Data-driven profiling of accelerometer-determined physical behaviors and health outcomes in adults: A systematic review

Vahid Farrahi[1], PhD., Esmaeil Farhang[1], MSc

[1]Research Group of Data Analytics, Institute for Sports and Sport Science, TU Dortmund University

Corresponding author

Vahid Farrahi, PhD

Institute for Sport and Sport Science

Otto-Hahn-Straße 3, 44227 Dortmund, Germany

E-mail: vahid.farrahi@tu-dortmund.de

ABSTRACT

Objective: Data-driven, person-centered methods are analytical approaches applicable for profiling physical behaviors from wearable accelerometry data. These methods rely on data rather than predefined, knowledge-driven hypotheses to first identify multiple subgroups within a sample population and then evaluate their relationships with health outcomes. This systematic review aims to describe and summarize multidimensional physical behavior profiles identified from wearable accelerometry data across different adult populations using data-driven, person-centered methods, along with their relationships with health outcomes.

Method: Three electronic databases were searched for relevant articles published up to July 2025. Peer-reviewed journal articles that applied data-driven, person-centered approaches to accelerometer-monitored physical behaviors in adult participants (18 years or older) to create profiles of physical behaviors, and that examined the associations of the formed profiles with a health outcome, were considered.

Results: Of the 16,289 publications retrieved, 40 studies were included. The most commonly employed technique for physical behavior profiling was the machine learning K-means clustering algorithm (n = 18), followed by latent profile analysis (n = 8). A diverse set of descriptor variables was derived from accelerometer signals and utilized. Hourly metrics, calculated for each hour of a 24-hour day, were the most commonly utilized in the analysis. These included hourly average acceleration, hourly monitor-independent movement summary units, hourly activity counts, and hourly moderate-to-vigorous physical activity minutes. The review of derived profiles from accelerometer-measured physical behavior revealed several hypothesis-generating, preliminary evidence about how different components and/or aspects of physical behaviors could cluster together and synergistically influence health outcomes.

Conclusion: Data-driven, person-centered methods are viable analytical approaches increasingly employed in accelerometry studies to drive distinct physical behavior profiles. The application of these techniques to accelerometer-measured physical behaviors has generated data-driven findings regarding how various physical behavior profiles may differentially relate to health outcomes.

Keywords: actigraphy, clustering, movement behavior profiles, activity behaviors

INTRODUCTION

Over the past few decades, cohort and epidemiological studies have increasingly relied on wearable accelerometers for measurement of physical activity (PA), sedentary behavior, and sleep, collectively known as physical behaviors [1,2]. Modern wearable accelerometers can nowadays capture acceleration signals over multiple days, enabling the quantification of various descriptors that reflect the amount, accumulation patterns, timing, and inter-day and intra-day variations of physical behaviors, among others [3,4]. This enhanced ability to measure physical behaviors in greater detail raises questions about how to best model and interpret the relationships between physical behaviors and health outcomes [2,5–7].

Currently, emerging evidence highlights that physical activities, sedentary behaviors, and sleep do not independently influence health outcomes; rather, these behaviors often interact, cluster together, and exhibit codependent relationships with various health markers and indicators [2,7–9]. Further complicating this, accumulating evidence suggests that the timing of PA [10], the regularity and stability of the rest-activity rhythmicity [11], and patterns of accumulation of sedentary and activity behaviors [12] are also important characteristics of one's physical behavior profile that may be linked to health outcomes. Given these complexities, proper modeling of the relationships between accelerometer-measured physical behaviors and health outcomes requires careful consideration of the analytical approaches and their adequacy for exploring such potentially sophisticated relationships [2,7,8].

Historically, the dominant approach for exploring the relationships between measures of physical behaviors and health outcomes was to employ classical regression approaches [7,8]. Recently, new evidence has highlighted a complex interplay between different components and dimensions of physical behaviors, leading to the development of innovative analytical techniques [2,6,9,13]. Analytical approaches, such as compositional data analysis [14],

isotemporal substitution methods [15], multivariate pattern analysis [16], and functional data analysis [17] are now frequently used for exploring the health impacts of physical behaviors [18–22]. These novel techniques are generally known to have improved capacity for better modeling of the complex relationships between PA, sedentary behaviors, and sleep with health outcomes over classical statistical approaches [2]. From a methodological perspective, however, such analytical approaches can be considered as variable-centered methods. A variable-centered method refers to techniques that focus on exploring the relationships between one or more variables of interest and an outcome variable [23,24], assessing how changes in one or more independent variables (e.g., physical activity, sedentary behavior, sleep) impact the outcome variable (e.g., weight).

Another type of analytical approach often used for modeling the health influence of accelerometer-measured physical behaviors is data-driven, person-centered methods [23–25]. From a methodological perspective, data-driven, person-centered methods are conceptually different from variable-centered approaches [24]. These methods divide the study population into distinct smaller groups typically based on a diverse set of descriptive variables [25,26], representing a person's characteristics. The input descriptors are used to form multiple subgroups in a data-oriented manner, maximizing within-group similarity and between-group dissimilarity based on individual (or person) characteristics [23,25]. This method is considered data-driven approach because the subgroups are formed solely based on input descriptor variables, with subsequent analysis focusing on understanding the differential associations between these derived subgroups and health outcomes.

When applied to characteristics of physical behaviors, the subgroups identified and formed using data-driven, person-centered techniques can be referred to as physical behavior profiles [27]. These profiles reflect various behavioral patterns within the sample population. Profiles

of individuals grouped by similar physical behaviors can then be compared with other profiles in terms of how the variables combine to create these profiles and how these combinations relate differentially to health outcomes. Despite the growing reliance on data-driven, person-centered approaches to derive multidimensional profiles of physical behaviors from wearable accelerometry data across various populations, it remains unclear what types of profiles would emerge in different adult populations and how these might relate to health outcomes. Additionally, the potential of data-driven, person-centered methods as an analytical approach for exploring the health associations in physical behavior research needs further clarification.

This study sought to systematically review the studies that created and identified profiles of physical behaviors in adults using data-driven, person-centered methods and wearable accelerometry data, and to examine whether and how these profiles relate to health outcomes. The objectives of this review were to (1) describe and summarize data-driven physical behavior profiles identified across different adult populations from wearable accelerometry data and (2) to examine how these physical behavior profiles relate differentially to health outcomes.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This systematic review was registered with the International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews (ID: CRD42024612460) and performed in accordance with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines [28].

Search strategy

Three electronic databases (PubMed, Scopus, and Web of Science) were used to identify relevant articles. The initial search was conducted in June, 2024 and repeated in July 2025. The search strings were reported in the Supplementary File. The search results were limited for human subjects and English-language articles. The search results were limited to human

101 subjects and English-language articles. These were not limited by date and included papers
102 from all years. Additional articles were identified by searching the references of relevant
103 articles identified by the search strategy.

104 **Eligibility criteria**

105 Full-text original peer-reviewed journal articles applying data-driven, person-centered
106 approaches to accelerometer-monitored physical behaviors in adult participants (18 years or
107 older) to create profiles of physical behaviors and examining the associations of the formed
108 profiles with a health outcome were considered. We defined "health outcome" as any health-
109 related problem that could be influenced by components (PA intensities, sedentary behaviors,
110 and sleep) or any of the dimensions (e.g., timing, temporal distribution, accumulation patterns,
111 or daily/weekly frequencies, etc.) of physical behaviors. Given that data-driven approaches can
112 be used for different purposes on the same dataset, studies performed with the same analytical
113 sample were included.

114 Studies were excluded if they met at least one of the following criteria: (1) physical behaviors
115 were not determined using wearable accelerometers; (2) data-driven profiles were created by
116 combining measures of accelerometer-determined physical behaviors with nonphysical
117 behavior measures (e.g., diet, background information, etc.); (3) profiles were formed based on
118 knowledge-driven criteria without employing a data-driven approach; (4) the associations
119 between identified physical behavior profiles and health outcomes were not statistically
120 examined; (5) the study was not conducted with adult participants; or (6) the study was
121 conducted with clinical or other specific sample populations.

122 **Study selection**

Covidence review management software was used for the screening and selection of records retrieved from the databases. One person (VF) performed the initial search and screened the titles and abstracts of all articles identified by the search strings to exclude articles that were not relevant according to the eligibility criteria. Articles identified in the title and abstract were first assessed for eligibility and then examined in full text independently by the authors (VF and EF). The reviewers were not blinded to authors or journals. Full consensus was achieved. Full-text versions of articles appearing relevant were obtained, and data were extracted with a common template. Reasons for exclusion of articles after full-article screening were recorded.

Data extraction

The extracted data items on the characteristics of the included studies were first author, year of publication, sample population, country, study design (cross-sectional or prospective design), number of participants included in profile analyses, age of participants, proportion of women, and the primary health outcomes. For profile analysis, extracted data items included input descriptor variables used for profile analysis and the method used for driving the profiles. The identified profiles and the number of participants within each profile were recorded. Statistically significant associations observed between physical behavior profiles and health outcomes were also recorded. Data items related to accelerometer data collection methods and characteristics included the type of device used (uniaxial or triaxial), device placement, wear time protocol, minimum valid hours and days required for inclusion in analyses, and criteria for nonwear time.

Assessment of bias

Risk of bias was assessed using a combination of two tools, adapted to accommodate both the observational nature of the studies and the wearable-accelerometer measurements. Four items from the Newcastle–Ottawa Quality Assessment Scale [29] and eight items based on

147 recommended reporting practices for accelerometer studies were utilized [30]. These items
148 evaluated the quality of selection strategies, outcome measures, and reporting methods related
149 to accelerometers. A total quality score was determined, with a maximum of 11 points for cross-
150 sectional studies and 12 points for prospective cohort studies (low quality [1–5 points],
151 moderate quality [6–10 points], and high quality [10–11/12 points]).

152 **Synthesis of results**

153 The derived profiles could be largely attributed to the input descriptor variables used for profile
154 analysis. For better synthesis of the results regarding the health implications of identified
155 profiles, the publications were categorized into five groups based on the input descriptors and
156 types of profiles identified in each study. These categories were PA profiles, sedentary behavior
157 profiles, sleep profiles, rest-activity profiles, and joint profiles. Joint profiles refer to those
158 profiles that were created by incorporating descriptors from at least two components of physical
159 behaviors (i.e., any combination of descriptors of PA, sedentary behavior, and sleep).

160 We presented the overview of profiles in color-coded figures. The input descriptors used for
161 profile analysis, the derived profiles, and statistically significant differences in health outcomes
162 among profiles were presented in tables. A persistent challenge in wearable accelerometer-
163 based measurement is the incomparability of study results because of large variability in
164 decisions related to accelerometer data cleaning and processing [31]. To enable a better
165 comparison among physical behavior profiles identified, profiles with comparable overall
166 characteristics that were seen in *two or more distinct* sample populations were identified and
167 marked.

168 The common approach to examining health associations with data-driven profiles involves
169 assessing differences relative to a referent profile. When selecting a reference profile, it is
170 typically chosen based on its representation of either the unhealthiest physical behavior profile

171 or, in some cases, the healthiest physical behavior profile. Comparing the differences in the
172 health outcomes among the derived profiles with respect to one another could also be
173 performed. When statistically significant associations or differences were observed between a
174 profile and a health outcome, both the direction of the association and the referent group were
175 indicated. Differences were denoted using upward arrows (↑) to indicate higher values in the
176 health outcome relative to the referent group. Downward arrows (↓) were used to indicate lower
177 values. Only statistically significant associations were reported. For analyses that were gender-
178 stratified, statistical significance was only noted if the observed associations were significant
179 for both men and women. If multiple unadjusted and covariate-adjusted models were built, the
180 significant association from the fully adjusted models was extracted and reported.

181 The characteristics and health associations of profiles identified across two or more sample
182 populations were compared and synthesized narratively. Other key emerging profiles in the
183 studies, together with the health associations linked to the key characteristics, were also
184 described and summarized narratively.

185 **RESULTS**

186 A flow diagram of the included publications at each stage is presented in Figure 1. Of the
187 16,289 records initially retrieved (3,244 from PubMed, 7,390 from Scopus, and 5,655 from
188 Web of Science), 7,156 duplicates were removed. Following the screening of titles and
189 abstracts, 60 articles were identified as potentially relevant. After conducting a full-text review
190 of these 60 publications, 38 were deemed eligible for inclusion. Additionally, two more articles
191 were identified through hand/citation searches, resulting in a final total of 40 included studies.



Figure 1: Flow diagram showing the selection of studies for inclusion in the systematic review

Study design, participant characteristics, and publication characteristics

The main characteristics of the included studies are summarized in Table 1. Publication dates for the 40 included articles ranged from 2013 to 2025, with the majority published since 2019 (n = 36). Of these studies, 25 were conducted using a cross-sectional design [32,33,42–51,34,52–56,35–41] while 15 studies had a prospective study design [57,58,67–71,59–66].

Among all included studies, the number of participants in the sample population used for physical behavior profiling ranged between 124 [56] to 102,323 [61]. Sample populations were drawn from 13 countries. Sixteen studies were performed with a sample population from the United States [34,36,56,58,63,65,70,71,41,42,47,49–51,54,55], seven from the United

Kingdom [57,59–61,67–69], four from Finland [40,43,46,53], two from Canada [37,39], two from Japan [38,66], and two from Denmark [33,45]. Other sample populations were from Sweden [64], the Netherlands [35], Switzerland [62], Ireland [52], Australia [44], Korea [32], and China [48]. A large number of studies analyzed accelerometer data from the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey study (NHANES, n = 10) [34,36,41,42,47,50,51,58,63,65] and the U.K. biobank study (n = 6) [59–61,67–69].

Table 1: Main characteristics of 40 studies included in the review, listed by study design, publication year, and primary health outcome.

