

Deep Learning-Based Recognition of Human Activities From Wearable Sensor Data

Budi Santoso

Associate Professor, School of Information Technology (Fictional), Indonesia

Abstract

Human activity recognition has become an important research area within artificial intelligence, wearable computing, and intelligent sensor-based information systems. Wearable devices equipped with accelerometers, gyroscopes, and related motion sensors generate continuous measurements that can be analyzed to identify different patterns of human movement. These observations provide opportunities for automated classification of activities such as walking, stair climbing, sitting, standing, and lying. However, activity recognition remains challenging because human movements exhibit considerable variation in speed, duration, intensity, sensor orientation, and individual performance characteristics. Conventional machine learning approaches frequently depend on manually constructed features that may not adequately capture complex temporal relationships within wearable sensor signals. The present paper develops a hypothetical methodological framework for examining deep learning-based human activity recognition using multichannel wearable sensor data. The proposed framework compares Random Forest classification using engineered features, a one-dimensional Convolutional Neural Network, a Bidirectional Long Short-Term Memory network, and a hybrid CNN–LSTM architecture.

A fictional dataset containing 15,000 sensor observation windows associated with 60 hypothetical participants is introduced to demonstrate the intended research design. Six everyday activities are considered as classification categories. The proposed methodology incorporates sensor signal preprocessing, temporal segmentation, feature representation, neural network development, participant-independent validation, and comparative classification assessment. Two illustrative analytical tables describe the hypothetical activity distribution and comparative classification performance. Accuracy and macro-averaged F1-score are considered principal evaluation measures. All numerical values are manually constructed and do not represent actual sensor recordings, executed experiments, or independently verified classification outcomes. The methodological discussion examines sensor placement, temporal dependencies, activity transitions, interindividual variation, computational requirements, and model generalization. Particular attention is given to the importance of participant-level data separation and the distinction between laboratory-based recognition accuracy and practical performance under everyday conditions. The paper concludes that deep learning provides a relevant methodological foundation for wearable activity recognition, although its effectiveness must be established through representative datasets, reproducible experiments, and independent evaluation.

Keywords: Human Activity Recognition, Deep Learning, Wearable Sensors, Convolutional Neural Networks, Long Short-Term Memory, Accelerometer, Gyroscope, Sensor Data Classification, Activity Monitoring, Artificial Intelligence.

1. Introduction

Wearable sensing technologies have created new opportunities for examining human movement through continuous digital measurement. Modern wearable devices incorporate motion sensors capable of recording acceleration, angular velocity, and other physical characteristics associated with everyday activities. These measurements can provide information about movement patterns without requiring continuous visual observation. Human activity recognition uses computational methods to transform sensor readings into meaningful activity categories. The development of reliable recognition systems is relevant to wearable computing, context-aware applications, interactive technologies, and movement research. As wearable devices become increasingly integrated into digital environments, the accurate interpretation of sensor-generated information has emerged as an important computational challenge.

Traditional human activity recognition systems generally involve signal acquisition, preprocessing, feature extraction, and classification. Accelerometer and gyroscope recordings are divided into temporal segments from which statistical or frequency-domain characteristics are calculated. These characteristics may include mean acceleration, signal variance, energy, and correlations among sensor channels. Conventional machine learning algorithms subsequently use the extracted features to distinguish different movement categories. Although these procedures have contributed substantially to activity recognition research, their performance may depend on the suitability of manually selected features. Complex movement sequences and subtle differences among activities can be difficult to represent through a limited collection of predefined signal characteristics.

Deep learning offers an alternative approach to human activity recognition by enabling computational models to identify relevant representations directly from multichannel sensor observations. Convolutional neural networks can learn local temporal patterns, while recurrent neural networks can represent relationships across successive time steps. Long Short-Term Memory architectures have been investigated for processing sequential information in which earlier observations may influence later predictions. Hybrid architectures combine convolutional feature extraction with recurrent temporal modeling. These approaches provide additional flexibility for representing human movement, although their effectiveness depends on training data quality, network configuration, and the characteristics of the activities being classified.

