

1 **Reference values for cut-point-free and traditional accelerometer metrics and**
2 **associations with cardiorespiratory fitness: a cross-sectional study of healthy adults**
3 **aged 20 to 89 years**

4 Schwendinger F.^{1*}, Wagner J.¹, Knaier R.¹, Infanger D.,¹ Rowlands A.V.^{2,3,4}, Hinrichs T.¹, &
5 Schmidt-Trucksäss A.^{1*}

6 ¹ Division of Sports and Exercise Medicine, Department of Sport, Exercise and Health,
7 University of Basel, Basel, Switzerland

8 ² Assessment of Movement Behaviours Group (AMBer), Diabetes Research Centre, Leicester
9 General Hospital, University of Leicester, Gwendolen Rd, Leicester, UK

10 ³ National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Leicester Biomedical Research Centre
11 (BRC), University Hospitals of Leicester NHS Trust and the University of Leicester,
12 Leicester, UK

13 ⁴ Alliance for Research in Exercise, Nutrition and Activity (ARENA), Sansom Institute for
14 Health Research, Division of Health Sciences, University of South Australia, Adelaide,
15 Australia

16

17 Jonathan Wagner (JW), jonathan.wagner@unibas.ch; ORCID: 0000-0002-3436-588X

18 Raphael Knaier (RK), raphael.knaier@unibas.ch; ORCID: 0000-0002-0244-7768

19 Denis Infanger (DI), denis.infanger@unibas.ch; ORCID: 0000-0001-9028-7110

20 Alex V. Rowlands (AVR), alex.rowlands@leicester.ac.uk; ORCID: 0000-0002-1463-697X

21 Timo Hinrichs (TH), timo.hinrichs@unibas.ch; ORCID: 0000-0001-6200-307X

22 * Correspondence:

23 Fabian Schwendinger (FS), fabian.schwendinger@unibas.ch; ORCID: 0000-0001-7795-1478

24 Arno Schmidt-Trucksäss (AST), arno.schmidt-trucksass@unibas.ch; ORCID: 0000-0002-
25 4662-3911

26

27 Abstract word count: 250

28

29 Manuscript word count: 2907

ACCELEROMETRY REFERENCE VALUES

2

30 Abstract

31 **Objectives:** To compare the association between cardiorespiratory fitness (CRF) and cut-
32 point-free accelerometer metrics (intensity gradient [IG] and average acceleration [AvAcc])
33 to that with traditional metrics in healthy adults aged 20 to 89 years and patients with heart
34 failure, and 2) provide age-, sex-, and CRF-related reference values for healthy adults.

35 **Methods:** In the COMplete study, 463 healthy adults and 67 patients with heart failure
36 wore GENEActiv accelerometers on their non-dominant wrist and underwent
37 cardiopulmonary exercise testing. Cut-point-free (IG: distribution of intensity of activity
38 across the day; AvAcc: proxy of volume of activity) and traditional (moderate-to-vigorous
39 and vigorous activity) metrics were generated. The ‘rawacceleration’ application was
40 developed to translate findings into clinical practice.

41 **Results:** IG and AvAcc yield complementary information on PA with both IG ($p=0.009$) and
42 AvAcc ($p<0.001$) independently associated with CRF in healthy individuals. Only IG was
43 independently associated with CRF in patients with heart failure ($p=0.043$). The best cut-
44 point-free and cut-point-based model had similar predictive value for CRF in both cohorts.
45 However, unlike traditional metrics, IG and AvAcc are comparable across populations and
46 the most commonly used accelerometers. We produced age- and sex-specific reference values
47 and percentile curves for IG, AvAcc, moderate-to-vigorous, and vigorous activity for healthy
48 adults.

49 **Conclusions:** IG and AvAcc are strongly associated with CRF and, thus, indirectly with the
50 risk of non-communicable diseases and mortality in healthy adults and patients with heart
51 failure. Our reference values enhance the utility of cut-point-free metrics and facilitate their
52 interpretation.

53 **Trial registration:** This study was registered on clinicaltrials.gov (NCT03986892).

ACCELEROMETRY REFERENCE VALUES

3

54 *Keywords:* accelerometry, physical activity, normative data, cardiorespiratory fitness,
55 GGIR, activity monitors

56 • **What is already known on this topic** – Cut-point free accelerometer metrics are
57 valuable to assess physical activity because of their comparability across populations
58 and association with various health parameters (e.g. body fat content or physical
59 functioning). Yet, their interpretation is not straightforward.

60 • **What this study adds** – This study found a strong and independent association of
61 cut-point-free metrics with cardiorespiratory fitness, a vital sign, in healthy
62 individuals aged between 20 to 89 years and patients with heart failure. We produced
63 the first reference values based on healthy individuals across the age span.

64 • **How this study might affect research, practice or policy** – Our reference values
65 together with the new open-source application may simplify the interpretation of cut-
66 point-free accelerometer metrics and their use in clinical practice and research.