Study, first author (year)	Sample population / Country	Study design	Age, mean (SD)	Number of participants (female%)	Profiling method	Profile type	Primary health outcomes
Yerramalla (2024) [57]	Whitehall II study / UK	Prospective	69.4 (5.7)	3,991(26%)	K-means	Joint	All-cause mortality
Zhang (2024) [58]	NHANES 2011–2014 / USA	Prospective	49.7 (17.4)	3,423 (51%)	K-means	Physical activity / sleep	All-cause mortality
Bai (2024) [61]	UK biobank / UK	Prospective	56.1 (7.8)	102,323 (56%)	K-means	Physical activity	All-cause mortality, CVD mortality, CVD incidence
Fabrizio (2024) [62]*	CoLaus-PsyCoLaus / Switzerland	Prospective	61.2 (9.7)	2,465 (55%)	K-means	Physical activity	CVD events
Chung (2023) [71]	MESA / USA	Prospective	68.2 (9.0)	1,759 (54%)	K-means	Sleep	All-cause mortality
Shim (2023) [63]	NHANES 2011-2014 / USA	Prospective	Median (IQR): 51 (36–65)	7,297 (53%)	Hierarchical clustering approach using Ward's linkage algorithm	Physical activity	All-cause mortality
Rosen (2020) [64]	Sweden Attitude Behaviour and Change / Sweden	Prospective	53 (NR)	851 (56%)	Latent class analysis	Joint	All-cause mortality
Evenson (2017) [65]	NHANES, 2003-2006 cycles / USA	Prospective	56.5 (NR)	4,510 (54%)	Latent profile analysis	Physical activity / sedentary behavior	All-cause mortality
Yamamoto (2025) [66]	Toon Health Study / Japan	Prospective	56.2 (11.7)	794 (100%)	Latent profile analysis	Physical activity	Metabolic syndrome onset
Albalak (2023) [67]	UK biobank / UK	Prospective	61.6 (7.8)	86,657 (58%)	K-means	Physical activity	CVD incidence
Bai (2024) [59]	UK biobank / UK	Prospective	55.9 (7.8)	96,687 (56%)	K-means	Physical activity	17 types of site-specific cancer incidence
Feng (2025) [68]	UK biobank / UK	Prospective	61.7 (7.9)	89,439 (57%)	K-means	Physical activity	Type 2 diabetes incidence
Bai (2024) [60]	UK biobank / UK	Prospective	56.0 (7.8)	99,532 (57%)	K-means	Physical activity	Type 2 diabetes incidence
Li (2024) [69]	UK biobank / UK	Prospective	61.2 (7.9)	70,617 (60%)	K-means	Physical activity	Incident hypertension
Reuter (2020) [70]	OPACH / USA	Prospective	79 (7)	6,204 (100%)	K-means for longitudinal data combined with hierarchical clustering	Sedentary behavior	Physical functioning

Choi (2025) [32]	KNHANES / Korea	Cross-sectional	Age: ≥65	425 (54%)	Latent profile analysis	Joint	Subjective health, metabolic syndrome, number of chronic diseases
Gupta (2025) [33]	DPHACTO / Denmark	Cross-sectional	45.1 (9.7)	807 (56%)	Compositional latent class analysis	Joint	Cardiorespiratory fitness, systolic blood pressure, self-rated health, low back pain
Farrahi (2024) [34]	NHANES, 2003-2006 cycles / USA	Cross-sectional	43.1 (12.5)	1,812 (53%)	Convolutional autoencoders with K-means	Joint	Insulin, triglycerides, homeostasis insulin resistance, plasma glucose, C-reactive protein, total/HDL cholesterol ratio, LDL, WC, BMI
Leskinen (2023) [35]	Maastricht Study / Netherlands	Cross-sectional	60.2 (8.6)	6,702 (50%)	Group-based multi-trajectory modeling	Physical activity	BMI, waist, HbA1c, fasting glucose, 2-hour glucose, total/HDL cholesterol ratio, triglycerides, systolic BP, diastolic BP
Ma (2023) [36]	NHANES 2003-2006 cycles / USA	Cross-sectional	Age: ≥20	5,285 (49%)	K-means	Physical activity	BMI and WC
Biswas (2023) [37]	CHMS, 2007-2017 cycles / Canada	Cross-sectional	38.5 (NR)	8,229 (47%)	Dynamic time warping with hierarchical clustering	Physical activity	WC, systolic BP, diastolic BP, cholesterol
Yamamoto (2023) [38]	Toon Health Study / Japan	Cross-sectional	57.7 (12.5)	1,850 (66%)	Latent profile analysis	Physical activity	Metabolic syndrome, abdominal obesity, hypertension, hyperglycemia, dyslipidemia
Biswas (2022) [39]	CHMS, 2007-2017 cycles / Canada	Cross-sectional	42.4 (0.3)	8,909 (47%)	Dynamic time warping with hierarchical clustering	Physical activity	10-year risk for CVD event
Farrahi (2022) [40]	NFBC1966 / Finland	Cross-sectional	46.6 (0.6)	3,702 (59%)	KmL3D (K-means for joint longitudinal data)	Joint	Fasting serum insulin, 2-hour insulin, fasting glucose, 2-hour glucose, triglycerides, total/HDL cholesterol ratio, LDL/HDL cholesterol ratio, body fat, fat mass, visceral fat area, BMI, WC
Hibbing (2022) [41]	NHANES 2003-2006 cycles / USA	Cross-sectional	54.3 (17.0)	5,495 (49%)	K-medoid	Sedentary behavior	10-year CVD risk
Aqeel (2021) [42]	NHANES, 2003-2006 cycles / USA	Cross-sectional	Age range: 20-65	1,999 (48%)	Dynamic time warping and kernel K-means	Physical activity	BMI, WC, hemoglobin A1c, Total cholesterol, triglycerides, fasting plasma glucose, HDL cholesterol, systolic BP, diastolic BP
Farrahi (2021) [43]	NFBC1966 / Finland	Cross-sectional	46.6 (0.6)	4,439 (57%)	K-means	Sedentary behavior	Fasting serum insulin, 2-hour insulin, fasting glucose, 2-hour glucose, triglycerides, total/HDL cholesterol ratio, LDL/HDL cholesterol ratio, body fat, fat mass, visceral fat area, BMI, WC
Matricciani (2021) [44]	CheckPoint / Australia	Cross-sectional	44.0 (5.1)	1,137 (87%)	K-means	Sleep	SBP, DPB, BMI, glycoprotein acetyls, apolipoprotein, metabolic syndrome severity score
Gupta (2020) [45]	DPHACTO / Denmark	Cross-sectional	45.1 (9.7)	807 (56%)	Compositional latent class analysis	Joint	BMI, WC, body fat percentage
Niemelä (2019) [46]	NFBC1966 / Finland	Cross-sectional	46 (NR)	4582 (58%)	X-means	Physical activity	10-year CVD risk score, HDL cholesterol, total cholesterol, systolic BP, being diabetic

Marschollek (2016) [47]	NHANES 2005-2006 cycles / USA	Cross-sectional	NR	7,334 (NR)	X-means	Physical activity	HDL cholesterol, C-reactive protein, BMI
Lee (2013) [48]	Hong Kong Jockey Club FAMILY / China	Cross-sectional	43.2 (16.4)	1,714 (54%)	K-means	Physical activity	Having chronic health condition, body fat percentage, BMI
Fukuoka (2018) [49]	mPED / USA	Cross-sectional	52.4 (11.2)	219 (100%)	K-means	Physical activity	Depression symptoms, BMI, WC, hip circumference, resting systolic BP, resting diastolic BP, cholesterol, triglycerides, LDL, HDL, hemoglobin A1c, fasting plasma glucose
Nawrin (2024) [50]	NHANES 2011-2012 cycles / USA	Cross-sectional	NR	6,613 (NS)	K-means	Physical activity	Depression
Smagula (2022) [51]	NHANES 2011-2014 cycles / USA	Cross-sectional	72.9 (7.3)	1,800 (57%)	Finite normal mixture modelling	Rest-activity	Depression symptoms and cognitive performance
O'Regan (2021) [52]	Move for Life / Ireland	Cross-sectional	Age: ≥45	485 (79%)	Hierarchical clustering	Joint	Having mental illness, obesity, having complex multimorbidity
Palmberg (2024) [53]	AGNES / Finland	Cross-sectional	75, 80, and 85 years old	441 (60%)	K-means	Joint	Indicators of physical capacity, life-space mobility, depression symptom
Graves (2021) [54]	MOVEUP and DECOS / USA	Cross-sectional	71.3 (6.7)	181 (79%)	K-means	Rest-activity	Perceived physical fatigability
Full (2019) [55]	Convenient sample from four US cities / USA	Cross-sectional	55.4 (10.2)	372 (100%)	Latent profile analysis	Joint	Physical functioning, BMI, self-rated health, number of health conditions
Paolillo (2023) [56]	Community-dwelling older adults / USA	Cross-sectional	72.2 (8.37)	124 (55%)	Latent profile analysis	Joint	Executive functioning, Memory, Vascular burden

*: Profiles were created based on data collected from two follow-ups; the items reported here correspond to the profiles identified during the first follow-up and were prospectively examined in relation to cardiovascular disease events. Abbreviations: NR = Not reported; BP = Blood pressure; BMI = Body mass index; CVD = Cardiovascular diseases; HDL = High-density lipoprotein; LDL = Low-density lipoprotein; WC = Waist circumference; CHMS = Canadian Health Measures Survey; DECOS = Developmental Epidemiologic Cohort Study; DPHACTO = Danish PHysical ACTivity cohort with Objective measurements; KNHANES = Korea National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey; MESA = Multi-Ethnic Study of Atherosclerosis; MOVEUP = Mobility and Vitality Lifestyle Program; mPED = Mobile Phone Based Physical Activity Education; NFBC1966 = Northern Finland Birth Cohort 1966; NHANES = National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey; OPACH = Objective Physical Activity and Cardiovascular Health Study.

Quality score, data collection methods, and accelerometer characteristics

Details of the accelerometer data collection measures are summarized in Supplementary Table S1. In most studies (n = 12), participants were asked to wear the accelerometer for 7 consecutive days while they were awake [32,34,64–66,35,37–39,41,42,47,49]. In 11 studies, participants were asked to wear the accelerometer continuously for 7 consecutive days, including while sleeping [50,54,70,58–61,63,67–69]. The number of valid accelerometer measurement days deemed sufficient across the studies ranged from 1 to 7 consecutive days.

Individual publication quality scores are shown in Supplementary Table S2. Twelve studies with a prospective study design [57,58,69,70,59,60,62–65,67,68] and 20 studies with a cross-sectional study design were rated as high quality [32,33,42,43,45,46,48–50,52–54,34–41].

Health outcomes

The health outcomes assessed in the included studies are shown in Table 1. In most prospective studies, the primary health outcome (n = 7) was all-cause mortality [57,58,61,63–65,71]. Other primary health outcomes in prospective studies were cardiovascular disease (CVD) incidence [61,62,67], type-2 diabetes incidence [60,68], hypertension incidence [69], onset of metabolic syndrome [66], site-specific cancer incidence [59], and deterioration in physical functioning [70]. Primary health outcomes in most studies with a cross-sectional design (n = 16) were indicators of cardiometabolic health, CVD risk factors, metabolic syndrome, and/or obesity indicators [32,34,43–49,35–42]. Other primary health outcomes in cross-sectional studies were depression or mental health outcomes [50–52]; indicators of physical function capacity, or frailty [53–55]; low back pain [33]; or indicators of cognitive health [56].

Profiling method

Of the 40 included studies (see Table 1), 18 used the K-means clustering algorithm to derive physical behavior profiles [36,43,59–62,67–69,71,44,48–50,53,54,57,58]. Seven of these applied different variations and forms of K-means, including K-means for longitudinal data [40,70], dynamic time warping and kernel K-means [42], convolutional autoencoders with K-means [34], X-means [46,47], and K-medoid [41]. Nine studies used latent profile analysis [32,33,38,45,55,56,64–66], four employed hierarchical clustering [37,39,52,63], one applied finite mixture modelling [51], and one used group-based multi-trajectory modeling [35].

Profile types

Among the 40 included studies, 22 identified profiles of PA [35,36,50,58–63,65–67,37,68,69,38,39,42,46–49], four identified profiles of sedentary behavior [41,43,65,70], three identified profiles of sleep [44,58,71], and two identified profiles of rest-activity rhythmicity [51,54]. One study reported both PA and sleep profiles [58] and another reported both PA and sedentary profiles [65]; these were counted in both respective categories. Joint profiling was performed in 11 studies [32,33,64,34,40,45,52,53,55–57].

Profiles of physical activity

An overview of the profiles identified in studies creating PA profiles is shown in Figure 2. The number of profiles identified ranged from two to seven. The input descriptor variables, the derived PA profiles, and their associations with health outcomes in each study are listed in Table 2.

All but one [61] of the studies creating PA profiles (n = 21), specified the accelerometer-derived descriptors used as input for profile analysis. PA profiling was most commonly conducted using hourly metrics derived from accelerometer outputs, although the specific summary metrics varied across studies. Of the 21 studies, 12 utilized average hourly summary metrics to drive

PA profiles [36,42,68,69,48,50,58–60,62,63,67]. These 12 studies computed the summary metrics for each hour of the 24-hour day. The summary metrics included hourly average acceleration [59,60,62,67–69], hourly monitor-independent movement summary (MIMS) unit [58,63], hourly activity counts [42,50], and hourly moderate-to-vigorous PA (MVPA) minutes [36]. One study used hourly activity counts calculated separately over weekdays and weekend days [48].

Four other studies computed slightly different types of summary metrics that were aggregated over different time intervals than on an hourly basis [35,37,39,46]. One of these studies used stepping minutes aggregated over two consecutive hours for PA profiling [35]. In three studies [37,39,46], summary metrics derived from accelerometers were averaged over a 10-minute interval. The summary metrics in these studies were activity counts [37,39] and metabolic equivalent task (MET) values [46].

Only five studies did not rely on summary metrics computed over specific time intervals for deriving PA profiles [38,47,49,65,66]. Of these studies, one used accelerometer-estimated metabolic equivalent (MET) values for profile analysis [49]. Three studies used descriptor variables that were primarily indicative of the amount of daily physical activities, such as the number of steps and daily duration of PA intensities for driving PA profiles [38,47,66]. One study performed PA profiling using daily average activity counts/minute [65].

Key profile characteristics and their relationships with health outcomes

Of the 22 studies identifying PA profiles, 14 identified PA profiles that were characterized by having the lowest level of PA relative to other PA profiles in the sample study population [35,37,61,63,65,66,38,39,46–49,59,60]. These profiles are depicted in orange in Figure 2. Depending on the study and when named (see Figure 2 and Table 2), these profiles were labeled as “Low activity” [37,39,63], “Least active” [65], “Less active” [48], “Inactive” [46,47],

"Unengaged" [49], "Consistently inactive" [35], "Consistently low" [60], or "Persistently low" [59,61].

Conversely, of the 22 studies identifying PA profiles, 12 identified PA profiles that were distinguished by having the highest level of PA relative to other identified profiles in the sample study population [35,37,65,66,38,39,46,48,59–61,63]. These profiles are shown in black in Figure 2. Depending on the study and when named (see Figure 2 and Table 2), these profiles were labeled as "Vigorous activity patterns" [61], "High activity" [63], "Most active" [65], "Intense" [60], "Highest activity" [37,39], "Consistently highly active" [35], "Very active" [46], "Active" [48], or "Vigorous" [59].

When a low PA profile emerged, it was generally one of the largest profiles in terms of participant numbers, with few exceptions [59–61]. As shown in Table 2, these profiles were generally treated as reference profiles against which other profiles were compared to assess differences in health outcomes [37–39,59–61,65,66]. Compared with profiles distinguished by the lowest level of PA, relatively more active profiles with a higher level of PA demonstrated reduced risks of all-cause mortality [61,65], incident CVD and CVD mortality [61], incident type-2 diabetes [60], and certain types of cancer [59], and better markers of cardiometabolic health and obesity [37,39,46,47].

In contrast to low PA profiles, high PA profiles represented a smaller group in terms of participant numbers [35,37–39,46,48,59,63,65,66] (see Figure 2). High PA profiles were found to have the most favorable health outcomes, exhibiting reduced risks of all-cause mortality [61,63,65], incident CVD and CVD mortality [61], incident type 2 diabetes [60], and certain types of cancer [59], and better markers of cardiometabolic health and obesity [35,37–39,46–48].