Wearable sensor-based activity recognition presents difficulties associated with movement variability, sensor placement, and the temporal boundaries between activities. Individuals may perform the same activity using different movement speeds, postures, and motion patterns. Sensor recordings can also vary according to device orientation, attachment position, sampling frequency, and measurement noise. Furthermore, short observation windows may provide insufficient information for distinguishing activities with similar motion characteristics. These difficulties become particularly important when a classifier developed using one group of participants is applied to individuals whose movements were not represented during training. Reliable evaluation therefore requires participant-independent testing and appropriate treatment of temporal dependencies.

The present paper examines deep learning-based recognition of human activities through a hypothetical comparative methodological framework. Four classification approaches are considered: Random Forest, one-dimensional Convolutional Neural Network, Bidirectional Long Short-Term Memory, and a hybrid CNN–LSTM network. A fictional wearable sensor dataset is introduced to demonstrate the proposed processing and evaluation procedures. The classification framework includes six everyday activities identified through accelerometer and gyroscope measurements. The investigation

emphasizes data preparation, temporal feature learning, comparative performance, and methodological limitations. No actual human participants were recruited, and no wearable sensor experiments were conducted for this illustrative study.

2. Objectives of the Study

The primary objective of this study is to examine the methodological application of deep learning techniques for recognizing human activities through wearable sensor measurements. The investigation concentrates on temporal signal representation, comparative classification performance, and model reliability. Three specific objectives guide the proposed framework and establish the analytical direction of the hypothetical research design.

2.1 Examination of Wearable Sensor-Based Movement Characteristics

The first objective is to examine how accelerometer and gyroscope measurements can be represented for automated recognition of everyday human activities. Wearable sensors produce multichannel time-series observations that reflect different aspects of body movement and orientation. The proposed study considers how temporal segmentation, signal normalization, and selected movement features may contribute to activity classification. Particular attention is given to distinguishing activities with similar sensor patterns, including standing and sitting, as well as walking on level surfaces and ascending or descending stairs.

The investigation further aims to examine the influence of individual movement characteristics on sensor-based activity representations. Participants may exhibit differences in walking speed, movement rhythm, body positioning, and the execution of transitions between activities. Such variations can affect the consistency of recorded motion signals and create difficulties for classification algorithms. Consequently, the proposed framework emphasizes representative observations and appropriate handling of temporal information. This objective seeks to establish methodological requirements for reliable activity recognition without assuming that identical activities produce uniform sensor measurements.

2.2 Comparative Evaluation of Deep Learning Classification Models

The second objective focuses on developing a comparative framework for evaluating conventional machine learning and deep learning approaches to human activity recognition. Random Forest, one-dimensional Convolutional Neural Network, Bidirectional Long Short-Term Memory, and hybrid CNN–LSTM architectures are selected to represent different computational strategies. Their intended comparison examines classification accuracy, macro-averaged F1-score, and sensitivity to movement characteristics. The study seeks to establish a consistent evaluation procedure through which alternative models can be assessed using equivalent sensor observations.

A further objective involves examining whether temporal representation learning provides meaningful classification advantages over manually engineered features. Convolutional models identify local signal patterns, while recurrent architectures consider relationships among successive observations. Hybrid methods attempt to combine these capabilities within a single computational structure. However, increased model complexity may introduce additional training requirements and opportunities for overfitting. The proposed framework therefore emphasizes independent testing, appropriate parameter optimization, and balanced interpretation of computational performance rather than assuming that deeper architectures necessarily achieve superior recognition.

2.3 Identification of Activity Recognition Reliability Constraints

The third objective is to identify methodological factors that may influence the reliability of wearable sensor-based activity recognition. Sensor displacement, inconsistent sampling intervals, motion artifacts, participant variability, and inaccurate activity labels may reduce classification performance. These conditions can introduce differences between training observations and previously unseen movement recordings. The proposed study examines how preprocessing, participant-level separation, and appropriate temporal segmentation could address selected difficulties while preserving information necessary for distinguishing different activity categories.

The investigation also considers the practical requirements associated with implementing activity recognition models in wearable devices. Computational capacity, memory availability, battery consumption, and response latency may influence the suitability of deep learning architectures. In addition, automated activity labels should be interpreted as estimates derived from sensor measurements rather than direct observations of every movement characteristic. This objective therefore emphasizes transparent evaluation, computational efficiency, and responsible interpretation. These considerations provide a foundation for examining recognition systems beyond classification accuracy alone.

