medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.14.24318939; this version posted December 16, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Self-reported acceptance of a wearable activity monitor in persons with stroke

Jamie Nam[1], Grace C. Bellinger[1], Junyao Li[2], Margaret A. French[3], Ryan T. Roemmich[1,4]*

[1]Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD 21205

[2]Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine, Chicago, IL 60611

[3]Department of Physical Therapy and Athletic Training, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT 84108

[4]Center for Movement Studies, Kennedy Krieger Institute, Baltimore, MD 21205

*corresponding author

Twitter: @GraceCBellinger (GCB), @MaggieFrenchDPT (MAF), @RyanRoemmich (RTR)

Contact information:

Room 240

Kennedy Krieger Institute

716 North Broadway

Baltimore, MD 21205

rroemmi1@jhmi.edu

Abstract word count: 433 Text word count: 3216

Number of figures: 3 Number of tables: 4

Key words: stroke, wearables, mobility, technology acceptance, physical activity, remote monitoring, rehabilitation

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.14.24318939; this version posted December 16, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

ABSTRACT

Background: Wearable activity monitors offer clinicians and researchers accessible, scalable, and cost-effective tools for continuous remote monitoring of functional status. These technologies complement traditional clinical outcome measures by providing detailed, minute-by-minute remote monitoring data on a wide array of biometrics that include, as examples, physical activity and heart rate. There is significant potential for the use of these devices in rehabilitation after stroke; however, the perceptions of persons with stroke regarding the acceptance of these devices are not well understood.

Objective: In this study, we investigated the participant-reported acceptance of a wrist-worn wearable activity monitor (the Fitbit Inspire 2) for remote monitoring of daily activity and heart rate in persons with stroke. We also assessed potential relationships between reported acceptance and real-world device wear.

Methods: Sixty-five participants with stroke wore a Fitbit Inspire 2 for three months. We assessed the perceived acceptance of the devices using the Technology Acceptance Questionnaire (TAQ) and calculated metrics of adherence to device wear in the three weeks preceding TAQ administration. We then also performed Spearman's correlations to assess relationships between responses on the TAQ and adherence metrics.

Results: In their responses to statements on the TAQ, most participants reported the device to be generally beneficial for their health, efficient for monitoring their health, easy to use and don/doff, and unintrusive to daily life; participants reported generally agreeable responses across all seven dimensions of the TAQ, indicating general acceptance of the device. Participants wore the Fitbit for an average of 80.0% of daily minutes (median: 91%, IQR: 22%) and had 78.0%

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.14.24318939; this version posted December 16, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

valid wear days (median: 90%, IQR: 33%). Contrary to our hypothesis, TAQ responses showed no significant positive correlations with adherence metrics.

Conclusions: Our study highlights the perceived acceptance of the Fitbit Inspire 2 among persons with stroke, with participants reporting agreement across all seven TAQ dimensions and no significant concerns interpreted as being directly relatable to post-stroke motor impairment (e.g., minimal concerns about donning and doffing devices, using the device independently). These findings align with previous studies on wearable technology acceptance in other populations and support the potential for scalable implementation of these devices in stroke rehabilitation. However, monitoring of wearable device adherence is required despite the high reported acceptance, as perceived acceptance was not positively related with adherence to wearing the device. Accordingly, technologies capable of automated monitoring and management of device wear will be important for scalability of these technologies in larger clinical and research use cases. In summary, this study provides new insights into the perceived acceptance of wearable activity monitors among persons with stroke and their association with real-world adherence to device use.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.14.24318939; this version posted December 16, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

INTRODUCTION

Wearable devices have the potential to revolutionize how clinicians and researchers measure functional status by offering accessible, scalable, and cost-effective remote monitoring tools.[1,2] Traditional outcome measures provide only a discrete snapshot of a patient or research participant's functional status;[3–5] emerging wearable technologies address this issue by providing minute-by-minute, longitudinal data on physical activity, heart rate, and many other biometrics from daily life that extend far beyond the clinical or laboratory setting. The use of wearable devices for remote monitoring could provide far more comprehensive data about functional status than are currently available in clinical settings.

Notably, wearable devices could provide valuable insight into recovery following neurologic damage (e.g., after stroke) by enabling granular assessment of activity, one of the core domains of the World Health Organization International Classification of Functioning, Disability, and Health model.[6] Approximately 80% of persons with stroke experience some form of motor impairment, and around 50% continue to have significant functional limitations six months post-stroke.[7–9] These limitations often translate into reduced daily activity, as persons with stroke generally walk approximately half as many steps each day as individuals without stroke.[10] However, the ability to perform remote monitoring after stroke using wearable devices relies on the perceived acceptance of these devices for persons with stroke.