Across all studies performing PA profiling, 17 identified at least one profile whose PA peaked at a certain time of the day within a 24-hour cycle [35,36,60–63,67–69,37,39,42,46,49,50,58,59]. Fifteen of these studies performed with six unique sample populations identified a profile that could be characterized by having a relatively higher PA peak at some time during morning or during the day [35,36,61,62,67–69,37,39,42,49,50,58–60]. These profiles are highlighted in green in Figure 2. Depending on the timing of peak PA, these profiles were labeled as "Early morning" [58], "Early morning peak" [67,68], "Early birds" [35], "Late morning peak" [67,68], "Morning" [36], "Morning engaged" [49], "Morning dominant" [50], "Midday" [36,58], "High daytime activity" [37,39], "Single peak" [59,60], "Single increase" [61], PA peak at around 10 a.m. [69], PA peak between 7 a.m. and 12 a.m. [62], and higher PA between 8:00 and 11:00 [42].

Profiles of afternoon or evening PA characterized by having a greater proportion of PA in the afternoon or evening emerged in 10 studies performed with six unique sample populations [36,37,39,42,46,49,50,58,67,68]. These profiles are highlighted in yellow in Figure 2. Depending on the timing of peak PA, these profiles were labeled as "Evening active" [46], "Early evening" [68], "Evening peak" [67], "Evening" [36], "Evening dominant" [50], "Moderate evening activity" [37,39], "Late afternoon" [58], "Afternoon engaged" [49], and lower PA between 6:00 and 12:00 [42].

There were substantial variations among the studies, making it difficult to compare the profiles with respect to the exact timing of peak PA. Those studies identifying morning and day PA profiles observed that PA in morning or day profiles generally peaked *approximately* at some time in between 5:00 and 10:00 [36,37,39,58,67] or 9:00 and 12:00 [35,42,49,50,59–61,67,69]. The PA peak in afternoon and evening profiles *approximately* occurred at some time in between

325 18:00 and 21:00 [36,49,58,67,68], or showed a steady increase starting sometime between
326 12:00 and 16:00 and continuing up to nearly midnight [37,39,46,50].

327 The association of morning, day, afternoon, and evening profiles with health outcomes was
328 somewhat mixed and different, depending on the health outcomes (see Table 2). One study
329 reported that the "Early morning" profile, but not the "Late afternoon," had a higher mortality
330 risk compared with the "Midday" profile [58]. Two studies were performed with the same
331 sample populations and identified the same profile [67,68]. One of these reported that both
332 "Early morning peak" and "Late morning peak" had a lower incidence of coronary artery
333 disease compared with "Average pattern," characterized by having average midday PA [67]. In
334 the same study [67], "Late morning peak" was also associated with a lower incidence of stroke
335 and ischemic stroke compared with the "Average pattern." In the other study [68], "Early
336 morning peak," but not "Late morning," was associated with a lower incidence of type 2
337 diabetes compared with "Midday average pattern." Another study reported that "Morning
338 engaged" had higher depression symptoms compared with "Afternoon engaged," while both
339 "Morning engaged" and "Afternoon engaged" had lower depression symptoms compared with
340 the "Unengaged" profile [49].

341 Three studies identified a profile in the same sample population whose PA peaked during the
342 day at around 9:00–10:00 [59–61]. One of these reported that the single peak profile was
343 associated with lower all-cause mortality, CVD mortality, stroke, and ischemic heart disease
344 incidence compared with the profile with the lowest PA [61]. Another study found that the
345 single peak profile was linked to a lower incidence of type 2 diabetes compared with the profile
346 with minimal PA [60]. The single peak was also found to be associated with lower breast,
347 kidney, and myeloma cancer incidence compared with the profile with the lowest PA [59].

348 One study reported that “High daytime activity,” but not “Moderate evening activity,” was
349 associated with lower waist circumference and cholesterol levels when compared with the
350 lowest activity profile [37]. In contrast, another study using the same sample population found
351 no associations for “High daytime activity” relative to the lowest activity profile, while
352 “Moderate evening activity” was linked to a lower composite 10-year CVD score [39]. In
353 another study, the “Evening active” profile did not have differences in terms of cardiometabolic
354 health markers or composite 10-year CVD score when compared with all other profiles,
355 including the profile with the lowest activity level [46]. However, one study reported that
356 “Evening (MVPA)” had higher BMI and waist circumference compared with both “Midday
357 (MVPA)” and “Morning (MVPA)” [36]. Another study identifying an “Evening dominant”
358 profile observed higher depression symptoms for this profile when compared with the
359 “Morning dominant” profile [50].

Study, first author (year)	Derived profiles (name or main characteristics)						
[1]Zhang (2024) [58]	Early morning (2,159)	Late afternoon (1,677)	Midday (2,837)				
[2]Bai (2024) [61]	Persistently low (6,388)	Moderate and stable (36,678)	Single increase (29,975)	Double increase (17,291)	Vigorous activity patterns (11,991)		
Fabrizio (2024) [62]	10 a.m. – 2 p.m. PA peak (386)	7 a.m. – 12 a.m. PA peak (364)	8 a.m. – 1 p.m. PA peak (670)	No clear PA peak (639)			
[1]Shim (2023) [63]	High activity (1,628)	Low activity (2,670)	Mild circadian rhythm disruption (1,256)	Severe circadian rhythm disruption (558)	Very low activity (1,185)		
[3, *]Evenson (2017) [65]	Class 6 [Most active] (41)	Class 5 (216)	Class 4 (66)	Class 3 (748)	Class 2 (1,892)	Class 1 [Least active] (1,547)	
[4]Yamamoto (2025) [66]	Group-A [low PA] (407)	Group-B (81)	Group-C (248)	Group-D [high PA] (58)			
[2]Albalak (2023) [67]	Average pattern (27,552)	Early morning peak (19,843)	Late morning peak (22,648)	Evening peak (16,614)			
[2]Feng (2025) [68]	Mid-day average pattern (27,681)	Early morning peak (18,614)	Late morning peak (23,299)	Early evening peak (19,845)			
[2]Bai (2024) [60]	Consistently low (13,764)	Single peak (47,500)	Double peak (18,681)	Intense (19,587)			
[2]Li (2024) [69]	PA peak at around 10 a.m. every day (37,216)	Peaks at around 8 a.m. and 6 p.m. daily (20,045)	A relatively uniform distribution of physical intensity throughout the day (12,666)	Even daily distribution of PA intensity (690)			
[3]Ma (2023) [36]	Morning [MVPA] (642)	Midday [MVPA] (2,456)	Evening [MVPA] (2,187)				
[5]Biswas (2023) [37]	Lowest activity (2,808)	Moderate consistent activity (3,219)	Fluctuating moderate activity (1,194)	High daytime activity (713)	Moderate evening activity (228)	Highest activity 750	
[4]Yamamoto (2023) [38]	Group-A [low PA] (1,047)	Group-B (261)	Group-C (418)	Group-D [high PA] (124)			
[5]Biswas (2022) [39]	Lowest activity (2,808)	Moderate consistent activity (3,219)	Fluctuating moderate activity (1,194)	High daytime activity (713)	Moderate evening activity (225)	Highest activity (750)	
Leskinen (2023) [35]	Consistently inactive (1,301)	Consistently low active (2,498)	Active on weekdays (881)	Early birds (138)	Consistently moderately active (449)	Weekend warriors (453)	Consistently highly active (352)
[3]Aqeel (2021) [42]	Lowest activity counts from 6:00–23:00 (783)	High activity counts with a decline after 18:00 (247)	Lower activity counts between 6:00–12:00 (336)	Higher activity counts between 8:00–11:00 (633)			
Niemelä (2019) [46]	Inactive (1,881)	Evening active (802)	Moderately active (1,297)	Very active (602)			
[3]Marschollek (2016) [47]	High overall physical with regular irregular high-intensity activity (92)	Regularly and extensively active (2,230)	Irregularly and less extensively active (2,990)	Inactive (2,010)			
Lee (2013) [48]	Active (480)	Less active (1,234)					
Fukuoka (2018) [49]	Morning engaged (65)	Afternoon engaged (48)	Unengaged (102)				
[1]Nawrin (2024) [50]	Morning dominant (1,964)	All-day dominant (1,792)	All-day or morning dominant (1,855)	Evening dominant (1,002)			
[2]Bai (2024) [59]	Persistent low (14,037)	Single peak (46,100)	Double peak (17,763)	Vigorous (18,787)			

Comparable profiles:

- Highest activity profile
- Lowest activity profile
- Morning/day peak
- Afternoon/evening peak
- Midday peak

Figure 2: Overview of derived profiles in 22 studied identifying physical activity (PA) profiles. The numbers shown in () are the number of participants in the profile. The profiles are specified according to the names given to them in the study or a short outline of the main characteristics. To facilitate comparison across studies, profiles with comparable overall characteristics *seen in at least two or more distinct sample populations* are highlighted using distinct background colors. Note that the color-coded profiles are not necessarily exactly identical or directly comparable, because of the underlying heterogeneities related to profile analysis and/or accelerometer data cleaning/processing. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5: studies marked with the same number were performed with the same sample population. *: Five models were created based on different input descriptor variables into the profiling approach; profiles reported here are for the profiles identified on the basis of average activity counts/minute.

Table 2: Input descriptor variables, profiles identified, and the statistically significant associations observed among the profiles identified in 22 studies performing physical activity (PA) profiling.

Study (first author (year))	Input descriptor variables	Derived profiles, name or main characteristics	Number of participants	Statistically significant associations
Zhang (2024) [58]	Hourly proportion of total MIMS units accumulated in each hour over a 24-hour period	Early morning	2,159	All-cause mortality risk (vs. Ref.)↑
		Late afternoon	1,677	No statistically significant association (vs. Ref.)
		Midday	2,837	Ref.
Bai (2024) [61]	Not reported clearly	Persistently low	6,388	Ref.
		Moderate and stable	36,678	All-cause mortality (vs. Ref.)↓, CVD mortality (vs. Ref.)↓, Incident ischemic heart disease (vs. Ref.)↓, Incident stroke (vs. Ref.)↓
		Single increase	29,975	All-cause mortality (vs. Ref.)↓, CVD mortality (vs. Ref.)↓, Incident ischemic heart disease (vs. Ref.)↓, Incident stroke (vs. Ref.)↓
		Double increase	17,291	All-cause mortality (vs. Ref.)↓, CVD mortality (vs. Ref.)↓, Incident ischemic heart disease (vs. Ref.)↓, Incident stroke (vs. Ref.)↓
		Vigorous activity patterns	11,991	All-cause mortality (vs. Ref.)↓, CVD mortality (vs. Ref.)↓, Incident ischemic heart disease (vs. Ref.)↓, Incident stroke (vs. Ref.)↓
Fabrizio (2024) [62]	Mean hourly acceleration over a 24-hour period standardized by average 24-hour acceleration across all measurement days	10 a.m. – 2 p.m. PA peak	386	Ref.
		7 a.m. – 12 a.m. PA peak	364	CVD event (vs. Ref.)↑
		8 a.m. – 1 p.m. PA peak	670	No statistically significant difference (vs. Ref.)
		No clear PA peak	639	CVD event (vs. Ref.)↑
Shim (2023) [63]	Mean hourly MIMS units over a 24-hour period across all measurement days, with recursive feature selection to remove irrelevant input features	High activity	1,628	Ref.
		Low activity	2,670	No statistically significant difference (vs. Ref.)
		Mild circadian rhythm disruption	1,256	All-cause mortality risk (vs. Ref.)↑
		Severe circadian rhythm disruption	558	No statistically significant difference (vs. Ref.)
		Very low activity	1,185	All-cause mortality risk (vs. Ref.)↑
[1]Evenson (2017) [65]	Average activity counts/minute on every day of the week	Class 6 [Most active]	41	No death observed
		Class 5	216	All-cause mortality (vs. Ref.)↓
		Class 4	66	No death observed
		Class 3	748	All-cause mortality (vs. Ref.)↓
		Class 2	1,892	All-cause mortality (vs. Ref.)↓
		Class 1 [Least active]	1,547	Ref.
Yamamoto (2025) [66]	Number of steps, LPA, MVPA, and the ratio of MVPA to total activity	Group-A [low PA]	407	Ref.
		Group-B	81	No statistically significant difference (vs. Ref.)
		Group-C	248	Metabolic syndrome onset (Ref.)↓
		Group-D [high PA]	58	No statistically significant difference (vs. Ref.)
Albalak (2023) [67]	Mean hourly relative acceleration over a 24-hour period across all measurement days	Average pattern	27,552	Ref.
		Early morning peak	19,843	Incident coronary artery disease (vs. Ref.)↓
		Late morning peak	22,648	Incident coronary artery disease (vs. Ref.)↓, Incident stroke (vs. Ref.)↓, Incident ischemic stroke (vs. Ref.)↓

		Evening peak	16,614	No statistically significant difference (vs. Ref.)
Feng (2025) [68]	Mean hourly relative acceleration over a 24-hour period across all measurement days	Mid-day average pattern	27,681	Ref.
		Early morning peak	18,614	No statistically significant difference (vs. Ref.)
		Late morning peak	23,299	Incident type 2 diabetes (vs. Ref.)↓
		Early evening peak	19,845	No statistically significant difference (vs. Ref.)
Bai (2024) [60]	Mean hourly acceleration over a 24-hour period across all measurement days	Consistently low	13,764	Ref.
		Single peak	47,500	Incident type 2 diabetes (vs. Ref.)↓
		Double peak	18,681	Incident type 2 diabetes (vs. Ref.)↓
		Intense	19,587	Incident type 2 diabetes (vs. Ref.)↓
Li (2024) [69]	Mean hourly acceleration over a 24-hour period across all measurement days	PA peak at around 10 a.m. every day	37,216	Incident ischemic heart disease (vs. Ref.)↓
		Peaks at around 8 a.m. and 6 p.m. daily	20,045	Incident ischemic heart disease (vs. Ref.)↓
		A relatively uniform distribution of physical intensity throughout the day	12,666	Ref.
		Even daily distribution of PA intensity	690	No statistically significant difference (vs. Ref.)
Ma (2023) [36]	Mean hourly proportion of MVPA over a 24-hour period	Morning [MVPA]	642	Ref.
		Midday [MVPA]	2,456	BMI (vs. Ref.)↑, WC (vs. Ref.)↑
		Evening [MVPA]	2,187	BMI (vs. Ref.)↑, WC (vs. Ref.)↑
Biswas (2023) [37]	Average counts per minute over 10-minute intervals throughout the 24-hour period	Lowest activity	2,808	Ref.
		Moderate consistent activity	3,219	WC (vs. Ref.)↓
		Fluctuating moderate activity	1,194	WC (vs. Ref.)↓, Systolic BP↓, Cholesterol (vs. Ref.)↓
		High daytime activity	713	WC (vs. Ref.)↓, Cholesterol (vs. Ref.)↓
		Moderate evening activity	225	No differences vs. Ref.
		Highest activity	750	WC (vs. Ref.)↓, Systolic BP (vs. Ref.)↓, Diastolic BP (vs. Ref.)↓, Cholesterol (vs. Ref.)↓
Yamamoto (2023) [38]	Number of steps, LPA, MVPA, and the ratio of MVPA to total activity	Group-A [low PA]	1,047	Ref.
		Group-B	261	No statistically significant difference (vs. Ref.)
		Group-C	418	Metabolic syndrome (vs. Ref.)↓, Abdominal obesity (vs. Ref.)↓
		Group-D [high PA]	124	Metabolic syndrome (vs. Ref.)↓, Abdominal obesity (vs. Ref.)↓
Biswas (2022) [39]	Average counts per minute over 10-minute intervals throughout the 24-hour period.	Lowest activity	2,808	Ref.
		Moderate activity	3,219	10-year risk for atherosclerotic CVD event (vs. Ref.)↓
		Fluctuations of moderate activity	1,194	10-year risk for atherosclerotic CVD event (vs. Ref.)↓
		High daytime activity	713	No statistically significant difference (vs. Ref.)
		Moderate evening activity	225	10-year risk for atherosclerotic CVD event (vs. Ref.)↓
		Highest activity	750	10-year risk for atherosclerotic CVD event (vs. Ref.)↓