67 **INTRODUCTION**

68 Accelerometer data can yield many physical activity (PA) outcomes.[1] Recorded
69 acceleration is often categorised using accelerometer cut-points and expressed as minutes
70 spent in intensity categories, i.e. light, moderate, and vigorous PA.[2] Numerous studies have
71 proposed such cut-points for different populations.[3, 4] Although this method makes
72 accelerometer data interpretable, the multitude of available cut-points complicates the
73 interpretation of PA data and comparison between studies. Moreover, using cut-points to
74 quantify the absolute intensity of PA has been shown to induce bias if cardiorespiratory
75 fitness (CRF) of the cohort of interest differs from the cohort the cut-points were derived
76 from.[5]

77 To circumvent this problem, Rowlands et al. (6) proposed cut-point-free accelerometer
78 metrics, namely intensity gradient (IG) and average acceleration (AvAcc) and demonstrated
79 their use across diverse populations. They moreover demonstrated the added value of using
80 IG by examining the relation to body fatness and physical function.[6] IG was inversely
81 associated with body fatness in adolescent girls and positively associated with physical
82 function in adults with type 2 diabetes, independent of AvAcc.[6] The authors concluded that
83 IG and AvAcc are appropriate for reporting as standardised measures and suitable for
84 comparison across studies using raw-acceleration accelerometers.[6] The independent
85 association of IG with health indicators (BMI z-scores, waist-to-height ratio, estimated CRF,
86 and metabolic syndrome score) was later confirmed in children.[7]

87 CRF, measured as peak oxygen uptake (VO_{2peak}), is a strong, independent risk predictor for
88 various non-communicable diseases and all-cause mortality.[8] Data on the relationship
89 between cut-point-free accelerometer metrics and CRF in healthy adults or diseased
90 populations e.g. patients with heart failure would therefore be relevant. Moreover, IG and

ACCELEROMETRY REFERENCE VALUES

5

91 AvAcc are not readily interpretable.[6] Reference values providing a framework for judging
92 the appropriateness of PA levels are required.[6]

93 Thus, we aimed to 1) examine the relationship between cut-point-free and traditional
94 accelerometer metrics, 2) compare the association between VO_{2peak} and cut-point-free metrics
95 to that with traditional metrics in healthy individuals and patients with heart failure, and 3)
96 produce reference values for cut-point-free and traditional accelerometer parameters for
97 healthy adults.

98

99

100 **METHODS**

101 **Study design**

102 Data were collected in the population-based, cross-sectional COMplete study at the
103 Department of Sport, Exercise and Health at the University of Basel, Switzerland. The study
104 protocol is available elsewhere.[9] All procedures were performed according to the
105 Declaration of Helsinki. The study was registered on clinicaltrials.gov (NCT03986892) and
106 approved by the Ethics Committee of North-western and Central Switzerland (EKNZ 2017–
107 01451).

108

109 **Study participants**

110 The COMplete study examined healthy adults (HEALTHY) and patients with chronic heart
111 failure (HEART). HEALTHY were ≥ 20 years of age, non-smoking, and had a BMI < 30
112 kg/m^2 . [9] Exclusion criteria were the presence of chronic exercise-limiting disease, known
113 pregnancy or breastfeeding, hypertonic blood pressure $> 160/100$ mmHg, orthopaedic
114 problems hindering the examinations, inability to follow the study procedures, and
115 contraindications for all-out exercise.[9] Individuals aged ≥ 20 years and diagnosed with

116 stable chronic heart failure were eligible for HEART.[9] All exclusion criteria and a rationale
117 for the study size are presented elsewhere.[9]

118

119 **Study procedures**

120 *Accelerometry and data processing*

121 Participants were asked to wear a triaxial accelerometer (GENEActiv, Activinsights Ltd.,
122 Kimbolton, UK) on their non-dominant wrist, for 24 hours/day over 14 days.[9] Data were
123 sampled at 50 Hz. Days with wear time >14 hours were considered valid. Participants needed
124 to have at least four valid weekdays (Monday to Friday) and one Saturday and Sunday
125 each.[5] Raw-data processing using the GGIR package[10, 11] is described in detail in the
126 Supplement.

127

128 *Cardiopulmonary exercise testing*

129 Gas exchange was measured breath-by-breath during a graded exercise test on a cycle
130 ergometer using the MetaMax 3B portable metabolic system (Cortex Biophysik GmbH,
131 Leipzig, Germany). One of five ramp protocols was chosen depending on the participant's
132 estimated CRF.[9] VO_{2peak} was recorded as the three highest consecutive values (30 s
133 average) during the test. Detailed information are presented elsewhere.[12]

134

135 **Statistical analyses**

136 Statistical analyses and figures were done in R version 4.2.0.[13] Correlations between
137 accelerometer parameters and VO_{2peak} were analysed using Spearman's Rank Correlation.
138 Explorative principal component and partial least squares analyses were performed to
139 examine the relationship between the abovementioned variables.[14, 15] Multiple linear
140 regression models were used to examine between-cohort differences and the association

ACCELEROMETRY REFERENCE VALUES

7

141 between VO_{2peak} and accelerometer parameters, i.e. IG, AvAcc, MVPA, VPA and time in PA
142 (TPA=light PA+MVPA). For each cohort, we planned to create three models with cut-point-
143 free metrics only (IG, AvAcc, and both parameters together), two models with cut-point-
144 based metrics only (MVPA and VPA), and two models containing IG or VPA as a measure of
145 PA intensity and TPA as a surrogate of time in PA. All models were adjusted for age and an
146 interaction between BMI and sex. We used restricted cubic splines with four knots placed at
147 appropriate percentiles of the data for age and BMI.[16] Fulfilment of model assumptions
148 was verified using residual diagnostics. The best model fit was selected based on residual
149 standard deviation and adjusted R^2 . A Likelihood-Ratio-Test was used to compare models.
150 Non-nested models were compared using the Vuong Test.[17] Percentile curves were created
151 with Generalised Additive Models for Location, Scale, and Shape with the GAMLSS package
152 (version 5.3-4).[18] Age or VO_{2peak} as the independent parameter was fitted using p-
153 splines.[19, 20] We adopted the Bayesian information criterion to select the conditional
154 distribution offering the best compromise between model complexity and goodness-of-fit.
155 Model fits were inspected using diagnostic residual plots.[21] We developed the application
156 ‘rawacceleration’ using ‘shiny’[22] to translate our findings into clinical practice. The level of
157 statistical significance was set at 0.05. All tests were two-sided.

