

Abstract

Purpose: To evaluate the feasibility of using wearable activity monitors as part of a physical activity (PA) intervention and describe patterns of device wear time and PA behavior in people with Parkinson (PD) and Huntington disease (HD).

Materials and Methods: Secondary analyses were conducted on two pilot studies where people with early-stage PD (n=13) and HD (n=14) enrolled in a 4-month PA coaching program. Participants wore a Fitbit Charge 2 and physical and occupational therapists guided them through understanding of PA data and goal-setting to build autonomy and facilitate PA uptake. Wear time, wear habits (delineated based on nighttime wear), and activity metrics including steps, resting heart rate, and metabolic equivalent of task (MET) *minutes were analyzed.

Results: Retention rate of the intervention was 85%. Participants had a mean (SD) of 92.3(9.2)% valid wear days over the intervention period. Average daily wear time was 18.4(4.5) hours, with an initial 2-week period of high wear time fluctuation. Regardless of diagnosis, day & night Fitbit wearers had more improvements in steps (d=1.02) and MET*min/week (d=0.69) compared to day-only wearers.

Conclusions: Implementing wearable activity monitors in a PA coaching intervention was feasible and provided insight into longitudinal PA behavior in people with neurodegenerative diseases.

Keywords: Exercise, Wearable Sensors, Digital Health, Parkinson Disease, Huntington Disease, Coaching, Physical Therapy, Occupational Therapy.

Introduction

Physical activity (PA) is essential for the maintenance of physical and mental wellbeing, and federal guidelines provide clear direction on frequency, intensity, and duration of exercise for most individuals.¹⁻³ In modern-day life, it is arguably difficult for the general population to reach recommended levels of PA, let alone those with neurodegenerative diseases who have motor and cognitive impairments that may impact mobility.⁴⁻⁶ Insufficient PA is especially detrimental for people living with neurodegenerative diseases, such as Parkinson disease (PD) and Huntington disease (HD), as there is evidence that PA can slow functional decline and is potentially neuroprotective.⁷⁻¹⁰ PD and HD are neurodegenerative diseases that primarily affect the basal ganglia, resulting in movement disorders that over time become progressively more disabling.^{11,12} Due to the length of time over which neural degeneration occurs in both diseases, developing interventions that facilitate initiation of, and adherence to, regular PA early in the disease is critical and can set the stage for long-term disease self-management.^{13,14}

Physical and occupational therapists are uniquely trained to provide consultation for PA uptake as they are trusted by patients and well-versed in exercise prescription, neurological disease presentation, and motivational interviewing. However, therapists are challenged by limited sessions of therapy and inadequate means of monitoring exercise outside of therapy.^{15,16} Remote monitoring devices such as wearable activity monitors can provide objective feedback on PA levels and have the potential to augment physical and occupational therapy interventions.¹⁷⁻¹⁹ Combining therapists' expert consultation and wearable activity monitors may result in increased and sustained PA uptake.

Wearable activity monitors such as Fitbit, Garmin, and Apple Watch are now ubiquitous in daily life. There is growing research that incorporates these wearable devices, especially in fields focused on cancer, cardiovascular, and metabolic diseases.²⁰⁻²³ People with neurodegenerative diseases have unique barriers related to their disease presentation, specifically in terms of motor, cognitive, and mood function.²⁴⁻²⁷ Several studies have shown that wearable activity monitors may provide useful information that can be used to support PA uptake in people with neurodegenerative diseases.²⁸⁻³⁰ Beyond the potential of wearable activity monitor data as an outcome measurement, they are also valuable as a behavior change intervention tool.³¹ Wearable activity monitors can provide insight into individual PA levels and enable more individualized goal setting and monitoring.

This paper reports secondary analysis of two related pilot studies in which a commercially available PA monitor, Fitbit Charge 2, was used as part of a 4-month PA coaching intervention in people with PD and HD. The purpose of this paper is to: 1) evaluate the feasibility of Fitbit devices as part of a PA intervention in neurodegenerative diseases, 2) describe Fitbit wear patterns and PA behavior during the intervention, and 3) explore if Fitbit wear habits impacted improvement of PA levels during the intervention.

Methods

Coaching Intervention

105 *PreActive-PD* and *PreActive-HD* were two pilot studies of therapist-delivered coaching
106 interventions designed for people with PD (NCT03696589) and HD (NCT03306888),
107 respectively;³² both pilot studies were used to inform larger clinical trials (NCT03344601 &
108 NCT05308238). The interventions were grounded in self-determination theory and coaching
109 elements focused on promoting autonomy, competence, and relatedness to improve PA
110 behavior.^{33,34} Logic models that describe components of these interventions are previously
111 published.^{35,36} Participants received between 4 and 6 one-on-one therapist coaching sessions
112 either in person or via telehealth over the course of 4 months. A physical or occupational
113 therapist worked collaboratively with the participant using motivational interviewing³⁷ skills
114 while offering support and education. Disease-specific workbooks were provided to participants
115 to reinforce the coaching sessions and self-monitoring.* Therapists provided structured support
116 for goal-setting and evidence-based exercise options. The focus of the intervention was to
117 increase levels of moderate to vigorous PA. To support autonomy, participants were encouraged
118 to select activities that they deemed feasible and meaningful. Therapists provided feedback and
119 strategies to overcome exercise barriers and supported planning for goal attainment.

