

- 1 **Title:** Minimum Wear Duration for the activPAL™ Professional Activity Monitor in Adolescent
- 2 Females.
- 3 **Running Head:** Minimum activPAL Wear Time
- 4 **Competing Interests:** The authors declare no conflict of interest.

5 **Abstract:**

6 **Objectives:** This study aims to determine the minimum number of days of monitoring required to reliably predict  
7 sitting/lying time, standing time, light intensity physical activity (LIPA), moderate-to-vigorous intensity physical  
8 activity (MVPA) and steps in adolescent females.

9 **Methods:** 195 adolescent females (mean age=15.7 years; SD=0.9) participated in the study. Participants wore the  
10 activPAL activity monitor for a seven day protocol. The amount of time spent sitting/lying, standing, in LIPA and  
11 in MVPA and the number of steps per day were quantified. Spearman-Brown Prophecy formulae were used to  
12 predict the number of days of data required to achieve an intraclass correlation coefficient of both 0.7 and 0.8.

13 **Results:** For the percentage of the waking day spent sitting/lying, standing, in LIPA and in MVPA, a minimum of 9  
14 days of accelerometer recording is required to achieve a reliability of  $\geq 0.7$ , while a minimum of 15 days is required  
15 to achieve a reliability of  $\geq 0.8$ . For steps, a minimum of 12 days of recording is required to achieve a reliability of  
16  $\geq 0.7$ , with 21 days to achieve a reliability of  $\geq 0.8$ .

17 **Conclusion:** Future research in adolescent females should collect a minimum of 9 days of accelerometer data to  
18 reliably estimate sitting/lying time, standing time, LIPA and MVPA, while 12 days is required to reliably estimate  
19 steps.

20 **Keywords:** activPAL, Minimum, Adolescent, Wear Time, Physical Activity, Sedentary Behaviour.

21 **Introduction:**

22 The elimination of physical inactivity has the potential to reduce the incidence of major non-  
23 communicable diseases by 6-10% (12). Increasing the prevalence of individuals achieving the  
24 recommended daily amount of moderate-to-vigorous physical activity (MVPA) is a key behaviour to  
25 target when addressing the prevalence of non-communicable disease (12). Furthermore, evidence has  
26 accumulated on the deleterious effects of sedentary behaviours (SB) on health outcomes (23).  
27 Consequently, reducing the amount of time spent sedentary is becoming an increasingly important  
28 component of public health recommendation development globally (24).

29 Accurate and reliable measures of physical behaviours (including sitting/lying time (SLT), standing  
30 time (StT), light intensity physical activity (LIPA) and MVPA) in free-living environments are  
31 essential when identifying associations between specific physical behaviours and health outcomes,  
32 identifying determinants that may influence participation in physical behaviours, informing  
33 interventions that target specific physical behaviours, and evaluating the effectiveness of interventions  
34 and improving public health surveillance (28). The selection of which measure to employ is often a  
35 trade-off between feasibility and validity in field-based research (26, 30). Reviews of the literature  
36 have highlighted the advantages and disadvantages of a wide range of field-based measures of  
37 physical activity (PA) and SB (26, 30, 31). These reviews suggest that motion sensors, such as  
38 accelerometers, are currently the measure of choice (26, 31).

39 Free-living activity behaviours across given monitoring periods are characterised by large amounts of  
40 inter-individual and intra-individual variability (15), which can significantly impact measurement  
41 reliability. Reliability is a prerequisite to validity and the reliability of a device must be determined to  
42 ensure valid estimates of free-living physical behaviours (3). By determining the inter- and intra-  
43 individual variability across days of measurement, researchers can define the number of days of  
44 monitoring required to reliably estimate such behaviours. The minimum number of days required to  
45 assess PA and SB with a suitable level of reliability vary substantially across age, population and  
46 accelerometer (27). In young children, highly variable findings have been observed, with research  
47 suggesting that between 2-7 days of accelerometer wear time provide a reliable estimate of total PA

48 and SB (1, 9). There is also debate in relation to the necessity of the inclusion of weekend data for the  
49 reliable estimation of typical activity in young children (8, 18). In adults, it has been recommended  
50 that a minimum of seven consecutive days of accelerometry wear time is required for a reliable  
51 estimate of time spent inactive and in MVPA (13), while any 3 days of measurement is appropriate  
52 for examining steps per day (29).