158

159

160 RESULTS

161 679 HEALTHY and 89 HEART were invited to this study. Of those, 585 HEALTHY and 70
162 HEART fulfilled all criteria. After excluding participants with missing covariate data, 463
163 HEALTHY and 67 HEART were analysed. Cohort characteristics are presented in Table 1.

164 *** insert Table 1 here ***

Table 1. Characteristics of healthy individuals and patients with heart failure stratified by sex.

Variable	HEALTHY (n=463)	HEART (n=67)
----------	-----------------	--------------

ACCELEROMETRY REFERENCE VALUES

	Females	Males	Females	Males
<i>n</i> (%)	221 (47.7)	242 (52.3)	15 (22.4)	52 (77.6)
Age, years, [range]	55 (36, 71) [20 to 89]	55 (37, 71) [20 to 89]	74 (63, 79) [26 to 89]	65 (56, 75) [31 to 85]
Height, cm	165.3 (6.9)	177.4 (7.1)	160.5 (4.1)	175.4 (5.8)
Body mass, kg	62.0 (8.1)	77.4 (9.3)	71.2 (16.4)	87.4 (14.9)
Body mass index, kg·m ⁻²	22.7 (2.7)	24.6 (2.4)	27.6 (6.1)	28.4 (4.2)
Smoking status, <i>n</i> (%)				
Smokers	0	0	0	5 (9.6)
Never smoked	177 (80.1)	191 (78.9)	9 (60)	24 (46.2)
Ex-smoker > 10 years	44 (19.9)	50 (20.7)	2 (13.3)	20 (38.5)
NYHA class, <i>n</i> (%)				
I	0	0	2 (13.3)	29 (55.8)
II	0	0	6 (40.0)	13 (25.0)
III	0	0	7 (46.7)	10 (19.2)
Non-wear time, % of day	0.3 (1.0)	0.4 (1.3)	0.1 (0.2)	0.5 (2.2)
Waking time, h per day	16.2 (0.8)	16.3 (0.9)	15.7 (1.4)	16.2 (1.2)
<i>Intensity regression line</i>				
Intensity gradient,	-2.549 (-2.644, -2.390)	-2.450 (-2.577, -2.301)	-2.745 (-2.801, -2.681)	-2.676 (-2.749, -2.544)
Intercept	14.7 (14.1, 15.1)	14.3 (14.7, 14.8)	15.4 (15.2, 15.5)	14.8 (13.4, 15.1)
Explained variance, R ² , %	90.4 (88.3, 91.7)	90.8 (88.8, 92.1)	91.0 (89.6, 92.7)	92.1 (90.2, 93.4)
Average acceleration, mg	29.72 (25.79, 35.41)	30.38 (24.79, 36.96)	23.31 (11.06, 25.72)	21.38 (9.88, 24.43)
Sedentary, min·day ⁻¹	594 (542, 644)	622 (561, 673)	621 (566, 661)	692 (634, 739)
MVPA, min·day ⁻¹	111 (87, 139)	120 (87, 147)	79 (65, 86)	65 (46, 84)
Vigorous PA, min·day ⁻¹	3 (1, 8)	5 (2, 13)	1 (0, 1)	1 (0, 2)
Time in PA, min·day ⁻¹	377 (326, 422)	358 (299, 408)	333 (284, 387)	277 (226, 336)
VO _{2peak} , mL·kg ⁻¹ ·min ⁻¹ , [range]	30.6 (24.2, 37.8) [13.5 to 53.5]	38.2 (29.8, 46.0) [16.4 to 65.1]	16.6 (132, 18.9) [10.1 to 29.9]	22.0 (18.5, 25.1) [13.4 to 39.5]
NT-proBNP, pg/mL	103.3 (69.8, 157.9)	54.0 (35.8, 113.6)	430.4 (304.0, 571.9)	291.2 (158.5, 795.5)

Data are presented as mean (SD) or median (25th percentile, 75th percentile) unless stated otherwise. Not available data for NT-proBNP in HEALTHY *n*=8 and HEART *n*=1; for smoking status in HEART *n*=7. Abbreviations: NYHA, New York Heart Association; PA, physical activity; MVPA, moderate-to-vigorous PA; VO_{2peak}, peak oxygen uptake, NT-proBNP, N-terminal pro b-type natriuretic peptide.

165

166

167 **Between-cohort differences**

168 HEART had significantly lower IG (*p*<0.001, 95% CI: -0.185 to -0.079), AvAcc (*p*<0.001;

169 95% CI: -8.59 to -3.92 mg), MVPA (*p*<0.001; 95% CI: -45 to -20 min), VPA (*p*=0.002; 95%

170 CI: -6.1 to -1.3 min), and TPA ($p < 0.001$; 95% CI: -80 to -33 min) than HEALTHY (see Table
171 1). HEART were more sedentary than HEALTHY ($p = 0.006$; 95% CI: 10 to 59 min).

172

173 **Interrelationship between accelerometer metrics and VO_{2peak} in HEALTHY and**
174 **HEART**

175 Correlations of VO_{2peak} , IG, AvAcc, MVPA, VPA, TPA, and sedentary time are available in
176 Figure 1.

177 *** insert Figure 1 here ***

178

179 Results of the explorative principal component and partial least squares analyses are
180 presented and discussed in Supplement 2.

181

182 Multiple regression models with key accelerometer parameters as independent variables and
183 VO_{2peak} as the dependent variable are presented in Table 2. In HEALTHY, model 2 (AvAcc)
184 had a better fit than model 1 (IG) ($p = 0.022$). Model 7 (AvAcc+IG) performed better than
185 model 1 (IG) ($p < 0.001$) and model 2 (AvAcc) ($p = 0.004$). The best cut-point-free model
186 including AvAcc and IG (model 7) and the best cut-point-based model including VPA (model
187 4) performed similarly.