120

121 Fitbit Use

122 To track PA during the intervention, participants were offered the option of using a Fitbit or a
123 written log, and all participants chose to use the Fitbit. Fitbit use served two main functions: 1) a
124 tool for participants to self-monitor their activity, and 2) data for therapists to review so as to
125 inform coaching. The Fitbits were given to participants in the first coaching session, and
126 therapists assisted with setting up the user accounts. Heart rate maximum was based on age-
127 predicted values as determined by Fitbit (220-age formula³⁸). Participants were provided a 'Fitbit
128 101 guide' for basic functions such as how to sync and charge the device and access activity data
129 on their smartphone or computer. Participants were instructed to wear the device as much as
130 possible during the waking hours, but no specific instructions for night time use were given. The
131 Fitbit accounts were synchronized to the Fitabase (Small Steps Labs LLC, San Diego, CA)
132 platform, a secure cloud-based research platform that enables remote monitoring by the
133 therapists. Prior to coaching sessions, therapists reviewed participants' data since their prior
134 session including daily steps, heart rate, and activity intensity. Fitabase provided graphic
135 visualization of the aforementioned measures that helped facilitate discussion during the
136 coaching sessions (figure 1). Heart rate data provided information on exercise intensity and
137 duration that was helpful for participant's understanding of effective exercise sessions. Exercise
138 goals were reviewed and revised based on wearable data and individual factors.³⁹

139

140 <Insert figure 1 around here>

141

142 Participants

143 Thirteen participants with PD and fourteen participants with HD were enrolled in the *PreActive*
144 intervention. Individuals with PD were recruited through local clinics and support groups and
145 were included if they were 18-85 years old, had a clinical diagnosis of PD Hoehn & Yahr stages
146 I or II, and were able to ambulate independently without an assistive device. Most participants
147 with HD were enrolled through a large clinical trial platform and observational study, Enroll-
148 HD.⁴⁰ Individuals with HD were included if they were 18-65 years old, either premanifest
149 (Unified Huntington Disease Rating Scale^{41,42} Diagnostic Confidence score of 0-3) or in early
150 disease stages (Unified Huntington Disease Rating Scale^{41,42} Total Functional Capacity score of

151 10-13), and had a minimum score of 24 on the Mini-mental State Examination (MMSE)⁴³. All
152 participants were screened using the Physical Activity Readiness Questionnaire (PAR-Q)⁴⁴ for
153 contraindications for exercise, and those who did not pass the PAR-Q were referred to their
154 physician for further screening. Participants with PD or HD were excluded if they had a
155 musculoskeletal injury that would prevent them from participating in exercise, had other
156 neurological disease or uncontrolled psychiatric disorder or behavioral problem, or were already
157 engaging in structured exercise for at least 30 minutes more than three times per week.
158 Participants provided written informed consent approved by the Institutional Review Board of
159 Teachers College, Columbia University and the New York State Psychiatric Institute (HD only).

160

161 Baseline evaluation

162 Basic demographics including age, sex, height, weight, and race/ethnicity were collected. All
163 participants underwent a 6-minute walk test and a Stroop interference test. The 6-minute walk
164 test is a standardized clinical measure that assesses walking capacity and general cardiovascular
165 fitness.⁴⁵ The Stroop interference test presents incongruent color-word matches to assess
166 cognitive abilities including attention and executive function.⁴⁶ Additionally, participants with
167 PD completed the Montreal Cognitive Assessment⁴⁷ and the Brunel Lifestyle Physical Activity
168 Questionnaire⁴⁸. The Montreal Cognitive Assessment is reliable and sensitive to detect cognitive
169 impairments in PD.⁴⁷ The Brunel Lifestyle Physical Activity Questionnaire is a valid and reliable
170 measure that provides insight into participants' planned and unplanned physical activity
171 behaviors.⁴⁸ Participants with HD underwent the Symbol Digit Modality Test and completed the
172 International Physical Activity Questionnaire (IPAQ). The Symbol Digit Modality Test is a brief
173 cognitive assessment that is sensitive to early cognitive changes in HD.⁴⁹ The IPAQ is a widely-
174 validated measure of self-reported physical activity levels.^{50,51}

175

176 Data Analyses

177 *Data extraction*

178 Daily step count, daily resting heart rate, minute-level heart rate, and minute-level metabolic
179 equivalent of task (MET) data were exported from Fitabase. Data cleaning and reduction were
180 done in Python. Wear time data were calculated throughout the intervention, whereas step count,
181 resting heart rate, and MET data were analyzed for a valid week during the first 14 days and the
182 last 14 days of the intervention. A valid week was defined as a 7-day period with at least 4 valid
183 wear days that included at least 1 weekend day. Baseline data were derived from the earliest
184 valid week within the first 14 days, and follow-up data were derived from the latest valid week
185 within the last 14 days of the intervention.

186

187 *Wear time*

188 Wear time was determined using the total minutes of valid heart rate data available per day. A
189 wear time of ≥ 600 minutes (10 hours) was deemed a valid wear day, which is the standard
190 accepted threshold.⁵² From this, average wear time per day and the percentage of valid wear days
191 throughout the intervention duration were calculated. Wear time data was plotted and smoothed
192 using a 30-day moving window.

193

194 *Wear habits*

195 Due to an emergence of two patterns of wear, day wearers (average wear time < 16 hours) and
196 day & night wearers (average wear time ≥ 16 hours) were delineated based on an 8-hour sleep

197 schedule, and these groups were used later to explore the influence of Fitbit wear habits on
198 changes in PA from baseline to follow-up of the intervention.

199

200 *Step count, resting heart rate, and MET*min*

201 Average steps and resting heart rate per day was calculated for baseline and follow-up weeks.

202 MET*min was calculated as the MET values multiplied by the number of minutes that MET

203 value appeared, but only when $MET \geq 3.0$.

204

205 Statistical analysis

206 Descriptive statistics on demographics and baseline assessments were calculated separately on

207 participants with PD and HD. Retention rate was calculated based on the number of participants

208 who completed the intervention. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize wear time,

209 expressed in average wear time as well as the percentage of valid wear day during the

210 intervention. Fitbit metrics including step count, resting heart rate, and MET*min per week were

211 compared between baseline and follow-up using effect sizes (Cohen's d) and calculated

212 separately for participants with PD and HD. The changes in steps and MET*min/week between

213 day wearers and day & night wearers were compared using Cohen's d. The thresholds for

214 interpreting effect size were small: $|d| \geq 0.2$, medium: $|d| \geq 0.5$, and large: $|d| \geq 0.8$. We did not

215 perform any inference statistics due to the feasibility and exploratory nature of this study, and

216 chose to use an estimation approach to provide insights on effect sizes and trends.⁵³

217

218

219 **Results**

220 *Participants*

221 Participants with HD (n=14) were younger and in earlier disease stages than the

222 participants with PD (n=13) (table 1). Due to scheduling availability for pre and post testing, the

223 mean (SD) intervention period for the participants was 101(18) days.