In this study, we examined the acceptance of a wrist-worn wearable device (the Fitbit Inspire 2) for remote monitoring of daily activity and heart rate in persons with stroke. The perception in user acceptance among wearable devices for remote monitoring has been high across a diverse range of applications spanning many populations, including studies of aging,[11] oncology,[12] and orthopedics.[13] In studies of persons with minimal motor impairment, the lack of

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.14.24318939; this version posted December 16, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

sustained Fitbit usage was primarily attributed to technical issues – difficulties with empty batteries, broken devices, or lost devices[14] – rather than usability concerns. Here, we studied perceived acceptance of wearable devices in persons with stroke who may perceive difficulty with usability aspects of wearable devices due to challenges donning and doffing or using mobile applications, as examples. We also measured adherence to wearing the Fitbit device to understand whether the self-reported measures of acceptance would correlate with real-world device use. We studied Fitbit devices specifically because these have been used extensively for remote monitoring of step count, heart rate, and energy expenditure – among other metrics – in many populations.[15]

To measure perceived acceptance of wearable technologies in persons with stroke, we utilized the Technology Acceptance Questionnaire (TAQ), a questionnaire derived from the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM).[11] The TAM is robust and widely used due to its simplicity and strong empirical support.[16,17] The TAM posits that perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use are deep fundamental determinants of user acceptance of technology.[18] *Perceived usefulness* in our study was adapted from the original definition of "improvements in one's job performance"[18] to refer specifically to the extent to which technology can aid in monitoring older adults' health and facilitate aging-in-place.[11] *Perceived ease of use* refers to the degree to which a person believes that using a technology will be free from effort. [18]

Numerous studies have validated the TAM across many contexts, demonstrating its predictive power in understanding technology adoption behaviors.[16,17,19–21] Not only has the original TAM demonstrated consistent predictive validity across various fields, but extensions of the model[22] have also incorporated additional factors, offering a more nuanced understanding of user acceptance. *Facilitating conditions* refer to external circumstances that impact the effort

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.14.24318939; this version posted December 16, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

required to use the technology, such as availability, affordability, and access to training resources.[23] *Subjective norm* refers to the an individual's perception that others who are important to them think they should use the technology, adding another layer of external influence.[23]

The TAQ also incorporates aspects of the Sensor Acceptance Model,[24] which builds on the TAM by adding factors specific to sensor-based technologies. In the context of our study, we included elements of the Sensor Acceptance Model to assess not only the perception of the design, but the trust of the user in the sensor technology devices.[24,25] *Equipment characteristics* have been described as critical factors affecting technology acceptance, including design elements and functionality that influence usability.[11,26] To address user concerns related to data security and risks, which significantly influence overall acceptance and trust in technology, Puri and colleagues added *privacy concerns* as a novel dimension in the TAQ and *perceived risk* as an additional factor.[11] *Privacy concerns* refer to issues related to data storage and analysis, particularly in the context of cloud-based communication protocols, and consider potential implications for HIPAA compliance. *Perceived risk* refers to the potential negative outcomes associated with using a technology, such as concerns over data breaches, financial loss, or misuse of personal information. This dimension has been shown to influence consumer behavior and is crucial when assessing user acceptance of new technologies.[11]

Here, we hypothesized that 1) reports of perceived acceptance – including TAQ dimensions (e.g., perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use) – of the Fitbit devices would be variable across persons with stroke but generally indicate that these technologies are acceptable, useful, and easy to use , and 2) TAQ total scores and dimension subscores would be significantly associated with metrics of Fitbit adherence (i.e., higher device wear time).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.14.24318939; this version posted December 16, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

METHODS

Participants

We recruited persons with stroke from the outpatient rehabilitation clinics at Johns Hopkins Hospital through clinician referrals. The inclusion criteria for this study were: age 18 years and older; history of stroke (as confirmed by ICD-10 codes); ownership of a smartphone and in-home Wi-Fi to access the internet; walking as a primary form of mobility (with assistive devices allowed); and ability and willingness to install the Fitbit mobile application on their smartphone device.

Of the 108 persons with stroke that we contacted, 98 participants enrolled in the study (the remaining 10 individuals either did not meet the inclusion criteria or declined to participate). Among the enrolled participants, four were lost to follow-up (i.e., they could not be reached despite repeated attempts during the three-month study period) and eight withdrew voluntarily (i.e., they chose to discontinue their involvement after enrolling). Furthermore, 21 participants did not complete the TAQ three months post-enrollment. As a result, we included 65 participants with stroke in the final analysis. We include a CONSORT diagram in Figure 1 and summarize study participant characteristics in Table 1. All participants provided oral consent, as approved by the Institutional Review Board at the Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine.

