

eScholarship@UMassChan

Validating and Testing Wearable Sensors to Assess Physical Activity and Sedentary Behavior in the Center for Personalized Health Monitoring

Item Type	Presentation
Authors	Freedson, Patty
DOI	10.13028/2xrg-g151
Rights	Copyright the Author(s)
Download date	2026-03-15 10:58:00
Item License	http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/
Link to Item	https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14038/28035



Validating and Testing Wearable Sensors to Assess Physical Activity and Sedentary Behavior in the Center for Personalized Health Monitoring

Patty Freedson, Ph.D.


Co-Chair, Organizing Committee, Center for Personalized Health Monitoring

Department of Kinesiology

School of Public Health and Health Sciences

University of Massachusetts Amherst

May 20, 2014



Outline

- Introduction
- Validation of wearable sensors
- Testing of wearable consumer activity trackers
- Capability of sensor evaluation in Human Testing Center in Center for Personalized Health Monitoring (CPHM)



Human testing facilities in the Center for Personalized Health Monitoring


- **Research on wearable monitors to develop algorithms to translate sensor signals into meaningful and biologically valid output for clinical applications**
 - Establishing meaning to personal biomarkers of health

- **To determine the functionality and wearability of sensors**

- **Evaluation to determine how human movement affects brain, muscle, bone, tendons, ligaments and supporting structures and systems**

- **Translation: Evaluation of sensors for the commercial pipeline by establishing accuracy, effectiveness and usability of sensors**
 - Usefulness of the 'Quantified Self'

Relationship between Actigraph counts and METS




Activity Intensity	MET Range	Activity Counts (cnts·min ⁻¹)
Light	<3.00	<1952
Moderate	3.00-5.99	1952-5724
Hard	6.00-8.99	5725-9498
Very hard	>8.99	>9498


— Regression
- - - 95% confid.

Freedson et al., MSSE, 1998

Activity counts and cutpoints






Minutes of moderate to vigorous physical activity: NHANES 2003-2004



Traditional Data Processing of Accelerometer Data

- **Provide physiological meaning to accelerometer data**
- **Linear regression models**
 - **Predict point estimate of energy expenditure**
 - **Classify activity intensity**
- **Extensively used in the literature to characterize/quantify physical activity behavior**
- **Numerous revised regression models**
 - **Confusion in the literature**
- **Method fails to discriminate intensity levels properly**
 - **Similar counts with different energy expenditure**
 - **Walking uphill vs walking on level ground**
 - **Different counts with same energy expenditure**

Illustration of a Fundamental Problem Using Average Counts



These three time series of simulated accelerometer data have the same total or mean counts per minute. They would all be classified as “moderate” activity using typical data processing methods, but they could represent activities with substantially different energy costs.


How Can We Maximize the Information Collected?

- **Use entire sequence and pattern of accelerometer signal**
 - **Use features of signal**
 - **Process with pattern recognition algorithms**


- **Continual 'learning' by example**
 - **Powerful**
 - **Flexible**

Advanced Data Processing: Machine Learning


Artificial Neural Network




Random Forest



Support Vector Machine



Estimated METs Using the ANN and Linear Regression Equations



We tested the method on data from Crouter et al. (2006).

48 subjects did a variety of activities.

Indirect calorimetry used to estimate average PAEE for each person & activity.

Leave 1 out cross validation:
method never fit and evaluated on same subject's data.

Staudenmayer et al, JAP, 2009

Artificial neural network trained to estimate METs and applied to independent dataset





Fig. 1. Measured metabolic equivalents (METs) vs. METs predicted from neural network (nnetMET). The nnetMET was developed on University of Massachusetts (UMass) data set ($n = 277$) and applied to University of Tennessee ($n = 65$) data set. The bias was 0.32 METs, and the root mean square error (RMSE) was 1.90 METs.