224

225 <Insert table 1 around here>

226

227 *Feasibility*

228 We assessed feasibility using retention rate and wear time. Retention rate was 85%, with

229 3 participants dropping out in the HD group and 1 in the PD group. Reasons for dropout were

230 time constraints (n=2), mood disorders (depression and apathy, n=1), and cognitive impairments

231 (n=1). Participants had a mean (SD) of 92.3 (9.2) % valid wear days (wear time ≥ 10 hours)

232 during the intervention period. Average daily wear time was 18.4 (4.5) hours. Wear time per day

233 varied over the intervention period, with an initial 14-day period of higher fluctuation followed

234 by a relatively steady pattern throughout the rest of the intervention (figure 2). Regardless of

235 diagnosis, participants naturally emerged as either day wearers (n=9, average wear time 13.0

236 (1.2) hours) or day & night wearers (n=14, average wear time 21.9 (1.0) hours) (figure 2).

237

238

239 <Insert figure 2 around here>

240

241

242 *Physical activity metrics at baseline and follow-up*

242 There was a small effect of increased steps per day in participants with PD and decreased
243 steps per day in participants with HD from baseline to follow-up (table 2). There was also small
244 effect of increased MET*min per week in participants with PD, but no apparent effect in
245 participants with HD (table 2). There were no apparent effects found in resting heart rate from
246 baseline to follow-up for either participants with PD or HD (table 2).

247
248 <Insert table 2 around here>

249 *Fitbit wear habits vs. pre-post activity change*

251 We explored whether day wearers and day & night wearers had different changes in steps
252 and MET*min/week from baseline to follow-up (figure 3). Those who were day & night wearers
253 appeared to have greater improvements in steps compared to the day wearers with a large effect
254 size ($d=1.02$). The day & night wearers also appeared to have greater improvements in
255 MET*min/week compared to the day wearers with a medium effect size ($d=0.69$).

256
257 <Insert figure 3 around here>

258 **Discussion**

259
260 This study demonstrated that the use of Fitbits to support therapist-led PA coaching is
261 feasible in people with PD and HD, with high acceptability, retention rate and device wear time.
262 There was a small effect size increase in daily steps and activity (measured as MET*min) in
263 people with PD after the intervention, but not in people with HD. Additionally, those who wore
264 the device day & night showed greater improvements in steps and activity after the intervention
265 compared to those who only wore the device during the day. These findings provide insight into
266 how wearable activity monitors can be implemented in interventions for people with
267 neurodegenerative diseases.

268
269 The use of wearable technology holds promise for the monitoring of health behaviors and as
270 a tool to support behavior change.^{51,54-56} This is true across all populations, but especially so for
271 people with PD and HD, who have lower levels of PA and more disease-specific barriers to
272 engage in PA than the general population.^{5,26,27} A device that allows for long-term monitoring of
273 health behaviors could a) identify changes related to disease progression, and b) deliver tailored
274 PA advice. There is a dearth of research on wearables in this population and the current study
275 offers insights on how people with neurodegenerative disease use this technology. Pradhan and
276 Kelly reported high Fitbit adherence in people with mild PD with less than 10% non-wear per
277 day for an average of 13.8 days out of a total trial time of 14 days.⁵⁷ However, long wear time in
278 a short trial like such is not generalizable to longer interventions that span months like *PreActive*.
279 Thus, further research is needed to understand long-term wearable activity monitor use in the
280 neurological population.

281
282 The high wear time and percentage of valid wear days (≥ 10 hrs), showed participant had
283 excellent adherence and tolerated wearing the device well.⁵⁸ When talking with participants, they
284 mentioned that the Fitbit device motivated them, kept them honest about their workouts,
285 provided daily reminders, and encouraged more walking with its step counting function. Most
286 participants also said they checked their data at least daily, indicating high device engagement.
287

288 The divide between day wearers and day & night wearers showed that there may be a natural
289 preference of wear habits, perhaps due to comfort during sleep. Moreover, the initial large
290 oscillations of wear time for about 2 weeks may indicate that there is a period of acclimation for
291 the participants to become used to the device and develop their own wearing habits.

292
293 Different wear habits that naturally emerged corresponded to different amount of PA uptake
294 throughout the intervention. In fact, more than half of the day & night wearers increased in steps
295 and MET*min, whereas more than half of the day wearers decreased in these metrics (figure 3).
296 Because a decline in PA over time is in line with the natural progression of neurodegenerative
297 diseases,⁴ maintaining or increasing PA during an intervention might be considered a success.
298 Further to this, the focus of our intervention was to increase time spent in moderate to vigorous
299 intensity PA and not necessarily total daily activity, which may explain the lack of a large
300 increase in step count. We speculate that the differences in PA change between people with
301 different wear habits may be due to the level of commitment and engagement to the device and
302 the *PreActive* program. Even though participants were not instructed to wear the devices to sleep,
303 those who are more enthusiastic and dedicated to improving their health and wellness in general
304 may be more motivated to track their sleep data. It is also possible that activity levels are linked
305 to sleep quality. For example, people with poor sleep (therefore less tolerant wearing a device at
306 night) might find it difficult to increase their activity levels during the day.

307
308 There is limited research on the validity of wearable devices in the collection of movement
309 and physiological data on people with PD and HD. de Carvalho Lana et al (2021) found a high
310 correlation ($R=.82$) in step counts between the Fitbit Charge and the criterion measure
311 (researcher count),⁵⁹ and Keren et al (2021) found similar positive findings among a free-living
312 HD population.⁶⁰ However, given changes in motor symptoms associated with PD and HD, and
313 that physiological responses to exercise may be different in people with PD and HD versus
314 healthy individuals, additional research on validity and reliability of wearables in this population
315 is warranted.