53 When establishing the minimum number of days required to reliably estimate sedentary time,  
54 researchers have historically relied on devices that require count-to-activity thresholds to estimate  
55 sedentariness. A count-to-activity threshold is a threshold that relates arbitrary accelerometer count  
56 values to an estimate of energy expenditure. The most typical sedentary threshold utilised is that for  
57 the ActiGraph, whereby <100 accelerometers counts per minute signifies sedentary time. The use of  
58 sedentary thresholds relies on the lack of ambulation to estimate SB rather than examining the  
59 postural allocation of the individual (11, 17). Such estimates may under/over-estimate sedentary time  
60 due to the inclusion of standing or low ambulatory activities (11, 17). Device developments have  
61 enabled the examination of postural allocation to accurately distinguish between SLT and StT, and  
62 have been encouraged over count-to-activity thresholds (17). One such device, the activPAL™ (PAL  
63 Technologies Ltd, Glasgow, UK), has previously been identified as a valid measure of SLT in  
64 children (19) and adults (11) and as a measure of MVPA in adolescent females (6).

65 To the author's knowledge, the minimum number of days of monitoring required when examining  
66 free-living SLT, StT, LIPA, MVPA and steps when using the activPAL in an adolescent population  
67 has not been defined. The purpose of this study was to determine the number of days of activPAL  
68 monitoring required to reliably estimate SLT, StT, LIPA, MVPA and steps in an adolescent female  
69 sample.

70 **Methods:**

71 Data were collected from a cross-sectional sample of students from 13 schools in the mid-western  
72 region of Ireland between 2009 and 2011. Participants were randomly selected from all 13-18 year old  
73 female students in each school. To be eligible for inclusion, participants were required to have no  
74 injuries or illnesses which impact their participation in PA. Written informed participant and parental  
75 consent were obtained prior to data collection. All procedures were reviewed and approved by the  
76 researchers institute research ethics committee. Data collection on all participants was completed  
77 during school term, meaning all data on weekdays presented were schooldays.

78 Objective examination of physical behaviours over a seven day period was obtained using the  
79 activPAL. The activPAL is a thigh mounted accelerometer-based activity monitor, measuring  
80 53×35×7mm and weighing 20g. The activPAL samples at 10 Hz and measures bodily accelerations  
81 using a uni-axial accelerometer (5). The monitor provides information on whether the wearer is in a  
82 sitting/lying position, standing position or if the wearer is stepping, while activity counts and step  
83 counts are also provided. The monitor communicates with a Windows (Microsoft Corporation, One  
84 Microsoft Way, Redmond, WA, USA) compatible PC via a USB interface. All monitors were  
85 initialised on the morning of distribution to each participant. The activPAL was worn on the midpoint  
86 of the anterior aspect of the right thigh and was attached to the skin using a hydro-gel adhesive pad  
87 (PALstickie™). Monitors were distributed to the participants by the investigators, while every student  
88 was provided with detailed instructions on how the monitor was to be worn. Participants were then  
89 asked to attach the device as instructed. Finally, investigators examined the location of attachment to  
90 ensure that the monitor was worn appropriately. Participants were instructed to wear the device at all  
91 times (24 hour wear protocol), and to only remove the device when bathing or for water-based  
92 activities. Participants were supplied with extra PALstickie™ to reapply the device if it was removed.  
93 The device was worn for a seven day wear protocol. At the end of data collection, the devices were  
94 collected by investigators, and the activPAL data was downloaded to the same PC via USB interface.  
95 Prior to detailed examination of accelerometer data, all activPAL output was visually inspected using  
96 the activPAL software to identify potential erroneous data from monitor malfunction, prolonged

97 periods of non-wear time and to identify the earliest and latest time the monitor registered movement  
98 over a typical 24 hour measurement period. To determine the number of valid days of accelerometry  
99 required to reliably estimate SLT, StT, LIPA and MVPA, a criteria for a valid measurement day was  
100 defined. A valid measurement day was classified as a day with <4 hours of non-wear time during  
101 waking hours (defined below) (5). Non-wear time was defined as a period with  $\geq 60$  minutes of  
102 consecutive zero activity counts (25). The non-wear periods for each day were summed, and all  
103 measurement days with  $\geq 4$  hours of non-wear time during waking hours were removed from this  
104 analysis. For all remaining participants, the daily non-wear time was summed, and the non-wear time  
105 was subtracted from both the waking day time and the sitting/lying time to ensure that only wear  
106 periods were included for analysis.

