

# Adjacency Matrix Decomposition Clustering for Human Activity Data

Martha Barnard<sup>1\*</sup>, Yingling Fan<sup>2</sup>, Julian Wolfson<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Division of Biostatistics and Health Data Science, School of Public Health, University of Minnesota

<sup>2</sup>Department of Urban and Regional Planning Area, Hubert H. Humphrey School of Public Affairs,  
University of Minnesota

## Abstract

Mobile apps and wearable devices accurately and continuously measure human activity; patterns within this data can provide a wealth of information applicable to fields such as transportation and health. Despite the potential utility of this data, there has been limited development of analysis methods for sequences of daily activities. In this paper, we propose a novel clustering method and cluster evaluation metric for human activity data that leverages an adjacency matrix representation to cluster the data without the calculation of a distance matrix. Our technique is substantially faster than conventional methods based on computing pairwise distances via sequence alignment algorithms and also enhances interpretability of results. We compare our method to distance-based hierarchical clustering through simulation studies and an application to data collected by Daynamica, an app that turns raw sensor data into a daily summary of a user's activities. Among days that contain a large portion of time spent at home, our method distinguishes days that also contain full-time work or multiple hours of travel, while hierarchical clustering groups these days together. We also illustrate how the computational advantage of our method enables the analysis of longer sequences by clustering full weeks of activity data.

*Keywords:* digital phenotyping, human activity, mobile health, dimension reduction, clustering


---

\* barna126@umn.edu

# 1 Introduction

With the ubiquity of mobile apps and wearable devices, we can measure human behavior in more detail than ever before. Phone- and wearable-based sensors accurately and continuously measure human activity to provide valuable information in the context of transportation, health, and other fields (Boaro et al., 2021; Beukenhorst et al., 2021; Panda et al., 2021; Song et al., 2021). Torous et al. (2016) described the use of this data as digital phenotyping: the “moment-by-moment quantification of the individual-level human phenotype in-situ using data from smartphones and other personal digital devices” which emphasizes the continuous, or intensively sampled, nature of the data. One type of this data, continuous location tracking of human activities and movements in space, has enabled researchers to explore connections beyond people’s home neighborhoods to where and how people work, shop, spend leisure time, attend school, and travel. For example, this data has enabled researchers in environmental health to generate mobility-based measures of human exposure to specific environmental amenities (e.g., green space) and risks (e.g., air pollution). Furthermore, continuous measurements of human activity have enabled time use researchers to classify people’s time use patterns based upon the timing, sequence, and interdependence of activities during the day, not just the total amount of time spent on each type of activity. Freedman et al. (2019) used this data to investigate the relationship between time use sequences and emotional well-being among older caregivers. Using the continuous time use data, they were able to identify five distinctive caregiving patterns through clustering. These patterns were found to vary by gender and work status of the caregiver.

In this paper, we will focus on digital phenotype data recorded by Daynamica, a smartphone application that uses sensor-based activity tracking and ecological momentary assessment (EMA) to provide high resolution human activity data (Fan et al., 2015). Daynamica uses machine learning techniques to convert raw sensor data to a summary of a user’s daily activities according to the major categories used by the American Time Use Survey (U.S.



**Figure 1:** Raw sensor data and the Daynamica app calendar view of the data.

Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2022): home, work, school, eating out, shopping, leisure and recreation, and education. In addition, Daynamica detects the method of travel between activities, which is separated into travel by car, bus, train, bike, or walking. Individuals are asked, through the app, to correct any incorrectly converted data and to answer questions that supplement the sensor data, such as questions about emotional well-being or social activity. The resulting data provides a continuous 24-hour picture of how an individual spends their day in terms of activity states. Figure 1 provides an example of the raw sensor data and corresponding activity state data within the Daynamica app.

### 1.1 Existing Methods

Many studies collect a variety of mobile or wearable device data, including continuous (e.g., heart rate, physical acceleration (Karas et al., 2019; Bolliger et al., 2020)) and categorical (e.g., location (Beukenhorst et al., 2021; Panda et al., 2021)) outcomes. A considerable portion of previous method development for digital phenotype data surrounds the processing and aggregation of raw sensor or mobile data. Straczkiwicz et al. (2021) distinguishes four steps in utilizing digital phenotype data: 1) data acquisition; 2) data pre-processing; 3) feature extraction; 4) activity classification. Within the data pre-processing step, Liu and Onnela

(2022) have created methods for detecting anomalies within smart-phone time-series data and Barnett and Onnela (2020) have proposed imputation methods for missing GPS data. A variety of methods have also been developed and validated for the translation of processed accelerometer (Huang et al., 2022; Strackiewicz et al., 2023) or smart-phone sensor data (Fan et al., 2015) into meaningfully classified activity data.

Despite the extensive work on methods for processing and classifying digital phenotype data, there has been limited work on data analysis methods. Functional data methods have been developed for intensively sampled data with a continuous outcome (e.g., minute-by-minute physical activity intensity); however, there are few methods for intensively sampled categorical data. Previous studies that incorporate GPS activity data have focused on univariate aggregate metrics, such as the amount of time spent at home, and then conducted standard statistical analyses on these metrics (Boaro et al., 2021; Beukenhorst et al., 2021). However, this simple aggregation does not take advantage of the richness of the data; while the data contains information about potentially many activity states, the time of day or week the states occur, and how the activity states relate to each other through time, a single metric can only capture one state at one time point. In addition, univariate metrics do not capture the dependence inherent within the data; for example, time spent at home and time spent at work for a given individual are related and constrained by the total amount of time in the day.

Multi-state models, such as competing risks and Markov models, have also been used with intensively sampled categorical data as they model the durations of and transitions between categorical states within a time series (Piccarreta and Studer, 2019). While these methods are attractive for their ability to accommodate the full, multidimensional data structure, model complexity increases quickly as the number of states increases due to separate model parameters for each state transition. Complex models can have substantial computational requirements and tend to be difficult to interpret. Increasing model complexity also does not guarantee a good model fit; Huang et al. (2023) found that these models, even when



complex, were incapable of simulating data that was similar to the real activity data used within the model. While these methods can be useful for data with few states or a restricted number of state transitions, human activity data does not generally conform to the simplifying assumptions needed to make these models tractable.