[2]Leskinen (2023) [35]	Hourly stepping minutes of two consecutive hours	Consistently inactive	1,301	BMI (vs. Ref.)↑, Waist (vs. Ref.)↑, 2-hour glucose (vs. Ref.)↑, Total/HDL ratio (vs. Ref.)↑, Triglycerides (vs. Ref.)↑
		Consistently low active	2,498	BMI (vs. Ref.)↑, Waist (vs. Ref.)↑, 2-hour glucose (vs. Ref.)↑, Total/HDL ratio (vs. Ref.)↑, Triglycerides (vs. Ref.)↑
		Active on weekdays	881	BMI (vs. Ref.)↑, Waist (vs. Ref.)↑
		Early birds	138	BMI (vs. Ref.)↑, Waist (vs. Ref.)↑, Systolic BP (vs. Ref.)↑, Diastolic BP (vs. Ref.)↑
		Consistently moderately active	449	No statistically significant difference (vs. Ref.)
		Weekend warriors	453	BMI (vs. Ref.)↑, Waist (vs. Ref.)↑
		Consistently highly active	352	Ref.
Aqeel (2021) [42]	Summation of hourly activity counts and time stamps	Lowest activity counts from 6:00–23:00	783	Ref.
		High activity counts with a decline after 18:00	247	BMI (vs. Ref.)↓, WC (vs. Ref.)↓
		Lower activity counts between 6:00–12:00	336	BMI (vs. Ref.)↓, WC (vs. Ref.)↓, Hemoglobin A1c (vs. Ref.)↓
		Higher activity counts between 8:00–11:00	633	BMI (vs. Ref.)↓, WC (vs. Ref.)↓
[3]Niemelä (2019) [46]	Average MET (metabolic equivalent) over 10-minute intervals throughout the 24-hour period	Inactive	1,881	10-year CVD risk (vs. Very active)↑, HDL cholesterol (vs. Very active)↑
		Evening active	802	No statistically significant difference (vs. any of the profiles)
		Moderately active	1,297	HDL cholesterol (vs. Very active)↓
		Very active	602	10-year CVD risk (vs. Inactive)↓, HDL cholesterol (vs. Inactive)↓, HDL cholesterol (vs. Moderately active)↑
Marschollek (2016) [47]	PA intensity, mean duration of PA per 1000 min, and PA regularity	Cluster 1: High overall physical with regular low-intensity activity and more irregular high-intensity activity	92	BMI (vs. Cluster 3)↓
		Cluster 2: Regularly and extensively active	2,230	C-reactive protein (vs. Cluster 3 and Cluster 4)↓, BMI (vs. Cluster 3 and Cluster 4)↓
		Cluster 3: Irregularly and less extensively active	2,990	C-reactive protein (vs. Cluster 4)↓, BMI (vs. Cluster 4)↓, C-reactive protein (vs. Cluster 2)↑, BMI (vs. Cluster 1 and Cluster 2)↑
		Cluster 4: Inactive	2,010	C-reactive protein (vs. Cluster 2 and Cluster 3)↑, BMI (vs. Cluster 1, Cluster 2, and Cluster 3)↑
Lee (2013) [48]	Hourly average counts per minute over a 24-hour period on weekdays and weekends	Active	480	Ref.
		Less active	1,234	Having been diagnosed with a chronic condition (vs. Ref.)↑, Asthma (vs. Ref.)↑
Fukuoka (2018) [49]	Raw minute-level MET for 7 consecutive days	Morning engaged	65	Depression symptom (vs. Afternoon)↑; Depression symptom (vs. Unengaged)↓
		Afternoon engaged	48	Depression symptom (vs. Morning engaged)↓

		Unengaged	102	Depression symptom (vs. Afternoon and Morning engaged)↑
Nawrin (2024) [50]	Hourly activity counts over a 24-hour period	Morning dominant	1,964	Ref.
		All-day dominant	1,792	No apparent differences in health outcomes
		All-day or morning dominant	1,855	No apparent differences in health outcomes
		Evening dominant	1,002	Depressive symptoms↑
Bai (2024) [59]	Mean hourly acceleration over a 24-hour period across all measurement days	Persistent low	14,037	Ref.
		Single peak	46,100	Incident breast cancer (vs. Ref.)↓, Incident kidney cancer (vs. Ref.)↓, Incident myeloma cancer (vs. Ref.)↓
		Double peak	17,763	Incident colorectal cancer (vs. Ref.)↓, Incident kidney cancer (vs. Ref.)↓
		Vigorous	18,787	Incident bladder cancer (vs. Ref.)↓, Incident breast cancer (vs. Ref.)↓, Incident kidney cancer (vs. Ref.)↓, Incident lung cancer (vs. Ref.)↓, Incident myeloma cancer (vs. Ref.)↓, Incident oral cavity and pharynx cancer (vs. Ref.)↓

Only statistically significant associations observed in the studies are reported. Upward arrow (↑) indicates higher values/incidence in the health outcome relative to the referent group, and downward arrow (↓) lower values/incidence in the health outcome relative to the referent group. [1]: Five models were created based on different input variables into the profiling approach; associations reported here are for the profiles identified on the basis of average activity counts/minute. [2]: The analyses were stratified by type 2 diabetes status; significant associations reported here are those that were seen for no diabetes group [3]: Analysis were stratified by gender; significant differences reported here are those that were seen in both males and females. Abbreviations: Ref. = Referent profile; BMI = Body mass index; BP = Blood pressure; CVD = Cardiovascular diseases; HDL = High-density lipoprotein; LDL = Low-density lipoprotein; LPA= Light-intensity physical activity; MET = Metabolic equivalents; MIMS = Monitor Independent Movement Summary unit; MVPA = Moderate-to-vigorous physical activity; PA = Physical activity; WC = Waist circumference.

360 **Profiles of sedentary behavior**

361 The overview of profiles identified in four studies creating sedentary behavior profiles is shown
362 in Figure 3. The number of profiles that emerged in these studies ranged from three to five.

363 The input descriptor variables used for profile analysis, the derived sedentary profiles, and their
364 associations with health outcomes in each study are listed in Table 3. In one study [65], the
365 daily percentage of total sedentary time from total accelerometer wear time was used to create
366 and identify sedentary behavior profiles. Two studies created sedentary behavior profiles using
367 several variables describing how sedentary time was accumulated and interrupted [41,43], but
368 the descriptor variables used in these studies differed. In the other study, sedentary behavior
369 profiles were created using mean hourly sedentary time computed for up to 14 hours after
370 waking [70]. This approach allowed the assessment of diurnal patterns of sedentary time.

371 **Key profile characteristics and their relationships with health outcomes**

372 Of the four studies creating sedentary profiles, two identified sedentary behavior profiles in
373 distinct sample populations based on how sedentary time was accumulated and interrupted
374 [41,43]. Both studies identified profiles characterized by having more frequent interruptions in
375 sedentary time compared with other emerging profiles. These profiles, labeled as "Interrupted"
376 [41] and "Breakers" [43] are highlighted in green in Figure 3 (part Sedentary profiles). In
377 contrast, both studies also identified profiles characterized by prolonged periods of
378 uninterrupted sedentary time, labeled as "Prolonged" [41] and "Prolonged sitters" [43]. These
379 profiles are highlighted in orange in Figure 3 (part Sedentary profiles). A comparable threshold
380 for defining prolonged sedentary bouts emerged in both studies. The "Prolonged" profile
381 accumulated sedentary time in uninterrupted bouts lasting >20 min [41], while "Prolonged
382 sitters" accumulated sedentary time in uninterrupted bouts lasting >15–30 min [43]. One of
383 these two studies identified another unique profile, labeled as "Shortened sitters," which was

384 characterized by accumulating sedentary time in relatively short bouts generally limited to 15–
385 30 min [43]. Another profile emerged in the same study was "Couch potatoes", which was
386 distinguished by having the highest level of sedentary time across all other emerged profiles
387 [43].

388 As shown in Table 3, the "Prolonged" profile was associated with a higher 10-year CVD risk
389 compared with the "Interrupted" profile [41]. In the other study [43], no statistically significant
390 differences in cardiometabolic health markers were observed between the "Couch potatoes"
391 and "Prolonged sitters." However, both the "Shortened sitters" and "Breakers" demonstrated
392 better cardiometabolic health compared with the "Couch potatoes" [43]. One study reported no
393 association for the identified sedentary behavior profiles identified based on sedentary time out
394 of total wear time per day across all days of the week [65].

395 One study creating sedentary behavior profiles found that temporal patterns of sedentary
396 activity were linked to rates of physical functioning decline [70], independent of total time
397 spent in sedentary activity. Most importantly, the study identified a profile characterized by
398 reduced morning sedentary behaviors, which was linked to slower rates of physical functioning
399 decline.

400 **Profiles of sleep**

401 The overview of profiles identified in three studies creating sleep profiles is shown in Figure
402 3. The input descriptor variables used for profile analysis, the derived sleep profiles, and their
403 associations with health outcomes in each study are listed in Table 3. The number of profiles
404 that emerged in these three data-driven sleep profiling studies was two [71], three [58] and four
405 [44]. One of these studies utilized hourly proportions of accumulated sleep minutes within each
406 hour over a 24-hour period as descriptor variables for profile analysis [58]. Although not

identical, the other two studies employed descriptor metrics related to sleep duration, timing, and variability [44,71].

Key profile characteristics and their relationships with health outcomes

The three studies identifying sleep profiles were conducted with distinct sample populations [44,58,71]. Among these, a profile characterized by late bedtime was identified in two studies, as illustrated in green in Figure 3 (part Sleep profile). In one study, the profiles identified were named "Irregular sleep", "Morning lark", and "Night owl" [58]. "Irregular sleep" was characterized by varying times of sleep onset and awakening throughout the day, "Morning lark" by sleeping early at night and waking early in the morning, and "Night owl" by going to bed late and waking up late [58]. As shown in Table 3, "Irregular sleep" was associated with a higher mortality risk compared with the "Morning lark." In contrast, the "Night owl" profile showed no statistically significant difference in mortality risk compared with the "Morning lark" profile.

In another study [44], the identified profiles were named "Overall good sleepers," "Late to bed," "Long sleepers", and "Short sleepers." "Overall good sleepers" was characterized by having adequate sleep, high sleep efficiency, early bedtime, and low day-to-day sleep variability. "Late to bed" profile was characterized by late bedtime and late rise time, "Long sleepers" by relatively longer time in bed, and "Short sleepers" by relatively shorter time in bed. Among these profiles [44], the "Late to bed" profile was associated with higher BMI and metabolic syndrome scores compared with the "Overall good sleepers" profile (see Table 3). However, neither "Long sleepers" nor "Short sleepers" profiles displayed statistically significant differences in cardiometabolic health outcomes when compared with the "Overall good sleepers" profile [44].

430 In the other study, two profiles labeled as "Regular-optimal" and "Irregular-insufficient" were
431 identified [71]. The "Regular-optimal" profile was characterized by consistent bedtimes and
432 wake-up times along with sleep durations that aligned closely with recommended ranges for
433 adults. In contrast, the "Irregular-insufficient" profile exhibited irregular bedtimes and wake-
434 up times coupled with alternating nights of insufficient sleep duration. The "Regular-optimal"
435 profile was associated with lower mortality risk compared with the "Irregular-insufficient"
436 profile [71].

437 **Profiles of rest-activity rhythmicity**

438 The overview of profiles identified in the two studies that created rest-activity rhythmicity
439 profiles is shown in Figure 3. The input descriptor variables used for profile analysis, the
440 derived rest-activity rhythmicity profiles, and their associations with health outcomes in each
441 study are listed in Table 3. Four profiles emerged in both studies that created and identified
442 profiles of rest-activity rhythmicity [51,54]. The rest-activity rhythm descriptors used as input
443 for profile analysis in both studies largely overlapped and were derived from an extended
444 cosine model [51,54].

445 **Key profile characteristics and their relationships with health outcomes**

446 The two studies identified rest-activity profiles in distinct populations [51,54]. "Early rising"
447 profile, highlighted in green in Figure 3 (part Rest-activity rhythmicity), was identified in both
448 studies. In one of the studies [51], "Shorter active period/less modelable" and "Shorter active
449 period/very weak," characterized by starting their daily activities later and settling down earlier,
450 with a relatively less rhythmic 24-hour rest-activity patterm, exhibited higher depression
451 symptoms, compared with "Earlier rising/robust," which was characterized by an estimated
452 activity onset before 7 AM and a more rhythmic 24-hour rest-activity pattern [51]. "Later
453 settling/very weak," characterized by having the latest estimated activity offset times and a

relatively less rhythmic 24-hour rest-activity pattern, also exhibited higher depression symptoms, compared to "Earlier rising" [51].

In the other study [54], "Later rest activity rhythms (RARs)," characterized by having a later activity onset, had higher perceived fatiguability compared with "Earlier risers," characterized by a relatively earlier activity onset. No statistically significant association was seen for "More active/robust," characterized by having higher and a more rhythmic rest-activity pattern, compared with "Earlier risers" [54]. The "Less activity/robust" profile, characterized by having relatively a more rhythmic rest-activity pattern, exhibited higher perceived fatiguability compared with "Earlier risers" [54].

Joint profiles of physical activity, sedentary behavior, and/or sleep

The overview of profiles identified in 11 studies creating joint profiles is shown in Figure 3. The number of profiles that emerged in these studies ranged from three to five [32,33,64,34,40,45,52,53,55–57].

The input descriptor variables used for profile analysis, the derived joint profiles, and their associations with health outcomes in each study are listed in Table 3. Although durations of physical activity and sedentary behavior were commonly used as descriptor variables, there was overall heterogeneity in the descriptors used as input for identifying and creating joint profiles (see Table 3). Of the 11 studies creating joint profiles, seven incorporated a combination of accelerometer-derived PA and sedentary behavior descriptors for profile analyses [32,33,40,53,56,57,64] and three incorporated a combination of accelerometer-derived PA, sedentary behavior, and sleep descriptors [45,52,55]. One study used transformed accelerometer outputs into what was named *activity images* and used the activity images for profile analysis [34].