3. Review of Literature

3.1 Foundations of Wearable Sensor-Based Activity Recognition

Bao and Intille (2004) investigated activity recognition using body-worn accelerometers and demonstrated the relevance of sensor-derived features for distinguishing everyday activities. Karantonis et al. (2006) examined real-time movement classification using triaxial acceleration measurements. Preece et al. (2009) subsequently reviewed techniques for identifying human activities through body-mounted sensors. These contributions established important foundations for computational movement recognition. Their methodological significance lies in demonstrating how sensor placement, feature extraction, and classification procedures influence the interpretation of recorded physical movements.

Mannini and Sabatini (2010) investigated machine learning methods for classifying physical activities using on-body accelerometers. Khan et al. (2010) developed a hierarchical activity recognition approach incorporating augmented acceleration features. Kwapisz et al. (2011) examined activity recognition using mobile-device accelerometers, while Plötz et al. (2011) investigated feature learning for activity recognition in ubiquitous computing. Together, these studies demonstrated the increasing relevance of statistical learning and automated representation methods. Their findings also highlighted the methodological importance of feature quality and differences among human movement patterns.

3.2 Wearable Datasets and Movement Segmentation Strategies

Reiss and Stricker (2012) introduced a benchmark dataset for physical activity monitoring and emphasized the importance of reproducible evaluation resources. Anguita et al. (2013) described a publicly available human activity recognition dataset using smartphone motion sensors. Lara and Labrador (2013) reviewed wearable sensor-based activity recognition and examined its principal computational components.

These contributions established important methodological foundations for constructing labeled activity datasets and comparing classification techniques across different sensor configurations and movement recognition tasks. Bulling et al. (2014) provided a systematic tutorial on activity recognition using body-worn inertial sensors. Banos et al. (2014) investigated how temporal window size influences

recognition performance. Stisen et al. (2015) examined differences among sensing devices and their implications for activity recognition reliability. These studies demonstrated that classification effectiveness depends on more than algorithm selection. Sensor characteristics, segmentation procedures, and variation among devices can influence predictive outcomes. Their contributions support controlled preprocessing and participant-independent evaluation when examining wearable movement recognition.

3.3 Development of Deep Learning Architectures for Activity Recognition

Zeng et al. (2014) investigated convolutional neural networks for activity recognition using mobile sensor observations. Yang et al. (2015) developed deep convolutional models for learning representations from multichannel activity signals. These studies demonstrated the relevance of hierarchical feature extraction to time-series classification. LeCun et al. (2015) provided a broader explanation of deep learning and representation learning, while Bengio et al. (2013) examined the theoretical foundations of learned data representations. These contributions support the application of neural methods to complex wearable sensing information.

Ordóñez and Roggen (2016) investigated hybrid convolutional and recurrent neural architectures for wearable activity recognition. Hammerla et al. (2016) compared deep, convolutional, and recurrent methods across wearable sensing tasks. Ronao and Cho (2016) examined deep neural networks using smartphone sensor data, while Ha and Choi (2016) investigated convolutional classification using multiple accelerometer and gyroscope sensors. These contributions expanded the available methodological approaches for learning temporal movement patterns and emphasized the importance of architecture selection, training conditions, and representative evaluation datasets.

4. Research Methodology

4.1 Research Design and Activity Classification Framework

The present paper adopts a hypothetical comparative quantitative research design for examining human activity recognition through wearable inertial sensor data. Four classification models are considered: Random Forest, one-dimensional Convolutional Neural Network, Bidirectional Long Short-Term Memory, and hybrid CNN–LSTM. The intended classification problem involves six everyday activities: walking, ascending stairs, descending stairs, sitting, standing, and lying. Each model would receive comparable sensor information while employing its own feature representation strategy. No actual algorithms were trained or evaluated for this illustrative manuscript.

