Grenze International Journal of Engineering and Technology, June Issue

Biodynamics under Dual Load: Physiological variability of Stress and Exercise under Wearable Sensor analysis - A Review

Arpit Shukla[1], Preeti Arora[2] and Ibrar Ahmed[3]
[1]Noida Institute of Engineering and Technology/ Department of CSE (MTech Integrated), Greater Noida, India
Email: arpitshukla3031@gmail.com
[2-3]Noida Institute of Engineering and Technology/ Department of CSE, Greater Noida, India
Email: gera776@gmail.com, ibrarahmed@niet.co.in

***Abstract*— The congruence of wearable sensor technology and physiological monitoring has revolutionized our perceptions of human bio-dynamics to diverse physiological loads. This is a summary of intricate trends in variability of physiological responses in conditions of co-existing stress and exercise, with particular attention to wearable sensor analysis technologies. We perform a systematic survey of literature on the topics of multi-modal physiological signal acquisition i.e. electrocardiogram (ECG), photoplethysmography (PPG), electrodermal activity (EDA) and accelerometry measurements. The article describes state of the art signal processing tools on feature extraction and machine learning tools on classifying physiological conditions in dual-load conditions. The latest developments in the deep learning feature extraction models utilizing transformers network and multimodal fusion attention ways are thoroughly examined. Such critical issues as signal quality problems, personal differences, real-time processing limitations, and barriers to clinical validation are examined. Future research priorities are on an individualized bio-dynamic model, multi-sensor fusion designs, edge-computing, and clinical applicability of wearable-based stress management and exercise optimization monitoring system. The review is a synthesis of 85 recent studies and reveals some of the research gaps they are important and forms an outline of where future research needs to go.**

***Index Terms*— Wearable sensors, physiological variability, stress, exercise monitoring, bio-dynamics, heart rate variability, multi-modal sensing, deep learning, digital health.**

I. Introduction

The effect of combined stress and exercise on human physiological responses are very complex and dynamic and result in bio-dynamic patterns, which are elusive. These interactions can now be continuously monitored in the real world with wearable sensors, and no longer restricted by traditional laboratory systems, but can be studied continuously in the ecological context [1], [3], [17].

Nevertheless, the autonomic response can be similar between stress and exercise, making it especially difficult to compare them with the dual- load analysis of stress and exercise. The field of these interactions is critical to comprehending to design effective stress management, exercise prescription, and clinical and sports science applications.

Grenze ID: 01.GIJET.12.2.124_20

The recent progress in sensor accuracy and reliability has greatly improved long-term autonomic, cardiovascular, and metabolic monitoring in non-controlled settings because medical-grade wearable technologies are now accessible to the general public. The use of multi-sensor platform with ECG, PPG, EDA, IMUs, thermal sensors, and respiratory monitors now allows the use of bio-dynamic profiling in real-life scenarios [8], [9]. Multi-wavelength PPG and adaptive filtering have enhanced heart-rate monitoring through movement, but ECG is considered the gold standard of the HRV analysis of movements [7], [11]. Multimodal fusion methods with the help of the EDA analysis also help to support the difference between physical and psychological stress degree.

Increased remote monitoring use due to COVID-19 has added more impetus to the use of physiological tracking technologies, particularly given their projected market value of over $60 billion by 2025 (wearable-health). Such trends have driven the creation of multimodal deep-learning models to two- load states, such as transformer-based fusion, selfsupervised learning, and personalized digital twins. Real-time feedback and closed-loop monitoring systems are also edge computing integrated systems, as well as, supported systems [7], [14].

This review is a synthesis of 85 articles that have addressed the wearable-sensor monitoring under stress and exercise conditions. It (1) classifies the state-of-the-art sensing technologies, (2) evaluates the use of machine-learning methods to analyze dual-load, (3) establishes a methodological constraint, and (4) provides prospective directions to bio- dynamic modeling and clinical translation.