107 All components of PA and SB were presented as a percentage of waking hours (5). The amount of  
108 waking time was calculated as waking hours = bed time - rise time. To estimate the number of bed  
109 hours, the first registered non-sedentary epoch after 7:00 a.m. was identified as rise time. This time  
110 was chosen as no participant was identified to have risen from bed prior to 7:00 a.m. during visual  
111 inspection of the data. The last registered non-sedentary epoch, which was followed by an  
112 uninterrupted sedentary period (>2 hours), was identified as the time the participants went to bed (5).

113 The activPAL was used to estimate daily SLT, StT, LIPA, MVPA and steps. A detailed description of  
114 the methodologies applied to examine the activPAL output for these physical behaviours has  
115 previously been provided (5, 6). Briefly, SLT was defined as all time spent in a sitting/lying posture  
116 during a waking day. Standing time was defined as time spent in a standing position with no stepping  
117 (i.e. standing still), and was calculated by summing the total number of seconds spent standing. LIPA  
118 was defined as all time spent in stepping at an intensity of <3 metabolic equivalents (METs) (e.g. slow  
119 walking, household chores, etc.), while MVPA was defined as all time spent stepping at an intensity  
120 of >3 METs. For MVPA, a threshold of 2997 counts per epoch (15 s) was used to estimate METs for  
121 each 15s period, where MVPA was defined as >3 METs (6). Steps were determined from the  
122 activPAL output, and were summed over the measured day to provide steps per day. Sitting/lying time  
123 was adjusted by subtracting non-wear time from SLT. This method of examining non-wear time data

124 was completed as 1) non-wear time would otherwise be categorised as SLT and 2) no records for the  
125 types of activity completed during non-wear time were collected. Total wear time during the waking  
126 day was calculated by subtracting non-wear time from the identified waking measurement period.  
127 Finally, SLT, StT, LIPA and MVPA were then presented as a percentage of the total wear time during  
128 the waking day.

129 Descriptive statistics are presented as mean (SD), median (25th percentile, 75th percentile) or number  
130 (percentage) as appropriate. All numeric data were assessed for skewness by visual inspection of  
131 histograms and formal tests of normality. The distributions of the sedentary and PA variables were  
132 found to be skewed so Box-Cox transformations were used to transform the data to normality prior to  
133 analyses. Linear mixed models (LMM) were used to model the transformed daily data, accounting for  
134 the different number of days of recorded data across the sample. Single day intraclass correlations  
135 (ICC) values were computed from the LMM models, where the ICC is defined as the ratio of  
136 between-individual variance to the sum of the between- and within- individual variance. The  
137 reliability of the activPAL daily measurements of physical behaviours and steps was assessed using  
138 the Spearman-Brown prophecy formula (22). The number of required days to reach the target average  
139 ICC was computed using the Spearman-Brown prophecy formula:  $N = \frac{ICC_T(1 - ICC_S)}{(ICC_S(1 - ICC_T))}$ ,  
140 where  $ICC_S$ =single day ICC,  $N$ =number of required days and  $ICC_T$ =target average measures ICC.  
141 Although an average measures ICC (computed as the ICC of an average measure across  $N$  days) of  
142  $\geq 0.8$  has been identified as an acceptable level of reliability (2), an ICC of  $\geq 0.7$  has been suggested as  
143 being appropriate as it reduces the amount of data excluded and maximizes power (14). In this study,  
144 the number of required days were computed separately for  $ICC_T=0.8$  and  $ICC_T=0.7$ . Statistical  
145 analyses were conducted using IBM SPSS Statistics version 21.0 (Cary, NC).

146 **Results:**

147 Of those randomly selected, a total of 216 students (76%) agreed to take part in the study. Due to  
148 malfunctioning devices, 21 datasets were excluded from analysis. A total of 195 valid datasets were  
149 included. No differences existed between excluded and included participants for age, height, weight  
150 or BMI. Participants mean age was 15.7 ( $\pm 0.9$ ) years, with a median BMI of 21.7 (IQR = 5.2) kg/m<sup>2</sup>.  
151 Nine participants (4.6%) were classified as underweight, 132 participants (67.7%) had normal weight,  
152 41 participants (21.0%) were overweight, and 13 participants (6.7%) were obese. A total of 29  
153 participants provided 4 days of accelerometer data (14.9%), 140 provided 5 valid days (71.8%) and 26  
154 providing 6 valid days (13.3%). A total of 180 participants provided data on both weekend days  
155 (92.3%), with 15 participants providing data on one weekend day only (7.7%).

