testing protocols remains a problem in the field of physical activity, with recent
242 reviews finding that 16% to 73% studies failed to report the sampling rate used in their data collection

243 protocol [10,18]. In an assessment of benchmark datasets, Khan et al [20] have argued that typical
244 accelerometer sampling rates in many human motion studies are up to 57% higher than necessary for
245 adequate data analysis, with optimal sampling rates between 12 and 63Hz depending on body location
246 and model of accelerometer. Migueles et al[18], however, argue that future data processing needs
247 are unknown, and thus the highest possible sampling frequency should be used. The world's largest
248 objectively-measured physical activity database contains accelerometer data from 100 Hz data
249 collection using the AX3 device [1]. Based on the results of the current study, if a reduced sampling
250 rate of 25 Hz is selected in a measurement protocol, acceleration magnitude can be adjusted for
251 comparison to a more standard 100 Hz dataset.

252

253 Strengths and limitations

254 A major strength of our study is that it includes a side-by-side comparison of standard and reduced
255 accelerometer sampling rates at multiple body locations, without dependency on downsampling. This
256 methodology includes the comprehensive use of vector magnitude, cut-point, and machine learning
257 variables to facilitate direct comparison of data collected at 25 Hz with existing large physical activity
258 cohorts that have collected data at 100 Hz. However, data was collected in a healthy convenience
259 sample, and there may be unquantified effects of measurement in disease populations. While
260 individual devices were randomised to body location (hip/wrist), a potential limitation is that the exact
261 position of devices at each location was not randomised by design. For example, when sensors were
262 placed side-by-side on participants' wrists, it could be possible that the 100 Hz sensor was more
263 frequently placed nearer to the wrist and thus experience slightly higher accelerations. However, we
264 feel this alternative explanation is unlikely to account for the differences we and others have found
265 [11]. Epoch-based comparisons can have sensitivity to exact epoch boundaries, as all individual sensor
266 clocks drift slightly over time. Comparing two epochs between devices that report the same
267 boundaries may be comparing two slightly different periods.

268 **Conclusion**

269 Reducing accelerometer sampling rate from 100 Hz to 25 Hz can dramatically extend study monitoring
270 periods while still providing valid data, after appropriate transformations. In order to facilitate
271 comparisons between studies, researchers should consider and discuss the effect of sampling rate on
272 data analysis, and fully report all accelerometer parameters in the study methodology.

273

274 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

275 SS is supported by the Clarendon Fund from Oxford University and the Oxford University Press. SK, AD
276 and PD are supported by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Oxford Biomedical Research
277 Centre (BRC). DJ is a director and shareholder of Axivity, Ltd. AD is supported by Health Data Research
278 UK. AD and SC are supported by the Alan Turing Institute and the British Heart Foundation (grant
279 number SP/18/4/33803). The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of
280 the NIHR. Funding sources played no role in study design. All authors have completed ICMJE disclosure
281 forms, which are included in the supplemental material. The STROBE checklist for cohort studies is
282 also included in the supplemental material. Figure 1 was created with BioRender.com.