## 1.2 Sequence-based Methods

Another set of methods, made common through life course analysis, represent the data as a character sequence (Aisenbrey and Fasang, 2010). To create the sequence, each individual's data is divided into temporally ordered, equal-sized time segments, where each segment is labeled by the state or category that occurs for the majority of the time segment. The result is an ordered character sequence, where each character represents a specific activity state. To characterize the similarity and differences between sequences, researchers have used the sequence alignment method (SAM) popularized within bioinformatics and genomics in the 1980s (Corpet, 1988; Sankoff et al., 1983). With SAM, each time position in two sequences is compared and a distance metric is calculated that describes differences between the sequences across all time points. A common distance metric used is the Levenshtein distance (Levenshtein, 1965; Sankoff et al., 1983), which is the number of changes (insertions, deletions, or substitutions) needed to make two sequences identical.

Life course analysis researchers have developed a variety of methods using SAM distances. These methods have focused on identifying common or representative sequence patterns and often leverage specific domain knowledge within life course sociology (Ritschard et al., 2013; Studer, 2021). Other more generalizable methods within life course analysis include k-medoid clustering of the sequence distance matrix and an extension of ANOVA based on distances rather than sum of squares (Studer et al. (2011); Piccarreta and Studer (2019)). Outside of life course analysis, there are few methods for identifying similarities and differences between sequences. Hierarchical clustering of the sequence distance matrix has been the common method for clustering sequences across a variety of disciplines (Corpet, 1988; Freedman et al.,

2019; Song et al., 2021).

While distance-based methods are popular, calculating the distance matrix can become computationally prohibitive as the number of sequences and sequence length increase. Computational requirements are of specific concern as digital phenotype data has the potential for determining close to real-time interventions, which require real-time data analyses (Onnela, 2021). In addition, while the distance between two sequences describes how different they are, it does not describe the manner in which they differ. Text analysis and genomic methods have developed alignment-free distance-based methods where sequences are compared through their  $n$ -grams or  $k$ -mers, respectively (Blaisdell, 1986; Kondrak, 2005; Kantorovitz et al., 2007). Using  $n$ -grams or  $k$ -mers is more computationally efficient than calculating the Levenshtein distance and has had superior performance in text classification problems and phylogenetic tree creation (Peng and Schuurmans, 2003; Wen et al., 2014). The application of these methods to data sources outside of genetics or text has been limited despite the computational improvements over full sequence alignment.

### 1.3 Outline of proposed method

In this paper, we propose a novel clustering method for sequential human activity data. Our technique uses an adjacency matrix representation of the sequences, clusters the sequences via a decomposition of the adjacency matrices, and evaluates the optimal cluster number with a new metric that adapts the Calinski-Harabasz index in the context of adjacency matrices. The technique provides considerable computational benefits in comparison to distance-based clustering methods (40 to 60 times faster with Daynamica data) for a large number of sequences. The adjacency matrix representation and further decomposition increases the interpretability of clustering results and the ability to weight specific parts of the adjacency matrix provides flexibility within the clustering procedure. We explore the behavior of our method in comparison to hierarchical clustering with full sequence alignment through simulations. We demonstrate the performance of our method on Daynamica activity data in

which we create meaningful clusters of daily and weekly activity patterns. The structure of the paper is as follows: in Section 2, we describe the steps within our clustering method. We present simulation methods in Section 3 and the application of our method to Daynamica data in Section 4. We discuss results and future work in Section 5.

## 2 Methods

### 2.1 Notation

Our data consists of  $n$  sequences,  $\{y_i\}, i = 1, \dots, n$ . Each sequence  $y_i$  is of common length  $l$  and takes the form  $\{y_{i,1}, \dots, y_{i,l}\}$ , where each  $y_{i,j} \in \mathcal{S}$ , a set of  $m$  unique state  $s_1, \dots, s_m$ . In this sequence formulation,  $y_{i,j} = s_u$  represents an amount of time,  $\delta$ , spent in the state  $s_u$  where  $\delta$  is the same for every  $j = 1, \dots, l$ .

### 2.2 Clustering Method

While our technique can be applied to any categorical sequence data, we present the method in the context of daily human activity data. Briefly, our clustering approach proceeds as follows. Each step is described in greater detail below:

1. Form an adjacency matrix  $\mathcal{T}_i$  for each sequence  $y_i$ .
2. Concatenate as columns the vectorized versions of each adjacency matrix to form a matrix  $\mathcal{M}$ .
3. Obtain the singular value decomposition of the centered matrix  $\mathcal{M}_c = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^T$ .
4. Select the first  $h$  columns of  $\mathbf{V}$ , and apply a clustering algorithm to them.
5. Apply a novel cluster evaluation metric to evaluate cluster quality.

### 2.2.1 Adjacency Matrix and SVD

For each sequence  $y_i$ , we create an  $m \times m$  adjacency matrix  $\mathcal{T}_i$ . The  $(u, v)$  entry of  $\mathcal{T}_i$  is the number of times the  $s_u$  state precedes the  $s_v$  state in  $y_i$ , i.e.,

$$\mathcal{T}_{i_{u,v}} = \sum_{j=1}^{l-1} I[y_{i,j} = s_u, y_{i,j+1} = s_v]$$

Then, for  $\{y_i\}$  a corresponding set of adjacency matrices is calculated,  $\{\mathcal{T}_i\}$ . We vectorize each adjacency matrix and obtain the set  $\{\mathbf{t}_i\}$  where  $\mathbf{t}_i = \text{vec}(\mathcal{T}_i)$  such that  $\mathbf{t}_i$  has length  $m^2$ . Then, we construct an  $m^2 \times n$  matrix where the  $i$ th column is  $\mathbf{t}_i$ ,  $\mathcal{M} = [\mathbf{t}_1, \dots, \mathbf{t}_n]$ . We center  $\mathcal{M}$ ,  $\mathcal{M}_c = \mathcal{M} - (l-1)/m^2 \mathbf{J}_{m^2 \times n}$ . Then, we decompose  $\mathcal{M}_c$  using singular value decomposition (SVD),  $\mathcal{M}_c = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^T$ , where  $\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}$  are orthogonal matrices and  $\mathbf{\Sigma}$  is a diagonal matrix.

The adjacency matrix  $\mathcal{T}_i$  is a compressed representation of the full sequence  $y_i$ . For each adjacency matrix,  $\mathcal{T}_i$ , the diagonal of the matrix is the number of same state transitions, which represents the contiguous duration spent in a state throughout the day (in relation to  $\delta$ ). All other entries represent how many times during the day there are transitions between states. By definition, we have  $\sum_{u,v} \mathcal{T}_{i_{u,v}} = l - 1$ . Scaling the entries of the adjacency matrix as  $\mathcal{T}_{i_{u,v}} / \sum_u \mathcal{T}_{i_{u,v}}$  yields the estimated first-order Markov transition probability matrix for  $y_i$ . The first-order Markov matrix representation standardizes the row sums to one, however since the row sums provide useful information in this context (total amount of time spent in a state throughout the day) we use the described adjacency matrix representation. We also note that the vectorized form of the adjacency matrix,  $\mathbf{t}_i$ , is the 2-mer count vector for the sequence  $y_i$ .