188 When combining IG as a metric of PA intensity and TPA as a surrogate of PA time (Model 5),
189 both metrics were independent predictors of VO_{2peak} . However, when including VPA and TPA
190 (model 6), there was little evidence for the latter being an independent predictor of VO_{2peak} .

191 In HEART, there was little evidence for a difference in fit between model 1 (IG), 2 (AvAcc),
192 or 7 (IG+AvAcc). Both IG and AvAcc were associated with VO_{2peak} with only IG being
193 independent of AvAcc but not vice versa. Moreover, the best model with cut-point-based
194 metric (model 3 with MVPA) performed equal to models 1 (IG) and 7 (AvAcc+IG), but was

ACCELEROMETRY REFERENCE VALUES

195 superior to model 2 (AvAcc) (p=0.012). Adding TPA to the model with IG or VPA did not
 196 significantly improve model fits (models 5&6).

197

198 *** insert Table 2 here ***

199

Table 2. Regression models for HEALTHY and HEART with peak oxygen uptake as the dependent variable.

Independent variables	Estimate	95% CI	p-value	Residual standard deviation	Adjusted R ²
<i>HEALTHY</i> (n=463)					
<u>Model 1</u>			<0.001	5.47	0.7153
IG	10.8	(7.9 to 13.8)	<0.001		
<u>Model 2</u>			<0.001	5.27	0.7361
AvAcc	0.3	(0.24 to 0.36)	<0.001		
<u>Model 3</u>			<0.001	5.44	0.7182
MVPA	0.05	(0.04 to 0.06)	<0.001		
<u>Model 4</u>			<0.001	5.21	0.7417
VPA	0.30	(0.24 to 0.36)	<0.001		
<u>Model 5</u>			<0.001	5.41	0.7215
IG	10.34	(7.44 to 13.25)	<0.001		
TPA	0.01	(0.005 to 0.018)	<0.001		
<u>Model 6</u>			<0.001	5.19	0.7431
VPA	0.29	(0.23 to 0.35)	<0.001		
TPA	0.01	(-0.00 to 0.01)	0.059		
<u>Model 7</u>			<0.001	5.24	0.7394
IG	4.49	(1.11 to 7.88)	0.009		
AvAcc	0.25	(0.17 to 0.32)	<0.001		
<i>HEART</i> (n=67)					
<u>Model 1</u>			<0.001	4.75	0.3802
IG	10.08	(3.49 to 16.67)	0.003		
<u>Model 2</u>			<0.001	4.87	0.3475
AvAcc	0.26	(0.05 to 0.48)	0.016		
<u>Model 3</u>			<0.001	4.73	0.3834
MVPA	0.05	(0.02 to 0.09)	0.003		
<u>Model 4</u>			<0.001	5.01	0.3082
VPA	0.43	(-0.09 to 0.95)	0.107		
<u>Model 5</u>			<0.001	4.76	0.3763
IG	9.33	(2.04 to 16.96)	0.009		
TPA	0.01	(-0.01 to 0.04)	0.422		
<u>Model 6</u>			<0.001	5.00	0.3120
VPA	0.35	(-0.19 to 0.89)	0.203		
TPA	0.01	(-7.08 to 0.03)	0.256		
<u>Model 7</u>			<0.001	4.73	0.3842
IG	7.85	(2.41 to 15.46)	0.043		
AvAcc	0.14	(-1.01 to 0.38)	0.249		

All models were adjusted for age * sex + BMI (age and BMI were modelled using restricted cubic splines). Abbreviations: AvAcc, average acceleration; HEALTHY, healthy individuals; HEART, patients with heart failure; IG, intensity gradient; MVPA, moderate to vigorous physical activity; TPA, time in physical activity; VPA, vigorous physical activity.

ACCELEROMETRY REFERENCE VALUES

201 **Reference values for healthy adults**

202 Sex-specific percentile curves were created for IG, AvAcc (see Figure 2), MVPA, and VPA

203 (see Supplementary Figure 3). Empirical data for IG and AvAcc per age decade are presented

204 in Table 3. Data for MVPA and VPA are shown in Supplementary Table 2.

205

206 *** insert Table 3 here ***

207

Table 3. Empirical data for IG and AvAcc in healthy individuals stratified by age decade and sex.

Age decade	P ₃	P ₁₅	P ₅₀	P ₈₅	P ₉₇
IG					
<i>Females</i>					
20 to 29	-2.662	-2.541	-2.392	-2.244	-2.123
30 to 39	-2.713	-2.581	-2.419	-2.256	-2.124
40 to 49	-2.769	-2.627	-2.454	-2.280	-2.138
50 to 59	-2.833	-2.686	-2.505	-2.324	-2.176
60 to 69	-2.902	-2.753	-2.569	-2.385	-2.235
70 to 79	-2.973	-2.822	-2.637	-2.452	-2.301
80 to 89	-3.043	-2.890	-2.702	-2.514	-2.361
<i>Males</i>					
20 to 29	-2.673	-2.526	-2.346	-2.167	-2.020
30 to 39	-2.682	-2.532	-2.349	-2.166	-2.016
40 to 49	-2.698	-2.546	-2.359	-2.173	-2.020
50 to 59	-2.740	-2.585	-2.394	-2.204	-2.049
60 to 69	-2.816	-2.658	-2.464	-2.270	-2.112
70 to 79	-2.921	-2.760	-2.563	-2.365	-2.204
80 to 89	-3.031	-2.867	-2.666	-2.465	-2.301
AvAcc, mg					
<i>Females</i>					
20 to 29	22.61	26.61	32.56	39.85	46.93
30 to 39	22.05	26.23	32.52	40.35	48.02
40 to 49	21.22	25.48	32.00	40.20	48.33
50 to 59	20.01	24.23	30.74	39.03	47.31
60 to 69	18.60	22.68	29.03	37.18	45.39
70 to 79	17.20	21.11	27.25	35.20	43.26
80 to 89	15.98	19.74	25.69	33.46	41.40

ACCELEROMETRY REFERENCE VALUES

12

<i>Males</i>					
20 to 29	18.87	23.85	31.98	42.94	54.40
30 to 39	19.61	24.79	33.24	44.63	56.54
40 to 49	20.11	25.37	33.93	45.42	57.41
50 to 59	19.98	25.03	33.18	44.03	55.27
60 to 69	18.95	23.44	30.56	39.87	49.39
70 to 79	17.11	20.78	26.48	33.75	41.05
80 to 89	15.19	18.12	22.56	28.10	33.55

Abbreviations: IG, intensity gradient; AvAcc, average acceleration per day.