316
317 The differences in steps and MET*min between participants with PD and HD at the start of
318 our intervention are potentially revealing distinctions in actual participant behavior and/or bias in
319 measurements. The higher steps and activity measured in those with HD may be due to their
320 younger age and greater agitation and restlessness as reported in some literature,⁶¹ compared to
321 PD. Given that our participants with HD are all early disease-stage, it is less likely that they have
322 chorea (involuntary movements of the arms), which has been shown to lead to a greater amount
323 of step counts in accelerometry.⁶⁰ One study demonstrated that individuals with early-stage HD
324 have been shown to have higher energy expenditure, which appears to be due to increased
325 physical activity, both voluntary and involuntary.⁶² In our study, we noticed a higher-than-typical
326 MET*min per week calculated from Fitbit data in both participants with PD and HD. For
327 example, MET*min per week data at the start of the intervention was almost double that
328 collected via self-reported IPAQ at baseline for people with HD (Tables 1 & 2). Fitbit does not
329 release information on how their MET estimates are calculated, but indicates that it is estimated
330 based on heart rate for non-step activities, and presumably based on steps for stepping
331 activities.⁶³ Furthermore, Fitbit's "activity minutes" metric, based on >3 METs for more than 10
332 minutes bouts, has been validated against research-grade accelerometers' estimate of moderate to
333 vigorous PA.⁶⁴ Assuming Fitbit MET scores are valid METs, the increased MET*min numbers

334 compared to self-report estimates may be due to the passive nature of Fitbit data collection,
335 enabling more activity to be captured that would not have been documented through recall.
336

337 There are several limitations to this study. Participants were not blinded to their device data
338 during these weeks used for comparison, so there may have been reactivity, especially in the
339 initial week. Similarly, it is possible that data at the start of the intervention are inflated due the
340 initiation of therapist-led coaching. Due to the variable individual cardiovascular conditions in
341 neurodegenerative diseases, use of age-predicted algorithms is likely not to have been as accurate
342 as maximal exercise testing would have been to inform heart rate response and better define
343 individual's exercising heart rate zones. However, exercise testing also presents inherent
344 limitations, as tests can be limited by local muscular fatigue or coordination issues with people
345 with PD and HD, thus underestimating maximum heart rate. Another limitation is related to wear
346 time calculation. We determined wear time by the availability of minute-level heart rate data, but
347 it is possible that wear time was underestimated if the device was worn too loose on the wrist,
348 missed measurements, or if the device discarded minute level data after prolonged period of
349 failure to sync. However, if this was the case, actual wear time in this cohort would have been
350 even higher, further supporting the high adherence and feasibility of Fitbit implementation.
351 Finally, we did not systematically collect qualitative data on participant's experience with Fitbit,
352 and further research understanding their perspective would be invaluable.
353

354 Despite wearable activity monitors' popularity among the general public and in PA research,
355 there are inherent logistical challenges to incorporating them into a study. A recent paper by
356 Balbim and colleagues provided a summary of these challenges and proposed solutions for
357 implementing wearable activity monitors in behavior change intervention studies.⁶⁵ Our
358 experience elicited additional considerations into specific barriers to implement Fitbit in the
359 neurodegenerative population, presented below (table 3).
360

361 <Insert table 3 around here>
362

363 Some additional considerations may be valuable for future implementation of wearable
364 activity monitors in PA intervention programs. Blinding device data to reduce reactivity will
365 likely offer a more accurate portrayal of usual PA behaviors. Commercial wearable devices are
366 also intervention tools due to the push notifications and may be hard to blind. Therefore in
367 certain situations that require blinding of data, employing research grade accelerometers should
368 be considered. Use of a data aggregation platform such as Fitabase was found to be very useful
369 for data visualization and management, however, alternative options exist. For example,
370 researchers with sufficient technical knowhow can connect directly to the Fitbit Application
371 Programming Interface (API) to access data. Alternatively, it is viable on a small scale to use
372 individual Fitbit account dashboards for research or clinical programs that have limited funding.
373 To make intervention programs more pragmatic, one may consider allowing participants to bring
374 their own wearable device. If participants are new to wearable activity monitors, it would be
375 valuable to include a 2-week acclimation period whether providing as an intervention and/or
376 using as a measurement tool. Additionally, if sleep data are of interest, considering participants'
377 willingness to wear the device at night may be an important inclusion criterion. Finally, our
378 coaching program was led by therapists that could guide participants on optimal use of Fitbit
379 monitors, including personalizing goal setting and notifications. We felt this coaching process

380 was important to allow participants to take full advantage of the wearable device and build
381 autonomy for long-term use.

382
383 Beyond just tracking activity, wearable monitors have the potential to motivate users through
384 a variety of embedded behavior change techniques such as goal-setting and self-monitoring. In
385 checking and visualizing their own data, controlling when they receive feedback, and deciding
386 how they would like to use this information, users can build autonomy around their health
387 management. By setting and achieving goals based on available metrics from the activity
388 monitors, users can also develop a sense of competence. People with neurodegenerative diseases
389 and other chronic conditions may be more motivated to maintain Fitbit use due to the potential
390 benefit of disease-management.⁶⁶ Importantly, considerations to disease-specific symptoms such
391 as motor, cognitive, and mood impairments must be made when implementing wearable activity
392 monitors in this population. Building sustained PA motivation is a long, but necessary path for
393 people with neurodegenerative diseases to harness this powerful tool for long-term disease self-
394 management. When paired with therapists' guidance, wearable activity monitors can support
395 each user's personal journey towards sustained healthy PA practice.