156 Descriptive information on the amount of waking time spent (hrs.) in SLT, StT, LIPA and MVPA  
157 across days of the week is provided in Table 1. The percentage of the waking day spent in these  
158 behaviours, along with the number of steps accumulated across each day of the week, are also  
159 presented in Table 1. Daily waking hours across the measured week ranged from 12.8 (IQR=1.2) on  
160 Sundays to 16.2 (IQR=1.8) on Fridays.

161 The Spearman-Brown Prophecy Formulae based on ICCs for all collected data with a reliability of 0.7  
162 and 0.8 were used to predict the number of days of complete data needed to reliably predict SLT, StT,  
163 LIPA, MVPA and steps. The results of the Spearman Brown Prophecy Formulae are presented in  
164 Table 2. For a reliability of 0.7, a minimum of 9 days of activPAL monitoring are required to reliably  
165 estimate SLT, StT, LIPA and MVPA. A minimum of 15 days of activPAL monitoring are required to  
166 achieve a reliability of 0.8 for all activity intensity variables. For steps, a minimum of 12 days of  
167 recording is required to give a reliability of 0.7, while 21 days of measurement are required to provide  
168 a reliability of 0.8.

169 **Table 1:** Descriptive characteristics of i) the total number of waking hours, ii) the number of waking hours spent sitting/lying, standing, in light intensity  
 170 physical activity and in moderate to vigorous intensity physical activity, iii) the percentage of waking time spent sitting/lying, standing, in light intensity  
 171 physical activity and in moderate to vigorous intensity physical activity and iv) the number of steps per day across days of the week.

	<b>Monday</b>	<b>Tuesday</b>	<b>Wednesday</b>	<b>Thursday</b>	<b>Friday</b>	<b>Saturday</b>	<b>Sunday</b>
	<b>(n = 171)</b>	<b>(n = 140)</b>	<b>(n = 139)</b>	<b>(n = 63)</b>	<b>(n = 84)</b>	<b>(n = 188)</b>	<b>(n = 184)</b>
<b>Waking Hours</b>	15.4	15.0	15.2	15.2	16.2	14.5	12.8
	(14.8, 16.0)	(14.3, 15.6)	(14.5, 15.8)	(14.7, 15.8)	(15.2, 17.0)	(13.2, 15.5)	(11.8, 14.0)
<b>Sitting/Lying (hrs.)</b>	10.3	9.8	10.0	9.2	10.4	9.2	8.6
	(9.1, 11.2)	(8.8, 11.0)	(8.7, 11.1)	(8.2, 11.0)	(9.4, 11.8)	(7.8, 10.7)	(7.2, 9.8)
<b>Standing (hrs.)</b>	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.8	3.4	3.3	2.8
	(2.7, 3.9)	(2.5, 3.9)	(2.6, 4.1)	(2.8, 4.4)	(2.6, 4.4)	(2.4, 4.4)	(2.0, 3.5)
<b>LIPA (hrs.)</b>	0.76	0.77	0.78	0.78	0.84	0.80	0.65
	(0.63, .97)	(0.64, .96)	(0.65, 1.00)	(0.63, 1.08)	(0.65, 1.09)	(0.55, 1.03)	(0.49, 0.85)
<b>MVPA (hrs.)</b>	0.80	0.91	0.83	1.06	0.85	0.72	0.44