477 **Key profile characteristics and their relationships with health outcomes**

478 Due to the heterogeneity and variety of input descriptor variables in profile analysis, comparing
479 joint profiles across the included studies in terms of similarities and differences was more
480 challenging than comparing other types of profiles. Most commonly, profiles distinguished by
481 low levels of PA combined with high levels of sedentary time emerged among the studies
482 identifying joint profiles (n = 7) [32,34,52,55–57,64]. Such profiles were labeled across studies
483 as "Most sedentary" [57], "Low active" [64], "Lowest activity" [34], "Low physical activity"
484 [56], "Inactive-sedentary" [52], "Low overall physical activity" [32], and "Inactives" [55].
485 These profiles are marked in orange in Figure 3 (part Joint profiles). When considered as the
486 referent profiles (see Table 3), relatively more active profiles, characterized by lower levels of
487 sedentary time combined with higher levels of PA, demonstrated reduced risks of mortality
488 [64], better cardiometabolic health and obesity indicators [34,55], and better cognitive health
489 [56] and physical capacity outcomes [56]. Compared with most active profiles identified in the
490 sample population, profiles most distinguished by a combination of low PA and high sedentary
491 time were found to be associated with increased mortality risk [57] and a higher amount of
492 chronic illness and multimorbidity [52].

493 Profiles most distinguished from other profiles by having high sedentary time combined with
494 having sufficient PA were seen in two studies conducted with distinct sample populations
495 [40,57]. These profiles are marked in green in Figure 3 (part Joint profiles). As shown in Table
496 3, in one of these studies, the "Active sitters," most distinguished by having sufficient MVPA
497 but also high sedentary time, were shown to have a higher mortality risk compared with the
498 "Active" profile, characterized by having both lower sedentary time and higher MVPA [57].
499 The other study identified an "Active couch potato" profile, most distinguished by having
500 sufficient MVPA coupled with high sedentary time. Compared with this profile, "Sedentary

501 light movers" who engaged in sufficient PA but had relatively less sedentary time and more

502 light-intensity PA were found to have better cardiometabolic health [40].

Sedentary profiles (n = 4)

Study, first author (year)	Derived profiles (name or main characteristics)				
[1]Hibbing (2022) [41]	Interrupted (1,740)	Intermediate (2,453)	Prolonged (1,302)		
Farrahi (2021) [43]	Couch potatoes (1,222)	Prolonged sitters (1,222)	Shortened sitters (1,529)	Breakers (509)	
[1, *]Evenson (2017) [65]	Class 1 [Most sedentary] (451)	Class 2 (1,286)	Class 3 (1,640)	Class 4 (872)	Class 5 [Least sedentary] (261)
Reuter (2020) [70]	High-SB-throughout-the-day (2,239)	Moderate-SB-with-lower-morning-SB (1,536)	Moderate-SB-with-higher-morning-SB (1,137)	Low-SB-throughout-the-day (1,292)	

Comparable profiles:
- Relatively longer sedentary bouts
- Frequent sedentary interruptions

Sleep profiles (n = 3)

Study, first author (year)	Derived profiles (name or main characteristics)			
Zhang (2024) [58]	Irregular sleep (2,159)	Morning lark (1,677)	Night owl (2,837)	
Chung (2024) [71]	Irregular-insufficient (744)	Regular-optimal (1,015)		
Matricciani (2021) [44]	Short sleepers (347)	Late to bed (269)	Long sleepers (297)	Overall good sleepers (424)

Comparable profiles:
- Late sleep

Rest-activity profiles (n = 2)

Study, first author (year)	Derived profile (name or main characteristics)			
Smagula (2022) [51]	Earlier rising/robust (677)	Shorter active period/less modellable (587)	Shorter active period/very weak (177)	Later settling/very weak (359)
Graves (2021) [54]	Earlier risers (70)	More active/Robust (37)	Later RARs (63)	Less active/Robust (14)

Comparable profiles:
- Early rising

Joint profiles (n = 11)

Study, first author (year)	Derived profiles (name or main characteristics)				
Yerramalla (2024) [57]	Active (726)	Active sitters (890)	Light movers (1,033)	Prolonged sitters (1,040)	Most sedentary (302)
Rosen (2020) [64]	Low active (147)	Average active (397)	High active (307)		
Choi (2025) [32]	High lifestyle physical activity (64)	High MVPA (37)	Low overall physical activity (108)	Average physical activity (219)	
[1]Gupta (2025) [33]	Chimpanzees (226)	Lions (179)	Koalas (158)	Ants (244)	
Farrahi (2024) [34]	Lowest activity (351)	Early morning movers (595)	Least sedentary movers (552)	Highest activity (314)	
Farrahi (2022) [40]	Active couch potatoes (1,173)	Sedentary light movers (1,199)	Sedentary exercisers (694)	Movers (636)	
[1]Gupta (2020) [45]	Chimpanzees (226)	Lions (179)	Koalas (158)	Ants (244)	
O'Regan (2021) [52]	Inactive-sedentary (50)	Low activity (295)	Active (111)	Very active (29)	
Palmberg (2024) [53]	Exercisers (79)	Actives (177)	Inactives (185)		
Full (2019) [55]	Moderately active poor sleepers (27)	Highly actives (151)	Inactives (34)	Moderately actives (105)	Actives (55)
Paolillo (2023) [56]	Low physical activity (49)	Average physical activity (59)	High intensity physical activity (16)		

Comparable profiles:
- High sedentary/Low physical activity
- Active and sedentary

Figure 3: Overview of derived profiles in studied identifying sedentary (n = 4), sleep (n = 2), rest-activity (n = 3), and joint (n = 11) profiles. The numbers shown in () are the number of participants in the profile. The profiles are specified according to the names given to them in the study or a short outline of the main characteristics. To facilitate comparison across studies, profiles with comparable overall characteristics *seen in at least two or more distinct sample populations* are highlighted with

distinct colors. Note that the color-coded profiles are not necessarily exactly identical, because of the underlying heterogeneities related to profile analysis and/or accelerometer data cleaning/processing. 1: studies marked with the same number were performed with the same sample population. *: Two models were created based on different input variables into the profiling approach; profiles reported here are for the profiles identified on the basis of percentage of sedentary behavior out of total wear time per day. Abbreviations: SB = sedentary behavior; MVPA = Moderate-to-vigorous physical activity.

Table 3: Input descriptor variables, profiles identified, and the statistically significant associations observed among the profiles in studies identifying sedentary behavior, sleep, rest-activity, and joint profiles.

Study, first author (year)	Input descriptor variables	Derived profiles, name or main characteristics	Number of participants	Observed associations
Sedentary profiles (n = 4)				
Hibbing (2022) [41]	10th-90th percentiles, interquartiled and interdecile range of sedentary bouts, number of sedentary bouts, % of wear time in sedentary	Interrupted	1,740	Ref.
		Intermediate	2,453	10-year CVD risk (vs. Ref.)↑
		Prolonged	1,302	10-year CVD risk (vs. Ref.)↑
Farrahi (2021) [43]	65 variables characterizing how sedentary time was accumulated and interrupted.	Couch potatoes	1,222	Ref.
		Prolonged sitters	1,222	No statistically significant differences (vs. Ref.)
		Shortened sitters	1,529	2-hour insulin (vs. Ref.)↓, Fasting serum insulin (vs. Ref.)↓, Triglycerides (vs. Ref.)↓, Total/HDL cholesterol ratio (vs. Ref.)↓, LDL/HDL cholesterol ratio (vs. Ref.)↓, Body fat (vs. Ref.)↓, Fat mass (vs. Ref.)↓, Visceral fat area (vs. Ref.)↓, BMI (vs. Ref.)↓, WC (vs. Ref.)↓
		Breakers	509	Total/HDL cholesterol ratio (vs. Ref.)↓, LDL/HDL cholesterol ratio (vs. Ref.)↓
[1]Evenson (2017) [65]	Percentage of sedentary behavior out of total wear time per day on every day of the week	Class 1 - Most sedentary	451	No statistically significant difference (vs. Ref.)
		Class 2	1,286	No statistically significant difference (vs. Ref.)
		Class 3	1,640	No statistically significant difference (vs. Ref.)
		Class 4	872	No statistically significant difference (vs. Ref.)
		Class 5 – Least sedentary	261	Ref.
[2]Reuter (2020) [70]	Mean hourly sedentary time up to 14 hours after waking time	High-SB-throughout-the-day	2,239	Rate of physical functioning decline (vs. Moderate-SB-with-lower-morning-SB)↑
		Moderate-SB-with-lower-morning-SB	1,536	Rate of physical functioning decline (vs. High-SB-throughout-the-day and Low-SB-throughout-the-day)↓
		Moderate-SB-with-higher-morning-SB	1,137	No statistically significant association
		Low-SB-throughout-the-day	1,292	Rate of physical functioning decline (vs. Moderate-SB-with-lower-morning-SB)↑
Sleep profiles (n = 3)				
Zhang (2024) [58]	Hourly proportions of accumulated sleep minutes accumulated in each hour over a 24-hour period	Irregular sleep	2,159	All-cause mortality risk (vs. Ref.)↑
		Morning lark	1,677	Ref.
		Night owl	2,837	No statistically significant difference (vs. Ref.)
Chung (2024) [71]	Total sleep duration, night-to-night timing irregularity, and night-to-night duration irregularity	Irregular-insufficient	744	Ref.
		Regular-optimal	1,015	All-cause mortality (vs. Ref.)↓
Matricciani (2021) [44]	Sleep period, sleep timing, day-to-day sleep variability, sleep efficiency	Short sleepers	347	No statistically significant difference (vs. Ref.)
		Late to bed	269	Metabolic syndrome severity score (vs. Ref.)↑, BMI (vs. Ref.)↑
		Long sleepers	297	No statistically significant differences (vs. Ref.)
		Overall good sleepers	424	Ref.
Rest-activity profiles (n = 2)				

Smagula (2022) [51]	Activity onset time, activity offset time, the pseudo–F statistic, interdaily stability, relative amplitude, and intradaily variability	Earlier rising/robust	677	Ref.
		Shorter active period/less modellable	587	Depressed mood (vs. Ref.)↑, Verbal fluency (vs. Ref.)↓, Delayed memory (vs. Ref.)↓
		Shorter active period/very weak	177	Tired/Little energy (vs. Ref.)↑, Guilt (vs. Ref.)↑, Suicidality (vs. Ref.)↑, Attention and processing speed (vs. Ref.)↓, Verbal fluency (vs. Ref.)↓, Delayed memory (vs. Ref.)↓
		Later settling/very weak	359	Sleep disturbance (vs. Ref.)↑, Tired/Little energy (vs. Ref.)↑, Suicidality (vs. Ref.)↑, Attention and processing speed (vs. Ref.)↓, Verbal fluency (vs. Ref.)↓, Delayed memory (vs. Ref.)↓
Graves (2021) [54]	Width of active period, amplitude, acrophase, beta (steepness), mesor, estimated rise time, and the pseudo-F statistic.	Earlier risers	70	Ref.
		More active/Robust	37	No statistically significant difference (vs. Ref.)
		Later RARs	63	Perceived physical fatigability (vs. Ref.)↑
		Less active/Robust	14	Perceived physical fatigability (vs. Ref.)↑
Joint profiles (n = 11)				
Yerramalla (2024) [57]	13 variables, representing overall activity level, total duration and frequency, typical duration, fragmentation, activity intensity distribution and timing of activity behaviors.	Active	726	Ref.
		Active sitters	890	All-cause mortality (vs. Ref.)↑
		Light movers	1,033	All-cause mortality (vs. Ref.)↑
		Prolonged sitters	1,040	All-cause mortality (vs. Ref.)↑
		Most sedentary	302	All-cause mortality (vs. Ref.)↑
Rosen (2020) [64]	14 measures representing duration of PA intensities and SB, variation of PA intensities and SB, total time of MVPA and sedentary bouts, number of sedentary and MVPA bouts, total counts, and the relative time spent in one behavior relative to the two remaining behaviors	Low active	147	Ref.
		Average active	397	All-cause mortality (vs. Ref.)↓
		High active	307	All-cause mortality (vs. Ref.)↓
Choi (2025) [32]	Minutes per week of sedentary behaviors, light PA, lifestyle PA, moderate PA, MVPA, and vigorous PA	High lifestyle physical activity	61	Subjective health (vs. Ref.)↑
		High MVPA	37	Metabolic syndrome (vs. Ref.)↓
		Low overall physical activity	108	No statistically significant difference (vs. Ref.)
		Average physical activity	219	Ref.
Gupta (2025) [33]	Isometric log ratio of time spent in sedentary, standing, LPA, and MVPA in work and leisure and time in bed	Chimpanzees	226	Ref.
		Lions	179	Systolic BP (vs. Ref.)↑, low back pain (vs. Ref.)↑
		Koalas	158	Systolic BP (vs. Ref.)↓, cardiorespiratory fitness (vs. Ref.)↑
		Ants	244	Self-rated health (vs. Ref.)↓, cardiorespiratory fitness (vs. Ref.)↑
Farrahi (2024) [34]	Valid minute-by-minute activity counts over 7 measurement days were shown as *'activity images'*	Lowest activity	351	Ref.
		Early morning movers	595	Insulin (vs. Ref.)↓, Triglycerides (vs. Ref.)↓, Homeostasis insulin resistance (vs. Ref.)↓, Plasma glucose (vs. Ref.)↓
		Least sedentary movers	552	WC (vs. Ref.)↓
		Highest activity	314	Insulin (vs. Ref.)↓, Triglycerides (vs. Ref.)↓, Homeostasis insulin resistance (vs. Ref.)↓, Plasma glucose (vs. Ref.)↓, C-reactive protein (vs. Ref.)↓, Total/HDL cholesterol ratio (vs. Ref.)↓
Farrahi (2022) [40]	Time spent in sedentary, LPA, and MVPA on each weekday and weekend day	Active couch potatoes	1,173	Ref.
		Sedentary light movers	1,199	2-hour insulin (vs. Ref.)↓, Fasting serum insulin (vs. Ref.)↓, Triglycerides (vs. Ref.)↓, Body fat (vs. Ref.)↓, Fat mass (vs. Ref.)↓, Visceral fat area (vs. Ref.)↓, BMI (vs. Ref.)↓, WC (vs. Ref.)↓