396
397

398

Acknowledgements

399 None.

400

401

402

Declaration of Interest Statement

403 The authors report no conflicts of interest related to this work.

404

405
406
407

408
409
410

411
412

413
414
415

416
417
418

419
420
421
422

423
424
425

426
427
428

429
430
431

432
433
434
435

436
437

438
439

Reference

1. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. *Physical Activity Guidelines for Americans, 2nd Edition.*; 2018.
2. Carty C, van der Ploeg HP, Biddle SJH, et al. The first global physical activity and sedentary behavior guidelines for people living With disability. *J Phys Act Health*. Published online January 3, 2021:1-8. doi:10.1123/jpah.2020-0629
3. 2018 Physical Acvitiy Guidelines Advisory Committee. 2018 Physical Activity Guidelines Advisory Committee Scientific Report. Published online 2018.
4. Amara AW, Chahine L, Seedorff N, et al. Self-reported physical activity levels and clinical progression in early Parkinson's disease. *Parkinsonism Relat Disord*. 2019;61:118-125. doi:10.1016/j.parkreldis.2018.11.006
5. Benka Wallen M, Franzen E, Nero H, Hagstromer M. Levels and patterns of physical activity and sedentary behavior in elderly people with mild to moderate Parkinson disease. *Phys Ther*. 2015;95(8):1135-1141. doi:10.2522/ptj.20140374
6. Hamana K, Quinn L, Gambling T, Busse M. An exploration of physical activity experiences throughout the Huntington's disease journey: supporting development of theoretically underpinned complex interventions. *Disabil Rehabil*. Published online October 7, 2019:1-11. doi:10.1080/09638288.2019.1671501
7. Moore CG, Schenkman M, Kohrt WM, Delitto A, Hall DA, Corcos D. Study in Parkinson disease of exercise (SPARX): translating high-intensity exercise from animals to humans. *Contemp Clin Trials*. 2013;36(1):90-98. doi:10.1016/j.cct.2013.06.002
8. Schenkman M, Moore CG, Kohrt WM, et al. Effect of high-intensity treadmill exercise on motor symptoms in patients with de novo Parkinson disease: a phase 2 randomized clinical trial. *JAMA Neurol*. 2018;75(2):219-226. doi:10.1001/jamaneurol.2017.3517
9. Campos C, Rocha NBF, Lattari E, Paes F, Nardi AE, Machado S. Exercise-induced neuroprotective effects on neurodegenerative diseases: the key role of trophic factors. *Expert Rev Neurother*. 2016;16(6):723-734. doi:10.1080/14737175.2016.1179582
10. Frazzitta G, Bertotti G, Riboldazzi G, et al. Effectiveness of intensive inpatient rehabilitation treatment on disease progression in parkinsonian patients: a randomized controlled trial with 1-year follow-up. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*. 2012;26(2):144-150. doi:10.1177/1545968311416990
11. Armstrong MJ, Okun MS. Diagnosis and Treatment of Parkinson Disease: A Review. *JAMA*. 2020;323(6):548. doi:10.1001/jama.2019.22360
12. Bates GP, Dorsey R, Gusella JF, et al. Huntington disease. *Nat Rev Dis Primer*. Published online April 2015:15005. doi:10.1038/nrdp.2015.5

- 440 13. Quinn L, Morgan D. From disease to health: physical therapy health promotion practices
441 for secondary prevention in adult and pediatric neurologic populations. *J Neurol Phys Ther.*
442 2017;41(Suppl 3 IV STEP Spec Iss):S46-S54. doi:10.1097/NPT.000000000000166
- 443 14. Dobkin BH. Behavioral self-management strategies for practice and exercise should be
444 included in neurologic rehabilitation trials and care: *Curr Opin Neurol.* 2016;29(6):693-699.
445 doi:10.1097/WCO.0000000000000380
- 446 15. Abbruzzese G, Marchese R, Avanzino L, Pelosin E. Rehabilitation for Parkinson's disease:
447 Current outlook and future challenges. *Parkinsonism Relat Disord.* 2016;22:S60-S64.
448 doi:10.1016/j.parkreldis.2015.09.005
- 449 16. Rafferty MR, Nettnin E, Goldman JG, MacDonald J. Frameworks for Parkinson's disease
450 rehabilitation addressing when, what, and how. *Curr Neurol Neurosci Rep.* 2021;21(3):12.
451 doi:10.1007/s11910-021-01096-0
- 452 17. Block VAJ, Pitsch E, Tahir P, Cree BAC, Allen DD, Gelfand JM. Remote Physical Activity
453 Monitoring in Neurological Disease: A Systematic Review. *PloS One.* 2016;11(4):e0154335.
454 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0154335
- 455 18. Block VJ, Zhao C, Hollenbach JA, et al. Validation of a consumer-grade activity monitor for
456 continuous daily activity monitoring in individuals with multiple sclerosis. *Mult Scler J - Exp*
457 *Transl Clin.* 2019;5(4):205521731988866. doi:10.1177/2055217319888660
- 458 19. Block VJ, Bove R, Zhao C, et al. Association of Continuous Assessment of Step Count by
459 Remote Monitoring With Disability Progression Among Adults With Multiple Sclerosis.
460 *JAMA Netw Open.* 2019;2(3):e190570. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2019.0570
- 461 20. Rossi A, Frechette L, Miller D, et al. Acceptability and feasibility of a Fitbit physical activity
462 monitor for endometrial cancer survivors. *Gynecol Oncol.* 2018;149(3):470-475.
463 doi:10.1016/j.ygyno.2018.04.560
- 464 21. Cadmus-Bertram L, Marcus BH, Patterson RE, Parker BA, Morey BL. Use of the Fitbit to
465 Measure Adherence to a Physical Activity Intervention Among Overweight or Obese,
466 Postmenopausal Women: Self-Monitoring Trajectory During 16 Weeks. *JMIR MHealth*
467 *UHealth.* 2015;3(4):e96. doi:10.2196/mhealth.4229
- 468 22. Hartman SJ, Nelson SH, Weiner LS. Patterns of Fitbit Use and Activity Levels Throughout a
469 Physical Activity Intervention: Exploratory Analysis from a Randomized Controlled Trial.
470 *JMIR MHealth UHealth.* 2018;6(2):e29. doi:10.2196/mhealth.8503
- 471 23. Whelan ME, Orme MW, Kingsnorth AP, Sherar LB, Denton FL, Esliger DW. Examining the
472 Use of Glucose and Physical Activity Self-Monitoring Technologies in Individuals at
473 Moderate to High Risk of Developing Type 2 Diabetes: Randomized Trial. *JMIR MHealth*
474 *UHealth.* 2019;7(10):e14195. doi:10.2196/14195