### 2.2.2 SVD Output and Clustering

After performing SVD, we select a subset of the columns of  $\mathbf{V}$  that correspond to the  $h$  largest singular values,  $\mathbf{V}_{1:h}$  (the first  $h$  principal axes in principal component analysis (PCA)). Each

row of  $\mathbf{V}_{1:h}$  corresponds to an single day sequence, so we can perform a cluster analysis on  $\mathbf{V}_{1:h}$  to obtain a clustering of the sequences. We are essentially clustering on the numerical vectors corresponding to a transformation of the adjacency matrix representation of the set of day sequences. There are multiple potential ways to select  $h$ , such as using methods for selecting principal axes in PCA, however, we suggest that  $h$  be selected through cluster evaluation metrics, which will be demonstrated in Sections 3 and 4.

Existing multidimensional clustering algorithms can be used to cluster  $\mathbf{V}_{1:h}$  (such as k-means, hierarchical, DBSCAN, etc.). It is beyond the scope of this paper to evaluate the behavior of the clustering algorithms in this application, however there has been work comparing these methods in general (Rodriguez et al., 2019). We use the k-means algorithm in applications of the method in Sections 3 and 4.

### 2.2.3 Cluster Evaluation

Suppose that, based on the procedure described above, sequences are clustered into  $p$  clusters where cluster  $C_k$  contains  $n_k$  sequences,  $k = 1, \dots, p$ . For each cluster, we construct a mean adjacency matrix for the cluster,  $\mathcal{T}_{(k)} = \frac{1}{n_k} \sum_{i:y_i \in C_k} \mathcal{T}_i$ . Using SVD, we decompose the matrices  $\mathcal{T}_{(k)} = \mathbf{U}_{(k)} \mathbf{\Sigma}_{(k)} \mathbf{V}_{(k)}^T$  for each  $\mathcal{T}_{(k)}$  and  $\mathcal{T}_i = \mathbf{U}_i \mathbf{\Sigma}_i \mathbf{V}_i^T$  for each  $\mathcal{T}_i$ . The within-cluster distance metric is based on the difference between each  $\mathcal{T}_i$  and an approximation of  $\mathcal{T}_i$  calculated from the SVD of the mean adjacency matrix  $\mathcal{T}_{(k)}$ :

$$d_w = \sum_{k=1}^p \sum_{i:y_i \in C_k} \|\mathcal{T}_i - \mathbf{U}_{(k)} \mathbf{\Sigma}_i \mathbf{V}_{(k)}^T\|_F^2 \quad (1)$$

where  $\|\cdot\|_F$  is the Frobenius norm. The average matrix of the entire set of adjacency matrices,  $\mathcal{T}_{(0)} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{T}_i$ , is decomposed  $\mathcal{T}_{(0)} = \mathbf{U}_{(0)} \mathbf{\Sigma}_{(0)} \mathbf{V}_{(0)}^T$ . Then, the between-cluster distance metric is based on the difference between each  $\mathcal{T}_{(k)}$  and an approximation of  $\mathcal{T}_{(k)}$  calculated from SVD of the mean adjacency matrix for all sequences  $\mathcal{T}_{(0)}$ :

$$d_b = \sum_{k=1}^p n_k \|\mathcal{T}_{(k)} - \mathbf{U}_{(0)} \mathbf{\Sigma}_{(k)} \mathbf{V}_{(0)}^T\|_F^2 \quad (2)$$

We note that in Equations 1 and 2 other matrix norms can be used instead of the Frobenius norm, which we choose due to its low computational cost. These two metrics can be combined in the same manner that the Calinski-Harabasz (CH) index (Calinski and Harabasz, 1974) combines the sum of squares within cluster and sum of squares between cluster metrics,

$$D = \frac{d_b/(p-1)}{d_w/(n-p)} \quad (3)$$

This final metric can be maximized to determine tuning parameter values for clustering the set of sequences  $\{y_i\}$ , including  $h$ , the number of columns chosen from the SVD for clustering, as well as the optimal number of clusters.

A direct matrix form translation of sum of squares within cluster and sum of squares between cluster is:

$$WSS = \sum_{k=1}^p \sum_{i:y_i \in C_k} \text{tr}[(\mathcal{T}_i - \mathcal{T}_{(k)})^T (\mathcal{T}_i - \mathcal{T}_{(k)})] = \sum_{k=1}^p \sum_{i:y_i \in C_k} \|\mathcal{T}_i - \mathcal{T}_{(k)}\|_F^2 \quad (4)$$

$$BSS = \sum_{k=1}^p n_k \text{tr}[(\mathcal{T}_{(k)} - \mathcal{T}_{(0)})^T (\mathcal{T}_{(k)} - \mathcal{T}_{(0)})] = \sum_{k=1}^p n_k \|\mathcal{T}_{(k)} - \mathcal{T}_{(0)}\|_F^2 \quad (5)$$

This formulation of  $WSS$  and  $BSS$  could also be combined in the same manner as the CH index and used to evaluate clusters (and may be desirable to use depending on computational considerations). However, selecting the optimal number of clusters based on these formulations tends to select a higher number of clusters than Equation 3. In addition, rather than evaluating the numerical spread of matrices within and between clusters (Equations 4 and 5), our proposed metric measures how well each cluster represents the sequences within it. In Equation 1,  $\mathbf{U}_{(k)}$  and  $\mathbf{V}_{(k)}^T$  encapsulate the shared aspects of matrices within cluster  $C_k$  while  $\mathbf{\Sigma}_i$  represents the individual attributes of a single matrix,  $\mathcal{T}_i$  (Tang et al., 2009; Dong et al., 2012). Then, if a sequence,  $\mathcal{T}_i$ , is well represented by a cluster,  $C_k$ ,  $\mathcal{T}_i \approx \mathbf{U}_{(k)} \mathbf{\Sigma}_i \mathbf{V}_{(k)}^T$  such that  $\|\mathcal{T}_i - \mathbf{U}_{(k)} \mathbf{\Sigma}_i \mathbf{V}_{(k)}^T\|_F^2 \approx 0$ .