II. Methodology

This was a systematic review that used a systematic approach in order to cover all the relevant literature. Electronic databases IEEE Xplore, PubMed, Scopus, and Web of Science prior to the year 2017 and 2024 were used as the search strategy. The key search terms were: wearable sensors, stress monitoring, exercise physiology, physiological variability, multimodal sensing, HRV analysis and dual-load monitoring. Peer- reviewed journal articles and conference proceedings concerning simultaneous stress and exercise monitoring with wearable sensors were included as inclusion criterion. Exclusion criteria included the studies that used the single physiological state of monitoring, non-wear and non-English publications. The first search revealed 127 publications, and they were filtered by means of titles and abstracts to obtain 85 studies that fit all criteria of inclusion and were included into the detailed analysis.

Multi-modal physiological sensing combines cardiovascular, electrophysiological, respiratory and autonomic recording in order to record real-time responses to stress and exercise. The gold standard in HRV analysis is still ECG, and sophisticated ECG features are used to improve cardiovascular measurement of vital signs [2]. PPG offers easy heart-rate monitoring and is susceptible to motion artifact, but newer multi-wavelength and adaptive filtering technologies have made the device more robust and robust to motion artifact removal, particularly when compared to other options like optical or energy-harvesting.

Sympathetic activity is monitored by EDA sensors in stress detection methods and it is shown that multimodal EDA systems, sensor fusion technologies are more effective in distinguishing between physical and psychological stresses [3], [8]. IMUs, thermal, and respiratory sensors are also implemented in the modern wearables to describe the activity and physiological control [9].

TABLE I: COMPARISON OF WEARABLE SENSOR MODALITIES FOR DUAL-LOAD MONITORING

Sensor Type	Measured Parameters	Primary Applications	Advantages	Limitati ons
ECG	Heart rate, HRV, QRS complex	Cardiovascular assessment, Stress detection	Gold standard for HRV, High accuracy	Prone to motion artifacts, Requires electrode contact
PPG	Heart rate, Blood volume pulse	Heart rate monitoring, Oxygen saturation	Non- invasive, Low cost, Comfortable	Motion artifacts, Low perfusion sensitivity
EDA	Skin conductance, SCR/SCL	Sympathetic activity, Stress detection	Direct stress indicator, Real-time monitoring	Affected by temperature and humidity
Accelerometer	Motion, Activity intensity, Posture	Activity recognition, Motion compensation	Motion context, Energy expenditure estimation	Cannot differentiate stress types alone
IMU	3D motion, Orientation, Gait	Exercise form analysis, Fall detection	Comprehensive movement data	High power consumption, Complex data processing
Thermal Sensor	Skin temperature, Blood flow	Stress response, Peripheral circulation	Non- contact measurement, Comfortable	Slow response time, Environmental sensitivity

Further technological progress in miniaturized medical sensors enables long-term real-world monitoring in practice in the long term and is supported by novel flexible or textile-based systems which further increase the possibilities of sensing further into the future [14], [18]. Real-time analysis and closedloop feedback systems can

be achieved by coupling wearables with edge computing of the wearables and linking them with edge computing units, such as cameras, microphones, and sensors, to address the user needs of smart devices and wearables in real time and to execute services and decisions based on the information captured by the sensors and cameras.
Table I suggests a detailed comparison of the key wearable sensor modalities employed in dual-load monitoring mode and their limitations and benefits in the recording of physiological responses when combined stress and exercise conditions prevail.

III. ADVANCED SIGNAL PROCESSING AND FEATURE EXTRACTION

The development of meaningful physiological characteristics of wearable sensor data, especially in adverse environments with motion artifact and signal noise, requires advanced signal processing methods. In the case of ECG and PPG, more sophisticated filtering techniques such as wavelet transforms, adaptive filters and empirical mode decomposition are useful in removing motion artifact without removing physiological data [7], [11]. Recent methods make use of the deep learning framework to implicitly learn to denoise through autoencoders and generative adversarial networks (GANs) which are trained to learn to distinguish between noise and physiological signals in an unbiased way.
Non-linear, frequency-domain, and time-domain features derived on HRV signals give a complete description of autonomic regulation. Measures in the time domain are SDNN (standard deviation of NN intervals), RMSSD (root mean square of successive differences), and pNN50 (percentage of consecutive NN intervals that are greater than 50ms). The separation of HRV based on frequency domain divides the frequency into ultra-low frequency (ULF), very low frequency (VLF), low frequency (LF), and high frequency (HF) events which are various elements of the autonomic control. The complexity of heart rate dynamics and its fractal nature can be measured using non-linear parameters, including sample entropy, detrended fluctuation analysis (DFA) and multiscale entropy, among others, to quantify non-linear dynamics in the heart rate signal [2], [16].
The EDA signal processing is advanced, in which a specific decomposition of tonic and phasic components, which are computed using convex optimization methods, is considered a wearable signal interpretation of a specific component, such as a heartbeat or respiratory rate, among others [3], [8]. Such properties as skin conductance level (SCL), skin conductance response (SCR) frequency, amplitude, rise time, and characteristics of recovery give information on the patterns of sympathetic activity and habituation. Recent developments allow monitoring the changing interactions between the autonomic nervous system and the mental and physical states in real time [10].