The proposed analytical procedure consists of sensor data acquisition planning, signal preprocessing, temporal segmentation, model development, and independent classification testing. Random Forest would use engineered movement features, whereas neural architectures would process multichannel temporal signals. Hyperparameters would be selected using validation information, and independent test participants would remain unavailable during model development.

4.2 Hypothetical Wearable Sensor Dataset

For illustrative purposes, the proposed study assumes a fictional dataset containing 15,000 sensor observation windows associated with 60 hypothetical participants. Each participant is assumed to contribute 250 nonoverlapping observation windows. The recordings conceptually include three-axis acceleration and three-axis angular velocity measurements obtained from a single waist-mounted

wearable device. The intended data acquisition frequency is 50 Hz, with each observation window representing 2.56 seconds of movement. These specifications are constructed examples rather than actual participant measurements.

The proposed preprocessing procedure would involve examination of missing sensor samples, inconsistent timestamps, measurement noise, and device orientation. Acceleration and angular velocity channels would be normalized using parameters estimated from development observations. Windows crossing transitions between activity labels would be excluded or handled through predefined labeling rules. The dataset would be divided by participant, with 36 individuals assigned to training, 12 to validation, and 12 to independent testing. This separation would reduce the possibility of participant-specific information leakage.

4.3 Deep Learning Models and Performance Evaluation

The Random Forest baseline would use manually engineered statistical and frequency-domain features extracted from each sensor window. The convolutional model would learn local temporal representations through one-dimensional filters. The Bidirectional LSTM would examine relationships across consecutive sensor samples, while the hybrid CNN–LSTM would combine convolutional feature extraction with recurrent sequence modeling. Model complexity and parameter settings would be selected using development-stage validation. Independent test observations would remain excluded from all optimization decisions.

The proposed evaluation would report classification accuracy and macro-averaged F1-score as principal performance measures. Accuracy would represent the proportion of correctly classified activity windows, whereas macro-F1 would assign equal importance to each activity category. A genuine investigation would additionally require class-specific precision, recall, confusion matrices, confidence intervals, and computational latency measurements. Statistical uncertainty would be assessed through appropriate participant-level procedures. The present paper uses fictional classification outcomes solely to demonstrate the intended analytical reporting structure.

5. Analysis

5.1 Illustrative Distribution of Human Activity Observations

The distribution of activity categories represents an important consideration in wearable sensor classification because different movements may occur with unequal frequency. Walking, stair climbing, and stationary postures can also produce varying degrees of within-class signal diversity. Table 1 presents a hypothetical activity distribution across participant-independent training, validation, and testing subsets. Six activity categories are included, with walking assigned a slightly larger proportion than the remaining categories. The numerical values are fictional and do not describe actual human movement observations.

The illustrative distribution demonstrates how participant-level data partitioning can be organized while preserving the intended proportions of activity categories. Such separation is important because overlapping observations from the same individual may contain movement characteristics that artificially improve classification performance when included across training and testing datasets. However, participant independence does not automatically guarantee generalization across different sensing devices or operating conditions. The proposed distribution therefore provides a methodological example rather than evidence of representative human activity behavior.

Table 1: Hypothetical Distribution of Wearable Sensor Activity Windows

Human Activity Category	Training Windows	Validation Windows	Test Windows	Total
Walking	1,800	600	600	3,000
Ascending Stairs	1,440	480	480	2,400
Descending Stairs	1,440	480	480	2,400
Sitting	1,440	480	480	2,400
Standing	1,440	480	480	2,400
Lying	1,440	480	480	2,400
Total	9,000	3,000	3,000	15,000

The illustrative dataset contains 15,000 activity windows, with walking representing 20% of observations and each remaining category representing 16%. These proportions are methodological assumptions and are not intended to describe actual activity frequencies within a population.

5.2 Illustrative Comparison of Deep Learning Recognition Models

Automated human activity recognition can be evaluated by comparing predicted movement categories against independently established reference labels. Classification accuracy provides an overall measure of correct predictions, while macro-averaged F1-score considers the balance of precision and recall across different activity classes. Table 2 presents hypothetical classification outcomes for four selected algorithms. The constructed test dataset contains 3,000 activity windows. All reported values were manually specified and do not represent actual computational predictions.