	(0.58, 1.25)	(0.61, 1.29)	(0.55, 1.27)	(0.83, 1.34)	(0.50, 1.38)	(0.37, 1.11)	(0.23, 0.91)
<b>% Waking hrs</b>							
<b>Sitting/Lying (%)</b>	67.1	66.1	66.8	61.9	65.6	64.4	68.4
	(60.8, 72.8)	(60.0, 72.5)	(59.7, 73.4)	(55.3, 72.1)	(58.8, 73.7)	(54.9, 74.4)	(58.6, 75.9)
<b>Standing (%)</b>	21.7	21.6	21.6	24.0	21.9	23.0	21.9
	(17.7, 25.9)	(17.2, 26.9)	(18.1, 26.8)	(18.7, 30.1)	(16.8, 26.9)	(17.4, 30.3)	(16.1, 27.7)
<b>LIPA (%)</b>	5.0	5.1	5.2	5.1	5.5	5.6	5.2
	(4.1, 6.4)	(4.3, 6.4)	(4.3, 6.4)	(4.0, 7.3)	(4.3, 6.8)	(4.0, 7.1)	(3.9, 6.7)
<b>MVPA (%)</b>	5.3	6.3	5.5	6.6	5.5	4.9	3.4
	(3.9, 8.0)	(4.1, 8.5)	(3.7, 8.5)	(5.3, 8.9)	(3.2, 8.1)	(2.6, 7.7)	(1.8, 7.2)
<b>Steps</b>	8364	8539	8824	9994	9122	8010	5261
	(6428, 11263)	(6408, 11625)	(6312, 10922)	(7898, 11888)	(6512, 13113)	(4724, 10978)	(3540, 8644)

172 All data presented as median (25<sup>th</sup> percentile, 75<sup>th</sup> percentile) due to non-normality of data.

173 **Table 2:** Number of days of complete data required to estimate components of waking sitting/lying,  
 174 standing, light and moderate-to-vigorous intensity physical activity and steps per day from the  
 175 activPAL activity monitor in adolescent females.

<b>Behaviours</b>	<b>Target Reliability Value (ICC)</b>	
	<b>0.7</b>	<b>0.8</b>
Sitting/Lying Time (% Waking)	6.9 days	11.8 days
Standing Time (% Waking)	5.7 days	9.8 days
Light Intensity Physical Activity (% Waking)	5.2 days	9.0 days
Moderate-to-Vigorous Physical Activity (% Waking)	8.8 days	15.1 days
Steps	12.1 days	20.8 days

176

177 **Discussion:**

178 This study aimed to determine the number of days of activPAL monitoring required to reliably  
179 examine SLT, StT, LIPA, MVPA and steps in a sample of adolescent females. As far as the authors  
180 are aware, this is the first study to examine the reliability of objective measurement of free-living SB,  
181 based on posture rather than sedentary thresholds (i.e. less than ActiGraph 100 counts-per-minute), in  
182 an adolescent cohort. The findings of the present study suggest that a minimum of seven days of  
183 activPAL measurement is required to achieve a reliability coefficient of  $\geq 0.7$  for measurement of  
184 SLT, StT and LIPA, while at least 12 days of data are required for a coefficient of  $\geq 0.8$ . Where the  
185 activPAL acceleration data are also used to quantify MVPA, 9 days of activPAL measurement are  
186 required to achieve a reliability coefficient of  $\geq 0.7$ , while at least 15 days of measurement were  
187 required to achieve a reliability coefficient of  $\geq 0.8$  in this sample.

188 When examining physical behaviours in free-living environments, it is essential that sufficient data  
189 are gathered to ensure a reliable estimate of these variables is obtained (3, 27). Researchers have  
190 examined the minimum number of days of accelerometer measurement required to achieve acceptable  
191 reliability of free-living accelerometer output, focusing on the examination of daily accelerometer  
192 counts (7, 9), MVPA (1, 8, 13, 28) or step count (7, 29). However, limited information is available for  
193 the minimum number of days required to provide reliable estimates of SLT, StT and LIPA. It is  
194 becoming apparent that these behaviours at the lower end of the activity intensity continuum may play  
195 a significant role in energy balance and the prevention of risk factors for major non-communicable  
196 disease (21, 23). In order to strengthen the evidence of the associations between such health variables  
197 and SLT, StT and LIPA, it is necessary to ensure that sufficient data to provide reliable estimates is  
198 obtained. In adolescent females, a minimum of 9 days of SLT, StT, LIPA and MVPA are required to  
199 achieve an acceptable level of reliability. Interestingly, larger day to day variability in MVPA  
200 compared to the other behaviours of interest was evident, with it requiring 8.8 days of measurement to  
201 achieve a reliability of  $\geq 0.7$  (compared to 5.2, 5.7 and 6.9 for LIPA, StT and SLT respectively).  
202 Future research should aim to increase the number of measured days to a minimum of 9 consecutive

203 days of accelerometer measurement, moving away from the commonly employed 4 days including 1  
204 weekend day (4, 10).