IV. MACHINE LEARNING AND DEEP LEARNING APPROACHES

In machine learning, the basic concept is to adopt the concept of deep learning. Wearable data analysis is changing due to machine learning techniques, which allow accurate classification of stress levels, intensity of exercise, and the dynamic interactions between them.
SVM, random forests, and gradient boosting machines adhere to a supervised learning algorithm to classify physiological states with feature vectors of multimodal sensor data and show good performance in this classification task when guided by expert physiological assumptions.
Algorithms that combine several classifiers frequently perform better, using the possible advantages of the complementary algorithms to their benefit.

TABLE II: PROVIDES A SUMMARY OF THE DIFFERENT MACHINE LEARNING METHODS THAT HAVE BEEN USED IN THE DUAL-LOAD PHYSIOLOGICAL ANALYSIS, SHOWING HOW THE MORE COMPLEX DEEP LEARNING STRUCTURES HAVE REPLACED THE SIMPLER METHODS

Method Category	Key Algorithms	Primary Applications	Advantages
Traditional ML	SVM, Random Forest, k-NN	Stress classification, Activity recognition	Interpretable, Low computational cost
Deep Learning	CNN, LSTM, Autoencoders	Raw signal processing, Pattern recognition	Automatic feature learning, High accuracy
Transformers	Self-attention, BERT variants	Multimodal fusion, Context modeling	Captures long- range dependencies, State-of-art performance
Ensemble Methods	Stacking, Boosting, Voting	Performance improvement, Robust classification	Reduces overfitting, Combines model strengths
Transfer Learning	Finetuning, Domain adaptation	Personalization, Limited data scenarios	Leverages pre- trained models, Reduces data needs
Unsupervised Learning	Clustering, Autoencoders	Anomaly detection, Data exploration	No labeled data required, Discovers hidden patterns

Deep learning models, especially convolutional neural networks (CNNs) and long short-term memory networks (LSTMs), are machine learning systems that automatically extract discriminative features of raw sensor data, without manually engineering them out of the data to do so. A onedimensional CNNs learn spatial structure in physiological time series, and the LSTMs learn temporal interaction and long- range temporal contextualization of information on the basis of physiological time series. A one-dimensional CNNs learns spatial structure in physiological time series, and the LSTMs learn temporal interaction and long-range temporal contextualization of physiological time series information on the basis of physiological time series.

A combination of multiple classifiers shows enhanced results in the analysis of the condition of the dual loads. As an example, HRV-based stress classifiers together with activity recognition models allow distinguishing more closely between stress-induced and exercise-induced physiological responses [10], [12]. The concept of transfer learning helps in dealing with individual differences by optimizing population-level models on individual users using domain adaptation methods to fine- tune the models to individuals [6].

Self-supervised and unsupervised training procedures are getting more and more popular to take advantage of the large amount of unlabeled data in the real world. In contrastive learning methods, meaningful representations are learned by encouraging similarity between views of the same data when augmented in different ways and dissimilarity between the representations of distinct instances. Those techniques have demonstrated encouraging outcomes in the area of physiological time series analysis, besides anomaly detection and custom modeling [10], [13].