208

209

210 *** insert Figure 2 here ***

211

212

213 CRF-specific percentile curves for IG and AvAcc are available in Figure 3.

214 *** insert Figure 3 here ***

215

216 We developed the application ‘rawacceleration’ using these reference data. It is freely

217 available on GitHub (<https://github.com/FSchwendinger/rawacceleration>). Further insights

218 into ‘rawacceleration’ are given in the Supplement and discussion section.

219

220

221 **DISCUSSION**

222 The major novel findings are IG and AvAcc yield complementary information on PA,

223 particularly intensity, with both being important predictors of VO_{2peak} in healthy individuals

224 and patients with heart failure. Both metrics together had similar predictive value for VO_{2peak}

225 as the best cut-point-based metric in healthy adults. In patients with heart failure, both IG

226 alone and IG+AvAcc together had similar predictive value as the best cut-point-based metric

227 with IG being independent of AvAcc. Cut-point-free metrics also have the advantage of being

228 comparable across cohorts and the most commonly used accelerometers.[6, 24] Importantly,
229 this population-based study produced percentile curves and reference values for both cut-
230 point-free and traditional accelerometer metrics for healthy adults aged 20 to 89 years. This
231 addresses the limited interpretability of the AvAcc and IG metrics by placing them into
232 context. Our results provide generalised support for policy making.

233

234 **Inter-relationship between accelerometer metrics and VO_{2peak} in HEALTHY and**
235 **HEART**

236 We confirmed previous findings in children and adults with type 2 diabetes suggesting AvAcc
237 and IG provide a complementary picture of PA.[6, 7] Our study demonstrated this in healthy
238 adults and patients with heart failure by examining correlations between accelerometer
239 metrics. These findings are strengthened by our explorative principle component analysis.
240 Lower communalities were seen for IG than for AvAcc or MVPA indicating IG may yield a
241 perspective on PA not covered by other metrics. AvAcc and IG may thus provide a more
242 complete impression of an individual's PA profile without having to rely on accelerometer
243 cut-points.

244 AvAcc and IG have been described to reflect PA volume and intensity, respectively.[6] Yet,
245 correlations between TPA, VPA, IG, and AvAcc indicate that AvAcc conveys information on
246 both PA intensity and volume. It should therefore be noted that cut-point-free metrics allow
247 the further investigation of intensity/volume, despite their overlap, as IG captures the
248 distribution as well as quantity of intensity. This is more difficult with cut-point-based
249 metrics because of their categorical and population-dependent nature. Thus AvAcc and IG
250 may be particularly appropriate when attempting to differentiate between the contribution of
251 PA intensity and volume to CRF as well as other health parameters (e.g. body fatness, BMI,
252 physical function).[6, 7]

ACCELEROMETRY REFERENCE VALUES

14

253 IG and AvAcc together had the greatest predictive value for VO_{2peak} in healthy adults and
254 both were independently associated, explaining a unique fraction of the variance. This is
255 partly compliant with a study in children that estimated CRF from a shuttle-run-test.[7] IG or
256 AvAcc as the only independent variable in the adjusted regression models was significantly
257 associated with estimated CRF.[7] Yet, only IG remained significantly associated with CRF
258 when AvAcc was added to the model.[7] AvAcc may consequently be more relevant in adults
259 than in children. This is possibly due to different activity patterns with higher IG and AvAcc
260 together with less sedentary time in children.[7] This highlights the utility of combining these
261 two metrics to gain insight into the relative importance of volume and intensity of the PA
262 profile which differs across populations.[6]

263 Interestingly, TPA significantly added to model 5 also containing IG. Both intensity
264 distribution (IG) and time spent in PA (TPA) may thus be relevant for VO_{2peak} . Notably,
265 AvAcc captures both time and intensity of PA, thus reflecting activity volume, while IG
266 captures the distribution of the intensity of activity. Combining IG and AvAcc thus yields
267 complementary perspectives on PA intensity.

268 In patients with heart failure, cut-point-free metrics had similar predictive value for VO_{2peak}
269 as the best cut-point-based metric, MVPA. Yet, unlike in healthy adults, only IG was
270 independent of AvAcc but not vice versa. This may reflect relatively little activity of higher
271 intensity in these patients; it is in contrast with findings of Dawkins et al. (25) and suggests
272 that a focus on intensity of activity, i.e. increasing the breadth of the intensity distribution,
273 may be more important than volume if intervening in this population.

274 This study demonstrated that IG and AvAcc are not only potentially more robust
275 accelerometer metrics than MVPA, VPA, or TPA, as they do not rely on cut-points, but also
276 have similar predictive value for VO_{2peak} and, in turn, indirectly for the risk of mortality and
277 longevity.[8, 26] Indeed, Dempsey et al. (23) recently demonstrated that AvAcc and IG were

278 independently associated with incident cardiovascular disease in participants from UK
279 Biobank. These results and those of previous studies[6, 7] provide an evidence-based
280 rationale that cut-point-free accelerometer metrics facilitate capture of the volume and
281 intensity distribution of the PA profile across populations, and thus may be a viable
282 alternative to cut-point-based outcomes in the measurement of PA.