283

284 References

- 285 1 Doherty A, Jackson D, Hammerla N, *et al.* Large scale population assessment of physical
286 activity using wrist worn accelerometers: The UK biobank study. *PLoS One* 2017;**12**:1–14.
287 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0169649
- 288 2 Ekelund U, Tarp J, Steene-Johannessen J, *et al.* Dose-response associations between
289 accelerometry measured physical activity and sedentary time and all cause mortality:
290 Systematic review and harmonised meta-analysis. *BMJ* 2019;**366**. doi:10.1136/bmj.l4570
- 291 3 Troiano RP, Berrigan D, Dodd KW, *et al.* Physical activity in the United States measured by
292 accelerometer. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2008;**40**:181–8. doi:10.1249/mss.0b013e31815a51b3
- 293 4 Redfield MM, Anstrom KJ, Levine JA, *et al.* Isosorbide Mononitrate in Heart Failure with
294 Preserved Ejection Fraction. *N Engl J Med* 2015;**373**:2314–24. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1510774
- 295 5 Wolff-Hughes DL, McClain JJ, Dodd KW, *et al.* Number of accelerometer monitoring days
296 needed for stable group-level estimates of activity. *Physiol Meas* 2016;**37**:1447–55.
297 doi:10.1088/0967-3334/37/9/1447
- 298 6 Ricardo LIC, Wendt A, Galliano LM, *et al.* Number of days required to estimate objectively
299 measured physical activity constructs in different age groups. *bioRxiv* 2019;:610030.
300 doi:10.1101/610030
- 301 7 Taraldsen K, Vereijken B, Thingstad P, *et al.* Multiple days of monitoring are needed to obtain
302 a reliable estimate of physical activity in hip-fracture patients. *J Aging Phys Act* 2014;**22**:173–
303 7. doi:10.1123/JAPA.2012-0130
- 304 8 Da Silva SG, Evenson KR, Ekelund U, *et al.* How many days are needed to estimate wrist-worn
305 accelerometry-assessed physical activity during the second trimester in pregnancy? *PLoS One*
306 2018;**14**. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0211442
- 307 9 Armitage LC, Chi Y, Santos M, *et al.* Monitoring activity of hip injury patients (MoHIP): A sub-
308 study of the World Hip Trauma Evaluation observational cohort study. *Pilot Feasibility Stud*
309 2020;**6**:3D.2. doi:10.1186/s40814-020-00612-2
- 310 10 Small SR, Bullock GS, Khalid S, *et al.* Current clinical utilisation of wearable motion sensors for
311 the assessment of outcome following knee arthroplasty: a scoping review. *BMJ Open*
312 2019;**9**:e033832. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2019-033832
- 313 11 Brønd JC, Arvidsson D. Sampling frequency affects the processing of Actigraph raw
314 acceleration data to activity counts. *J Appl Physiol* 2016;**120**:362–9.
315 doi:10.1152/jappphysiol.00628.2015
- 316 12 Zhang S, Murray P, Zillmer R, *et al.* Activity classification using the genea: Optimum sampling
317 frequency and number of axes. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2012;**44**:2228–34.
318 doi:10.1249/MSS.0b013e31825e19fd
- 319 13 Clevenger KA, Pfeiffer KA, Mackintosh KA, *et al.* Effect of sampling rate on acceleration and
320 counts of hip- and wrist-worn ActiGraph accelerometers in children. *Physiol Meas*
321 2019;**40**:095008. doi:10.1088/1361-6579/ab444b
- 322 14 Karas M, Bai J, Strackiewicz M, *et al.* Accelerometry data in health research: challenges and
323 opportunities Review and examples. Published Online First: 2018. doi:10.1055/s-0034-
324 1387696
- 325 15 van Hees VT, Fang Z, Langford J, *et al.* Autocalibration of accelerometer data for free-living

- 326 physical activity assessment using local gravity and temperature: an evaluation on four
327 continents. *J Appl Physiol* 2014;**117**:738–44. doi:10.1152/jappphysiol.00421.2014
- 328 16 Hildebrand M, Van Hees VT, Hansen BH, *et al.* Age group comparability of raw accelerometer
329 output from wrist-and hip-worn monitors. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2014;**46**:1816–24.
330 doi:10.1249/MSS.0000000000000289
- 331 17 Willetts M, Hollowell S, Aslett L, *et al.* Statistical machine learning of sleep and physical
332 activity phenotypes from sensor data in 96 , 220 UK Biobank participants. *Sci Rep* 2018;**1**–10.
333 doi:10.1038/s41598-018-26174-1
- 334 18 Migueles JH, Cadenas-Sanchez C, Ekelund U, *et al.* Accelerometer Data Collection and
335 Processing Criteria to Assess Physical Activity and Other Outcomes: A Systematic Review and
336 Practical Considerations. *Sport Med* 2017;**47**:1821–45. doi:10.1007/s40279-017-0716-0
- 337 19 Farrahi V, Niemelä M, Korpelainen R, *et al.* Calibration and Validation of Accelerometer-based
338 Activity Monitors: A Systematic Review of Machine-Learning Approaches Nordic indicators for
339 eHealth, NeRN View project Patient-Specific Multi-components Finite Element Analysis of
340 Low-Energy Acetabular Fra. *Gait Posture* 2018;**68**:285–99. doi:10.1016/j.gaitpost.2018.12.003
- 341 20 Khan A, Hammerla N, Mellor S, *et al.* Optimising sampling rates for accelerometer-based
342 human activity recognition. *Pattern Recognit Lett* 2016;**73**:33–40.
343 doi:10.1016/j.patrec.2016.01.001
- 344
- 345
- 346