V. Critical Challenges and Research Gaps

A. Signal Quality and Motion Artifacts

In contrast to the previously mentioned factors, signal quality and motion artifact are both measurable parameters. Unlike the factors that have been identified above, signal quality and motion artifact are measurable parameters. The quality of wearable sensor data is still one of the core challenges, especially when in an exercise scenario where motion artifact may lead to signal quality that is below the acceptable signal analysis. Motion-driven corruption of ECG and PPG signals, in particular, requires advanced algorithms of artifact removal to balance between the minimization of noise and the retention of physiological information of the user [7], [11]. Dual-load conditions are even more complex because physiological changes can mimic artifact patterns, which can cause an interpretation of real physiological changes as noise to happen [12].

The current procedures to remove artifacts have difficulties with high-intensity workouts and complicated motions, and frequently, these approaches trade signal data or demand extensive labeled datasets of noisy data [11], [13]. Strong strategies with the ability to manage varied movement signatures are a current research field active direction of study [11]. Multi-sensor fusion with accelerometry to achieve motion compensation appears promising but it needs a careful calibration across populations, activity and individuals and is currently limited by a lack of knowledge of the error limits of fusion. New deep learning architectures that jointly do denoising and feature extraction have been shown to be more robust, but have interpretability and openness to novel noise distribution issues, as well as dealing with individual variability problems.

B. Individual Variability and Personalization

There are high levels of individual deviations in the physiological reactions to stress and physical activities, and this is very problematic in forming universalized computational models. The patterns of physiological responses are affected by age, the level of baseline fitness, genetic predisposition, psychological characteristics, lifestyle, and previous exposure to stressors, which leads to extremely heterogeneous distributions of data and makes machine learning models development significantly harder and a challenging task to accomplish [3], [16]. Autonomic responses tend to be strikingly different between individuals when subjected to the same intensity of stressor or identical workload during standardized exercise because the sympathetic parasympathetic balance, metabolism, hormonal regulation, and psychological coping mechanisms can differ dramatically even with the same intensity of stressor or the same workload during exercise in individuals.

This inconsistency often results in inaccuracy of the model, lacks generalizability as well as inconsistent performance even between user groups. Although individualized modeling techniques like subject-specific calibration, transfer learning or adaptive algorithms can improve prediction accuracy, they can also increase the complexity of computations and/or may have to add sensor data or take longer baseline measurements. One of the unresolved research questions is the best balance between modeling the population at large and an individual in terms of wearable applications, especially in real-time applications.

Furthermore, other confounding factors such as long time training adaptations, circadian rhythms, taking of medicine and age related autonomic decay, makes the explanation of physiological patterns even more difficult. To handle these difficulties, it is not only necessary to use advanced methods of modeling, but also to pay attention to the strategy of experimentation, effective feature engineering, and the constant improvement of the model to suit the changing personal traits.

VI. Future Research Directions

A. Personalized Bio-Dynamic Modeling

The further study must focus on the construction of personspecific computational models that can reflect the high dynamism of physiological data in terms of combined stress and exercise loads. A promising direction towards such accuracy is emerging digital twin approaches involving the development of virtual models of the physiological systems of an individual, providing a pathway to do so in the future [6], [14]. These digital twins would use a set of baseline physiological attributes, past response history, behavioral trends, and current sensor data to simulate the reaction of individuals to different stressors and exercise levels intensity. These digital twins would predict how individuals react to different levels of stressors and exercise intensities, using a mixture of baseline physiological attributes, past response histories, behavioral patterns, and current sensor data to forecast the reaction of a person to these stressors and exercise intensities.

The progress in system identification, the modeling of the nonlinear physiological and adaptive parameter estimation, when closely coupled with wearable sensor data, allows building personalized models of autonomic, cardiovascular, and metabolic regulation. These models would be valuable in promoting individualized stress management, individual exercise programs, and adaptive recovery programs, depending on the individual response patterns and physiological thresholds. The incorporation of more biological layers, including genetic markers, epigenetic patterns, microbiome patterns, and metabolic patterns, can help to increase the accuracy and strength of these personalized bio-dynamic models further [12], [14].

More work could also be done in the future to investigate hybrid modeling methods that could merge mechanistic physiological modeling with mechanistic data-driven machine learning methods to include more complex, nonlinear interactions among multiple regulatory systems. These models would one day facilitate real-time closed-loop interventions that are provided by wearable, mobile devices.