Data collection

We mailed a Fitbit Inspire 2 (Fitbit Inc., San Francisco, CA, USA) to participants and asked them to wear it for three months. As an incentive, we allowed participants to keep the Fitbit following completion of the study. We instructed participants to wear the Fitbit on their non-paretic (i.e., less impaired) wrist throughout the entire day, including during sleep; if

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.14.24318939; this version posted December 16, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

participants had difficulty donning the device and lacked available assistance, we permitted them to wear it on the paretic wrist. We documented the paretic side and the wrist on which the Fitbit was worn. Then, we guided the participants over the phone to set up the device and install the Fitbit application on their smartphone. We instructed participants to remove the device only when showering or charging it. We also asked them to synchronize the device at least once per day using the Fitbit smartphone application, which did not require removing the Fitbit.

Participants agreed to wear the Fitbit for the duration of the three-month study, but we used the 21-day window of Fitbit data immediately prior to the completion of the survey for analysis to determine wear time and valid wear days (because the TAQ questions ask specifically about user perceptions over the past three weeks). The study team incorporated notifications and reminders to assist with device adherence, as detailed in our previous work.[27] Participants completed the TAQ approximately three months after enrollment to assess their experience with the Fitbit.

The TAQ consisted of 31 statements rated on a 5-point Likert scale where participants indicated their levels of agreement or disagreement with each statement along with six additional multiple choice questions. The first 31 statements covered dimensions of perceived usefulness (PU; n=5 statements), perceived ease of use (PEOU, n=7 statements), facilitating conditions (FC; n=2 statements), subjective norm (SN; n=3 statements), equipment characteristics (EC; n=8 statements), privacy concerns (PC; n=3 statements), and perceived risk (PR; n=3 statements). The six additional questions addressed various aspects of device use in the form of multiple choice responses.

Measures of Fitbit adherence

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.14.24318939; this version posted December 16, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

We first identified Fitbit wear minutes as any minute with a non-zero heart rate. We then calculated two measures of Fitbit adherence. First, we calculated the percentage of wear time for each day as the total number of wear minutes divided by 1440 minutes (the total number of minutes in one day) multiplied by 100. Second, we calculated valid wear days as days when a participant wore the device for at least 75% (1080 minutes) of the total minutes in a day (1440 minutes). Valid wear days were also converted to a percentage of the 3-week period by dividing the number of valid days by 21 and multiplying by 100.

Statistical analysis

We calculated descriptive statistics for the Fitbit adherence metrics as well as the full-scale TAQ, seven dimensions, and 37 individual items. To assess relationships between Fitbit adherence and TAQ responses, we used Spearman's correlations (due to the ordinal nature of the TAQ responses). We performed all statistical analyses using R version 4.4.1 with $\alpha=0.05$.

RESULTS

TAQ responses

We show proportions of responses (Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, Strongly Disagree) to each of the 31 TAQ statements rated by Likert scales organized by dimension (Figure 2). The five statements with the highest proportions of "Agree" or "Strongly Agree" responses were (in order):

1) Statement 1: "I think that monitoring my activity and health 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, can be a good thing."

2a) Statement 7: "I was able to perform my daily tasks as usual while wearing the device."

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.14.24318939; this version posted December 16, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

2b) Statement 11: "The battery life of the device meets my expectations."

4) Statement 18: "I was able to put the device on in a reasonable amount of time."

5) Statement 20: "I am comfortable with my health data being shared with equipment manufacturers as long as it is shared anonymously."

The five statements with the lowest proportions of "Agree" or "Strongly Agree" responses were (in order):

1a) Statement 25: "Wearing the device caused me to have joint pain."

1b) Statement 27: "I was embarrassed to wear the device in front of family members."

3a) Statement 2: "I was afraid that the device would discover a major health issue."

3b) Statement 17: "I was concerned that the device is not securely attached to me."

3c) Statement 26: "I was able to shower or bathe normally while wearing the device."

With the exceptions of the five statements immediately above as well as statements 10 ("I experience skin irritations while wearing the device") and 15 ("I find the display of the device easy to read outdoors"), a majority of participants responded either "Agree" or "Strongly Agree" to each of the remaining 24 statements.

We calculated individual participant summed TAQ responses ("Strongly Disagree" = 1 point, "Disagree" = 2 points, "Neutral" = 3 points, "Agree" = 4 points, "Strongly Agree" = 5 points) within each of the seven dimensions. We show group means, standard deviations, medians, and interquartile ranges of these scores for each of the seven dimensions in Table 2 (Table 2 also includes the maximum and minimum possible scores for each dimension) and for each individual TAQ statement in Table 3. Note that, in Tables 2 and 3, responses to statements 2, 10, 17, 25, and 27 have been reversed to preserve directionality.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.14.24318939; this version posted December 16, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Next, we analyzed responses to the six multiple choice questions from the TAQ (questions 32-37) that did not have designated dimensions (Table 4). Most participants found the device useful (question 32), with 95.4% rating the information provided as either "very useful" or "somewhat useful". Nearly all participants (92.3%) expressed willingness to continue using the device to monitor their health (question 33), and 96.9% reported wearing the device for 15–21 days out of the 21-day period (question 34). In terms of value, most participants indicated willingness to pay no more than $100 for the device (question 35). Most (90.8%) participants reported looking at their health data provided by their device (question 36). Finally, self-perception of activity levels varied among participants with 64.6% considering themselves to be active (question 37).

