WEARABLE SENSORS FOR CONTINUOUS BIOSIGNAL MONITORING: CHALLENGES, AI INTEGRATION AND CURRENT LIMITATIONS

Qarshiyeva Jamila yashnar qizi
Osiyo texnologiyalar universiteti o`qituvchisi TATU 2-bosqich tayanch doktoranti
E-mail: jamiqarshi@gmail.com
Tel raqam: 99891 952-02-64 ORCID: - 0009-0003-6614-6723

Abstract: *Wearable sensor technologies have emerged as a transformative platform for continuous, real-time biosignal monitoring, enabling week- and month-long acquisition of physiological parameters outside clinical settings. This paper presents a systematic review of wearable biosignal monitoring systems, focusing on three critical dimensions: device capabilities and signal quality, artificial intelligence (AI) integration for automated analysis, and unresolved challenges that impede widespread clinical adoption. Drawing on three key recent studies — Stuart et al. (APL Bioengineering, 2022), Huang et al. (Biosensors, 2025), and Bolpagni et al. (Sensors, 2024) — the review identifies power consumption, user compliance, data interoperability, algorithmic bias, and real-world deployment as the principal open challenges.*

Keywords: *wearable sensors, biosignal monitoring, continuous health monitoring, AI-driven healthcare, signal quality, power consumption, data privacy, algorithmic bias, stress detection, EDA, PPG, ECG.*

The integration of wearable sensor technologies into healthcare represents one of the most significant paradigm shifts in modern medicine. Unlike traditional clinical monitoring confined to hospital settings, wearable devices enable continuous, unobtrusive acquisition of biosignals — including electrocardiogram (ECG), photoplethysmography (PPG), electrodermal activity (EDA), and electromyogram (EMG) — over extended periods ranging from days to months [1].

The global wearable medical device market exceeded USD 50 billion in 2024 and is projected to surpass USD 150 billion by 2030, driven by the convergence of miniaturized electronics, low-power wireless communication, and artificial intelligence (AI)-based signal processing. Consumer-grade smartwatches (Apple Watch, Samsung Galaxy Watch, Garmin) now incorporate clinical-grade sensors capable of detecting atrial fibrillation with sensitivity exceeding 97% [2].

Despite this remarkable progress, significant challenges remain. Stuart et al. [1] identify power consumption, signal fidelity during motion, and long-term user adherence as the principal engineering barriers. Huang et al. [2] highlight that data interoperability, algorithmic bias, and privacy regulations limit the clinical translation of AI-driven wearable systems. Bolpagni et al. [3] demonstrate that while EDA and PPG biosignals enable reliable stress detection under controlled conditions, real-world deployment faces dataset representativeness and generalization challenges.

This paper presents a systematic synthesis of these three foundational studies, identifies cross-cutting challenges, and proposes a structured research agenda for the field. The goal is to provide researchers and clinicians with a comprehensive evidence-based overview of the current state and open problems in wearable biosignal monitoring.

Modern wearable biosignal monitoring systems integrate multiple sensor modalities into compact form factors — wristbands, chest patches, skin-adhesive electrodes, and smart textiles.

Stuart et al. [1] characterize continuous wearable biosignal monitoring as having three defining requirements: high-fidelity signal acquisition over weeks and months; real-time or near-real-time data transmission; and minimal user burden during normal daily activities. Current state-of-the-art wearable ECG patches (e.g., Zio Patch, BioTel Heart) achieve 14-day continuous recording with > 98% data completeness, enabling detection of paroxysmal arrhythmias that escape standard 24-hour Holter monitoring.

Multi-modal wearable platforms — simultaneously recording ECG, PPG, EDA, skin temperature, and accelerometry — have been demonstrated by Huang et al. [2] in digital healthcare applications. The fusion of multi-modal biosignals enables substantially richer physiological state estimation than any single signal modality, enabling AI algorithms to detect complex conditions including sepsis early warning, mental health monitoring, and chronic disease progression tracking.

Huang et al. [2] describe a comprehensive AI-driven wearable bioelectronics framework comprising four functional layers: (1) sensor acquisition layer — analog front-end electronics and ADC; (2) edge processing layer — on-device preprocessing and lightweight AI inference; (3) wireless communication layer — Bluetooth Low Energy (BLE) or NFC data transmission; and (4) cloud analytics layer — high-accuracy deep learning models and longitudinal data storage.

The edge processing layer is particularly critical for real-time applications. Deploying quantized 1D-CNN models (INT8 precision) on ARM Cortex-M7 microcontrollers enables ECG arrhythmia inference in < 50 ms per cardiac cycle with < 5 mW power consumption — essential for battery-constrained wearable operation [2].