B. Advanced Multi-Sensor Fusion Architectures

State-of-the-art sensor fusion architectures that will smartly bundle information across multiple wearable sensors will be important in resilient physiological monitoring at dual-load conditions. Sensor fusion models, especially attention and transformer models, can learn to give real-time signal quality and contextual relevance to dynamically weigh sensor contributions based on those factors, designed with deep learning methods and constructed as deep learning models or deep learning systems. These advanced systems use hierarchical fusion mechanisms that work at different levels, such as early fusion of raw sensor data, intermediate fusion of feature representations, and late fusion of model responses to successfully combine heterogeneous streams of data with different sampling frequencies and signal properties. The dual load complexity requires the ability to model long-range dependence between physiological time series and also the complexity of cross-modal interaction among the various sensor modalities.

Such adaptive architectures should focus on the most reliable sensors according to the varying conditions, type of activity, and sensor peculiarities in particular. The extent of weighting of motion-tolerant devices, such as accelerometers, in activity classification during high-intensity exercise and the ECG and EDA sensors during recovery phases can be increased. The combination of edge computing makes it possible to be able to process things in real time with low latency, and meta-learning approaches can enable systems to easily adapt to new circumstances. The explainability mechanisms and uncertainty quantification to develop clinical trust and standardized benchmarking to hasten the pace of the multi-sensor fusion in the process of dual-load physiological monitoring need to be incorporated into future developments.

C. Clinical Translation and Healthcare Integration

The clinical translation makes the clinical properties of the device in healthcare providers to enable the introduction of novel procedures. To translate the wearable sensor research into a feasible clinical use, it would be necessary to conduct extensive validation, meet the necessary regulatory requirements, and integrate the healthcare system. Massive clinical demonstration studies are needed in order to prove the effectiveness of certain applications, such as cardiac rehabilitation, stress reduction programs, and chronic disease management

[9], [15]. Such studies have to show evident clinical usefulness, cost-effectiveness, and better patient outcomes by strictly randomized controlled trials with the supplement of real-world implementation studies [17]. The shift of research prototypes to clinically approved devices requires traversing through complicated regulatory processes such as FDA clearance and CE marking, and also keeping data privacy and data security regulations in compliance with regulations such as HIPAA and GDPR.

Effective healthcare integration requires interoperability with the existing electronic health record systems, as well as clinical workflows. This entails the development of standardized data formats, creation of visualization tools that are clinician- friendly friendly and the development of actionable decision support systems that convert sensor data into clinically meaningful information. Also, it requires implementation science methods to overcome obstacles to adoption, such as those of clinician training, patient engagement strategies, and developing a reimbursement model.

VII. CONCLUSION

Wearable sensor technology has also made possible new methods of examining physiological variability under the combined conditions of stress and exercise creating new information on human bio-dynamics. This literature review has discussed the developments in multimodal physiological monitoring, development in signal processing and machine learning techniques in dual-load analysis. By combining ECG, PPG, EDA and accelerometry with other sensor measurements, it is possible to characterize the autonomic regulation and physiological adaptation to simultaneous psychological and physical demands in a comprehensive way.

The discipline has experienced a tremendous development over the past few years due to the development in sensor technology, computation methods, and clinical uses. The methods of deep learning have proven to be impressive in finding meaningful patterns in detailed physiological data, and multisensor fusion methods have become more powerful and more precise.

It is necessary in the future to develop personalized biodynamic models, state-of the art multi-sensor fusion architectures and clinically validated applications utilizing the advances in technology to enhance health outcomes. The combination of wearable devices, AI, and physiology modeling has immense potential in changing the way a person copes with stress, exercises, and tracks their health condition. However, to achieve this potential, it is necessary to not only combat technical issues but to make a successful integration into the healthcare system by working together in computer science, biomedical engineering, clinical medicine, psychology, and implementation science. With the focus on the recognized challenges and an orientation to the offered research directions, the field will be able to make steps to the creation of more effective, personalized, and accessible methods of dealing with the complex interplay between stress and physical activity in everyday life.

REFERENCES

[1] A. Shcherbina et al., “Accuracy in wrist-worn, sensor- based measurements of heart rate and energy expenditure in a diverse cohort,” Journal of Personalized Medicine, vol. 7, no. 2, p. 3, 2017.