Table 2: Hypothetical Classification Performance of Wearable Activity Recognition Models

Classification Model	Correct Predictions	Incorrect Predictions	Accuracy (%)	Macro-F1
Random Forest	2,382	618	79.40	0.788
One-Dimensional CNN	2,568	432	85.60	0.850
Bidirectional LSTM	2,526	474	84.20	0.834
Hybrid CNN–LSTM	2,691	309	89.70	0.892

The hypothetical pattern demonstrates how convolutional and recurrent approaches could be compared with a conventional feature-based classifier. However, actual differences in model performance would

depend on sensor configuration, participant characteristics, training procedures, and evaluation conditions.

6. Discussion

6.1 Temporal Sensor Representation and Activity Recognition

Wearable sensor measurements contain temporal relationships that contribute to the identification of different human activities. Walking and stair climbing involve repeated movement patterns, while stationary postures may exhibit lower levels of acceleration variation. Deep learning methods can represent these relationships through learned filters and sequential processing mechanisms. However, the usefulness of temporal information depends on sensor quality, window duration, and the consistency of activity labels. The proposed framework emphasizes these relationships as essential components of wearable activity classification.

The methodological comparison also highlights differences between manually engineered features and automated representation learning. Random Forest classification relies on predefined statistical characteristics, whereas neural approaches can learn features through model optimization. Nevertheless, learned representations are not automatically more informative than carefully designed conventional features. Their effectiveness depends on the available training observations and the complexity of the activities being classified. Consequently, feature-based methods remain important comparative baselines when evaluating deep learning architectures for wearable movement recognition.

6.2 Convolutional and Recurrent Neural Learning

Convolutional neural networks provide mechanisms for recognizing localized patterns within multichannel sensor sequences. Their filters can identify recurring combinations of acceleration and angular velocity measurements associated with particular activities. Recurrent architectures instead emphasize relationships among successive observations and may capture temporal dependencies extending across a measurement window. These approaches represent different computational assumptions about how movement information should be organized. Their comparative suitability therefore depends on the temporal characteristics and variability of the target activities.

The proposed hybrid CNN–LSTM configuration combines convolutional feature extraction with recurrent sequence modeling. Such integration may provide complementary information when movement classification depends on both localized signal patterns and broader temporal relationships. However, increased architectural complexity also introduces additional parameters and computational requirements. The hypothetical performance table illustrates a possible advantage for hybrid modeling but does not establish one empirically. Future experiments should examine whether any improvement remains consistent across participants, activities, and alternative sensor configurations.

6.3 Recognition Accuracy and Participant-Level Generalization

Human activity recognition models may perform differently when evaluated using participants whose movements were included during training compared with individuals who were not represented previously. Participant-specific characteristics can influence walking rhythm, posture, movement speed, and sensor orientation. Consequently, random window-level partitioning may provide overly favorable results when highly related observations appear across evaluation subsets. The proposed framework

addresses this issue through participant-level separation, allowing the intended test procedure to examine recognition performance on previously unseen individuals.

The interpretation of activity recognition performance also requires consideration of differences among activity categories. A model may classify walking accurately while confusing sitting and standing or distinguishing stair ascent from descent less reliably. Aggregate accuracy can conceal these variations. Therefore, genuine evaluation should report class-specific precision, recall, and confusion matrices alongside summary metrics. The hypothetical results presented here cannot identify actual category-level weaknesses because no classification experiment has been conducted.

7. Challenges

7.1 Sensor Placement and Measurement Inconsistency

Wearable sensor recordings can vary substantially according to device placement, orientation, attachment stability, and sampling characteristics. A sensor attached to the waist may record movement patterns that differ from those captured at the wrist or ankle. Even when the device remains at the same body location, small orientation changes can alter the distribution of measured acceleration and angular velocity. Consequently, recognition models developed using standardized laboratory configurations may perform differently when devices are worn under less controlled conditions.

Measurement inconsistency also arises from sensor calibration differences, timestamp irregularities, and temporary signal interruptions. These characteristics can distort temporal patterns and influence the representations learned by classification algorithms. Preprocessing methods may reduce selected technical differences, but excessive filtering can remove movement information relevant to classification. The proposed framework therefore emphasizes consistent data preparation and appropriate documentation of sensing conditions. Future experiments should examine model reliability across device orientations and sensor configurations before establishing general applicability.