Fitbit adherence

Participants wore the Fitbit for 80.0%±24.7% of the total minutes in a day, with a median wear time of 91% and an interquartile range of 22%. Participants showed 78.0%±25.8% valid wear days with a median of 90% and an interquartile range of 33%.

Relationships between Fitbit adherence and TAQ responses

The scatterplots in Figures 3A and 3B show relationships between the summed scores of the different TAQ dimensions (as well as TAQ total scores) and the percentages of wear time and valid wear days, respectively. Relationships between TAQ dimensions and the metrics of Fitbit adherence were not statistically significant with the exception of the associations between PU and percent wear time ($\rho=-0.27$, $p=0.03$) and between PU and the percentage of valid wear days ($\rho=-0.26$, $p=0.04$). Note that these correlations demonstrate an inverse relationship counter to our hypotheses; there were no statistically significant positive relationships between TAQ dimension summed scores or total scores and Fitbit adherence metrics.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.14.24318939; this version posted December 16, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

DISCUSSION

Our study highlights the perceived acceptance of the Fitbit Inspire 2 wearable activity monitor among persons with stroke. In their responses to statements on the TAQ, a majority of the participants reported the device to be generally beneficial for their health, efficient for monitoring their health, easy to use and don/doff, and unintrusive to daily life; one notable exception was the response to the statement "I find the display of the device easy to read outdoors". Generally, participants did not express significant concerns about privacy or data security, consistent with prior studies.[18,22] Our adherence data showed that most participants wore the device a majority of the time over the three-week study period. Contrary to our hypothesis, more agreeable responses to the TAQ statements were not positively correlated with device wear time or the number of valid wear days at a statistically significant level.

The findings of our study are consistent with previous literature demonstrating acceptance of wearable activity monitors in other populations.[11,28–32] We considered it important to assess acceptance of these devices in persons with stroke in particular because of the growing interest in using wearables for both activity monitoring and telerehabilitation after stroke.[33–37] There were no commonly reported acceptance concerns that we deemed likely to be related to post-stroke motor impairment: as examples, participants widely reported agreement to the statements "I was able to wear the device easily without help from another person," "I find the device easy to use," "I was able to put the device on in a reasonable amount of time," and "I was able to remove the device easily without help from another person." These findings complement recent studies demonstrating the perceived value and user satisfaction of wearable technologies in stroke rehabilitation[38–40] and support a path toward scalable implementation of these devices.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.14.24318939; this version posted December 16, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

We also highlight that participants reported generally agreeable responses across all seven dimensions of the TAQ. All dimensions – with the exception of Perceived Ease of Use – showed a median-to-max possible score ratio of 0.8, corresponding to a median score of 4 (or "Agree") on each question. Perceived Ease of Use showed a median-to-max possible score ratio of 0.71; the modestly lower scores in this dimension were largely driven by generally less agreeable responses to the statements "I find the display of the device easy to read outdoors" and "I was able to shower or bathe normally while wearing the device". The latter statement received a majority of "Neutral" responses, likely because we informed the participants to remove the device before showering or bathing. Previous work highlighted that technical and usability issues – such as difficulties with battery life or syncing – may affect the perceived usefulness of wearable devices;[14] however, we did not observe this in our sample. Our findings across the different dimensions were largely similar to those reported in a previous sample of older adults.[11]

It is important to emphasize that monitoring of device adherence is required despite the high reported acceptance. Our findings did not support the hypothesis that higher user acceptance as measured by the TAQ would correlate with measures of device wear, as we did not observe statistically significant positive correlations between TAQ responses and our measures of adherence. This revealed that high reported acceptance of the device does not guarantee that a patient or research participant will necessarily adhere to wearing the device in real-world settings. Technologies that help to automate oversight of device wear and messaging to promote adherence will be important for ensuring data quality.[41]

As the push toward clinical use of wearables in stroke rehabilitation continues to move forward, it is also important to consider the needs and perspectives of all key stakeholders – patients, their family members and caregivers, and clinicians – in addition to the device

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.14.24318939; this version posted December 16, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

acceptance reported by patients in our study. For example, recent studies have: provided useful information regarding how persons with stroke prefer to receive data from wearables and identified a set of metrics deemed most useful;[42] incorporated perspectives from patients and clinicians on the value of using wearables and identified preferences for incorporation into clinical care;[39] and demonstrated important design considerations for adoption of the wearables and accompanying smartphone applications as outlined by persons with stroke.[40] Future work should consider these multifaceted aspects – patient acceptance, patient and clinician data provision preferences, and device design – as we move closer to clinical implementation of wearables in stroke rehabilitation.