- 475 24. Afshari M, Yang A, Bega D. Motivators and barriers to exercise in Parkinson's disease. *J*
476 *Park Dis*. 2017;7(4):703-711. doi:10.3233/JPD-171173
- 477 25. Asano M, Duquette P, Andersen R, Lapierre Y, Mayo NE. Exercise barriers and preferences
478 among women and men with multiple sclerosis. *Disabil Rehabil*. 2013;35(5):353-361.
479 doi:10.3109/09638288.2012.742574
- 480 26. Ellis T, Boudreau JK, DeAngelis TR, et al. Barriers to exercise in people with Parkinson
481 disease. *Phys Ther*. 2013;93(5):628-636. doi:10.2522/ptj.20120279
- 482 27. Quinn L, Busse M, Khalil H, Richardson S, Rosser A, Morris H. Client and therapist views on
483 exercise programmes for early-mid stage Parkinson's disease and Huntington's disease.
484 *Disabil Rehabil*. 2010;32(11):917-928. doi:10.3109/09638280903362712
- 485 28. Cai G, Huang Y, Luo S, Lin Z, Dai H, Ye Q. Continuous quantitative monitoring of physical
486 activity in Parkinson's disease patients by using wearable devices: a case-control study.
487 *Neurol Sci*. 2017;38(9):1657-1663. doi:10.1007/s10072-017-3050-2
- 488 29. Adams JL, Dinesh K, Xiong M, et al. Multiple Wearable Sensors in Parkinson and
489 Huntington Disease Individuals: A Pilot Study in Clinic and at Home. *Digit Biomark*.
490 Published online 2017. doi:10.1159/000479018
- 491 30. Dinesh K, Snyder CW, Xiong M, et al. A Longitudinal Wearable Sensor Study in
492 Huntington's Disease. *J Huntingt Dis*. 2019;9(1):1-13. doi:10.3233/jhd-190375
- 493 31. Coughlin SS, Stewart J. Use of Consumer Wearable Devices to Promote Physical Activity: A
494 Review of Health Intervention Studies. *J Environ Health Sci*. 2016;2(6). Accessed June 17,
495 2021. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5395205/>
- 496 32. Long KM. Pre-active PD: A Therapist Delivered Physical Activity Behavior Change Program
497 for People With Early Stage Parkinson's Disease. *ProQuest Publ*. 2020;(27739595):1-225.
498 doi:<https://doi.org/10.7916/d8-d59j-tb74>
- 499 33. Fortier MS, Duda JL, Guerin E, Teixeira PJ. Promoting physical activity: development and
500 testing of self-determination theory-based interventions. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act*.
501 2012;9:20. doi:10.1186/1479-5868-9-20
- 502 34. Ryan RM, Deci EL. Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation,
503 social development, and well-being. *Am Psychol*. 2000;55(1):68-78. doi:10.1037//0003-
504 066x.55.1.68
- 505 35. Quinn L, Macpherson C, Long K, Shah H. Promoting physical activity via telehealth in
506 people with Parkinson disease: the path forward after the COVID-19 pandemic? *Phys Ther*.
507 2020;100(10):1730-1736. doi:10.1093/ptj/pzaa128

- 508 36. Quinn L, Trubey R, Gobat N, et al. Development and delivery of a physical activity
509 intervention for people with huntington disease: facilitating translation to clinical practice.
510 *J Neurol Phys Ther JNPT*. 2016;40(April):1-10. doi:10.1097/NPT.000000000000119
- 511 37. O'Halloran PD, Blackstock F, Shields N, et al. Motivational interviewing to increase physical
512 activity in people with chronic health conditions: a systematic review and meta-analysis.
513 *Clin Rehabil*. 2014;28(12):1159-1171. doi:10.1177/0269215514536210
- 514 38. Fox SM, Naughton JP, Haskell WL. Physical activity and the prevention of coronary heart
515 disease. *Ann Clin Res*. 1971;3(6):404-432. doi:doi: 10.1136/heartjnl-2015-308773.
- 516 39. American College of Sports Medicine. *ACSM's Guidelines for Exercise Testing and*
517 *Prescription*. 10th ed. (Riebe D, ed.). Wolters Kluwer; 2017. Accessed June 22, 2020.
518 [https://www.amazon.com/ACSMs-Guidelines-Exercise-Testing-](https://www.amazon.com/ACSMs-Guidelines-Exercise-Testing-Prescription/dp/149633907X/ref=sr_1_2?crd=2PO041BRJ2ISV&dchild=1&keywords=acsm+guidelines+for+exercise+testing+and+prescription+10th+edition&qid=1592851471&sprefix=acsm+%2Caps%2C169&sr=8-2)
519 [Prescription/dp/149633907X/ref=sr_1_2?crd=2PO041BRJ2ISV&dchild=1&keywords=acsm](https://www.amazon.com/ACSMs-Guidelines-Exercise-Testing-Prescription/dp/149633907X/ref=sr_1_2?crd=2PO041BRJ2ISV&dchild=1&keywords=acsm+guidelines+for+exercise+testing+and+prescription+10th+edition&qid=1592851471&sprefix=acsm+%2Caps%2C169&sr=8-2)
520 [+guidelines+for+exercise+testing+and+prescription+10th+edition&qid=1592851471&spref](https://www.amazon.com/ACSMs-Guidelines-Exercise-Testing-Prescription/dp/149633907X/ref=sr_1_2?crd=2PO041BRJ2ISV&dchild=1&keywords=acsm+guidelines+for+exercise+testing+and+prescription+10th+edition&qid=1592851471&sprefix=acsm+%2Caps%2C169&sr=8-2)
521 [ix=acsm+%2Caps%2C169&sr=8-2](https://www.amazon.com/ACSMs-Guidelines-Exercise-Testing-Prescription/dp/149633907X/ref=sr_1_2?crd=2PO041BRJ2ISV&dchild=1&keywords=acsm+guidelines+for+exercise+testing+and+prescription+10th+edition&qid=1592851471&sprefix=acsm+%2Caps%2C169&sr=8-2)
- 522 40. Sathe S, Ware J, Levey J, et al. Enroll-HD: An Integrated Clinical Research Platform and
523 Worldwide Observational Study for Huntington's Disease. *Front Neurol*. 2021;12:667420.
524 doi:10.3389/fneur.2021.667420
- 525 41. Waters S, Tedroff J, Kiebertz K. Poster 19: Validation of the Modified Motor Score (mMS):
526 A Subscale of the Unified Huntington's Disease Rating Scale (UHDRS) Motor Score.
527 *Neurotherapeutics*. 2010;7(1):144-144. doi:10.1016/j.nurt.2009.10.003
- 528 42. Kiebertz K. Unified Huntington's disease rating scale: Reliability and consistency. *Mov*
529 *Disord*. 1996;11(2):136-142. doi:10.1002/mds.870110204
- 530 43. Creavin ST, Wisniewski S, Noel-Storr AH, et al. Mini-Mental State Examination (MMSE) for
531 the detection of dementia in clinically unevaluated people aged 65 and over in community
532 and primary care populations. Cochrane Dementia and Cognitive Improvement Group, ed.
533 *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. Published online January 13, 2016.
534 doi:10.1002/14651858.CD011145.pub2
- 535 44. Thomas S, Reading J, Shephard RJ. Revision of the physical activity readiness questionnaire
536 (PAR-Q). *Can J Sport Sci J Can Sci Sport*. 1992;17(4):338-345.
- 537 45. Kobayashi E, Himuro N, Takahashi M. Clinical utility of the 6-min walk test for patients with
538 moderate Parkinson's disease. *Int J Rehabil Res*. 2017;40(1):66-70.
539 doi:10.1097/MRR.000000000000205
- 540 46. Perriñez JA, Lubrini G, García-Gutiérrez A, Ríos-Lago M. Construct Validity of the Stroop
541 Color-Word Test: Influence of Speed of Visual Search, Verbal Fluency, Working Memory,
542 Cognitive Flexibility, and Conflict Monitoring. *Arch Clin Neuropsychol*. 2021;36(1):99-111.
543 doi:10.1093/arclin/aaa034