### 2.3 Computational Benefits

The primary computational benefits of the method compared to SAM come from eliminating the calculation of the sequence distance matrix with full sequence alignment. Computing the distance matrix with the Levenshtein distance has complexity  $O(n^2l^2)$  where  $n$  is the number of sequences in the set and  $l$  is the length of the sequences. Our method instead computes the SVD of the vectorized adjacency matrices which has complexity  $O(\min(nm^4, n^2m^2))$  where  $m$  is the number of unique states in the set of sequences. In this application, most often  $\min(nm^4, n^2m^2) = nm^4$  and  $m \ll l$ , hence the complexity of the SVD calculation is substantially less than the complexity of the distance matrix calculation. In the analysis of Daynamica data in Section 4,  $m = 4$  for all sequences while  $l = 288$  for day sequences and  $l = 1440$  for week sequences.

### 2.4 Weighting

The adjacency matrix representation of a sequence gives equal weight to every state transition, regardless of the location in the sequence where the transition occurs or the states involved in the transition. However, it may be desirable to emphasize the transitions that occur within a given region of the sequence or transitions that involve a specific state. For example, a researcher may want to increase the relative influence of transitions that occur during standard commuting hours (6-9 a.m., 3-6 p.m.) to better distinguish individuals with different commuting patterns. Or, a researcher may want to increase the influence of the amount of time an individual spends outside of home or work to better determine patterns in leisure activities.

For a set of sequences  $\{y_i\}$ , we can weight aspects of the adjacency matrix in order to increase their influence within the clustering procedure. Formally, for the transition from entry  $j$  to entry  $j+1$  in sequence  $y_i$  we assign a corresponding weight  $w_j$  such that the  $(u, v)$  entry of the weighted adjacency matrix,  $\mathcal{T}_i^w$ , is constructed as  $\mathcal{T}_{i,u,v}^w = \sum_{j=1}^{l-1} w_j I[y_{i,j} = s_u, y_{i,j+1} = s_v]$ . The weighted adjacency matrix is then scaled such that the entries in each matrix still

sum to  $l - 1$ ,  $\mathcal{T}_i^w = \frac{\text{sum}(\mathcal{T}_i^w)}{l-1} \mathcal{T}_i^w$ . The rest of the clustering process remains the same, simply using the set of weighted adjacency matrices,  $\{\mathcal{T}_i^w\}$ . For the example previously mentioned, we can assign a weight  $w^*$  to all transitions occurring between 6-9 a.m. and 3-6 p.m and a weight  $w$  to transitions occurring at all other times such that  $w^*/w > 1$  to emphasize the commuting hours. Note that the weights can also be changed continuously for each  $j$  based on some criteria of interest. We illustrate a few simple examples of applying weights in Section 4.

### 3 Simulation

#### 3.1 Methods

Simulating sequences that are similar to real data, in a manner that is parametrizable, is challenging and an active area of research (Huang et al., 2023). Rather than attempt to replicate real data via simulation, we assess the performance of the clustering methods on simple simulated sequences to explore the behavior of the methods and identify what aspects of sequences each method can distinguish.

To explore the performance of our method, sequences are generated from a mixture of data generating processes (i.e., true clusters), which differ according to the distribution of states present in the sequences and the probability of state transitions (or equivalently, the contiguous average state duration). In all cases, data is generated from an equal mix of the true clusters. For clusters determined by differences in the states present, we create three scenarios of increasing difficulty based on the overlap of states present between clusters (with four possible states:  $A$ ,  $B$ ,  $C$ , and  $D$ ): 1) Low overlap: two clusters with no overlap in states; 2) Medium overlap: three clusters with 1 pairwise state overlapping; 3) High overlap: four clusters with 2 pairwise states overlapping. For each of these scenarios, we explore three different duration and state pattern scenarios: 1) the state pattern is the same within clusters and all state durations are sampled from  $N(30, 3)$ ; 2) the state pattern varies



within a cluster (i.e., a cluster with the states  $A$  and  $B$  will contain sequences of the form  $A \cdots AB \cdots BA \cdots A$  and  $B \cdots BA \cdots AB \cdots B$ ) and all state durations are sampled from  $N(30, 3)$ ; 3) The state pattern is the same within each cluster, and all state durations are sampled from  $\mu \sim U(10, 80), N(\mu, 3)$ . Figure S1 provides an example of the sequences in each cluster within these simulation scenarios.

For clusters determined by differences in average contiguous state duration, we create three scenarios of increasing difficulty based on the overlap in the state duration sampling distributions between three true clusters. For these three scenarios, the state durations that vary by cluster are sampled from: 1) Low overlap ( $< 1\%$ ):  $N(15, 5), N(41, 5), N(67, 5)$ ; 2) Medium overlap ( $\approx 10\%$ ):  $N(15, 5), N(28, 5), N(41, 5)$ ; 3) High overlap ( $\approx 25\%$ ):  $N(15, 5), N(21.5, 5), N(28, 5)$ . All clusters have three states ( $A, B,$  and  $C$ ) and we explore varying the average contiguous duration of one state, two states, and three states by cluster for each overlap scenario. When the duration of two or three states varies by cluster, we further explore scenarios where all varying states within a given cluster have the same duration sampling distribution (e.g.,  $A, B \sim N(15, 5)$  in one cluster) and when they have a different sampling distributions (e.g.,  $A \sim N(15, 5), B \sim N(41, 5)$  in one cluster). The state durations that do not vary by cluster are sampled from  $N(30, 3)$ . Figure S2 provides an example of the sequences in each cluster within these simulation scenarios. For all simulation scenarios, we simulate 500 datasets with 250 sequences of length 300; these values are chosen in part to ensure reasonable computation time for the comparison method (hierarchical clustering).

We compare our method, adjacency matrix decomposition clustering, to agglomerative hierarchical clustering using the average linkage function of the Levenshtein sequence distance matrix. For hierarchical clustering, we select the optimal number of clusters by the Dunn Index (Dunn, 1974). We run the clustering algorithms (k-means and hierarchical) ten times on each simulated dataset and select the best set of clusters through the respective cluster evaluation metric. For each simulated dataset, we calculate the percent accuracy of the methods when selecting the true number of clusters by taking the highest accuracy possible

given the constraint that the calculated clusters must have a bijective relationship with the true clusters. In addition, we determine the optimal number of clusters by the respective criteria for each method. For each simulation scenario, we then assess the clustering methods by the average percent accuracy and the mode optimal number of clusters in comparison to the true number of clusters across simulated datasets.