		Sedentary exercisers	694	2-hour insulin (vs. Ref.)↓, Fasting serum insulin (vs. Ref.)↓, Triglycerides (vs. Ref.)↓, Total/HDL cholesterol (vs. Ref.)↓, LDL/HDL cholesterol (vs. Ref.)↓, 2-hour glucose (vs. Ref.)↓, Body fat (vs. Ref.)↓, Fat mass (vs. Ref.)↓, Visceral fat area (vs. Ref.)↓, BMI (vs. Ref.)↓, WC (vs. Ref.)↓
		Movers	636	2-hour insulin (vs. Ref.)↓, Fasting serum insulin (vs. Ref.)↓, Triglycerides (vs. Ref.)↓, Total/HDL cholesterol (vs. Ref.)↓, LDL/HDL cholesterol (vs. Ref.)↓, Body fat (vs. Ref.)↓, Fat mass (vs. Ref.)↓, Visceral fat area (vs. Ref.)↓, WC (vs. Ref.)↓
Gupta (2020) [45]	Isometric log ratio of time spent in sedentary, standing, LPA, and MVPA in work and leisure and time in bed	Chimpanzees	226	Ref.
		Lions	179	BMI (vs. Ref.)↑, WC (vs. Ref.)↑, Body fat percentage (vs. Ref.)↑
		Koalas	158	WC (vs. Ref.)↑, Body fat percentage (vs. Ref.)↑
		Ants	244	No statistically significant difference (vs. Ref.)
O'Regan (2021) [52]	Average daily hours in bed, average daily waking sedentary hours, average daily standing hours, average daily LPA hours, average daily MVPA minutes and average daily step count	Inactive-sedentary	50	Having mental illness (vs. Ref.)↑, Being obese (vs. Ref.)↑, Having multi-morbidity (vs. Ref.)↑
		Low activity	295	Having mental illness (vs. Ref.)↑, Being obese (vs. Ref.)↑, Having multi-morbidity (vs. Ref.)↑
		Active	111	Having mental illness (vs. Ref.)↑, Being obese (vs. Ref.)↑, Having multi-morbidity (vs. Ref.)↑
		Very active	29	Ref.
[3]Palmberg (2024) [53]	13 features describing duration of movement intensities, gait characteristics, sit-to-stand transition, and activity fragmentation	Exercisers	79	6MWT walking speed (vs. Inactives)↑
		Actives	177	10-m walking speed (vs. Inactives)↑, 6MWT walking speed (vs. Inactives)↑
		Inactives	185	10-m walking speed (vs. Actives)↓, 6MWT walking speed (vs. Exercisers and Actives)↓
Full (2019) [55]	Nightly sleep time, nightly sleep efficiency, MVPA, and percent time spent sedentary	Moderately active poor sleepers	27	Physical functioning (vs. Moderately Actives)↓
		Highly actives	151	No statistically significant difference (vs. any of the other profiles)
		Inactives	34	BMI (vs. Moderately actives)↑
		Moderately actives	105	BMI (vs. Inactives)↓, Physical functioning (vs. Inactives)↑
		Actives	55	No statistically significant difference (vs. any of the other profiles)
Paolillo (2023) [56]	Average daily step count, average daily sedentary time, and average daily high intensity time	Low physical activity	49	Ref.
		Average physical activity	59	No statistically significant difference (vs. Ref.)
		High intensity physical activity	16	Executive functioning (vs. Ref.)↑, vascular burden (vs. Ref.)↓

Only statistically significant associations observed in the studies are reported. Upward arrow (↑) indicates higher values/incidence in the health outcome relative to the referent group, and downward arrow (↓) lower values/incidence in the health outcome relative to the referent group. [1]: Two models were created based on different input variables into the profiling approach; associations reported here are for the profiles identified on the basis of percentage of sedentary behavior out of total wear time per day. [2]: Analysis were stratified by low MVPA and high MVPA groups; the associations reported here are for the low MVPA group. [3]: Analysis were stratified by gender; significant differences reported here are those that were seen in both males and females. Abbreviations: Ref. = Referent profile; 6MWT = 6-minute walking test; BMI = Body mass index; BP = Blood pressure; CVD = Cardiovascular diseases; HDL = High-density lipoprotein; LDL = Low-density lipoprotein; LPA= Light-intensity physical activity; MET = Metabolic equivalents; MVPA = Moderate-to-vigorous physical activity; PA = Physical activity; RARs = Rest-activity rhythm; SB= sedentary behavior. WC = Waist circumference.

503 **DISCUSSION**

504 The present study systematically identified and reviewed 40 studies that utilized data-driven,
505 person-centered techniques to drive multidimensional physical behavior profiles from
506 wearable accelerometry data in a sample of adult participants. These techniques appear to be a
507 viable approach for segmenting populations into multiple distinct subgroups based on multiple
508 measures of physical behaviors. The review of derived profiles from accelerometer-monitored
509 physical behaviors revealed several hypothesis-generating, preliminary evidence about how
510 different components and/or dimensions of physical behaviors could cluster together and
511 synergistically influence health outcomes.

512 Data-driven, person-centered methods are widely used in a number of different research fields
513 [24]. In the domains related to health and medicine, these data-driven techniques have been
514 predominantly employed for examining how different risk factors in multidimensional data
515 may cluster together [24,25,72,73]. Consistent with previous research in other domains
516 [24,25,72,73], our study highlights the utility of data-driven profiling of accelerometer-
517 measured physical behaviors for addressing questions about how different components and
518 dimensions of physical behaviors cluster together, and analyzing whether and how the relative
519 similarities and dissimilarities observed across different profiles may relate to health outcomes.
520 Notably, the most commonly employed methods for physical behavior profiling were the
521 machine learning K-means clustering algorithm and latent profile analysis. These algorithms
522 originated from biostatistics and unsupervised machine learning fields [24–26]. Compared with
523 variable-centered approaches [2], these algorithms can accommodate a large number of input
524 variables without a priori hypothesis about their distribution or units [25–27,39,43,46], making
525 them an appropriate choice for investigating the health impacts of accelerometer-measured
526 physical behaviors.

527 Overall, profiles identified using data-driven, person-centered techniques based on a relatively
528 large number of accelerometer-derived descriptors of physical behaviors aligned with the well-
529 established evidence observed in studies employing variable-centered approaches. For
530 example, profiles distinguished by relatively a low PA combined with high sedentary time
531 frequently emerged in studies examining how different components of physical behaviors
532 cluster together [32,34,52,55–57,64]. Consistent with previous findings [74,75], profiles most
533 distinguished by a combination of low PA and high sedentary time were consistently found to
534 be linked with increased risks of CVD and all-cause mortality and adversely to several other
535 risk indicators [32,34,52,55–57,64].

536 Low PA profiles most distinguished by having the lowest levels of PA, were repeatedly
537 identified across studies performing physical activity profiling. These profiles emerged across
538 several sample populations from various countries and often represented one of the largest
539 participant groups among the identified profiles. Low PA profiles were repeatedly associated
540 with the poorest health outcomes or were considered the unhealthiest profiles overall [37–
541 39,59–61,65,66]. The health risks associated with insufficient PA are well-documented and
542 extensively studied previously [76]. However, current estimates based on self-reported PA
543 indicate that nearly one-third of adults worldwide do not meet the recommended levels of PA
544 [77]. Supporting these findings, data-driven PA profiles derived from multidimensional
545 accelerometer data further confirm the prevalence of low PA among adults.

546 Joint profiles identified in data-driven studies suggest that a segment of the adult population
547 may exhibit a behavioral pattern characterized by being physically active while simultaneously
548 engaging in significant amounts of sedentary behavior. Current robust evidence indicates that
549 although prolonged sedentary behavior is associated with increased risks of various chronic
550 conditions and mortality [78], high levels of PA can mitigate some of the health risks linked to

excessive sedentary time [74]. However, it remains unclear how many adults fall into the *active yet sedentary* category. Even less is known about whether the level of PA among these individuals is sufficient to offset the health risks posed by their sedentary behavior. The findings of this review highlight that *active yet sedentary* profile may be present among adults, underscoring the need for further research to better understand its prevalence and health implications within this population.

Several studies identifying PA profiles found a profile in which PA peaked at sometime during morning, day, afternoon, or evening [35,36,60–63,67–69,37,39,42,46,49,50,58,59], highlighting that, in addition to intensity of movement the timing of PA may also be important. The health implications of these profiles were mixed in terms of whether PA during a certain time of the 24-hour period is more beneficial than at other times. Although it remains unclear which time window could enhance the health benefits, this finding is consistent with the emerging evidence and further supports the hypothesis that time of day may influence the health benefits of PA [10,79].

Two studies created sedentary profiles based on how sedentary time is accumulated and interrupted, both identifying a profile distinguished by spending sedentary time in relatively longer bouts lasting 15–30 min [41,43]. Currently, it is well-established that excessive sedentary time, particularly when accumulated in uninterrupted bouts, poses a health risk [78]. However, it remains unclear at what point sedentary behavior begins to negatively impact health outcomes [80]. Sedentary profiles derived using data-driven techniques provide preliminary, hypothesis-generating evidence suggesting that limiting sedentary time to about 15–30 min may be linked to better cardiometabolic health [41,43]. This data-driven hypothesis warrants further research to explore whether similar profiles can be observed across different

574 populations and how limiting sedentary bouts to specific durations is linked to other health
575 outcomes.

576 Only a few studies have created and identified rest-activity rhythmicity or sleep profiles. Due
577 to the limited number of studies and the heterogeneity observed among them, synthesizing
578 evidence regarding the profiles derived from these studies was challenging. In general, there
579 has been a tendency to apply data-driven, person-centered techniques primarily to
580 accelerometer-determined physical behaviors during waking hours. This may be partly because
581 earlier wearable accelerometers were traditionally used to monitor physical behaviors only
582 during waking hours, with relatively recent studies adopting a 24-hour wear protocol [1,4].
583 Although evidence remains inconclusive, early findings from data-driven profiles of sleep
584 suggest that patterns of bedtime and wake-up time may be linked to mortality risk and
585 cardiometabolic health [44,58]. Studies identifying rest-activity profiles also provided some
586 support for this hypothesis indicating that earlier activity onset, compared with later activity
587 onset, may be favorably linked with depressive symptoms [51] and perceived fatiguability [54].

588 This review study has several notable strengths. An extensive literature search was conducted
589 and both prospective cohort and cross-sectional studies were included. While a previously
590 conducted systematic scoping review has described the application of latent profile analysis to
591 accelerometry data based on a total of 12 included studies [81], our study is significantly more
592 inclusive. It is the first to systematically review studies that identify physical behavior profiles
593 from wearable accelerometry data in adult participants using data-driven, person-centered
594 techniques. Multiple data-driven hypotheses were identified from the review of physical
595 behavior profiles and summarized their relationships with various health outcomes.

596 This study is not without limitations. In general, profiles derived from accelerometer-measured
597 physical behaviors in different sample populations seem to be largely dependent on the

descriptor variables used as input for profile analysis. The decisions made for cleaning and preparing accelerometer data, as well as measurement specification and accelerometer wear location, could potentially have influenced the final derived profiles within the included studies [82]. However, due to the heterogeneity in accelerometer data collection across studies, we were unable to assess the influence of such decisions and specifications on the final derived profiles. Currently, it is still unclear whether and how physical behavior profiles identified in one sample population could differ from those identified in another population independent of differences attributed to accelerometer data and data processing decisions. Although the selection of profiling algorithms employed (e.g., K-means, latent profile analysis, etc.) is likely to influence the final identified profiles [81], it remains unclear how the reported physical behavior profiles depend on the specific algorithm used.

CONCLUSIONS

Data-driven, person-centered approaches are appropriate methods for exploring the complex and potentially unknown interplay among multiple components and aspects of physical behaviors, particularly for investigating how these behaviors could cluster together and synergistically influence health outcomes and indicators. The use of data-driven techniques on wearable accelerometer-measured physical behaviors has generated several hypothesis-generating, data-driven findings that warrant further investigation. Multiple studies have identified data-driven profiles most distinguished by the temporal distribution of PA at specific times during a 24-hour period, suggesting that time of day may play a role in influencing the health benefits of PA. Joint profiles emerging in data-driven studies indicate that being physically active while simultaneously spending considerable amounts of time in sedentary behaviors may represent a profile present among the adult population. Beyond total sedentary

621 time, patterns of accumulation and interruption of sedentary time may also be linked with
622 health risks and indicators.

REFERENCES

1. Evenson KR, Scherer E, Peter KM, Cuthbertson CC, Eckman S. Historical development of accelerometry measures and methods for physical activity and sedentary behavior research worldwide: A scoping review of observational studies of adults. PLoS One. 2022;17:e0276890.

2. Migueles JH, Aadland E, Andersen LB, Brønd JC, Chastin SF, Hansen BH, et al. GRANADA consensus on analytical approaches to assess associations with accelerometer-determined physical behaviours (physical activity, sedentary behaviour and sleep) in epidemiological studies. Br J Sports Med. 2022;56:376–84.

3. Backes A, Gupta T, Schmitz S, Fagherazzi G, van Hees V, Malisoux L. Advanced analytical methods to assess physical activity behavior using accelerometer time series: A scoping review. Scand J Med Sci Sports. 2022;32:18–44.

4. Giurgiu M, von Haaren-Mack B, Fiedler J, Woll S, Burchartz A, Kolb S, et al. The wearable landscape: Issues pertaining to the validation of the measurement of 24-h physical activity, sedentary, and sleep behavior assessment. J Sport Heal Sci. 2025;14:101006.

5. Farrahi V, Rostami M. Machine learning in physical activity, sedentary, and sleep behavior research. J Act Sedentary Sleep Behav [Internet]. 2024;3:5. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1186/s44167-024-00045-9

6. Rosenberger ME, Fulton JE, Buman MP, Troiano RP, Grandner MA, Buchner DM, et al. The 24-hour activity cycle: a new paradigm for physical activity. Med Sci Sports Exerc. 2019;51:454–64.

7. Pedišić Ž, Dumuid D, S Olds T. Integrating sleep, sedentary behaviour, and physical activity research in the emerging field of time-use epidemiology: definitions, concepts, statistical methods, theoretical framework, and future directions. Kinesiology. 2017;49:252–69.

8. Pedišić Ž. Measurement issues and poor adjustments for physical activity and sleep undermine sedentary behaviour research—the focus should shift to the balance between sleep,

648 sedentary behaviour, standing and activity. Kinesiology. 2014;46:135–46.
649 9. Chastin S, Palarea-Albaladejo J, Dontje ML, Skelton DA. Combined effects of time spent in
650 physical activity, sedentary behaviors and sleep on obesity and cardio-metabolic health
651 markers: a novel compositional data analysis approach. PLoS One. 2015;10:e0139984.
652 10. Feng H, Yang L, Liang YY, Ai S, Liu Y, Liu Y, et al. Associations of timing of physical
653 activity with all-cause and cause-specific mortality in a prospective cohort study. Nat Commun.
654 2023;14.
655 11. Makarem N, German CA, Zhang Z, Diaz KM, Palta P, Duncan DT, et al. Rest-Activity
656 Rhythms Are Associated With Prevalent Cardiovascular Disease, Hypertension, Obesity, and
657 Central Adiposity in a Nationally Representative Sample of US Adults. J Am Heart Assoc.
658 2024;13:e032073.
659 12. Herold F, Zou L, Theobald P, Manser P, Falck RS, Yu Q, et al. Beyond FITT: addressing
660 density in understanding the dose–response relationships of physical activity with health—an
661 example based on brain health. Eur J Appl Physiol. 2025;
662 13. Rollo S, Antsygina O, Tremblay MS. The whole day matters: Understanding 24-hour
663 movement guideline adherence and relationships with health indicators across the lifespan. J
664 Sport Heal Sci. 2020;9:493–510.
665 14. Dumuid D, Pedišić Ž, Stanford TE, Martín-Fernández J-A, Hron K, Maher CA, et al. The
666 compositional isotemporal substitution model: a method for estimating changes in a health
667 outcome for reallocation of time between sleep, physical activity and sedentary behaviour. Stat
668 Methods Med Res. 2019;28:846–57.
669 15. Mekary RA, Willett WC, Hu FB, Ding EL. Isotemporal substitution paradigm for physical
670 activity epidemiology and weight change. Am J Epidemiol. 2009;170:519–27.
671 16. Aadland E, Kvalheim OM, Anderssen SA, Resaland GK, Andersen LB. Multicollinear
672 physical activity accelerometry data and associations to cardiometabolic health: challenges,

pitfalls, and potential solutions. Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act. 2019;16:74.