283

284 **Reference values for healthy adults**

285 Our reference values and percentile curves may be pivotal to assessing the appropriateness of
286 PA on population- or individual-level and to determining the level of PA necessary for a
287 healthy lifestyle.[6]

288 IG and AvAcc at the 50th percentile are higher than in participants of the UK Biobank Study
289 aged 40 to 69 years, despite them wearing the accelerometer on their dominant hand which
290 typically elicits accelerations approximately 10% higher.[1, 27] This seems reasonable in
291 light of the good health condition (see inclusion/exclusion criteria) and the likely higher
292 CRF[12] of the COMplete cohort compared to the aforementioned study. Hence, our
293 reference values might be desirable benchmarks for healthy PA patterns in adults.

294 Age trajectories of IG and AvAcc were curvilinear and inverse for both sexes (see Figure 2).

295 This is in line with the accelerometer data of another Swiss adult cohort.[28] Interestingly, the
296 decline in IG and AvAcc with age seems to resemble that of CRF and muscular strength in
297 the COMplete cohort.[12, 29] With age, less time is spent at higher absolute intensities

298 which might be due to reduced physical functioning as apparent by lower CRF and muscular
299 strength. However, when expressed in relative terms (as % of an individual's VO_{2peak}),

300 intensity may still be high. This explanation is underpinned by questionnaire data, which may

301 also reflect the rate of perceived exertion, showing more moderate and vigorous PA in

302 individuals aged > 59 years than in 40 to 59-year-olds.[28] Moreover, the inverse relationship

303 seen between accelerometer-based VPA and age seems not to be apparent in questionnaire
304 data.[28]

305 The proposed reference values may also be useful when PA is measured with other raw-
306 acceleration, wrist-worn accelerometers. Migueles et al. (24) found high inter-instrument
307 reliability for four common accelerometers (GENEActiv, Movisens Move 4, ActiGraph
308 GT3X+, and Axivity AX3) provided that raw data are processed identically. The between-
309 device difference ranged between 1 (95% CI: -6 to 7) and 8 (95% CI: 1 to 15) min per
310 day.[24] Our reference values may thus be applicable for at least the examined
311 accelerometers (i.e. GENEActiv, Movisens Move 4, ActiGraph GT3X+, and Axivity
312 AX3).[24]

313 Reference values and percentile curves for cut-point-based metrics (VPA and MVPA, see
314 Supplement: Figure 3 and Table 2) were also created. These are still commonly used and
315 directly interpretable. Comparison to these data is however only possible when using the cut-
316 points by Hildebrand et al. (3) (MVPA=0.1 g and VPA=0.4 g) and processing data
317 identically.[24] Due to the aforementioned disadvantages of cut-point-based accelerometer
318 metrics (also discussed elsewhere[5]), cut-point-free metrics should be reported in future
319 studies examining PA with raw-acceleration accelerometers.

320 Importantly, the reference values for traditional metrics are specific to accelerometer data and
321 examine the whole activity profile. They are not comparable to e.g. the PA guidelines by the
322 WHO which focus on MVPA and were developed predominantly from self-reported data.[2,
323 30] This is supported by numerous studies.[31, 32]

324 Our reference values facilitate interpretation of accelerometer-assessed PA data relative to a
325 ‘healthy norm’, and may thus be an important complement to the current PA guidelines by the
326 WHO.[30]

327

328 **Limitations**

329 PA levels differ between countries.[33] Nonetheless, it seems to be desirable to promote the
330 present reference values also in countries other than Switzerland considering the good general
331 health of our cohort in combination with their high CRF.[12] Importantly, the present
332 reference values are only applicable if the data are processed similarly (see Methods section
333 and configuration file). The R-package GGIR will facilitate this process.[10] Large
334 differences in sampling frequency of accelerometer data may impact outcomes. In a study
335 comparing 25 Hz with 100 Hz, the lower sampling frequency led to 3.1%–13.9% lower
336 overall acceleration values.[34] The difference may however be smaller at 50 Hz, as used in
337 our study. Yet, sampling frequency should be considered when comparing PA metrics to the
338 present reference values. Available algorithms may help transform PA metrics to match those
339 obtained from higher sampling frequencies.[34] Lastly, no causation between PA and VO_{2peak}
340 can be implied from the present study.

341

342

343 **CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS**

344 IG and AvAcc provide complementary information on PA, particularly the intensity
345 distribution of the PA profile. IG and AvAcc were strongly associated with VO_{2peak} in healthy
346 adults and patients with heart failure. These metrics are independent of accelerometer cut-
347 points, facilitate investigation of the relative contribution of intensity and volume of PA for a
348 given health marker, and thus may be important parameters with regard to general health and
349 risk for mortality and non-communicable diseases. To the best of our knowledge, this is the
350 first study to produce reference values for IG and AvAcc for healthy adults. These reference
351 values may be valuable to judge an individual's or a population's level of PA and facilitate
352 cross-study comparison. The 'rawacceleration' application may be helpful for to compare

353 individual- or cohort-level data to healthy age- and sex-matched adults and translate results
354 into meaningful outcomes in research settings and clinical practice.

355

356

357 **Declarations**

358 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

359 This study was approved by the Ethics Committee of North-western and Central Switzerland
360 (EKNZ 2017–01451). All participants in this study provided informed written consent.

361 **Consent for publication**

362 Not applicable.

363 **Availability of data and materials**

364 The datasets used and/or analysed during the current study are available from the
365 corresponding author on reasonable request.

366 **Competing interests**

367 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

368 **Funding**

369 The COMpLETE study was funded by the Swiss National Science Foundation (Grant no.
370 182815). AVR is supported by the Lifestyle Theme of the Leicester NHR Leicester Biomedical
371 Research Centre and NIHR Applied Research Collaborations East Midlands (ARC-EM).