347 **Box 1: Example of converting data collected at 25 Hz so that it can be compared to data collected**
348 **at 100 Hz**

349 A 68 year-old female participant has 7-day mean overall acceleration magnitude of 24.8 mg as
350 recorded at 25 Hz on the dominant wrist with an AX3 accelerometer. Researchers wish to compare
351 this individual to the baseline 65-74 year-old female in the UK Biobank database 26.6 (SD 7.1) mg,
352 recorded at 100 Hz with an AX3 accelerometer[1]. Without sampling rate conversion, a 24.8 mg
353 activity level is below average for her age group, and places this patient in the 40th percentile of
354 activity in the 65-74 year-old female cohort. With 25 Hz to 100 Hz conversion following the wrist-based
355 regression model, $Acc_{100} = 1.038 * Acc_{25} + 3.310$, the participant's comparable acceleration magnitude
356 is 29.1 mg, placing her in the 64th percentile of the appropriate demographic cohort.

357

358 **Table 1: Participant demographics**

359

	Mean	SD
Age (years)	43.4	17.6
Height (cm)	170.5	10.8
Weight (kg)	70.5	13.3
BMI (kg/m ²)	24.2	3.6
Sex		
Female	33	61%
Male	21	39%
Handedness		
Left	8	15%
Right	46	85%

360

361

362

363 **Table 2: Accelerometer measured physical activity for both overall and diary-reported activities in a convenience sample of 51 adults over a single 24hr period.**

	Overall Activity mg	Time in MVPA* mins	Cycling mg	Eating mg	Exercising mg	Sleeping mg	Walking mg
Wrist	<i>n = 51</i>	<i>n = 51</i>	<i>n = 13</i>	<i>n = 44</i>	<i>n = 16</i>	<i>n = 51</i>	<i>n = 44</i>
25 Hz mean [SD]	28.7 [11.4]	86.2 [47.9]	73.4 [21.1]	26.9 [12.4]	301.7 [307.7]	3.2 [0.7]	126.2 [56.0]
100 Hz mean [SD]	33.1 [12.0]	112.1 [53.7]	119.5 [46.5]	31.7 [13.8]	329.5 [326.3]	3.4 [0.8]	136.3 [58.8]
25 Hz -100 Hz mean difference [SD]	-4.4 [2.1]	-25.9 [16.0]	-46.1 [27.5]	-4.8 [2.5]	-27.8 [25.7]	-0.2 [0.3]	-10.1 [11.6]
Spearman's correlation	0.97	0.96	0.96	0.96	1.00	0.90	0.96
ICC	0.98	0.95	0.71	0.98	1.00	0.92	0.98
Hip	<i>n = 45</i>	<i>n = 45</i>	<i>n = 11</i>	<i>n = 40</i>	<i>n = 14</i>	<i>n = 45</i>	<i>n = 39</i>
25 Hz mean [SD]	14.1 [6.1]	72.0 [46.0]	51.7 [16.9]	9.2 [6.4]	97.5 [102.0]	2.5 [0.3]	102.2 [44.6]
100 Hz mean [SD]	16.1 [7.1]	81.7 [47.6]	60.2 [18.7]	10.8 [7.5]	117.2 [125.5]	2.6 [0.3]	117.3 [52.0]
25 Hz -100 Hz mean difference [SD]	-2.0 [1.2]	-9.7 [6.1]	-8.5 [3.0]	-1.6 [1.3]	-19.6 [24.5]	-0.1 [0.3]	-15.1 [8.2]
Spearman's correlation	0.99	0.99	1.00	0.98	1.00	0.48	0.99
ICC	0.98	0.99	0.99	0.98	0.98	0.57	0.99