17. Goldsmith J, Zipunnikov V, Schrack J. Generalized Multilevel Function-on-Scalar Regression and Principal Component Analysis. Biometrics. 2015;71:344–53.

18. Blodgett JM, Ahmadi MN, Atkin AJ, Chastin S, Chan H-W, Suorsa K, et al. Device-measured physical activity and cardiometabolic health: the Prospective Physical Activity, Sitting, and Sleep (ProPASS) consortium. Eur Heart J. 2024;45:458–71.

19. Farrahi V, Rostami M, Nauha L, Korpisaari M, Niemelä M, Jämsä T, et al. Replacing sedentary time with physical activity and sleep: Associations with cardiometabolic health markers in adults. Scand J Med Sci Sports. 2023;33:907–20.

20. Leviäkangas A, Korpelainen R, Pinola P, Fridolfsson J, Nauha L, Jämsä T, et al. Associations of accelerometer-estimated free-living daily activity impact intensities with 10-year probability of osteoporotic fractures in adults. Gait Posture. 2024;112:22–32.

21. Niemelä M, Kiviniemi A, Ikäheimo TM, Tulppo M, Korpelainen R, Jämsä T, et al. Compositional association of 24-hour movement behavior with incident major adverse cardiac events and all-cause mortality. Scand J Med Sci Sports. 2023;33:641–50.

22. Seppänen M, Lankila T, Niemelä M, Rautio N, Korpisaari M, Timonen M, et al. Compositional associations of 24-h physical activities, sedentary time and sleep with depressive symptoms in urban and rural residents: a cross-sectional study. BMC Med. 2025;23.

23. Howard MC, Hoffman ME. Variable-Centered, Person-Centered, and Person-Specific Approaches: Where Theory Meets the Method. Organ Res Methods. 2017;21:846–76.

24. Woo SE, Hofmans J, Wille B, Tay L. Person-Centered Modeling: Techniques for Studying Associations Between People Rather than Variables. Annu Rev Organ Psychol Organ Behav. 2024;11:453–80.

25. Liu P, Wang Z, Liu N, Peres MA. A scoping review of the clinical application of machine learning in data-driven population segmentation analysis. J Am Med Informatics Assoc.

2023;30:1573–82.

26. Weller BE, Bowen NK, Faubert SJ. Latent Class Analysis: A Guide to Best Practice. J Black Psychol. 2020;46:287–311.

27. Kebede M, Howard AG, Ren Y, Anuskiewicz B, Di C, Troester MA, et al. A systematic scoping review of latent class analysis applied to accelerometry-assessed physical activity and sedentary behavior. PLoS One. 2024;19:e0283884.

28. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ. 2021. p. n71.

29. Wells GA, Shea B, O'Connell D, Peterson J, Welch V, Losos M, et al. The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for assessing the quality of nonrandomised studies in meta-analyses. 2000;

30. Montoye AHK, Moore RW, Bowles HR, Korycinski R, Pfeiffer KA. Reporting accelerometer methods in physical activity intervention studies: a systematic review and recommendations for authors. Br J Sport Med. 2018;52:1507–16.

31. Pedišić Ž, Bauman A. Accelerometer-based measures in physical activity surveillance: current practices and issues. Br J Sports Med. 2015;49:219–23.

32. Choi J, Park J, Choi J-Y, Lee T, Jeon G, Cho S. The Patterns of Physical Activity Using Latent Profile Analysis Applied to Accelerometry and Associated Sociodemographic and Health Factors Among Older Adults in Korea. J Aging Phys Act. 2025;1–11.

33. Gupta N, Hallman DM, Korshøj M, Rasmussen CL, Holtermann A. From Single Movement Behaviors to Complete 24-h Behaviors Profiles and Multiple Health Outcomes—A Cross-Sectional Study Using Accelerometry. Scand J Med Sci Sports. 2025;35:e70060.

34. Farrahi V, Collings PJ, Oussalah M. Deep learning of movement behavior profiles and their association with markers of cardiometabolic health. BMC Med Inform Decis Mak. 2024;24:74.

35. Leskinen T, Lima Passos V, Dagnelie PC, Savelberg HHCM, De Galan BE, Eussen SJPM,

723 et al. Daily Physical Activity Patterns and Their Associations with Cardiometabolic
724 Biomarkers: The Maastricht Study. Med Sci Sport Exerc. 2023;55:837–46.
725 36. Ma T, Bennett T, Lee C-D, Wicklow M. The diurnal pattern of moderate-to-vigorous
726 physical activity and obesity: a cross-sectional analysis. Obesity. 2023;31:2638–47.
727 37. Biswas A, Chen C, Prince SA, Smith PM, Mustard CA. Daily accelerometer-measured
728 physical activity patterns and associations with cardiometabolic health among Canadian
729 working adults. Heal reports. 2023;34:15–29.
730 38. Yamamoto N, Maruyama K, Saito I, Tomooka K, Tanigawa T, Kawamura R, et al. Latent
731 profile analysis approach to the relationship between daily ambulatory activity patterns and
732 metabolic syndrome in middle-aged and elderly Japanese individuals: The Toon Health Study.
733 Environ Health Prev Med. 2023;28:57.
734 39. Biswas A, Chen C, Prince SA, Smith PM, Mustard CA. Workers' Activity Profiles
735 Associated With Predicted 10-Year Cardiovascular Disease Risk. J Am Heart Assoc.
736 2022;11:e025148.
737 40. Farrahi V, Rostami M, Dumuid D, Chastin SFM, Niemelä M, Korpelainen R, et al. Joint
738 Profiles of Sedentary Time and Physical Activity in Adults and their Associations with
739 Cardiometabolic Health. Med Sci Sport Exerc. 2022;54:2118–28.
740 41. Hibbing PR, Bellettiere J, Carlson JA. Sedentary Profiles: A New Perspective on
741 Accumulation Patterns in Sedentary Behavior. Med Sci Sports Exerc. 2022;54:696–706.
742 42. Aqeel M, Guo J, Lin L, Gelfand S, Delp E, Bhadra A, et al. Temporal physical activity
743 patterns are associated with obesity in U.S. adults. Prev Med (Baltim). 2021;148:106538.
744 43. Farrahi V, Kangas M, Kiviniemi A, Puukka K, Korpelainen R, Jämsä T. Accumulation
745 patterns of sedentary time and breaks and their association with cardiometabolic health markers
746 in adults. Scand J Med Sci Sports. 2021;31:1489–507.
747 44. Matricciani L, Paquet C, Fraysse F, Grobler A, Wang Y, Baur L, et al. Sleep and

748 cardiometabolic risk: a cluster analysis of actigraphy-derived sleep profiles in adults and
749 children. Sleep. 2021;44:zsab014.
750 45. Gupta N, Hallman DM, Dumuid D, Vij A, Rasmussen CL, Jørgensen MB, et al. Movement
751 behavior profiles and obesity: a latent profile analysis of 24-h time-use composition among
752 Danish workers. Int J Obes. 2020;44:409–17.
753 46. Niemelä M, Kangas M, Farrahi V, Kiviniemi A, Leinonen A-M, Ahola R, et al. Intensity
754 and temporal patterns of physical activity and cardiovascular disease risk in midlife. Prev Med
755 (Baltim). 2019;124:33–41.
756 47. Marschollek M. Associations between sensor-based physical activity behaviour features
757 and health-related parameters. Hum Mov Sci. 2016;45:1–6.
758 48. Lee PH, Yu Y-Y, McDowell I, Leung GM, Lam TH. A cluster analysis of patterns of
759 objectively measured physical activity in Hong Kong. Public Health Nutr. 2013;16:1436–44.
760 49. Fukuoka Y, Zhou M, Vittinghoff E, Haskell W, Goldberg K, Aswani A. Objectively
761 measured baseline physical activity patterns in women in the mPED trial: cluster analysis.
762 JMIR public Heal Surveill. 2018;4:e10.
763 50. Nawrin SS, Inada H, Momma H, Nagatomi R. Twenty-four-hour physical activity patterns
764 associated with depressive symptoms: a cross-sectional study using big data-machine learning
765 approach. BMC Public Health. 2024;24:1254.
766 51. Smagula SF, Zhang G, Gujral S, Covassin N, Li J, Taylor WD, et al. Association of 24-
767 Hour Activity Pattern Phenotypes With Depression Symptoms and Cognitive Performance in
768 Aging. JAMA Psychiatry. 2022;79:1023–31.
769 52. O'Regan A, Hannigan A, Glynn L, Garcia Bengoechea E, Donnelly A, Hayes G, et al. A
770 cluster analysis of device-measured physical activity behaviours and the association with
771 chronic conditions, multi-morbidity and healthcare utilisation in adults aged 45 years and older.
772 Prev Med Reports. 2021;24:101641.

773 53. Palmberg L, Löppönen A, Hyvärinen M, Portegijs E, Rantanen T, Rantalainen T, et al.
774 Physical Behavior Profiles Among Older Adults and Their Associations With Physical
775 Capacity and Life-Space Mobility. J Aging Phys Act. 2024;32:472–9.
776 54. Graves JL, Qiao YS, Moored KD, Boudreau RM, Venditti EM, Krafty RT, et al. Profiles
777 of Accelerometry-Derived Physical Activity Are Related to Perceived Physical Fatigability in
778 Older Adults. Sensors. 2021;21:1718.
779 55. Full KM, Moran K, Carlson J, Godbole S, Natarajan L, Hipp A, et al. Latent profile analysis
780 of accelerometer-measured sleep, physical activity, and sedentary time and differences in
781 health characteristics in adult women. PLoS One. 2019;14:e0218595.
782 56. Paolillo EW, Lee SY, VandeBunte A, Saloner R, Gaynor LS, Djukic N, et al. Data-driven
783 physical actigraphy patterns relate to cognitive and vascular health in older adults. Exp
784 Gerontol. 2023;178:112231.
785 57. Yerramalla MS, Chen M, Dugravot A, van Hees VT, Sabia S. Association between profiles
786 of accelerometer-measured daily movement behaviour and mortality risk: a prospective cohort
787 study of British older adults. BMJ Open Sport Exerc Med. 2024;10.
788 58. Zhang Y, Kivimäki M, Carrillo-Larco RM, Cheng Y, Zhou Y, Wang H, et al. Diurnal
789 patterns of accelerometer-measured physical activity and sleep and risk of all-cause mortality:
790 a follow-up of the National Health and Nutrition Examination Surveys (NHANES). Int J Behav
791 Nutr Phys Act. 2024;21.
792 59. Bai P, Ning X, Gao R, Shao X, Zhou S, Li J, et al. Association between circadian physical
793 activity patterns and cancer incidence through regulation of inflammation: A UK biobank
794 study. Prev Med (Baltim). 2024;179:107831.
795 60. Bai P, Shao X, Chen L, Zhou S, Lin Y, Liu H, et al. Association between circadian physical
796 activity trajectories and incident type 2 diabetes in the UK Biobank. Sci Rep. 2024;14:6459.
797 61. Bai P, Zhou S, Shao X, Lin Y, Liu H, Yu P. Ideal 24-h physical activity trajectory reduces

798 all-cause, cause-specific mortality and cardiovascular outcomes through aging deceleration and
799 inflammation regulation: A UK biobank study. Int J Cardiol. 2024;399:131770.
800 62. Fabrizio C, Julien V, Pedro M-V, Vanessa K. Associations Between Physical Activity
801 Patterns and Cardiovascular Events and Risk Factors. JACC Adv. 2024;3:101324.
802 63. Shim J, Fleisch E, Barata F. Wearable-based accelerometer activity profile as digital
803 biomarker of inflammation, biological age, and mortality using hierarchical clustering analysis
804 in NHANES 2011–2014. Sci Rep. 2023;13:9326.
805 64. von Rosen P, Dohrn I-M, Hagströmer M. Latent profiles analysis of physical activity and
806 sedentary behaviour with mortality risk: a 15-year follow-up. Scand J Med Sci Sports.
807 2020;30:1949–56.
808 65. Evenson KR, Herring AH, Wen F. Accelerometry-Assessed Latent Class Patterns of
809 Physical Activity and Sedentary Behavior With Mortality. Am J Prev Med. 2017;52:135–43.
810 66. Yamamoto N, Maruyama K, Saito I, Tomooka K, Tanigawa T, Kawamura R, et al. Patterns
811 of daily ambulatory activity and the onset of metabolic syndrome in middle-aged and older
812 Japanese women: the Toon Health Study. Environ Health Prev Med. 2025;30:11.
813 67. Albalak G, Stijntjes M, van Bodegom D, Jukema JW, Atsma DE, van Heemst D, et al.
814 Setting your clock: associations between timing of objective physical activity and
815 cardiovascular disease risk in the general population. Eur J Prev Cardiol. 2023;30:232–40.
816 68. Feng Q, Albalak G, van Dijk KW, van der Velde JHPM, Xiao Q, Noordam R, et al.
817 Accelerometer-measured chronoactivity and type 2 diabetes risk: A prospective study in UK
818 Biobank participants. Prev Med (Baltim). 2025;197:108312.
819 69. Li X, Zeng J, Chen B, Fan M, Wang J, Wei L, et al. Effects of the Timing of Intense
820 Physical Activity on Hypertension Risk in a General Population: A UK-Biobank Study. Curr
821 Hypertens Rep. 2024;26:81–90.
822 70. Reuter C, Bellettiere J, Liles S, Di C, Sears DD, LaMonte MJ, et al. Diurnal patterns of

823 sedentary behavior and changes in physical function over time among older women: a
824 prospective cohort study. Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act. 2020;17:88.
825 71. Chung J, Goodman MO, Huang T, Castro-Diehl C, Chen JT, Sofer T, et al. Objectively
826 regular sleep patterns and mortality in a prospective cohort: The Multi-Ethnic Study of
827 Atherosclerosis. J Sleep Res. 2024;33:e14048.
828 72. Kang J, Ciecierski CC, Malin EL, Carroll AJ, Gidea M, Craft LL, et al. A latent class
829 analysis of cancer risk behaviors among U.S. college students. Prev Med (Baltim).
830 2014;64:121–5.
831 73. Hafkamp F, Dekker L, Tio R, van Veghel D, Hartman M, Vinck T, et al. Characterizing
832 High Risk Patients in Heart Failure: A Latent Class Analysis of Rehospitalization and
833 Mortality. J Cardiovasc Nurs. 9900;
834 74. Ekelund U, Steene-Johannessen J, Brown WJ, Fagerland MW, Owen N, Powell KE, et al.
835 Does physical activity attenuate, or even eliminate, the detrimental association of sitting time
836 with mortality? a harmonised meta-analysis of data from more than 1 million men and women.
837 Lancet. 2016;388:1302–10.
838 75. Stamatakis E, Gale J, Bauman A, Ekelund U, Hamer M, Ding D. Sitting time, physical
839 activity, and risk of mortality in adults. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2019;73:2062–72.
840 76. Lee I-M, Shiroma EJ, Lobelo F, Puska P, Blair SN, Katzmarzyk PT. Effect of physical
841 inactivity on major non-communicable diseases worldwide: an analysis of burden of disease
842 and life expectancy. Lancet. 2012;380:219–29.
843 77. Strain T, Flaxman S, Guthold R, Semenova E, Cowan M, Riley LM, et al. National,
844 regional, and global trends in insufficient physical activity among adults from 2000 to 2022: a
845 pooled analysis of 507 population-based surveys with 5.7 million participants. Lancet Glob
846 Heal. 2024;12:e1232–43.
847 78. Biswas A, Oh PI, Faulkner GE, Bajaj RR, Silver MA, Mitchell MS, et al. Sedentary time