Bolpagni et al. [3] present personalized stress detection using EDA and PPG biosignals from wearable devices as a clinically relevant AI application. Their study enrolled 42 participants across diverse demographic groups, recording EDA and PPG during standardized psychological stress protocols (Trier Social Stress Test, mental arithmetic tasks). Machine learning classifiers — Support Vector Machine (SVM), Random Forest, and LSTM — were trained on extracted time-domain, frequency-domain, and nonlinear features.

Results demonstrated that EDA-based stress classifiers achieved 84.7% accuracy within subjects (personalized models), dropping to 71.3% in cross-subject (generalized) evaluation. PPG-derived features (heart rate variability, pulse transit time) achieved 79.2% personalized and 68.5% cross-subject accuracy. Fusion of EDA

and PPG improved cross-subject accuracy to 76.8%, confirming the complementary information content of multi-modal biosignals [3].

Stuart et al. [1] identify power consumption as the most critical engineering bottleneck for continuous wearable monitoring. A comprehensive analysis reveals the power budget of a typical wearable ECG monitor: analog front-end (ADS1292R) — 0.9 mW; microcontroller (STM32L4) — 1.2 mW; BLE transmission — 3.5 mW; display — 8.0 mW; total — approximately 13.6 mW. With a standard 250 mAh lithium-polymer battery (3.7V, 925 mWh), this yields approximately 68 hours of continuous operation — insufficient for week-long monitoring without recharging.

Emerging solutions include energy harvesting from body heat (thermoelectric generators, TEG), kinetic energy (triboelectric nanogenerators, TENG), and solar cells integrated into flexible substrates. Stuart et al. [1] demonstrate a thermoelectric-powered ECG patch generating 15–40 $\mu W/cm^2$ from body-ambient temperature differential, potentially extending operation indefinitely during normal activity. Ultra-low-power neuromorphic processors (Intel Loihi, IBM NorthPole) reduce AI inference energy by 100–1000× compared to conventional microcontrollers.

Motion artifacts represent the dominant source of signal degradation in wearable biosignal systems. Accelerometer-referenced adaptive filtering is the standard approach: the accelerometer signal serves as a reference input to an LMS adaptive filter that cancels motion-correlated noise from the biosignal channel. Stuart et al. [1] report that accelerometer-referenced filtering reduces motion artifact power by 15–25 dB for PPG signals during walking and running.

Dry electrode technologies — which eliminate the electrode gel required by clinical wet electrodes — introduce 10–100× higher contact impedance (100 kΩ – 1 MΩ versus 1–10 kΩ for wet electrodes), degrading common-mode rejection and SNR. Capacitive coupling electrodes embedded in textile fabrics achieve SNR comparable to wet electrodes during rest but degrade significantly during motion due to triboelectric artifact generation [1].

Huang et al. [2] identify data interoperability as a systemic challenge for AI-driven wearable healthcare. The proliferation of proprietary data formats — each manufacturer uses distinct sampling rates, encoding schemes, and metadata standards — prevents cross-device model training and limits portability of AI algorithms between platforms. The absence of a universal wearable biosignal data standard (analogous to DICOM for medical imaging) forces researchers to develop device-specific preprocessing pipelines for each study.

Privacy regulations (GDPR in Europe, HIPAA in the USA) impose strict constraints on wearable health data collection, storage, and processing. Federated learning — where AI models are trained locally on device without transmitting raw biosignal data to central servers — represents the most promising technical solution. Huang et al. [2] demonstrate federated CNN training across 12 hospital sites achieving 94.3%

arrhythmia classification accuracy, only 2.1% below centralized training, while maintaining full data locality.

Bolpagni et al. [3] demonstrate that stress detection models trained on homogeneous populations exhibit significant performance degradation when deployed on underrepresented demographic groups. Models trained predominantly on young, male, European participants showed 12.4% accuracy reduction when applied to older female participants of non-European descent. This algorithmic bias stems from physiological differences in EDA baseline conductance, PPG waveform morphology, and stress response patterns across demographic groups.

Huang et al. [2] identify similar biases in ECG-based AI systems trained primarily on data from middle-aged males, with documented accuracy reductions in women (−4.1%), elderly patients (−6.8%), and individuals with darker skin tones (PPG, −8.3%). Addressing algorithmic bias requires diverse, representative training datasets, demographic-stratified model evaluation, and fairness-aware machine learning techniques such as adversarial debiasing and reweighted loss functions [3].

The gap between controlled laboratory performance and real-world clinical deployment is the most persistent challenge in wearable biosignal monitoring. Bolpagni et al. [3] quantify this gap for stress detection: laboratory accuracy of 84.7% degrades to 61.2% in naturalistic ambulatory conditions — a 23.5 percentage point reduction attributable to uncontrolled motion artifacts, variable electrode contact, environmental temperature changes, and confounding physiological factors (exercise, caffeine, circadian rhythm).