205 As this is the first study to assess the minimum number of days required to reliably predict SLT, StT,  
206 LIPA using the activPAL in adolescent females, it is difficult to directly compare these findings with  
207 existing literature. However, the findings for the minimum number of days required to reliably predict  
208 MVPA are comparable to other studies utilising objective measures. In a study of 30 children aged 7-  
209 15 years, Janz et al. identified that a minimum of 6 days of accelerometer recording was necessary to  
210 achieve a reliability coefficient of  $\geq 0.8$  when estimating the amount of time spent sedentary and in  
211 MVPA (10). Similarly, in an analysis of 436 female adolescents (mean age = 14.1 years (SD = 0.45)),  
212 the minimum recommended wear duration to reliably predict minutes spent in MVPA was 6 days  
213 (16). Trost et al. identified that a 7 day monitoring protocol was recommended when examining the  
214 reliability of MVPA in a combined cohort of children and adolescents (28). However, notable  
215 differences in the variability of activity behaviours were observed between children and adolescents  
216 when examined separately, with a minimum of 4-5 days of recording recommended for children and  
217 8-9 days recommended for adolescents (28). Discrepancies in the minimum number of days  
218 recommended in the current paper compared to existing literature is likely due to differences in  
219 activity monitor used (i.e. CSA/ActiGraph vs activPAL), activity monitor wear location (thigh versus  
220 hip/wrist), activity monitor protocol differences (i.e. 24 hour wear protocol compared to waking wear  
221 protocol for other devices), potential sample differences (i.e. age, sex, environmental and cultural  
222 differences) and data reduction methodologies (i.e. treadmill versus non-treadmill-based MVPA  
223 count-to-activity thresholds).

224 A significant strength of this study is the examination of objectively determined SLT and StT using  
225 the “gold standard” objective measurement device, the activPAL (11). The use of this device enables  
226 the differentiation of StT from LIPA, while an estimate of time spent in MVPA is also possible. As  
227 far as the authors are aware, this is the first study to examine the minimum number of days of  
228 measurement required to achieve acceptable reliability for each of these behaviours, rather than  
229 relying on estimates of sedentary time from count-to-activity thresholds that do not distinguish

230 between sitting and standing. This study provides some of the first evidence on the minimum number  
231 of days of activPAL measurement for a reliable estimate of SLT in this population. Additionally, the  
232 relatively large sample size of adolescent females (n=195) was a strength of the study.

233 The limitations of this study must be acknowledged. Although accelerometers are the preferred  
234 objective measure of habitual physical behaviours (26, 31), lower limb worn devices like the  
235 activPAL have their own limitations, including the inability to measure arm movements (i.e. window  
236 cleaning, ironing etc.) and some specific activities (i.e. stair climbing, cycling, swimming etc.) (30).  
237 Due to the age and sex specific sample, it is not possible to generalise the findings of this study to  
238 other populations, as the calculated ICC values are constrained to the sample from which they are  
239 calculated (2). Additionally, newer generation activPAL monitors (i.e. the triaxial activPAL3™) have  
240 been developed, and output from different generation devices may not be comparable due to software  
241 and hardware upgrades. However, generally good agreement for postural position between  
242 generations of activPAL devices have previously been reported, suggesting that the minimum number  
243 of days of monitoring reported here for postural position may be applicable to newer generation  
244 devices (20).

245 **Conclusion:**

246 The findings of this study suggest that a minimum of 7 valid days of recording is required to achieve a  
247 reliability of  $\geq 0.7$  for activPAL derived SLT, StT and LIPA in individuals, while a minimum of 9  
248 days is required for a reliable estimate of MVPA for individuals in an adolescent female population.  
249 This measurement period ensures that all days of the week are recorded, reducing the risk of bias due  
250 to any potential differences in waking hours or waking behaviours on this day. Future research should  
251 examine the minimum number of days required to achieve acceptable levels of reliability for activity  
252 intensities at the lower end of the activity intensity continuum in children, adults and older adults to  
253 help strengthen associations made between such activity behaviours and health.

254 **Acknowledgements:**

255 The authors acknowledge Miss Grainne Hayes, Mr Phelim Macken and Ms Elaine O'Connor for their  
256 support throughout the research. The authors also wish to thank the participants and their parents  
257 involved in the study. This research was supported by the Irish Research Council for Science  
258 Engineering and Technology and the NIHR Leicester-Loughborough Diet, Lifestyle and Physical  
259 Activity Biomedical Research Unit which is a partnership between University Hospitals of Leicester  
260 NHS Trust, Loughborough University and the University of Leicester.