7.2 Activity Transitions and Interindividual Movement Variability

Human activities do not always occur as clearly separated events with fixed temporal boundaries. Individuals may move gradually from sitting to standing, change walking speed, or alternate between different movement patterns within short intervals. Such transitions complicate the assignment of a single activity label to a temporal observation window. A classification model may therefore encounter mixed sensor characteristics that do not correspond closely to any predefined category. Reliable evaluation requires clearly defined segmentation and labeling procedures.

Interindividual variability introduces further challenges because movement patterns differ across participants according to habitual behavior, task execution, and environmental conditions. Two individuals performing the same activity may generate sensor recordings with different temporal characteristics. Consequently, a model trained on a restricted participant group may not generalize reliably to other users. The proposed framework emphasizes participant-independent testing and representative data collection. Future research should investigate recognition stability across diverse movement styles without assuming that one learned representation applies equally to every individual.

7.3 Computational Efficiency and Evaluation Reliability

Deep learning models may require substantial computational resources during training because they process multichannel time-series observations through multiple neural layers. Recurrent architectures

can introduce additional sequential computation, while hybrid models may combine the costs of convolutional and recurrent processing. These requirements become relevant when activity recognition must operate continuously on portable wearable devices. Consequently, classification performance should be assessed alongside memory consumption, energy requirements, inference latency, and the computational capabilities of the intended hardware.

Evaluation reliability presents another challenge because activity windows from the same participant may share substantial statistical information. Inappropriate data partitioning can therefore produce optimistic classification results. Repeated hyperparameter optimization using independent test observations can introduce additional bias. The proposed methodology emphasizes participant-level separation, controlled validation, and transparent reporting of computational decisions. These safeguards are necessary for distinguishing genuine recognition capability from performance advantages caused by methodological weaknesses in the evaluation procedure.

8. Conclusion

Deep learning provides a relevant methodological foundation for recognizing human activities through wearable accelerometer and gyroscope measurements. The present paper developed a hypothetical comparative framework involving Random Forest, one-dimensional Convolutional Neural Network, Bidirectional Long Short-Term Memory, and hybrid CNN–LSTM architectures. Its principal focus was the representation of temporal movement information, classification performance, and participant-independent evaluation. The proposed methodology demonstrates how alternative computational approaches could be compared within a consistent wearable activity recognition framework.

The illustrative tables demonstrate possible procedures for reporting activity-window distributions and comparative classification outcomes. However, all numerical values were manually constructed and do not represent actual wearable sensor recordings or completed experiments. Establishing meaningful recognition performance would require representative participant data, implemented classification models, independent testing, and appropriate statistical analysis. Consequently, the hypothetical results cannot establish the superiority of deep learning architectures or demonstrate reliable activity recognition in operational environments.

Overall, the study identifies sensor placement, movement variability, temporal segmentation, computational efficiency, and evaluation reliability as important considerations in wearable activity recognition. Future empirical research should examine these factors through carefully designed experiments and reproducible computational procedures. Deep learning may support intelligent movement classification when trained and evaluated using appropriate sensor information. Nevertheless, genuine conclusions concerning predictive effectiveness and practical implementation must be established through independently verified experimental evidence.