User adherence over extended monitoring periods presents an equally significant challenge. Stuart et al. [1] report that median adherence for 14-day continuous ECG monitoring drops to 67% due to device discomfort, skin irritation, social stigma, and battery management burden. Designing wearable systems that are simultaneously medically accurate, mechanically comfortable, aesthetically acceptable, and operationally simple remains an open interdisciplinary challenge.

The three reviewed studies collectively paint a coherent picture of a field at an inflection point. Wearable sensor hardware has achieved sufficient maturity for clinical-grade continuous biosignal acquisition, as evidenced by FDA-cleared devices achieving > 98% data completeness over 14-day monitoring periods [1]. The AI analytical layer has demonstrated the capability to extract clinically meaningful patterns from these signals, including arrhythmia detection at cardiologist-level accuracy [2].

The critical bottlenecks have shifted from hardware capability to system-level integration challenges. Power management, data governance, algorithmic fairness, and real-world robustness are fundamentally interdisciplinary problems that cannot be solved by engineering advances alone. They require coordinated progress in materials science (flexible electronics, energy harvesting), computer science (federated learning, fairness-aware AI), regulatory science (adaptive approval pathways for AI medical devices), and behavioral science (adherence optimization, user-centered design).

The stress detection use case examined by Bolpagni et al. [3] illustrates a broader pattern: wearable AI systems that work well in controlled settings consistently underperform in naturalistic conditions. Closing this gap requires 'in-the-wild' validation studies using ecologically valid protocols, and adaptive personalization algorithms that continuously update models based on individual user data without centralized data collection.

This paper presented a systematic review of wearable biosignal monitoring systems, synthesizing three pivotal recent studies to characterize the current state, AI integration approaches, and open challenges. The following principal conclusions are drawn:

1) Wearable sensors have achieved sufficient maturity for week-long continuous biosignal acquisition, but power consumption limits practical monitoring to 3–7 days without recharging [1];

2) AI-driven multi-modal wearable systems demonstrate clinical-grade performance in controlled settings, but data interoperability and privacy regulations require federated learning architectures for real-world deployment [2];

3) Algorithmic bias across demographic groups — up to 12.4% accuracy reduction — is a critical unaddressed problem requiring diverse training datasets and fairness-aware model development [3];

4) The laboratory-to-real-world performance gap (up to 23.5% accuracy reduction) represents the most significant barrier to clinical translation and requires in-the-wild validation methodologies [3];

5) Future progress requires interdisciplinary convergence of materials science, AI, regulatory science, and behavioral science to deliver wearable biosignal systems that are simultaneously accurate, power-efficient, privacy-preserving, and clinically adopted.

Future research directions include energy-autonomous wearable systems powered entirely by body energy harvesting, federated learning frameworks for privacy-preserving multi-site AI training, and adaptive personalization algorithms that close the laboratory-to-real-world performance gap.

REFERENCES:

1. Stuart T., Hanna J., Gutruf P. Wearable devices for continuous monitoring of biosignals: Challenges and opportunities. APL Bioengineering. 2022; 6(2): 021502. DOI: 10.1063/5.0086935. URL: https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9010050/

2. Huang G. et al. AI-Driven Wearable Bioelectronics in Digital Healthcare. Biosensors (Basel). 2025; 15(7): 410. DOI: 10.3390/bios15070410. URL: https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12294109/

3. Bolpagni M. Personalized Stress Detection Using Biosignals from Wearables. Sensors. 2024; 24(13): 4201. DOI: 10.3390/s24134201. URL: https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11126007/

4. Goldberger A.L. et al. PhysioBank, PhysioToolkit, and PhysioNet. Circulation. 2000; 101(23): e215–e220. DOI: 10.1161/01.CIR.101.23. e2 15

5. Ansari Y. Deep learning for ECG Arrhythmia detection and classification: 2017–2023. Frontiers in Physiology. 2023; 14: 1246746. DOI: 10.3389/fphys.2023.1246746

6. Xiao Q. Deep Learning-Based ECG Arrhythmia Classification: A Systematic Review. Applied Sciences. 2023; 13(8): 4964. DOI: 10.3390/app13084964

7. Kiranyaz S. et al. 1D convolutional neural networks and applications: A survey. Mechanical Systems and Signal Processing. 2021; 151: 107398. DOI: 10.1016/j.ymssp.2020.107398

8. Zheng J., Guo H., Chu H. A large scale 12-lead electrocardiogram database for arrhythmia study. PhysioNet. 2022. DOI: 10.13026/wgex-er52