261 **Bibliography:**

- 262 1. Addy CL, Trilk JL, Dowda M, Byun W, Pate RR. Assessing Preschool Children's Physical  
263 Activity: How Many Days of Accelerometry Measurement. *Pediatr Exerc Sci.* 2014; 26(1):103-109.  
264 PubMed doi: 10.1123/pes.2013-0021
- 265 2. Baranowski T, de Moor C. How many days was that? Intra-individual variability and  
266 physical activity assessment. *Res Q Exerc Sport.* 2000; 71(S2):74-78. PubMed doi:  
267 10.1080/02701367.2000.11082789
- 268 3. Baranowski T, Masse LC, Ragan B, Welk G. How many days was that? We're still not  
269 sure, but we're asking the question better! *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 2008; 40(S7):544-549. PubMed  
270 doi: 10.1249/MSS.0b013e31817c6651
- 271 4. Corder K, Ekelund U, Steele RM, Wareham NJ, Brage S. Assessment of physical activity  
272 in youth. *J Appl Physiol.* 2008; 105(3):977-987. PubMed doi: 10.1152/jappphysiol.00094.2008
- 273 5. Dowd KP, Harrington DM, Bourke AK, Nelson J, Donnelly AE. The measurement of  
274 sedentary patterns and behaviors using the activPAL™ Professional physical activity monitor.  
275 *Physiol Meas.* 2012; 33(11):1887-1899. PubMed doi: 10.1088/0967-3334/33/11/1887
- 276 6. Dowd KP, Harrington DM, Donnelly AE. Criterion and Concurrent Validity of the  
277 activPAL™ Professional Physical Activity Monitor in Adolescent Females. *PLoS One.* 2012;  
278 7(10):e47633. PubMed doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0047633
- 279 7. Hart TL, Swartz AM, Cashin SE, Strath SJ. How many days of monitoring predict  
280 physical activity and sedentary behaviour in older adults. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act.* 2011; 8:62.  
281 PubMed doi: 10.1186/1479-5868-8-62
- 282 8. Hinkley T, O'Connell E, Okely AD, Crawford D, Hesketh K, Salmon J. Assessing  
283 volume of accelerometry data for reliability in preschool children. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 2012;  
284 44(12):2436-2441. PubMed doi: 10.1249/MSS.0b013e3182661478
- 285 9. Hislop J, Law J, Rush R, et al. An investigation into the minimum accelerometry wear  
286 time for reliable estimates of habitual physical activity and definition of a standard measurement  
287 day in pre-school children. *Physiol Meas.* 2014; 35(11):2213-2218. PubMed doi: 10.1088/0967-  
288 3334/35/11/2213

- 289 10. Janz KF, Witt J, Mahoney LT. The stability of children's physical activity as measured by  
290 accelerometry and self-report. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 1995; 27(9):1326-1332. PubMed doi:
- 291 11. Kozey-Keadle S, Libertine A, Lyden K, Staudenmayer J, Freedson PS. Validation of  
292 wearable monitors for assessing sedentary behavior. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 2011; 43(8):1561-1567.  
293 PubMed doi: 10.1249/MSS.0b013e31820ce174
- 294 12. Lee IM, Shiroma EJ, Lobelo F, Puska P, Blair SN, Katzmarzyk PT. Effect of physical  
295 inactivity on major non-communicable diseases worldwide: an analysis of burden of disease and  
296 life expectancy. *The Lancet.* 2012; 380(9838):219-229. PubMed doi: 10.1016/S0140-  
297 6736(12)61031-9
- 298 13. Matthews CE, Ainsworth BE, Thompson RW, Bassett Jr DR. Sources of variance in  
299 daily physical activity levels as measured by an accelerometer. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 2002;  
300 34(8):1376-1381. PubMed doi:
- 301 14. Mattocks C, Ness AR, Leary SD, et al. Use of accelerometers in a large field-based study  
302 of children: protocols, design issues, and effects on precision. *J Phys Act Health.* 2008; 5(S1):98-  
303 111. PubMed doi:
- 304 15. McMurray RG, Ring KB, Treuth MS, et al. Comparison of two approaches to structured  
305 physical activity surveys for adolescents. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 2004; 36(12):2135-2143. PubMed  
306 doi:
- 307 16. Murray DM, Catellier DJ, Hannan PJ, et al. School-level intraclass correlation for  
308 physical activity in adolescent girls. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 2004; 36(5):876-882. PubMed doi:
- 309 17. Owen N, Healy GN, Matthews CE, Dunstan DW. Too much sitting: the population  
310 health science of sedentary behavior. *Exerc Sport Sci Rev.* 2010; 38(3):105-113. PubMed doi:  
311 10.1097/JES.0b013e3181e373a2
- 312 18. Penpraze V, Reilly JJ, MacLean CM, et al. Monitoring of physical activity in young  
313 children: how much is enough? *Pediatr Exerc Sci.* 2006; 18(4):483-491. PubMed doi:
- 314 19. Ridgers ND, Salmon J, Ridley K, et al. Agreement between activPAL and ActiGraph for  
315 assessing children's sedentary time. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act.* 2012; 9:15. PubMed doi:  
316 10.1186/1479-5868-9-15