## 3.2 Results

Across all scenarios where the clusters are determined by differences in state, adjacency matrix decomposition clustering has 100% accuracy (Table 1). Hierarchical clustering performs poorly in both the medium and high state overlap scenarios when the pattern of the states varies within cluster. In medium and high overlap scenarios where neither state duration nor pattern varies, adjacency matrix decomposition clustering tends to select too many clusters. Often, this is due to the fact that the true clusters are then split into two separate clusters. Our method also selects a higher number of clusters in scenarios where duration is varied; however, this is expected as the method may be identifying patterns in the varied durations in addition to the differences in state within the simulated sequences. All results for state-driven clustering simulations are presented in Table 1.

In scenarios where only one state’s duration varies, both methods perform well in the low overlap scenario (Table 2). However, in the medium and high overlap scenarios, hierarchical clustering and adjacency matrix decomposition clustering perform better, respectively. In general, our method does not perform as well when the average contiguous duration of multiple states varies in the same way within each cluster. This is a consequence of the adjacency matrix representation of a sequence; often the total duration of the states in these scenarios is similar across clusters, even though the contiguous sections of a given state within the sequence are different between clusters. However, as overlap increases, the performance of our method improves, and it actually outperforms hierarchical clustering in the high overlap scenario with two duration varying states.

**Table 1:** Simulation results for simulated sequence clusters that differ by the states present in the sequence.

Overlap	Type	Hierarchical				Adjacency Matrix			
		True No.	% Accuracy	SD % Accuracy	Mode No.	% Accuracy	SD % Accuracy	Mode No.	
Low	Same	2	1.00	0.00	2	1.00	0.00	2	
Medium		3	1.00	0.00	3	1.00	0.00	6	
High		4	1.00	0.00	4	1.00	0.00	7	
Low	Vary	2	1.00	0.00	2	1.00	0.00	2	
Medium	Pattern	3	0.54	0.02	4	1.00	0.00	6	
High		4	0.53	0.02	7	1.00	0.00	4	
Low	Vary	2	1.00	0.00	2	1.00	0.00	5	
Medium	Duration	3	1.00	0.00	3	1.00	0.00	6	
High		4	0.99	0.03	2	1.00	0.00	4	

Note: “Overlap” indicates the extent of the overlap in sequences between the true clusters (high overlap corresponds to less distinct clusters), “Type” indicates whether the state pattern or average state duration differs within the sequences in a given true cluster. For column names that contain “No.,” “No.” means the number of clusters.

In low and medium overlap scenarios where the duration of two or three states varies differently within each cluster, the two methods perform similarly well. However, in high overlap scenarios, adjacency matrix decomposition clustering has higher accuracy than hierarchical clustering. In general, as the clusters become less distinct, our method tends to outperform hierarchical clustering across a majority of the scenarios. In selecting the optimal number of clusters, both methods tend to perform similarly. In all but one case, both methods select either the correct number of clusters or are off by one cluster. All results for state duration clustering simulations are presented in Table 2.

## 4 Sequential Human Activity Data

Our motivating data come from the COVID-19 Implications on Public Transportation Study conducted between March 2021 and June 2021 in the Minneapolis-St. Paul metropolitan area (Fan et al., 2022). The study recruited 339 participants through various digital marketing tools, such as social media and website advertising, in order to remotely recruit a diverse sample of individuals. The study consisted of two components: an intake survey and

**Table 2:** Simulation results for simulated sequence clusters that differ by average contiguous state(s) duration.

Overlap	Type	Hierarchical			Adjacency Matrix			
		% Accuracy	SD % Accuracy	Mode No.	% Accuracy	SD % Accuracy	Mode No.	
Low	1	1.00	0.00	2	0.99	0.05	2	
Medium		0.97	0.04	2	0.75	0.16	2	
High		0.71	0.10	6	0.87	0.04	2	
Low	2	1.00	0.00	3	0.59	0.11	2	
Medium		Same	1.00	0.00	2	0.91	0.17	2
High		0.91	0.11	2	0.94	0.03	3	
Low	2	1.00	0.00	3	0.99	0.01	3	
Medium		Different	1.00	0.00	3	0.99	0.01	5
High		0.85	0.15	2	0.91	0.05	4	
Low	3	1.00	0.00	3	0.59	0.09	3	
Medium		Same	1.00	0.00	3	0.60	0.14	3
High		0.96	0.09	2	0.71	0.21	2	
Low	3	1.00	0.02	2	1.00	0.00	3	
Medium		Different	1.00	0.00	3	1.00	0.00	3
High		0.93	0.14	3	1.00	0.00	3	

Note: “Overlap” indicates the extent of the overlap in sequences between the true clusters (high overlap corresponds to less distinct clusters), “Type” indicates the number of states with varied average duration by cluster and whether the durations of multiple states vary in the same way or different way within a cluster. For column names that contain “No.,” “No.” means the number of clusters.

the use of a smartphone app to collect data on daily activities. The intake survey was administered virtually and collected demographic, health, and transportation information about the participants. The smartphone app, called Daynamica (previously SmarTrAC (Fan et al., 2015)), used mobile sensing to automatically detect activities and trips in real time and collected survey data on subjective trip information (e.g., trip companionship, general trip experience) for at least 14 days. Of the recruited participants, 154 completed the full two weeks of data collection. Our interest is in identifying common time use patterns (clusters) from this smartphone-derived daily activity data.

The 24-hour data from the multi-day collection period is aggregated into five-minute intervals, creating sequences with 288 positions. Each position contains the state where the individual spent the majority of the corresponding five-minute interval. Daynamica

categorizes the data into 14 activity states (such as work, home, travel by bus, bike, car, eating out, shopping, etc.). However, we use the following possible states: H - Home, W - Work, T - Transport, and O - any other activity (Out). We chose to use this aggregation of states to facilitate a more meaningful interpretation of the time use patterns. Any sequences with missing data are removed from the analysis and we randomly select at most 20 sequences per unique individual. Days with over 90% of time spent at work, traveling, or out are also removed from the analysis as they likely contain data collection errors.

The final dataset of 24-hour sequences contains 2,229 sequences from 187 individuals. While sequences from the same individuals are likely correlated, we are interested in identifying common patterns in the daily sequences themselves, not common patterns among individuals. However, having multiple day sequences per individual motivates identifying sequence patterns for longer time periods, such as a week. Individuals with complete, consecutive data for Monday-Friday are combined to create week sequences, where each week sequence is of length 1440. There are 126 five-day sequences from 102 individuals. We perform both hierarchical clustering and the proposed clustering method on all day and week sequences. In addition, we demonstrate two examples of weighted adjacency matrix decomposition clustering on the day sequences. The first weighting scheme uses a relative weight of two for the 9AM-5PM time period, while the second weighting scheme applies a relative weight of five to the Out duration entry in the adjacency matrices. Note that these weights are chosen for illustration purposes; selection of weights for a given research question would require additional considerations, as further discussed in Section 5.