- 544 47. Dalrymple-Alford JC. The MoCA - Well-suited screen for cognitive impairment in Parkinson
545 disease. Published online 2010:9.
- 546 48. Karageorghis CI, Vencato MM, Chatzisarantis NLD, Carron AV. Development and initial
547 validation of the Brunel lifestyle physical activity questionnaire. *Br J Sports Med*.
548 2005;39(5):e23-e23. doi:10.1136/bjism.2004.014258
- 549 49. Paulsen JS, Miller AC, Hayes T, Shaw E. Cognitive and behavioral changes in Huntington
550 disease before diagnosis. In: *Handbook of Clinical Neurology*. Vol 144. Elsevier; 2017:69-91.
551 doi:10.1016/B978-0-12-801893-4.00006-7
- 552 50. Hallal PC, Victora CG. Reliability and validity of the International Physical Activity
553 Questionnaire (IPAQ). *Med Sci Sports Exerc*. 2004;36(3):556. doi:doi:
554 10.1249/01.mss.0000117161.66394.07
- 555 51. Hagströmer M, Oja P, Sjöström M. The International Physical Activity Questionnaire (IPAQ):
556 a study of concurrent and construct validity. *Public Health Nutr*. 2006;9(6):755-762.
557 doi:10.1079/phn2005898
- 558 52. Migueles JH, Cadenas-Sanchez C, Ekelund U, et al. Accelerometer Data Collection and
559 Processing Criteria to Assess Physical Activity and Other Outcomes: A Systematic Review
560 and Practical Considerations. *Sports Med*. 2017;47(9):1821-1845. doi:10.1007/s40279-
561 017-0716-0
- 562 53. Herbert R. Research note: Significance testing and hypothesis testing: meaningless,
563 misleading and mostly unnecessary. *J Physiother*. 2019;65(3):178-181.
564 doi:10.1016/j.jphys.2019.05.001
- 565 54. Adams JL, Lizarraga KJ, Waddell EM, et al. Digital Technology in Movement Disorders:
566 Updates, Applications, and Challenges. *Curr Neurol Neurosci Rep*. 2021;21(4):16.
567 doi:10.1007/s11910-021-01101-6
- 568 55. Arigo D, Jake-Schoffman DE, Wolin K, Beckjord E, Hekler EB, Pagoto SL. The history and
569 future of digital health in the field of behavioral medicine. *J Behav Med*. 2019;42(1):67-83.
570 doi:10.1007/s10865-018-9966-z
- 571 56. Mercer K, Li M, Giangregorio L, Burns C, Grindrod K. Behavior Change Techniques Present
572 in Wearable Activity Trackers: A Critical Analysis. *JMIR MHealth UHealth*. 2016;4(2):e4461.
573 doi:10.2196/mhealth.4461
- 574 57. Pradhan S, Kelly VE. Quantifying physical activity in early Parkinson disease using a
575 commercial activity monitor. *Parkinsonism Relat Disord*. 2019;66:171-175.
576 doi:10.1016/j.parkreldis.2019.08.001