372 **Authors contributions**

373 FS conceptualised the manuscript and wrote the original draft. FS and DI analysed and
374 interpreted the data. JW, AST, TH, and RK conceptualised the study and defined the methods.

375 JW and RK collected the data. FS, JW, and RK were responsible for data curation. JW, DI,

376 RK, AVR, TH, and AST revised the manuscript. AST obtained funding for the project. All

377 authors approved the final version of the manuscript.

378 **Acknowledgements**

379 We are grateful for the valuable contributions of all study participants in the COMplete
380 study.

381

382 **List of abbreviations**

383	AvAcc	Average acceleration
384	CRF	Cardiorespiratory fitness
385	ENMO	Euclidean norm minus one
386	HEALTHY	Healthy adults
387	HEART	Patients with heart failure
388	IG	Intensity gradient
389	MVPA	Moderate-to-vigorous physical activity
390	NT-proBNP	N-terminal pro b-type natriuretic peptide
391	NYHA	New York Heart Association
392	PA	Physical activity
393	SD	Standard deviation
394	SED	Sedentary time
395	TPA	Total physical activity
396	VO _{2peak}	Peak oxygen uptake
397	VPA	Vigorous physical activity

398

399

400 **REFERENCES**

- 401 1. Rowlands AV, Fairclough SJ, Yates TOM, Edwardson CL, Davies M, Munir F, et al.
402 Activity Intensity, Volume, and Norms: Utility and Interpretation of Accelerometer Metrics.
403 Med Sci Sports Exerc. 2019;51(11):2410-22.
404 2. Troiano RP, McClain JJ, Brychta RJ, Chen KY. Evolution of accelerometer methods
405 for physical activity research. Br J Sports Med. 2014;48(13):1019-23.

- 406 3. Hildebrand M, van Hees VT, Hansen BH, Ekelund U. Age Group Comparability of
407 Raw Accelerometer Output from Wrist- and Hip-Worn Monitors. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.*
408 2014;46(9):1816-24.
- 409 4. Esliger DW, Rowlands AV, Hurst TL, Catt M, Murray P, Eston RG. Validation of the
410 GENE Accelerometer. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 2011;43(6):1085-93.
- 411 5. Schwendinger F, Wagner J, Infanger D, Schmidt-Trucksäss A, Knaier R.
412 Methodological aspects for accelerometer-based assessment of physical activity in heart
413 failure and health. *BMC Med Res Methodol.* 2021;21(1):251.
- 414 6. Rowlands AV, Edwardson CL, Davies MJ, Khunti K, Harrington DM, Yates T.
415 Beyond Cut Points: Accelerometer Metrics that Capture the Physical Activity Profile. *Med*
416 *Sci Sports Exerc.* 2018;50(6):1323-32.
- 417 7. Fairclough SJ, Taylor S, Rowlands AV, Boddy LM, Noonan RJ. Average acceleration
418 and intensity gradient of primary school children and associations with indicators of health
419 and well-being. *J Sports Sci.* 2019;37(18):2159-67.
- 420 8. Kodama S, Saito K, Tanaka S, Maki M, Yachi Y, Asumi M, et al. Cardiorespiratory
421 Fitness as a Quantitative Predictor of All-Cause Mortality and Cardiovascular Events in
422 Healthy Men and Women: A Meta-analysis. *JAMA.* 2009;301(19):2024-35.
- 423 9. Wagner J, Knaier R, Infanger D, Arbeev K, Briel M, Dieterle T, et al. Functional
424 aging in health and heart failure: the COMLETE Study. *BMC Cardiovasc Disord.*
425 2019;19(1):180.
- 426 10. Migueles JH, Rowlands AV, Huber F, Sabia S, van Hees VT. GGIR: A Research
427 Community-Driven Open Source R Package for Generating Physical Activity and Sleep
428 Outcomes From Multi-Day Raw Accelerometer Data. *J Meas Phys Behav.* 2019;2(3):188-96.
- 429 11. van Hees VT, Gorzelniak L, Dean León EC, Eder M, Pias M, Taherian S, et al.
430 Separating Movement and Gravity Components in an Acceleration Signal and Implications
431 for the Assessment of Human Daily Physical Activity. *PloS ONE.* 2013;8(4):e61691.
432 10.1371/journal.pone.0061691.
- 433 12. Wagner J, Knaier R, Infanger D, Königstein K, Klenk C, Carrard J, et al. Novel CPET
434 Reference Values in Healthy Adults: Associations with Physical Activity. *Med Sci Sports*
435 *Exerc.* 2020;53(1):26-37.
- 436 13. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing Vienna,
437 Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2021 [Available from: [https://www.R-](https://www.R-project.org/)
438 [project.org/](https://www.R-project.org/)].
- 439 14. Kassambara A, Mundt F. Factoextra: Extract and Visualize the Results of Multivariate
440 Data Analyses. R Package Version 1.0.7. 2020.
- 441 15. Mevik B-H, Wehrens R. The pls Package: Principal Component and Partial Least
442 Squares Regression in R. *J Stat Softw.* 2007;18(2):1-23.
- 443 16. Harrell FE, Jr. Regression modeling strategies. 2 ed: Springer International
444 Publishing; 2015.
- 445 17. Vuong QH. Likelihood Ratio Tests for Model Selection and Non-Nested Hypotheses.
446 *Econometrica.* 1989;57(2):307-33.
- 447 18. Stasinopoulos DM, Rigby RA. Generalized Additive Models for Location Scale and
448 Shape (GAMLSS) in R. *J Stat Softw.* 2007;23(7):1-46.
- 449 19. Stasinopoulos MD, Rigby, R.A., Heller, G.Z., Voudouris, V., De Bastiani, F. . Flexible
450 Regression and Smoothing: Using GAMLSS in R. 1 ed: Chapman and Hall/CRC; 2017.
- 451 20. Eilers PHC, Marx, B. D. Practical smoothing. *The joys of P-splines*: Cambridge
452 University Press; 2021.
- 453 21. van Buuren S, Fredriks M. Worm plot: a simple diagnostic device for modelling
454 growth reference curves. *Stat Med.* 2001;20(8):1259-77.