#### **4.1 Day Sequence Analysis**


Hierarchical clustering of all day sequences results in two optimal clusters, as chosen by the Dunn Index (Figure 2, Panel 1). Almost all sequences (96.9%) are in cluster A, while cluster B contains sequences with a majority of Out states. In contrast, adjacency matrix decomposition clustering selects eight optimal clusters, four of which are shown in Figure

2, Panel 2. A little over half of the sequences are in cluster A and these sequences contain mostly Home states. The second-largest cluster contains sequences with mostly Work and Home states. Clusters C and D are similar to cluster A but have more Out and Transport states. The other four clusters contain sequences with mostly Work, Transport, or Out states (Figure S3).

While hierarchical clustering clusters most sequences into a single cluster, adjacency matrix decomposition clustering separates those sequences into multiple meaningful clusters. For example, clusters A and B separate day patterns in which people spend most of their days at home and day patterns in which people go to work full-time, an important distinction, while hierarchical clustering is unable to separate these two day types. Clusters C and D further separate the person-day patterns where a majority of time is spent at home but there is still substantial time spent at other activities (Out and Transport). Specifically, clusters C and D distinguish daily time use patterns in which people spent significant time moving from place to place from other daily time use patterns in which people were able to limit their travel time and yet spent significant time outside home and work. Even when eight clusters are selected in hierarchical clustering, one cluster still contains a majority of sequences (92.6%) and workdays are not separated from other day types (Figure S4).

## 4.2 Week Sequence Analysis

Hierarchical clustering of week sequences results in four optimal clusters; however, three of the clusters contain only one sequence such that one cluster contains almost all (97.6%) sequences. Adjacency matrix decomposition clustering selects six optimal clusters where the sequences in each cluster differ primarily by the number of Home and Work states (Figure S5). We can calculate the contribution of each adjacency matrix entry to the column vectors of  $\mathbf{V}$  to explicitly understand what factors are influencing the clusters. Formally, each row of  $\mathcal{M}_c$  corresponds to an entry of the adjacency matrix, and we can identify the percent contribution of each of row to the columns of  $\mathbf{V}$  with  $\mathbf{C} = (\mathcal{M}_c \mathbf{V})^{\circ 2} (100 / (\Sigma^2))$  where  $\circ$




**Figure 2:** Day sequence clusters by clustering method. Panel one depicts the two optimal clusters from hierarchical clustering and panel two depicts four of the eight optimal clusters from adjacency matrix decomposition clustering. Labels indicate the percent of all sequences in the respective cluster.

indicates element-wise operation.

In this case, the optimal clustering uses the first two column vectors of  $\mathbf{V}$ ; the Home duration entry of the adjacency matrix contributes 91.4% to the first vector and the Work duration entry contributes 91.1% to the second vector, which confirms the primary influence of the Home and Work states on the clustering. Figure 3 shows three of the clusters: cluster A contains weeks that were spent mostly at home, cluster B contains weeks of five in-person,

eight-hour workdays, and cluster C contains week patterns where either individuals worked five shorter work days or individuals worked fewer than five in-person, eight-hour work days. Essentially, each cluster contains week patterns of people who stay at home (A), work in-person full-time (B), and work part-time or hybrid (C). With these longer sequences, hierarchical clustering is unable to detect and separate any substantial differences in the sequences. However, our method provides clusters with clear interpretations in the context of Monday-Friday time use.



**Figure 3:** Monday-Friday sequence clusters from adjacency matrix decomposition clustering. Black vertical lines separate each of the five days. This figure presents three of the five optimal clusters which predominantly distinguish days by amount of time spent at home and work. Labels indicate the percent of all sequences in the respective cluster.

### 4.3 Weighted Day Sequence Analysis

When weighting the 9AM-5PM portion of each sequence by two, we still obtain eight optimal clusters from adjacency matrix decomposition clustering (Figure S6). Figure 4 demonstrates how some of the clusters change from those in Figure 2. One cluster that does not have a




parallel from the original day clusters is cluster B in Figure 4. This cluster contains days where individuals worked eight hours outside of the 9AM-5PM time or worked fewer than eight hours; this is in comparison to cluster A which contains days where people worked in the 9AM-5PM time frame. The adjacency matrix representation retains little information about the ordering of states, and therefore the original clustering places all eight-hour workday sequences in the same cluster regardless of the time the work occurs. With up-weighting 9AM-5PM, the clustering method is able to distinguish days with abnormal work times. Clusters C and D in Figure 4 are similar to clusters A and D in Figure 2. However, a portion of sequences originally in the Home sequence cluster (Cluster A in Figure 2) with some Transport states in the 9AM-5PM time frame are now in the Home and Transport sequence cluster (Cluster D in Figure 4) after weighting. While the weighted clustering maintains many of the original clusters, it also identifies a new cluster of abnormal work days and creates subtle changes in the original clusters specific to the weighted time period.

When weighting the Out duration adjacency matrix entry by five, we obtain seven optimal clusters (Figure S7). The largest changes from the original clusters are in the three clusters presented in Figure 5. After weighting, the Home sequence cluster (Cluster A in Figure 2 and 5) has substantially fewer sequences, as many of the sequences that contain any Out states are now in the Home and Out cluster or the Out cluster (Clusters B and C in Figure 5). Essentially, for sequences that contain Out states, the duration of the Out state now drives the clustering rather than the other states present within that sequence.


#### 4.4 Computational Benefits

Adjacency matrix decomposition clustering data preparation (calculation of adjacency matrices and SVD) requires 0.04% of the computation time needed for calculating the day sequence distance matrix. For the entire data preparation and clustering procedure for day sequences, our method requires 2.47% of the computational time of hierarchical clustering. Our method has similar computational benefits over hierarchical clustering in the week sequence analysis



**Figure 4:** 9AM-5PM weighted day sequence clusters from adjacency matrix decomposition clustering. Darker shading distinguishes the sequences that are in a different cluster than in the original day sequence set of clusters in Figures 2 and S3. This figure presents four out of the eight optimal clusters. Labels indicate the percent of all sequences in the respective cluster.