References

1. Lara, Ó. D., & Labrador, M. A. (2012). A survey on human activity recognition using wearable sensors. *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, 15(3), 1192–1209. <https://doi.org/10.1109/SURV.2012.110112.00192>
2. Bulling, A., Blanke, U., & Schiele, B. (2014). A tutorial on human activity recognition using body-worn inertial sensors. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 46(3), Article 33. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2499621>
3. Bao, L., & Intille, S. S. (2004). Activity recognition from user-annotated acceleration data. In *Pervasive Computing* (pp. 1–17). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-24646-6_1
4. Ravi, N., Dandekar, N., Mysore, P., & Littman, M. L. (2005). Activity recognition from accelerometer data. In *Proceedings of the Seventeenth Conference on Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence* (pp. 1541–1546). AAAI Press.
5. Anguita, D., Ghio, A., Oneto, L., Parra, X., & Reyes-Ortiz, J. L. (2013). A public domain dataset for human activity recognition using smartphones. In *Proceedings of the 21st International European Symposium on Artificial Neural Networks, Computational Intelligence and Machine Learning* (pp. 437–442).
6. Zeng, M., Nguyen, L. T., Yu, B., Mengshoel, O. J., Zhu, J., Wu, P., & Zhang, J. (2014). Convolutional neural networks for human activity recognition using mobile sensors. In *Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Mobile Computing, Applications and Services* (pp. 197–205). <https://doi.org/10.4108/icst.mobihealth.2014.257786>
7. Chen, Y., & Xue, Y. (2015). A deep learning approach to human activity recognition based on single accelerometer. In *2015 IEEE International Conference on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics* (pp. 1488–1492). IEEE.
8. Ordóñez, F. J., & Roggen, D. (2016). Deep convolutional and LSTM recurrent neural networks for multimodal wearable activity recognition. *Sensors*, 16(1), Article 115. <https://doi.org/10.3390/s16010115>
9. Hammerla, N. Y., Halloran, S., & Plötz, T. (2016). Deep, convolutional, and recurrent models for human activity recognition using wearables. In *Proceedings of the 25th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence* (pp. 1533–1540). <https://www.ijcai.org/Proceedings/16/Papers/220.pdf>
10. Nweke, H. F., Teh, Y. W., Al-garadi, M. A., & Alo, U. R. (2018). Deep learning algorithms for human activity recognition using mobile and wearable sensor networks: State of the art and research challenges. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 105, 233–261. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2018.03.056>
11. Wang, J., Chen, Y., Hao, S., Peng, X., & Hu, L. (2019). Deep learning for sensor-based activity recognition: A survey. *Pattern Recognition Letters*, 119, 3–11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.patrec.2018.02.010>
12. Chen, Z., Zhang, L., Cao, Z., & Guo, J. (2018). Distilling the knowledge from handcrafted features for human activity recognition. *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics*, 14(10), 4334–4342.
13. Zhang, S., Li, Y., Zhang, S., Shahabi, F., Xia, S., Deng, Y., & Alshurafa, N. (2022). Deep learning in human activity recognition with wearable sensors: A review on advances. *Sensors*, 22(4), Article 1476. <https://doi.org/10.3390/s22041476>
14. Khatun, M. A., Yousuf, M. A., Ahmed, S., Uddin, M. Z., Alyami, S. A., Al-Ashhab, S., Akhdar, H. F., Khan, A., Azad, A., & Moni, M. A. (2022). Deep CNN-LSTM with self-attention model for

- human activity recognition using wearable sensor. IEEE Journal of Translational Engineering in Health and Medicine, 10, 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1109/JTEHM.2022.3177710>
15. Nouriani, A., McGovern, R. A., & Rajamani, R. (2022). Deep-learning-based human activity recognition using wearable sensors. IFAC-PapersOnLine, 55(37), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ifacol.2022.11.152>
16. Nooruddin, S., Milani, A., & colleagues. (2022). Human activity recognition using tools of convolutional neural networks: A state of the art review, data sets, challenges, and future prospects. Computers in Biology and Medicine, 149, Article 106060. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.combiomed.2022.106060>
17. Koşar, E., & Barshan, B. (2023). A new CNN-LSTM architecture for activity recognition employing wearable motion sensor data: Enabling diverse feature extraction. Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence, 124, Article 106529. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.engappai.2023.106529>
18. Sun, J., et al. (2018). Sequential human activity recognition based on deep convolutional network and extreme learning machine using wearable sensors. Journal of Sensors, 2018, Article 8580959. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2018/8580959>
19. A DCNN-LSTM based human activity recognition by mobile and wearable sensor networks. (2023). Alexandria Engineering Journal, 80, 542–552. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aej.2023.09.013>
20. Ferrara, E. (2024). Large language models for wearable sensor-based human activity recognition, health monitoring, and behavioral modeling: A survey of early trends, datasets, and challenges. Sensors, 24(15), Article 5045. <https://doi.org/10.3390/s24155045>