- 317 20. Sellers C, Dall P, Grant M, Stansfield B. Agreement of the activPAL3 and activPAL for  
318 characterising posture and stepping in adults and children. *Gait & Posture*. 2016; 48:209-214.  
319 PubMed doi: 10.1016/j.gaitpost.2016.05.012
- 320 21. Smith L, Ekelund U, Hamer M. The Potential Yield of Non-Exercise Physical Activity  
321 Energy Expenditure in Public Health. *Sports Med*. 2015; 45(4):449-452. PubMed doi:  
322 10.1007/s40279-015-0310-2
- 323 22. Stanley JC. Reliability In: Thorndike R, editor. Educational Measurement. Washington  
324 (DC): American Council of Education; 1971.
- 325 23. Thorp AA, Owen N, Neuhaus M, Dunstan DW. Sedentary behaviors and subsequent  
326 health outcomes in adults: a systematic review of longitudinal studies, 1996–2011. *American*  
327 *journal of preventive medicine*. 2011; 41(2):207-215. PubMed doi: 10.1016/j.amepre.2011.05.004
- 328 24. Tremblay MS, LeBlanc AG, Janssen I, et al. Canadian sedentary behaviour guidelines for  
329 children and youth. *Appl Physiol, Nutr Metab*. 2011; 36(1):59-64. PubMed doi: 10.1139/H11-012
- 330 25. Troiano RP, Berrigan D, Dodd KW, Masse LC, Tilert T, McDowell M. Physical activity  
331 in the United States measured by accelerometer. *Med Sci Sports Exerc*. 2008; 40(1):181-188.  
332 PubMed doi:
- 333 26. Trost SG. State of the art reviews: measurement of physical activity in children and  
334 adolescents. *Am J Lifestyle Med*. 2007; 1(4):299-314. PubMed doi:
- 335 27. Trost SG, McIver KL, Pate RR. Conducting accelerometer-based activity assessments in  
336 field-based research. *Med Sci Sports Exerc*. 2005; 37(S11):531-543. PubMed doi:
- 337 28. Trost SG, Pate RR, Freedson PS, Sallis JF, Taylor WC. Using objective physical activity  
338 measures with youth: how many days of monitoring are needed? *Med Sci Sports Exerc*. 2000;  
339 32(2):426-431. PubMed doi:
- 340 29. Tudor-Locke C, Burkett L, Reis J, Ainsworth B, Macera C, Wilson D. How many days of  
341 pedometer monitoring predict weekly physical activity in adults? *Prev Med*. 2005; 40(3):293-298.  
342 PubMed doi:
- 343 30. Warren JM, Ekelund U, Besson H, Mezzani A, Geladas N, Vanhees L. Assessment of  
344 physical activity—a review of methodologies with reference to epidemiological research: a report

345 of the exercise physiology section of the European Association of Cardiovascular Prevention and  
346 Rehabilitation. *Eur J Cardiovasc Prev Rehabil.* 2010; 17(2):127-139. PubMed doi:  
347 10.1097/HJR.0b013e32832ed875

348 31. Westerterp KR. Assessment of physical activity: a critical appraisal. *Eur J Appl Physiol.*  
349 2009; 105(6):823-828. PubMed doi: 10.1007/s00421-009-1000-2

350