(0.07% of the computational time for data preparation, 1.62% for the entire procedure). The relative increase in computational time between data preparation and the entire procedure is predominantly due to adjacency matrix decomposition clustering computing more sets of clusters than hierarchical clustering in order to select the optimal number of columns of  $\mathbf{V}$ . Regardless, performing the proposed method is 40 to 60 times faster than performing hierarchical clustering on this data; adjacency matrix decomposition clustering provides considerable computational improvements over hierarchical clustering.



**Figure 5:** Out duration weighted day sequence clusters from adjacency matrix decomposition clustering. Darker shading distinguishes the sequences that are in a different cluster than in the original day sequence set of clusters in Figures 2 and S3. This figure presents three out of the seven optimal clusters. Labels indicate the percent of all sequences in the respective cluster.

## 5 Discussion

There are few methods for clustering sequential human activity data that 1) leverage all the information the data provides and 2) are computationally efficient for large datasets. We improve on standard sequence representation methods by eliminating the need to compute the sequence distance matrix for clustering problems. Our method represents each sequence as an adjacency matrix and clusters the sequences through a decomposition of these adjacency matrices. We also propose a new cluster evaluation metric that leverages the adjacency matrix structure. The ability to weight sequence sections of interest also allows researchers to explore specific questions of interest while still clustering on the entire, rather than a

subset, of the sequence. In addition to lowering the computational cost, adjacency matrix decomposition clustering generates a more complete and nuanced understanding of different activity or time use patterns than hierarchical clustering.

The proposed method uses SVD, a Euclidean space technique, on compositional data (a simplex space) since each column in  $\mathcal{M}_c$  sums to the same value and is constrained by the length of the sequence. While there are methods to transform compositional data into the Euclidean space, most methods (such as the log-ratio transform) rely on the assumption that there are not true zeros within the data (Greenacre, 2021). In this data, there are often true zeros, as some sequences never contain a particular state transition, which yields zeros in the adjacency matrix. In addition, we found that using compositional data techniques with a true zero correction factor in this stage led to poorer final clustering performance compared to standard SVD.

We use the k-means algorithm throughout the demonstrations of our method, but other multidimensional clustering algorithms could also be applied. Determining the behavior of these algorithms on this data may be beneficial to fully optimizing the performance of the method. We also note that while our cluster evaluation metric specifically adapts the CH index, there is potential for other metrics (such as the Silhouette coefficient) to be adapted in a similar way. In Sections 3 and 4, we only utilize our proposed cluster evaluation metric with adjacency matrix decomposition clustering; however, this metric can be used with other clustering methods. For example, we can implement hierarchical clustering on the data and assess the optimal number of clusters with our proposed metric.

In general, our method can be applied to any categorical sequence data, not solely to human activity data. However, the performance of the method may vary depending on the nature of the categorical sequences. While Section 3 provides guidance about the types of sequence patterns our method successfully distinguishes, there could be other attributes of the sequences that influence method performance. The proposed metric cluster evaluation

can also be applied to any data in which the concept of an average matrix applies, such as graph adjacency matrices.

In Section 2.4, we introduced the framework for weighting the adjacency matrices; however, more work is needed to determine the process for choosing specific weights and assessing their impact on the clustering results. In addition, there is potential for incorporating weights into the standard adjacency matrix decomposition clustering procedure to better distinguish sequences that primarily differ in the order in which the states occur within the sequence.

## **Funding**

This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship Program under Grant No. 2237827.

## **Disclosure Statement**

Drs. Julian Wolfson and Yingling Fan are co-founders of Daynamica, Inc. They and the University of Minnesota hold equity and royalty interests in Daynamica pursuant to the exclusive license agreement involving the software program that provides smartphone solutions for travel and activity capturing. These interests have been reviewed and managed by the University of Minnesota in accordance with its Conflict of Interest policies.

## **References**

- Aisenbrey, S. and Fasang, A. E. (2010). New Life for Old Ideas: The "Second Wave" of Sequence Analysis Bringing the "Course" Back Into the Life Course. *Sociological Methods & Research*, 38(3):420–462. Publisher: SAGE Publications Inc.
- Barnett, I. and Onnela, J.-P. (2020). Inferring mobility measures from GPS traces with missing data. *Biostatistics*, 21(2):e98–e112.
- Beukenhorst, A. L., Collins, E., Burke, K. M., Rahman, S. M., Clapp, M., Konanki, S. C.,

- Paganoni, S., Miller, T. M., Chan, J., Onnela, J., and Berry, J. D. (2021). Smartphone data during the COVID-19 pandemic can quantify behavioral changes in people with ALS. Muscle & Nerve, 63(2):258–262.
- Blaisdell, B. E. (1986). A measure of the similarity of sets of sequences not requiring sequence alignment. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 83(14):5155–5159.
- Boaro, A., Leung, J., Reeder, H. T., Siddi, F., Mezzalana, E., Liu, G., Mekary, R. A., Lu, Y., Groff, M. W., Onnela, J.-P., and Smith, T. R. (2021). Smartphone GPS signatures of patients undergoing spine surgery correlate with mobility and current gold standard outcome measures. Journal of Neurosurgery. Spine, 35(6):796–806.
- Bolliger, L., Lukan, J., Luštrek, M., De Bacquer, D., and Clays, E. (2020). Protocol of the STRESS at Work (STRAW) Project: How to Disentangle Day-to-Day Occupational Stress among Academics Based on EMA, Physiological Data, and Smartphone Sensor and Usage Data. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 17(23):8835.
- Calinski, T. and Harabasz, J. (1974). A dendrite method for cluster analysis. Communications in Statistics, 3(1):1–27.
- Corpet, F. (1988). Multiple sequence alignment with hierarchical clustering. Nucleic Acids Research, 16(22):10881–10890.
- Dong, X., Frossard, P., Vandergheynst, P., and Nefedov, N. (2012). Clustering with multi-layer graphs: A spectral perspective. IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing, 60(11):5820–5831.
- Dunn, J. C. (1974). Well-separated clusters and optimal fuzzy partitions. Journal of Cybernetics, 4(1):95–104.
- Fan, Y., Becker, A., Ryan, G., and Wolfson, J. (2022). COVID-19 Implications on Public Transportation: Understanding Post-Pandemic Transportation Needs, Behaviors, and