We acknowledge some limitations in our study. First, our sample was heterogeneous with regard to stroke chronicity. Accordingly, we did not design this study to assess how wearable device acceptance may differ across stages of stroke recovery (e.g., acute, subacute, chronic). Second, we only used the Fitbit Inspire 2 device. While we anticipate that many of our findings may generalize across different models of wearable devices due to the nature of the statements included in the TAQ, we do not have data to support this directly. Third, we focused on the TAQ to provide information about device acceptance in particular. We did not use other instruments that could provide additional data on other aspects of patient perceptions about wearable devices (e.g., the System Usability Scale for assessment of usability).

CONCLUSIONS

This study reported the perceived acceptance of a wrist-worn activity monitor in persons with stroke. In response to statements on the TAQ, participants with stroke generally reported the device to be beneficial for their health, useful for monitoring their health, easy to use, and

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.14.24318939; this version posted December 16, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

minimally intrusive. We observed generally agreeable responses to TAQ statements across all seven dimensions of the instrument. Contrary to our hypothesis, more agreeable responses to the TAQ statements were not positively correlated with metrics of device wear, revealing that adherence to wearing the device should not be assumed even when participants report high device acceptance. In summary, this study detailed new information about the acceptance of wearable activity monitors in persons with stroke and its association with real-world device wear.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.14.24318939; this version posted December 16, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We acknowledge funding from the American Heart Association (grants 23IPA1054140 and 935556 to RTR, grant 24POST1187285 to GCB) and the Sheikh Khalifa Stroke Institute at Johns Hopkins Medicine.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The authors declare no relevant conflicts of interest.

ABBREVIATIONS

TAQ: Technology Acceptance Questionnaire

TAM: Technology Acceptance Model

HIPAA: Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act

IQR: Interquartile range

PU: Perceived usefulness

PEOU: Perceived ease of use

FC: Facilitating conditions

SN: Subjective norm

EC: Equipment characteristics

PC: Privacy concerns

PR: Perceived risk

CONSORT: Consolidated standards of reporting trials

DATA AVAILABILITY

Data will be made available upon reasonable request.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.14.24318939; this version posted December 16, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

FIGURE CAPTIONS

Figure 1. CONSORT diagram showing the enrollment and participation of participants at various stages throughout the study.

Figure 2. Percentages of responses to each individual statement on the TAQ grouped by the seven TAQ dimensions.

Figure 3. A) Scatterplots showing relationships between summed scores for each TAQ dimension (as well as total TAQ scores) and Fitbit wear time. B) Scatterplots showing relationships between summed scores for each TAQ dimension (as well as total TAQ scores) and valid Fitbit wear days. In both A) and B), we italicize statistics to indicate statistically significant relationships ($p<0.05$).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.14.24318939; this version posted December 16, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

REFERENCES

1. Patel MS, Asch DA, Volpp KG. Wearable Devices as Facilitators, Not Drivers, of Health Behavior Change. *JAMA*. 2015;313(5):459. doi:10.1001/jama.2014.14781

2. Piwek L, Ellis DA, Andrews S, Joinson A. The Rise of Consumer Health Wearables: Promises and Barriers. *PLOS Med*. 2016;13(2):e1001953. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1001953

3. Chang M, Büchel D, Reinecke K, Lehmann T, Baumeister J. Ecological validity in exercise neuroscience research: A systematic investigation. *Eur J Neurosci*. 2022;55(2):487-509. doi:10.1111/ejn.15595

4. Ingram JN, Wolpert DM. Naturalistic approaches to sensorimotor control. In: *Progress in Brain Research*. Vol 191. Elsevier; 2011:3-29. doi:10.1016/B978-0-444-53752-2.00016-3

5. Peterson SM, Singh SH, Wang NXR, Rao RPN, Brunton BW. Behavioral and Neural Variability of Naturalistic Arm Movements. *eneuro*. 2021;8(3):ENEURO.0007-21.2021. doi:10.1523/ENEURO.0007-21.2021

6. Organization WH. *International Classification of Functioning Disability and Health (ICF)*. World Health Organization; 2001.