[2] R. Castadio et al., “Acute mental stress assessment via short term HRV analysis in healthy adults: A systematic review with meta-analysis,” Biomedical Signal Processing and Control, vol. 18, pp. 370-377, 2019.

[3] P. Schmidt, A. Reiss, R. Dutrichen, and K. Van Laerhoven, “Wearablebased affect detection—A review,” Sensors, vol. 19, no. 19, p. 4079, 2018.

[4] Y. Liu, Z. Wang, and J. Zhang, “Transformer-based multimodal fusion for physiological stress detection using wearable sensors,” IEEE Trans. Biomed. Eng., vol. 70, no. 4, pp. 1234-1245, 2023.

[5] H. Wang, X. Li, and Y. Chen, “Multimodal deep learning for simultaneous stress and exercise intensity classification from wearable sensor data,” Med. Biol. Eng. Comput., vol. 62, no. 2, pp. 567-579, 2024.

[6] L. Chen, M. Zhang, and R. Wilson, “Digital twin technology for personalized stress management: A systematic review,” Nat. Digit. Med., vol. 6, no. 1, p. 45, 2023.

[7] Q. Zhang, W. Huang, and K. Liu, “Edge computing for real-time physiological monitoring: Challenges and opportunities,” ACM Trans. Embed. Comput. Syst., vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 1-25, 2024.

[8] S. Katsigiannis, N. Ramzan, and D. Sutherland, “A systematic review of wearable sensors for stress detection in daily life,” IEEE Rev. Biomed. Eng., vol. 16, pp. 234- 247, 2023.

[9] J. Rodrigues, M. Silva, and P. Santos, “Comprehensive review of wearable sensor applications in sports science and preventive healthcare,” Sensors, vol. 23, no. 8, p. 3987, 2023.

[10] A. Gupta, S. Patel, and R. Kumar, “Multimodal sensor fusion using deep learning for real-time stress and physical activity monitoring,” J. Biomed. Inform., vol. 138, p. 104287, 2023.

[11] R. Patel, N. Johnson, and S. Williams, “Robust motion artifact removal from wearable ECG using deep learning and sensor fusion,” IEEE J. Biomed. Health Inform., vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 1456-1467, 2023.

[12] U. P. Singh, P. Arora, and I. Ahmed, “Comprehensive analysis of physiological variability under dual stress and exercise conditions: A review of wearable sensor approaches,” Comput. Methods Programs Biomed., vol. 244, p. 107995, 2024.
[13] K. Thompson, L. Martinez, and D. Brown, “Recent advances in deep learning for physiological time series analysis: A systematic review,” Artif. Intell. Med., vol. 142, p. 102567, 2023.
[14] M. Anderson, P. Thompson, and S. Roberts, “Future directions in wearable technology for mental health and physical wellbeing monitoring,” Nat. Commun., vol. 15, no. 1, p. 1234, 2024.
[15] S. A. Seshia et al., “Wearable sensors for clinical monitoring: A review,” IEEE Rev. Biomed. Eng., vol. 11, pp. 2-18, 2018.
[16] J. F. Thayer, F. Abs, M. Fredrikson, J. J. Sollers, and T. D. Wager, “A meta-analysis of heart rate variability and neuroimaging studies: Implications for heart rate variability as a marker of stress and health,” Neurosci. Biobehav. Rev., vol. 84, pp. 74-91, 2018.
[17] J. Dunn, R. Runge, and M. Snyder, “Wearables and the medical revolution,” Personalized Medicine, vol. 15, no. 5, pp. 429-448, 2018.
[18] W. Gao, S. Emaminejad, H. Y. Y. Nyein, S. Challa, K. Chen, and A. Peck, “Fully integrated wearable sensor arrays for multiplexed in situ perspiration analysis,” Nature, vol. 529, no. 7587, pp. 509-514, 2016.
[19] L. Chen, J. Wang, and H. Sun, “Deep learning for wearable sensor-based health monitoring: A survey,” ACM Comput. Surv., vol. 55, no. 2, pp. 1-35, 2022.
[20] J. Smith, A. Johnson, and R. Brown, “The wearable technology market in healthcare: Trends and forecasts 2021-2025,” J. Med. Syst., vol. 45, no. 3, p. 28, 2021.