- 455 22. Chang W, Cheng J, Allaire J, Xie Y, McPherson J. Shiny: web application framework
456 for R. R package version. 2017;1(5):2017.
- 457 23. Dempsey PC, Rowlands AV, Strain T, Zaccardi F, Dawkins NP, Razieh C, et al.
458 Physical activity volume, intensity and incident cardiovascular disease. *Eur Heart J*.
459 2022;43(46):4789-4800.
- 460 24. Migueles JH, Molina-Garcia P, Torres-Lopez LV, Cadenas-Sanchez C, Rowlands AV,
461 Ebner-Priemer UW, et al. Equivalency of four research-grade movement sensors to assess
462 movement behaviors and its implications for population surveillance. *Sci Rep*.
463 2022;12(1):5525. 10.1038/s41598-022-09469-2.
- 464 25. Dawkins NP, Yates T, Edwardson CL, Maylor B, Henson J, Hall AP, et al. Importance
465 of Overall Activity and Intensity of Activity for Cardiometabolic Risk in Those with and
466 Without a Chronic Disease. *Med Sci Sports Exerc*. 2022;54(9):1582-90.
- 467 26. Mok A, Khaw K-T, Luben R, Wareham N, Brage S. Physical activity trajectories and
468 mortality: population based cohort study. *BMJ*. 2019;365:l2323. 10.1136/bmj.l2323.
- 469 27. Buchan DS, Boddy LM, McLellan G. Comparison of Free-Living and Laboratory
470 Activity Outcomes from ActiGraph Accelerometers Worn on the Dominant and Non-
471 Dominant Wrists. *Meas Phys Edu Exerc Sci*. 2020;24(4):247-57.
- 472 28. Wanner M, Hartmann C, Pestoni G, Martin BW, Siegrist M, Martin-Diener E.
473 Validation of the Global Physical Activity Questionnaire for self-administration in a
474 European context. *BMJ Open Sport Exerc Med*. 2017;3(1):e000206. 10.1136/bmjsem-2016-
475 000206.
- 476 29. Lichtenstein E, Wagner J, Knaier R, Infanger D, Roth R, Hinrichs T, et al. Norm
477 Values of Muscular Strength Across the Life Span in a Healthy Swiss Population: The
478 COMpLETE Study. *Sports Health*. 2022. 10.1177/19417381221116345.
- 479 30. Bull FC, Al-Ansari SS, Biddle S, Borodulin K, Buman MP, Cardon G, et al. World
480 Health Organization 2020 guidelines on physical activity and sedentary behaviour. *Br J*
481 *Sports Med*. 2020;54(24):1451-62.
- 482 31. Tucker JM, Welk GJ, Beyler NK. Physical activity in U.S.: adults compliance with the
483 Physical Activity Guidelines for Americans. *Am J Prev Med*. 2011;40(4):454-61.
- 484 32. Schuna JM, Jr., Johnson WD, Tudor-Locke C. Adult self-reported and objectively
485 monitored physical activity and sedentary behavior: NHANES 2005-2006. *Int J Behav Nutr*
486 *Phys Act*. 2013;10:126. 10.1186/1479-5868-10-126.
- 487 33. Bauman A, Ainsworth BE, Sallis JF, Hagströmer M, Craig CL, Bull FC, et al. The
488 Descriptive Epidemiology of Sitting: A 20-Country Comparison Using the International
489 Physical Activity Questionnaire (IPAQ). *Am J Prev Med*. 2011;41(2):228-35.
- 490 34. Small S, Khalid S, Dhiman P, Chan S, Jackson D, Doherty A, et al. Impact of
491 Reduced Sampling Rate on Accelerometer-Based Physical Activity Monitoring and Machine
492 Learning Activity Classification. *J Meas Phys Behav*. 2021;4(4):298-310.

494

495 **Figure legends**

496 **Figure 1.** Spearman correlations of average acceleration (AvAcc), intensity gradient (IG), moderate-to-vigorous
497 physical activity (MVPA), sedentary time (SED), time in physical activity (TPA), peak oxygen uptake
498 (VO₂peak), and vigorous physical activity (VPA) for healthy individuals (HEALTHY) and patients with heart
499 failure (HEART), respectively. Non-significant correlations are crossed.

ACCELEROMETRY REFERENCE VALUES

22

500

501 **Figure 2.** Percentile curves for intensity gradient (A & B) and average acceleration (C & D) in relation to age in
502 healthy adults. The left column shows data for females and the right column for males. Mean values of IG and
503 AvAcc of other cohorts were plotted to highlight the potential of the reference curves for comparability across
504 studies and between devices. Data by Rowlands et al. (1): pre- and post-menopausal women ($n_{pre}=1218$,
505 $n_{post}=1316$; device: Axivity). Dempsey et al. (23): participants of the UK Biobank study (females, $n = 51,509$;
506 males, $n=36,903$, device: Axivity, dominant wrist). Our data of patients with heart failure (HEART; device:
507 GENEActiv) were also plotted.

508

509 **Figure 3.** Percentile curves for intensity gradient (A & B) and average acceleration (C & D) in relation to
510 VO_{2peak} in healthy adults stratified by sex. The left column shows data for females and the right column for
511 males. Abbreviations: VO_{2peak} , peak oxygen uptake.

512