364

365 *MVPA reported in minutes calculated by 30s epochs with acceleration magnitude ≥ 100 mg at the wrist and ≥ 70 mg at the hip

366

367

368

369 **Table 3: Machine learned activity classification for wrist accelerometers in a convenience sample of 51 adults over a single 24hr period.**

370

	Cycling min	Mixed Activity min	Sit/Stand min	Sleep min	Vehicle min	Walking min
Participants with the identified activity	<i>n</i> = 13	<i>n</i> = 51	<i>n</i> = 51	<i>n</i> = 51	<i>n</i> = 41	<i>n</i> = 51
25 Hz classified mean time [SD]	27.0 [17.2]	143.0 [115.0]	568.4 [139.2]	475.0 [68.1]	64.4 [58.6]	192.4 [91.9]
100 Hz classified mean time [SD]	28.3 [18.9]	164.0 [129.6]	553.3 [148.7]	475.9 [73.9]	79.7 [57.2]	171.1 [89.1]
25-100 Hz mean difference in classified time [SD]	-1.3 [4.0]	-21.0 [36.4]	15.1 [40.4]	-1.0 [30.8]	-15.3 [28.6]	21.3 [31.0]
Spearman's correlation	0.97	0.92	0.95	0.86	0.89	0.92
ICC	0.98	0.96	0.96	0.91	0.88	0.94

371

372


373 **Table 4: Linear regression to convert accelerometer data collected at 25 Hz so that it can be compared to data collected at 100 Hz. R² and RMSE values are reported from**
 374 **Leave-one-subject-out cross-validation.**

	Coefficient [SE]	95% CI	p	Intercept [SE]	95% CI	R²	RMSE
Acceleration Magnitude (mg)							
25 Hz to 100 Hz							
Wrist	1.038 [0.026]	(0.986, 1.090)	<0.001	3.310 [0.798]	(1.706, 4.914)	0.967	2.155
Hip	1.158 [0.019]	(1.120, 1.195)	<0.001	-0.180 [0.283]	(-0.751, 0.391)	0.988	0.757
Activity Classification at Wrist (min)							
25 Hz to 100 Hz							
Cycling			Not necessary				
Mixed Activity	1.085 [0.044]	(0.997, 1.172)	<0.001	8.905 [7.952]	(-7.074, 24.88)	0.921	36.1
Sit/Stand	1.0282 [0.041]	(0.945, 1.111)	<0.001	-31.14 [24.15]	(-79.67, 17.40)	0.921	41.5
Sleep			Not necessary				
Vehicle	0.858 [0.075]	(0.707, 1.009)	<0.001	24.47 [6.466]	(11.40, 37.55)	0.695	32.7
Walking	0.913 [0.047]	(0.820, 1.007)	<0.001	-4.630 [9.911]	(-24.55, 15.29)	0.877	31.0

375

376

377



378
379
380
381
382

Figure 1: Diagram of accelerometer placement with flow chart of participants with valid wear time at each body location.





Figure 2: Schematic of study design to inform conversion of accelerometer data collected at 25 Hz to enable comparison with studies collected at 100 Hz.



386


387 **Figure 3:** Plot of mean (95%CI) 24-hour activity in 1-hour epochs as measured by acceleration vector magnitude across a convenience sample of 51 participants at each of
 388 the four sensor location/rate combinations.

389

390

391

392



393
 394
 395
 396
 397
 398
 399
 400

Figure 4: Bland-Altman plots comparing the mean acceleration vector magnitude and differences between the 25 Hz and 100 Hz sensors at the wrist and hip in a convenience sample of 51 adults. Dashed lines indicated mean bias and 95% limits of agreement. Negative bias on the y-axis indicates lower values in the 25 Hz sensor.