- 577 58. Tang LM, Meyer J, Epstein DA, et al. Defining Adherence: Making Sense of Physical Activity
578 Tracker Data. *Proc ACM Interact Mob Wearable Ubiquitous Technol.* 2018;2(1):1-22.
579 doi:10.1145/3191769
- 580 59. de Carvalho Lana R, Ribeiro de Paula A, Souza Silva AF, Vieira Costa PH, Polese JC. Validity
581 of mHealth devices for counting steps in individuals with Parkinson's disease. *J Bodyw Mov*
582 *Ther.* 2021;28:496-501. doi:10.1016/j.jbmt.2021.06.018
- 583 60. Keren K, Busse M, Fritz NE, et al. Quantification of Daily-Living Gait Quantity and Quality
584 Using a Wrist-Worn Accelerometer in Huntington's Disease. *Front Neurol.* 2021;12:719442.
585 doi:10.3389/fneur.2021.719442
- 586 61. Rossi G, Oh JC. Management of Agitation in Huntington's Disease: A Review of the
587 Literature. *Cureus.* Published online August 14, 2020. doi:10.7759/cureus.9748
- 588 62. Gaba AM, Zhang K, Marder K, Moskowitz CB, Werner P, Boozer CN. Energy balance in
589 early-stage Huntington disease. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 2005;81(6):1335-1341.
590 doi:10.1093/ajcn/81.6.1335
- 591 63. What are Active Zone Minutes or active minutes on my Fitbit device? Accessed April 22,
592 2022. https://help.fitbit.com/articles/en_US/Help_article/1379.htm
- 593 64. Brewer W, Swanson BT, Ortiz A. Validity of Fitbit's active minutes as compared with a
594 research-grade accelerometer and self-reported measures. *BMJ Open Sport — Exerc Med.*
595 2017;3(1). doi:10.1136/bmjsem-2017-000254
- 596 65. Balbim GM, Marques IG, Marquez DX, et al. Using Fitbit as an mHealth Intervention Tool to
597 Promote Physical Activity: Potential Challenges and Solutions. *JMIR MHealth UHealth.*
598 2021;9(3). doi:http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/10.2196/25289
- 599 66. Fox S, Duggan M. Pew Research Center. Part Three: Tracking for Health. Published
600 November 26, 2013. Accessed April 22, 2022.
601 <https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2013/11/26/part-three-tracking-for-health/>
- 602
603

604
605

Tables

Table 1. Participant characteristics at enrollment.

	PD (N=13)	HD (N=14)
Age (years)	61.7 ± 9.1	44.6 ± 11.4
Sex	9M, 4F	7M, 7F
Height (cm)	172.8 ± 11.7	170.5 ± 9.9
Weight (kg)	75.9 ± 15.0	80.2 ± 17.6
Race/Ethnicity	White = 11 Hispanic = 1 Asian = 1	White = 12 Black = 2
Disease stage	H&Y I = 4 H&Y II = 9	Pre-manifest = 9 Early stage = 5
6MWT	442.96 ± 87.61	450.17 ± 103.63*
Stroop Test	40.5 ± 10.72	44.20 ± 12.57
Cognitive assessments - MoCA	26.5 ± 2.9	
Cognitive assessments – Symbol digit modality (#correct)		42.9 ± 17.6 [†]
Self-reported PA – Brunel (scores 1-5)	Planned PA: 3.85 ± 0.96 Unplanned PA: 2.40 ± 0.72	
Self-reported PA – IPAQ (MET*min/week)		3506.50 ± 3264.84

606 *N=11 due to missing data while study moved remote; [†]N=10 due to missing data.
 607 IPAQ, International Physical Activity Questionnaire; MoCA (range 0-30, <26 mild cognitive
 608 impairments); Symbol digit modality normative value: 50.
 609

610 Table 2. Mean \pm standard deviation of Fitbit metrics during qualified week at baseline and follow-up for participants with Parkinson's
 611 (PD) and Huntington's disease (HD).

	N	Steps/day				Resting HR				MET*Min/week			
		Start	End	End - Start [95%CI]	Cohen's d	Start	End	End - Start [95%CI]	Cohen's d	Start	End	End - Start [95%CI]	Cohen's d
PD	12	7564 \pm 2804	8313 \pm 2783	750 [-204, 1703]	0.27	67 \pm 10	68 \pm 7	0.5 [-3.2, 4.2]	0.06	5240 \pm 2502	5840 \pm 2850	600 [-368, 1568]	0.22
HD	11	11193 \pm 3342	10165 \pm 3484	-1028 [-2482, 426]	-0.30	66 \pm 7	65 \pm 6	-1.0 [-3.8, 1.8]	-0.15	6689 \pm 2502	7011 \pm 2371	322 [-980, 1623]	0.13

612 Table 3. Implementation barriers and proposed strategies to using wearable devices in a
613 neurodegenerative population.

Barriers	Potential Strategies
Cognitive impairments leading to difficulty learning, wearing, synching, and charging the device.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Identify care partners available for assistance.- Send scheduled text reminders for synching and charging.- Monitor participant data and reach out to remind participants if non-wear or no synching/charging occurred.- Encourage participants to contact research personnel for assistance if they have issues without waiting until next coaching session.
Medication or disease affects heart rate response (e.g. beta-blockers).	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Document participants who are taking medications that affects cardiac response to exercise.- Set individual maximum heart rate on the device using results of exercise testing or validated formula for prediction of maximum heart rate in patients on beta-blockers.
Neurological symptoms (gait abnormality, tremor, chorea) that affects accelerometry.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Wear device on the less affected side.- Perform stride length calibration during Fitbit set up.- Collect tremor or chorea symptom severity to account for potential artificial increase in step counts.- Collect perceived physical activity levels using validated questionnaires to cross validate accelerometry.

614
615

616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633

linFigure Captions

Figure 1. Sample data visualization used in the coaching sessions to review goal attainment, discuss barriers, and set future goals (From the Fitabase platform).

Figure 2. 30-day moving average of individual wear time over the course of the intervention. Note an initial period of high fluctuation of wear time before participants settled into two groups representing different Fitbit wear habits: those who were day wearers, and those who were day & night wearers. Key: PD, Parkinson Disease; HD, Huntington Disease.

Figure 3. Difference in pre-post changes of (A) steps and (B) MET*min/week between Fitbit day and day & night wearers. Horizontal markers of the violin plots indicate median and interquartile range of the data distribution. The shaded shape of the violin plots indicates the probability density of the data.

Steps

Steps/Day


Kilometers/Day

Miles/Day


Hour-by-Hour

Average Week

Floors




Wear time (30-day moving average)



(A)

Wear Habits and Steps



(B)

Wear Habits and MET*Min/Week