- Experiences. Technical Report CTS 22-08, Center for Transportation Studies, University of Minnesota.
- Fan, Y., Wolfson, J., Adomavicius, G., Das, K. V., Khandelwal, Y., and Kang, J. (2015). Smartrac: A smartphone solution for context-aware travel and activity capturing.
- Freedman, V., Cornman, J., Carr, D., and Lucas, R. (2019). Time use and experienced wellbeing of older caregivers: A sequence analysis. The Gerontologist, 59.
- Greenacre, M. (2021). Compositional data analysis. Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application, 8(1):271–299.
- Huang, E. J., Yan, K., and Onnela, J.-P. (2022). Smartphone-Based Activity Recognition Using Multistream Movelets Combining Accelerometer and Gyroscope Data. Sensors, 22(7):2618. Number: 7 Publisher: Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute.
- Huang, Z., Wolfson, J., Fulkerson, J. A., Demmer, R., and Chen, H. N. (2023). A flexible framework for synthesizing human activity patterns with application to sequential categorical data. arXiv:2311.05819 [stat].
- Kantorovitz, M. R., Robinson, G. E., and Sinha, S. (2007). A statistical method for alignment-free comparison of regulatory sequences. Bioinformatics, 23(13):i249–i255.
- Karas, M., Bai, J., Strackiewicz, M., Harezlak, J., Glynn, N. W., Harris, T., Zipunnikov, V., Crainiceanu, C., and Urbanek, J. K. (2019). Accelerometry data in health research: challenges and opportunities. Statistics in Biosciences, 11(2):210–237.
- Kondrak, G. (2005). N-gram similarity and distance. In SPIRE.
- Levenshtein, V. I. (1965). Binary codes capable of correcting deletions, insertions, and reversals. Soviet physics. Doklady, 10:707–710.

- Liu, G. and Onnela, J.-P. (2022). Online Anomaly Detection for Smartphone-Based Multivariate Behavioral Time Series Data. Sensors, 22(6):2110. Number: 6 Publisher: Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute.
- Onnela, J.-P. (2021). Opportunities and challenges in the collection and analysis of digital phenotyping data. Neuropsychopharmacology, 46(1):45–54. Number: 1 Publisher: Nature Publishing Group.
- Panda, N., Solsky, I., Hawrusik, B., Liu, G., Reeder, H., Lipsitz, S., Desai, E. V., Lowery, K. W., Miller, K., Gadd, M. A., Lubitz, C. C., Smith, B. L., Specht, M., Onnela, J.-P., and Haynes, A. B. (2021). Smartphone Global Positioning System (GPS) Data Enhances Recovery Assessment after Breast Cancer Surgery. Annals of surgical oncology, 28(2):985–994.
- Peng, F. and Schuurmans, D. (2003). Combining naive bayes and n-gram language models for text classification. In Proceedings of the 25th European Conference on IR Research, ECIR'03, page 335–350, Berlin, Heidelberg. Springer-Verlag.
- Piccarreta, R. and Studer, M. (2019). Holistic analysis of the life course: Methodological challenges and new perspectives. Advances in Life Course Research, 41:100251.
- Ritschard, G., Burgin, R., and Studer, M. (2013). Exploratory Mining of Life Event Histories. Contemporary Issues in Exploratory Data Mining in Behavioral Sciences, pages 221–253.
- Rodriguez, M. Z., Comin, C. H., Casanova, D., Bruno, O. M., Amancio, D. R., Costa, L. d. F., and Rodrigues, F. A. (2019). Clustering algorithms: A comparative approach. PLOS ONE, 14(1):1–34.
- Sankoff, D., Kruskal, J. B., Laboratories, B., and Hill, M. (1983). Time Warps, String Edits, and Macromolecules: The Theory and Practice of Sequence Comparision. Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Reading, Massachusetts.




- Song, Y., Ren, S., Wolfson, J., Zhang, Y., Brown, R., and Fan, Y. (2021). Visualizing, clustering, and characterizing activity-trip sequences via weighted sequence alignment and functional data analysis. Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies, 126:103007.
- Strackiewicz, M., Huang, E. J., and Onnela, J.-P. (2023). A “one-size-fits-most” walking recognition method for smartphones, smartwatches, and wearable accelerometers. npj Digital Medicine, 6(1):1–16. Number: 1 Publisher: Nature Publishing Group.
- Strackiewicz, M., James, P., and Onnela, J.-P. (2021). A systematic review of smartphone-based human activity recognition methods for health research. npj Digital Medicine, 4(1):1–15. Number: 1 Publisher: Nature Publishing Group.
- Studer, M. (2021). Validating Sequence Analysis Typologies Using Parametric Bootstrap. Sociological Methodology, 51(2):290–318. Publisher: SAGE Publications Inc.
- Studer, M., Ritschard, G., Gabadinho, A., and Müller, N. S. (2011). Discrepancy Analysis of State Sequences. Sociological Methods & Research, 40(3):471–510.
- Tang, W., Lu, Z., and Dhillon, I. (2009). Clustering with multiple graphs. pages 1016–1021.
- Torous, J., Kiang, M. V., Lorme, J., and Onnela, J.-P. (2016). New tools for new research in psychiatry: A scalable and customizable platform to empower data driven smartphone research. JMIR Mental Health, 3(2):e16.
- U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (2022). American Time Use Survey Activity Lexicon.
- Wen, J., Chan, R. H., Yau, S.-C., He, R. L., and Yau, S. S. (2014). K-mer natural vector and its application to the phylogenetic analysis of genetic sequences. Gene, 546(1):25–34.

# Supplemental Materials




(a) Same state duration and pattern

(b) Same state duration and varied state pattern




(c) Varied state duration and same state pattern

**Figure S1:** One sample set of simulated sequences for clusters that differ by the states present in the sequences (see Table 1 for corresponding results). Columns differentiate each cluster and rows differentiate simulation scenarios by overlap level.




**Figure S2:** One sample set of simulated sequences for clusters that differ by average contiguous state duration (see Table 2 for corresponding results). Columns differentiate each cluster and rows differentiate simulation scenarios by overlap level.






**Figure S4:** Day sequence clusters from hierarchical clustering when selecting eight clusters (the optimal number of clusters from adjacency matrix decomposition clustering). Labels indicate the percent of all sequences in the respective cluster.




**Figure S5:** All optimal week sequence clusters from adjacency matrix decomposition clustering. Black vertical lines separate each of the five days. Labels indicate the percent of all sequences in the respective cluster



**Figure S6:** All optimal 9AM-5PM weighted day sequence clusters from adjacency matrix decomposition clustering. Labels indicate the percent of all sequences in the respective cluster





**Figure S7:** All optimal Out weighted day sequence clusters from adjacency matrix decomposition clustering. Labels indicate the percent of all sequences in the respective cluster