7. Langhorne P, Bernhardt J, Kwakkel G. Stroke rehabilitation. *The Lancet*. 2011;377(9778):1693-1702. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(11)60325-5

8. Lawrence ES, Coshall C, Dundas R, et al. Estimates of the Prevalence of Acute Stroke Impairments and Disability in a Multiethnic Population. *Stroke*. 2001;32(6):1279-1284. doi:10.1161/01.STR.32.6.1279

9. Li S. Stroke Recovery Is a Journey: Prediction and Potentials of Motor Recovery after a Stroke from a Practical Perspective. *Life*. 2023;13(10):2061. doi:10.3390/life13102061

10. Fini NA, Holland AE, Keating J, Simek J, Bernhardt J. How is physical activity monitored in people following stroke? *Disabil Rehabil*. 2015;37(19):1717-1731. doi:10.3109/09638288.2014.978508

11. Puri A, Kim B, Nguyen O, Stolee P, Tung J, Lee J. User Acceptance of Wrist-Worn Activity Trackers Among Community-Dwelling Older Adults: Mixed Method Study. *JMIR MHealth UHealth*. 2017;5(11):e8211. doi:10.2196/mhealth.8211

12. Nyrop KA, Deal AM, Choi SK, et al. Measuring and understanding adherence in a home-based exercise intervention during chemotherapy for early breast cancer. *Breast Cancer Res Treat*. 2018;168(1):43-55. doi:10.1007/s10549-017-4565-1

13. Master H, Bley JA, Coronado RA, et al. Effects of physical activity interventions using wearables to improve objectively-measured and patient-reported outcomes in adults

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.14.24318939; this version posted December 16, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

following orthopaedic surgical procedures: A systematic review. *PloS One*. 2022;17(2):e0263562. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0263562

14. Hermsen S, Moons J, Kerkhof P, Wiekens C, De Groot M. Determinants for Sustained Use of an Activity Tracker: Observational Study. *JMIR MHealth UHealth*. 2017;5(10):e164. doi:10.2196/mhealth.7311

15. Fuller D, Colwell E, Low J, et al. Reliability and Validity of Commercially Available Wearable Devices for Measuring Steps, Energy Expenditure, and Heart Rate: Systematic Review. *JMIR MHealth UHealth*. 2020;8(9):e18694. doi:10.2196/18694

16. Lee Y, Kozar KA, Larsen KRT. The Technology Acceptance Model: Past, Present, and Future. *Commun Assoc Inf Syst*. 2003;12. doi:10.17705/1CAIS.01250

17. Holden RJ, Karsh BT. The Technology Acceptance Model: Its past and its future in health care. *J Biomed Inform*. 2010;43(1):159-172. doi:10.1016/j.jbi.2009.07.002

18. Davis FD. Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, and User Acceptance of Information Technology. *MIS Q*. 1989;13(3):319. doi:10.2307/249008

19. Chen K, Chan AHS. Predictors of gerontechnology acceptance by older Hong Kong Chinese. *Technovation*. 2014;34(2):126-135. doi:10.1016/j.technovation.2013.09.010

20. Kim J, Park HA. Development of a Health Information Technology Acceptance Model Using Consumers' Health Behavior Intention. *J Med Internet Res*. 2012;14(5):e133. doi:10.2196/jmir.2143

21. Scherer R, Siddiq F, Tondeur J. The technology acceptance model (TAM): A meta-analytic structural equation modeling approach to explaining teachers' adoption of digital technology in education. *Comput Educ*. 2019;128:13-35. doi:10.1016/j.compedu.2018.09.009

22. Venkatesh V, Davis FD. A Theoretical Extension of the Technology Acceptance Model: Four Longitudinal Field Studies. *Manag Sci*. 2000;46(2):186-204. doi:10.1287/mnsc.46.2.186.11926

23. Venkatesh, Morris, Davis, Davis. User Acceptance of Information Technology: Toward a Unified View. *MIS Q*. 2003;27(3):425. doi:10.2307/30036540

24. Fensli R, Pedersen PE, Gundersen T, Hejlesen O. Sensor acceptance model - measuring patient acceptance of wearable sensors. *Methods Inf Med*. 2008;47(1):89-95. doi:10.3414/me9106

25. Mihailidis A, Cockburn A, Longley C, Boger J. The Acceptability of Home Monitoring Technology Among Community-Dwelling Older Adults and Baby Boomers. *Assist Technol*. 2008;20(1):1-12. doi:10.1080/10400435.2008.10131927

26. Mercer K, Giangregorio L, Schneider E, Chilana P, Li M, Grindrod K. Acceptance of Commercially Available Wearable Activity Trackers Among Adults Aged Over 50 and With

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.14.24318939; this version posted December 16, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Chronic Illness: A Mixed-Methods Evaluation. *JMIR MHealth UHealth*. 2016;4(1):e7. doi:10.2196/mhealth.4225

27. French MA, Keatley E, Li J, et al. The feasibility of remotely monitoring physical, cognitive, and psychosocial function in individuals with stroke or chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. *Digit Health*. 2023;9:205520762311761. doi:10.1177/20552076231176160