Machine learning models to detect activity types developed and tested in lab and free living settings in older adults



Consumer wearable sensors to estimate activity and sleep



Fitbit One



Samsung Gear Fit



Fitbit flex



Garmin Vivofit

Nike Fuel

Jawbone Up

Misfit Shine



Withings Pulse



Basis Carbon Steel




Polar loop

Accuracy of the Fitbit in estimating energy expenditure

Methods

- N = 20 college-age participants
- Performed treadmill walking and running and other activities
- Compared ee from indirect calorimetry to fitbit estimate of ee

Fitbit EE vs Indirect calorimetry



Fitbit social media application

Compete or share with friends

Up for a little healthy competition? Bring friends and family in on the fun so you can compare stats, share progress, and cheer each other on. Your leaderboard refreshes all day long in the Fitbit App so you know exactly how many more steps you need to rise to the top.

fitbit

Hi hugh@hughwilliams.com | Help | Log Out | Cart


DASHBOARD LOG PRODUCTS COMMUNITY PREMIUM

Friends **Leaderboard** Top Badges

7 day 30 day Leaders among your friends

Steps	Distance	Active Score	Very Active Minutes
1 David 157,287 steps 22,470 avg.	1 David 80.33 miles 11.48 avg.	1 David 12,945 pts	1 David 519 mins very active 74 avg.
2 Hugh W. 123,700 steps 17,671 avg.	2 Hugh W. 57.23 miles 8.18 avg.	2 Hugh W. 9,705 pts	2 Cookie 406 mins very active 58 avg.
3 selina 110,806 steps 15,844 avg.	3 Cookie 50.60 miles 7.23 avg.	3 Cookie 8,346 pts	3 Hugh W. 350 mins very active 50 avg.
4 Cookie 108,105 steps 15,444 avg.	4 selina 48.89 miles 6.98 avg.	4 selina 8,010 pts	4 selina 275 mins very active 39 avg.


Fitbit output wirelessly transmitted to smart phone or computer: sleep and activity data





How does this relate to the CPHM?

- **This work uses off the shelf activity sensors**
- **We have established ourselves as leaders in the activity monitor testing and algorithm development space**
- **Most of our previous work is in lab settings**
- **In CPHM we will have the capacity to:**
 - **Test many types of sensors built in house collaborating with electrical and computer engineering, polymer science, computer science, mathematics and statistics, other disciplines**
 - **Work with industry (e.g. medical device companies, activity monitor companies)**
 - **Test in real world instrumented home setting**
 - **Study clinical applications**
 - **Use in interventions for self monitoring**
 - **Social media for motivation and sustaining behavior change**


Human testing facilities in CPHM




Human testing facilities in CPHM




Human testing facilities in CPHM



Human testing facilities in CPHM



Normalized overlaid plot for a representative participant (10-year-old boy, weight = 76.5 kg, height = 155 cm) obtained during first 600 min of the ~24-h stay in the whole-room indirect calorimeter.




AHA Scientific Statement

Guide to the Assessment of Physical Activity: Clinical and Research Applications

A Scientific Statement From the American Heart Association

Scott J. Strath, PhD, Chair; Leonard A. Kaminsky, PhD, Co-Chair;
Barbara E. Ainsworth, PhD, MPH, FAHA; Ulf Ekelund, PhD; Patty S. Freedson, PhD;
Rebecca A. Gary, RN, PhD; Caroline R. Richardson, MD; Derek T. Smith, PhD;
Ann M. Swartz, PhD; on behalf of the American Heart Association Physical
Activity Committee of the Council on Lifestyle and Cardiometabolic Health and Cardiovascular,
Exercise, Cardiac Rehabilitation and Prevention Committee of the Council on Clinical Cardiology, and
Council on Cardiovascular and Stroke Nursing

Decision matrix guide to selecting a physical activity measurement instrument



Note: 1=Physical activity questionnaires; 2=Physical activity logs/diaries; 3=Heart Rate Monitoring; 4=Pedometers; 5=Accelerometer; 6=Multi-unit Sensors; 7=Doubly Labeled Water

Strath S J et al. *Circulation*. 2013;128:2259-2279

Acknowledgements

Collaborators

John Staudenmayer
David Pober
Scott Crouter
David Bassett
Amanda Hickey
Dinesh John
Sarah Kozey
Kate Lyden
Albert Mendoza
Jeffer Sasaki

Funding Support

NIH R01 CA121005
NIH U01 CA 130783
NIH RC1 HL0099557





Thank-you