848 and its association with risk for disease incidence, mortality, and hospitalization in adults: a
849 systematic review and meta-analysis. Ann Intern Med. 2015;162:123–32.
850 79. Keiser T, Katz S, Robson SM, Greaney JL, Healy S, Malone SK, et al. Association between
851 time-of-day for eating, exercise, and sleep with blood pressure in adults with elevated blood
852 pressure or hypertension: a systematic review. J Hypertens. 2024;42:95.
853 80. Chastin S, Egerton T, Leask C, Stamatakis E. Meta-analysis of the relationship between
854 breaks in sedentary behavior and cardiometabolic health. Obesity. 2015;23:1800–10.
855 81. Brusco MJ, Shireman E, Steinley D. A comparison of latent class, K-means, and K-median
856 methods for clustering dichotomous data. Psychol Methods. 2017;22:563–80.
857 82. Migueles JH, Cadenas-Sanchez C, Ekelund U, Nyström CD, Mora-Gonzalez J, Löf M, et
858 al. Accelerometer data collection and processing criteria to assess physical activity and other
859 outcomes: a systematic review and practical considerations. Sport Med. 2017;47:1821–45.
860

Search term

1. **Pubmed**

("clustering"[Title/Abstract] OR "cluster analysis"[Title/Abstract] OR "profile analysis"[Title/Abstract] OR "data driven"[Title/Abstract] OR "data-driven"[Title/Abstract] OR "person centered"[Title/Abstract] OR "unsupervised"[Title/Abstract])
AND
("sedentary behavior"[Title/Abstract] OR "sedentary behaviour"[Title/Abstract] OR "physical activity"[Title/Abstract] OR "physical activities"[Title/Abstract] OR "sleep"[Title/Abstract] OR "movement behavior"[Title/Abstract] OR "movement behaviour"[Title/Abstract] OR "sleep"[Title/Abstract] OR "activity behavior"[Title/Abstract] OR "activity behaviour"[Title/Abstract] OR "accelerometer"[Title/Abstract] OR "accelerometry"[Title/Abstract] OR "activity monitor"[Title/Abstract])

2. **Web of Science**

("clustering" OR "cluster analysis" OR "profile analysis" OR "data driven" OR "data-driven" OR "person centered" OR "unsupervised")
AND
("sedentary behavior" OR "sedentary behaviour" OR "physical activity" OR "physical activities" OR “sleep” OR "movement behavior" OR "movement behaviour" OR "sleep" OR "activity behavior" OR "activity behaviour" OR "accelerometer" OR “accelerometry” OR "activity monitor")

3. **Scopus**

("clustering" OR "cluster analysis" OR "profile analysis" OR "data driven" OR "data-driven" OR "person centered" OR "unsupervised")
AND
("sedentary behavior" OR "sedentary behaviour" OR "physical activity" OR "physical activities" OR “sleep” OR "movement behavior" OR "movement behaviour" OR "sleep" OR "activity behavior" OR "activity behaviour" OR "accelerometer" OR “accelerometry” OR "activity monitor")

Table S1: Device type and details of accelerometer measurement and data processing criteria used in 39 included studies in the review.

Study (first author, year)	Device	Uniaxial or triaxial	Unit of measurement	Device placement	Days monitored	Measurement period	Number of valid days	Valid hours
Yerramalla (2024) [57]	GENEActiv	Triaxial	Raw acceleration	Non-dominant wrist	9 days	24-hour	At least 2 weekdays and 2 weekend days	Wear time ≥2/3 of the waking period
Zhang (2024) [58]	ActiGraph GT3X+	Triaxial	Raw acceleration	Non-dominant wrist	7 days	24-hour	4 days or more	10 hours or more
Bai (2024) [61]	Axivity AX3	Triaxial	Raw acceleration	Dominant wrist	7 days	24-hour	NR	NR
Fabrizio (2024) [62]	GENEActiv	Triaxial	Raw acceleration	Wrist	14 days	24-hour	NR	NR
Chung (2024) [71]	Actiwatch Spectrum	NR	NR	Wrist	7 days	NR	NR	Valid nights were considered with no more than an hour of "off time"
Shim (2023) [63]	ActiGraph GT3X+	Triaxial	Raw acceleration	Non-dominant wrist	7 days	24-hour	At least 4 days	16 hour or more
Rosen (2020) [64]	ActiGraph AM7164	Uniaxial	CPM	Lower back	7 days	Awake	At least 1 day	10 hours or more
Evenson (2017) [65]	ActiGraph AM7164	Uniaxial	CPM	Hip	7 days	Awake	3 days or more	8 hours or more
Yamamoto (2025) [66]	Lifecorder-Ex	Uniaxial	NR	NR	7 days	Awake	4 days or more	8 hours or more
Albalak (2023) [67]	Axivity AX3	Triaxial	Raw acceleration	Dominant wrist	7 days	24-hour	Minimum of three days	NR
Bai (2024) [59]	Axivity AX3	Triaxial	Raw acceleration	Dominant wrist	7 days	24-hour	NR	NR

Feng (2025) [68]	Axivity AX3	Triaxial	Raw acceleration	Dominant wrist	7 days	24-hour	NR	NR
Bai (2024) [60]	Axivity AX3	Triaxial	Raw acceleration	Dominant wrist	7 days	24-hour	NR	NR
Li (2024) [69]	Axivity AX3	Triaxial	Raw acceleration	Dominant wrist	7 days	24-hour	Minimum of 72 hours of data	NR
Reuter (2020) [70]	ActiGraph GT3X+	Triaxial	Raw acceleration	Hip	7 days	24-hour	At least four days	10 hours or more
Choi (2025) [32]	ActiGraph GT3X+	Triaxial	Raw acceleration	NR	7 days	Awake	3 days or more	10 hours or more
Gupta (2025) [33]	ActiGraph GT3X+	Triaxial	Raw acceleration	Right thigh	4 consecutive days including 2 working days	24-hour	At least one valid day	At least 4 hours or 75% of the wearer's average wok and leisure time.
Farrahi (2024) [34]	ActiGraph AM7164	Uniaxial	CPM	Hip	7 days	Awake	4 days or more	10 hours or more
Leskinen (2023) [35]	activPAL3	Triaxial	Raw acceleration	Right thigh	7 days	24-hour	At least 4 days including one weekend day	Over 10 hours
Ma (2023) [36]	ActiGraph AM7164	Uniaxial	CPM	Hip	4 days	Awake	At least 4 days	10 hours or more
Biswas (2023) [37]	Actical	NR	CPM	Right hip	7 days	Awake	4 days or more	10 hours or more
Yamamoto (2023) [38]	Lifecorder-Ex	Uniaxial	NR	NR	7 days	Awake	4 days or more	8 hours or more
Biswas (2022) [39]	Actical	NR	CPM	Right hip	7 days	Awake	4 days or more	10 hours or more
Farrahi (2022) [40]	Hookie	Triaxial	Raw acceleration	Hip	14 days	Awake	7 consecutive days	10 hours or more

Hibbing (2022) [41]	ActiGraph AM7164	Uniaxial	CPM	Hip	7 days	Awake	4 days or more	More than 10 hours
Aqeel (2021) [42]	ActiGraph AM7164	Uniaxial	CPM	Hip	7 days	Awake	One random day from all valid days	10 hours
Farrahi (2021) [43]	Hookie	Triaxial	Raw acceleration	Hip	14 days	Awake	7 consecutive days	10 hours or more
Matricciani (2021) [44]	GENEActiv	Triaxial	Raw acceleration	Wrist	NR	NR	At least four nights of sleep	Sleep time >200 min and at least one night on Fri-Sat
Gupta (2020) [45]	ActiGraph GT3X+	Triaxial	Raw acceleration	Right thigh	4 consecutive days including 2 working days	24-hour	At least one valid day	At least 4 hours or 75% of the wearer's average wok and leisure time.
Niemelä (2019) [46]	Polar Active	Uniaxial	MET values	Wrist	14 days	24-hour	7 consecutive days	10 hours or more
Marschollek (2016) [47]	ActiGraph AM7164	Uniaxial	CPM	Hip	7 days	Awake	NR	NR
Lee (2013) [48]	ActiGraph AM7164	Uniaxial	CPM	Hip	4 days	Awake	4 days	At least 12 hours
Fukuoka (2018) [49]	Active Style Pro	Triaxial	Raw acceleration	Hip	7 days	Awake	All 7 days	At least 8 hours
Nawrin (2024) [50]	ActiGraph GT3X+	Triaxial	Raw acceleration	Wrist	7 days	24-hour	7 days	NR
Smagula (2022) [51]	ActiGraph GT3X+	Triaxial	Raw acceleration	Non-dominant wrist	7 days	24-hour	NR	NR
O'Regan (2021) [52]	ActivPAL 3	Triaxial	Raw acceleration	Right thigh	8 days	24-hour	At least 3 weekdays and 1 weekend	10 hours or more

Palmberg (2024) [53]	UKK RM42	Triaxial	Raw acceleration	Dominant thigh	3-10 days	24-hour	At least 3 complete days	Complete days with no non-wear
Graves (2021) [54]	ActiGraph GT3X+	Triaxial	Raw acceleration	Non-dominant wrist	7 days	24-hour	Minimum of 3 days	At least 10 hours
Full (2019) [55]*	Actigraph GT3X+	Triaxial	Raw acceleration	Two devices worn concurrently on hip and wrist	7 days	Hip (Awake) Wrist (24-hour)	Hip worn device: 5 days Wrist worn device: NR	Hip worn device: At least 10 hours Wrist worn device: NR
Paolillo (2023) [56]	Fitbit Flex 2	Triaxial	Proprietary	NR	30 continuous days	24-hour	NR	NR

*The hip-worn device was used to measure physical activity during waking hours, while the wrist-worn device was worn continuously for 24 hours and used to obtain sleep parameters. Abbreviations: NR = Not reported; CPM = Counts per minute;

Adapted quality assessment scale used in this study was based on the combination of items from Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessment Scale Cohort Studies [29] and recommendations by Montoye et al. [30] for reporting accelerometer methods.
Four items were selection from Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessment Scale for Cohort Studies [29] and recommendations by Montoye et al. [30] for reporting accelerometer methods. A study can be awarded a maximum of one point for each numbered item within the Selection, Outcome, and Accelerometer information, data processing and interpretation categories. If any of the categories marked with * is selected, the point given to the study for that item is 1.

Selection

1) Representativeness of the exposed cohort
   a) truly representative *
   b) somewhat representative *
   c) selected group of users eg nurses, volunteers
   d) no description of the derivation of the cohort

2) Ascertainment of exposure
   a) secure record (eg surgical records) *
   b) structured interview *
   c) written self-report
   d) no description

3) Demonstration that outcome of interest was not present at start of study (not applicable for cross-sectional studies)
   a) yes *
   b) no

Outcome

4) Assessment of outcome
   a) independent blind assessment *
   b) record linkage *
   c) self report
   d) no description

Accelerometer information, data processing and interpretation

5) Brand of accelerometer used is specified.
   a. yes *
   b. no
6) Model of accelerometer is specified.
   a. yes *
   b. no
7) Placement of accelerometer is specified.
   a. yes *
   b. no

8) Days of protocol is specified.
    a. yes *
    b. no
9) Non-wear criteria is described.
    a. yes *
    b. no
10) Hours/minutes needed to be considered a valid day is specified.
    a. yes *
    b. no
11) Number of valid days needed is specified.
    a. yes *
    b. no
12) Metrics and meaning of metrics derived from accelerometer signal are clearly specified.
    a. yes *
    b. no

Table S2: Assessment of bias according to items adapted from Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessment Scale for Cohort Studies [29] and recommendations by Montoye et al [30].

	Selection			**Outcome**	**Accelerometer information, data processing and interpretation**								
Study, first author (year)	**1**	**2**	**3***	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	**Score**
Prospective studies (n = 14)													
Yerramalla (2024) [57]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	12▲
Zhang (2024) [58]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	12▲
Bai (2024) [61]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	8▪
Fabrizio (2024) [62]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	12▲
Chung (2024) [71]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	9▪
Shim (2023) [63]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	12▲
Rosen (2020) [64]	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11▲
Evenson (2017) [65]	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11▲
Yamamoto (2025) [66]	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	9▪
Albalak (2023) [67]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	11▲
Bai (2024) [59]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	10▲
Feng (2025) [68]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	10▲
Bai (2024) [60]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	10▲
Li (2024) [69]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	11▲
Reuter (2020) [70]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	11▲
Cross-sectional studies (n = 25)													
Choi (2025) [32]	0	1	-	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	9▲

Gupta (2025) [33]	0	1	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11▲
Farrahi (2024) [34]	1	1	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11▲
Leskinen (2023) [35]	1	1	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11▲
Ma (2023) [36]	1	1	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11▲
Biswas (2023) [37]	1	1	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11▲
Yamamoto (2023) [38]	1	1	-	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	10▲
Biswas (2022) [39]	1	1	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11▲
Farrahi (2022) [40]	1	1	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11▲
Hibbing (2022) [41]	1	1	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11▲
Aqeel (2021) [42]	1	1	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11▲
Farrahi (2021) [43]	1	1	-	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	9▲
Matricciani (2021) [44]	1	1	-	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	8▪
Gupta (2020) [45]	1	1	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11▲
Niemelä (2019) [46]	1	1	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11▲
Marschollek (2016) [47]	1	1	-	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	7▪
Lee (2013) [48]	1	1	-	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10▲
Fukuoka (2018) [49]	0	1	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10▲
Nawrin (2024) [50]	1	1	-	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	9▲
Smagula (2022) [51]	1	1	-	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	8▪

O'Regan (2021) [52]	0	1	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10▲
Palmberg (2024) [53]	0	1	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10▲
Graves (2021) [54]	0	1	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10▲
Full (2019) [55]	0	1	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	8▪
Paolillo (2023) [56]	0	1	-	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	6▪

The 12 criteria used for assessment of bias are shown. The maximum number of points that prospective studies can get is 12. The maximum number of points that prospective studies can get is 11. *Only for prospective studies. ▪, moderate quality; ▲, high quality.