28. de Looff PC, Noordzij ML, Nijman HLI, Goedhard L, Bogaerts S, Didden R. Putting the usability of wearable technology in forensic psychiatry to the test: a randomized crossover trial. *Front Psychiatry*. 2024;15. doi:10.3389/fpsyt.2024.1330993

29. Drehlich M, Naraine M, Rowe K, et al. Using the Technology Acceptance Model to Explore Adolescents' Perspectives on Combining Technologies for Physical Activity Promotion Within an Intervention: Usability Study. *J Med Internet Res*. 2020;22(3):e15552. doi:10.2196/15552

30. Jiang A, Al-Dajani N, King C, Hong V, Koo HJ, Czyz E. Acceptability and feasibility of ecological momentary assessment with augmentation of passive sensor data in young adults at high risk for suicide. *Psychiatry Res*. 2023;326:115347. doi:10.1016/j.psychres.2023.115347

31. Michalsen H, Henriksen A, Pettersen G, et al. Using mobile health to encourage physical activity in individuals with intellectual disability: a pilot mixed methods feasibility study. *Front Rehabil Sci*. 2023;4. doi:10.3389/fresc.2023.1225641

32. Rosenberg D, Kadokura EA, Bouldin ED, Miyawaki CE, Higano CS, Hartzler AL. Acceptability of Fitbit for physical activity tracking within clinical care among men with prostate cancer. *AMIA Annu Symp Proc*. 2017;2016:1050-1059.

33. Koffman LJ, Crainiceanu CM, Roemmich RT, French MA. Identifying Unique Subgroups of Individuals With Stroke Using Heart Rate and Steps to Characterize Physical Activity. *J Am Heart Assoc*. 2023;12(18):e030577. doi:10.1161/JAHA.123.030577

34. Lang CE, Waddell KJ, Barth J, Holleran CL, Strube MJ, Bland MD. Upper Limb Performance in Daily Life Approaches Plateau Around Three to Six Weeks Post-stroke. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*. 2021;35(10):903-914. doi:10.1177/15459683211041302

35. Waddell KJ, Strube MJ, Tabak RG, Haire-Joshu D, Lang CE. Upper Limb Performance in Daily Life Improves Over the First 12 Weeks Poststroke. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*. 2019;33(10):836-847. doi:10.1177/1545968319868716

36. Waddell KJ, Patel MS, Clark K, Harrington TO, Greysen SR. Effect of Gamification With Social Incentives on Daily Steps After Stroke: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Neurol*. 2022;79(5):528-530. doi:10.1001/jamaneurol.2022.0231

37. Waddell KJ, Patel MS, Wilkinson JR, et al. Deploying Digital Health Technologies for Remote Physical Activity Monitoring of Rural Populations With Chronic Neurologic Disease. *Arch Rehabil Res Clin Transl*. 2023;5(1):100250. doi:10.1016/j.arrct.2022.100250

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.14.24318939; this version posted December 16, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

38. Demers M, Bishop L, Cain A, et al. Wearable technology to capture arm use of stroke survivors in home and community settings: feasibility and early insights on motor performance. Published online September 14, 2023:2023.01.25.23284790. doi:10.1101/2023.01.25.23284790

39. Miller AE, Holleran CL, Bland MD, et al. Perspectives of Key Stakeholders on Integrating Wearable Sensor Technology into Rehabilitation Care: A Mixed-Methods Analysis. Published online November 29, 2024:2024.11.25.24317911. doi:10.1101/2024.11.25.24317911

40. Stock R, Gaarden AP, Langørgen E. The potential of wearable technology to support stroke survivors' motivation for home exercise – Focus group discussions with stroke survivors and physiotherapists. *Physiother Theory Pract*. 2024;40(8):1779-1790. doi:10.1080/09593985.2023.2217987

41. French MA, Balasubramanian A, Hansel NN, et al. Impact of automated data flow and reminders on adherence and resource utilization for remotely monitoring physical activity in individuals with stroke or chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. Published online April 18, 2024:2024.04.15.24305852. doi:10.1101/2024.04.15.24305852

42. Demers M, Cain A, Bishop L, et al. Understanding stroke survivors' preferences regarding wearable sensor feedback on functional movement: a mixed-methods study. *J NeuroEngineering Rehabil*. 2023;20:146. doi:10.1186/s12984-023-01271-z

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.14.24318939; this version posted December 16, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.14.24318939; this version posted December 16, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.14.24318939; this version posted December 16, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.14.24318939; this version posted December 16, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 1. Study participant characteristics (n=65).

	Mean±SD
Age (years)	64±12
Days post-stroke at date of enrollment	1054±1664
Days between date of enrollment and date of TAQ completion	127±12
	N (%)
Sex	
Male	37 (56.9%)
Female	28 (43.1%)
Race	
African American or Black	21 (32.3%)
American Indian or Alaska Native	2 (3.1%)
Asian	3 (4.6%)
White/Caucasian	38 (58.5%)
Other	1 (1.5%)
Ethnicity	
Hispanic or Latino	4 (6.2%)
Not Hispanic or Latino	61 (93.8%)
Fitbit Wrist Worn	
Paretic	15 (23.1%)
Non-paretic	49 (75.4%)
Unknown	1 (1.5%)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.14.24318939; this version posted December 16, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 2. Statistics of the responses to TAQ dimensions and the full TAQ.

	Mean±SD	Median	IQR	Max possible	Min possible
Perceived Usefulness	19.1±3.3	20	4	25	5
Perceived Ease of Use	25.7±3.9	25	5	35	7
Facilitating Conditions	7.7±1.5	8	1	10	2
Subjective Norm*	11.6±1.9	12	3	15	3
Equipment Characteristic*	32.5±3.5	32	5	40	8
Privacy Concern	11.8±2.0	12	3	15	3
Perceived Risk*	11.9±2.0	12	3	15	3
Technology Acceptance Questionnaire	120.4±12.8	118	14	155	31

*These dimensions have reverse items in the subscore. Note that PR consists of all reversed questions, therefore the entire dimension is reversed.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.14.24318939; this version posted December 16, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 3. Statistics of the responses to each individual statement of the TAQ.

Statement	Mean±SD	Median	IQR
1) 24/7 activity monitoring beneficial	4.4±0.6	4	1
2) Afraid of discovering health issue*	4.1±0.9	4	1
3) Comfortable with data storage	3.9±0.9	4	0
4) Assistance available if needed	3.8±1.1	4	0
5) Wore device easily unassisted	3.9±1.2	4	1
6) Removed device unassisted	4.0±1.1	4	1
7) Daily tasks performed normally	4.4±0.7	4	1
8) Device easily concealed	4.0±0.9	4	0
9) Forgot device was worn	4.0±1.0	4	1
10) Experienced skin irritation*	3.6±1.3	4	3
11) Battery life meets expectations	4.3±0.6	4	1
12) Smartphone app easy to use	3.8±0.9	4	0
13) Device easy to use	4.1±0.8	4	1
14) Display easy to read indoors	3.7±1.0	4	1
15) Display easy to read outdoors	3.1±1.2	3	2
16) Pleasant to wear during night	3.9±0.8	4	0
17) Concerned about secure attachment*	4.1±0.8	4	1
18) Device donning reasonable	4.0±0.9	4	0
19) No privacy concerns	3.9±1.1	4	1
20) Comfortable with data sharing	4.1±0.7	4	1

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.14.24318939; this version posted December 16, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

21) Necessary device knowledge	3.9±0.9	4	0
22) Efficient for monitoring health	3.5±1.1	4	1
23) Device motivated activity	3.6±1.0	4	1
24) Device can improve health	3.9±0.9	4	0
25) Device caused joint pain*	4.3±0.5	4	1
26) Bathed normally with device	2.8±0.8	3	0
27) Embarrassed wearing around family*	4.4±0.7	4	1
28) Friends would encourage device use	3.4±0.9	4	1
29) Family would encourage device use	3.8±1.0	4	1
30) Device extends home living	3.7±0.9	4	1
31) Usable in various locations	4.0±0.8	4	1

*These questions have been reverse coded to preserve directionality.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.14.24318939; this version posted December 16, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 4. Responses to TAQ multiple choice questions.

	% Responses
32. How useful did you find the information provided by the smart wearable device (such as step count, sleep data, heart rate) either on the wearable itself, or in the smartphone application?	
Very useful	55.4%
Somewhat useful	40.0%
Not very useful	4.6%
Not at all useful	0.0%
33. Would you use the device you used during the last 21 days to continue to monitor or track your physical activity or health?	
Yes	92.3%
No	7.7%
34. Over the last 21 days, how often do you think you wore the smart wearable device?	
Never	0.0%
Between 0-7 days	0.0%
Between 8-14 days	3.1%
Between 15-21 days	96.9%
35. How much would you be willing to pay for the device you wore during the last 21 days?	
$0	23.1%
$1-$50	26.2%
$51-$100	36.9%
$101-$200	13.9%
$201-$300	0.0%
$300-$400	0.0%
36. Did you find yourself looking at your health data in the smartphone application more/less often after the first few days?	
No, I looked at the health data fairly consistently throughout the 21-day period	32.3%
Yes, I looked at the health data more often after the first few days of use	43.1%
Yes, I looked at the health data less often after the first few days of use	15.4%
I did not look at my health or am not interested in monitoring it	9.2%
37. Do you consider yourself to be an active person?	
Yes	64.6%
No	35.4%