

1 Manuscript

2 Bouts of rest and physical activity in C57BL/6J mice

3 *Running title: Bouts of rest and activity in mice*

4

5 Pernold, K., Rullman, E. and Ulfhake, B.

6 Div. clinical physiology, Department of Laboratory medicine, Karolinska Institutet

7 **CA** Karin Pernold; karin.pernold@ki.se

8

9 Manuscript contains 15 Figures and 7 Tables.

10 Supportive information (Figs S1-S10 and Tables S1)

11

12 **Funding:** The work at KI was funded by Karolinska Institutet and the National research council (VR; project
13 2020-02009-3). DVC™ equipment at KI and SU, respectively, was made freely available to BU by Tecniplast SpA.
14 Study design and the execution of the study including data analyses and conclusions made based on results
15 generated by the DVC were conducted independently of grant providing bodies and Tecniplast SpA. Nor did
16 these entities partake in the decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript. The specific roles of the
17 authors are articulated in the 'author contributions' section. The results remain the intellectual property of the
18 authors.

19 **Authors contribution:**

20 KP: local management and execution of the experiments including collecting data, script writing, data analyses
21 and preparation of illustrations, tables, and statistical analyses. Editing of manuscript.

22 ER: Data analyses and reading and commenting on the manuscript.

23 BU: Study design and supervision, data analysis and preparation of illustrations. Drafting and editing of
24 manuscript.

25 **Acknowledgements**

26 Help and advice from technical staff at the Wallenberg laboratory facility at Karolinska Institutet (KI) and the
27 ECF facility at Stockholm University (SU) are gratefully acknowledged. We thank Mara Rigamonti and Giorgio
28 Rosati of the DVC division at Tecniplast SpA, Italy, for technical support and discussions, and the assistance with
29 transfer of the raw data files with millisecond resolution.

30 **Data files and data availability**

31 Scripts and libraries are either available through publication sources cited in the paper or will be made available
32 by the authors on request. Original raw data files will also be made available by the authors upon request.

33 **Competing interests:** The authors declare no conflict of interest.

34 **Animal testing ethics**

35 The experimental procedures were agreed upon, reviewed, and approved by the Regional Ethics Council
36 Stockholms Djurförsöksetiska nämnd; project licenses N116-15, N184/15 plus amendments, and project license
37 9467/2020 with addendum 12337-2021. In the reporting we adhere to the ARRIVE guidelines.

38 **Authors ORCID:**

39 Brun Ulfhake, <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5037-7461> (primary email: brun.ulfhake@ki.se).

40 Eric Rullman, <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-2854-7262> (primary email: eric.rullman@ki.se).

41 Karin Pernold, <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-0478-5629> (primary email: karin.pernold@ki.se).

42

43 **Abstract**

44 The objective was to exploit the raw data output from a scalable home cage (type IIL IVC)
45 monitoring (HCM) system (DVC®), to characterize pattern of undisrupted rest and physical
46 activity (PA) of C57BL/6J mice. The system's tracking algorithm show that mice in isolation
47 spend 67% of the time in bouts of long rest (≥ 40 s) and 59 % of the time was interpreted as
48 sleep. Twenty percent is physical activity (PA), split equally between local movements and
49 locomotion. Decomposition revealed that a day contains ~ 6500 discrete bouts of short and
50 long rest, local and locomotor movements. Mice travel ~ 330 m per day, mainly during the
51 dark hours, while travelling speed is similar through the light-dark cycle. Locomotor bouts
52 are usually < 0.2 m and $< 1\%$ are > 1 m. Tracking revealed also fits of abnormal behaviour. The
53 starting positions of the bouts showed no preference for the rear over the front of the cage
54 floor, while there was a strong bias for the peripheral (75%) over the central floor area. The
55 composition of bouts has a characteristic circadian pattern, however, intrusive husbandry
56 routines increased bout fragmentation by $\sim 40\%$.

57 Extracting electrode activations density (EAD) from the raw data yielded results close to
58 those obtained with the tracking algorithm, with 59% of time in long rest (< 1 EAD s^{-1}) and
59 20% in PA. We confirm that EAD correlates closely with movement distance ($r_s > 0.95$) and the
60 data agreed in $\sim 96\%$ of the file time. Thus, albeit EAD being less informative it may serve as a
61 proxy for PA and rest, enabling monitoring group housed mice. The data show that a change
62 in housing density from one to two, and up to three mice had the same effect size on EAD
63 (~ 2) with no difference between sexes. The EAD deviated significantly from this stepwise
64 increase with 4 mice per cage, suggesting a crowdedness stress inducing sex specific
65 adaptations.

66 We conclude that informative metrics on rest and PA can be automatically extracted from
67 the raw data flow in near-real time (< 1 hrs). These metrics relay useful longitudinal
68 information to those that use or care for the animals.

69 Introduction

70 Metrics of rest and activity in every-day life are important measures of well-being and health
71 in humans and animals alike. These metrics are useful to monitor changes through life,
72 impact of lifestyle, disease signature and progression, and responses to environmental
73 conditions. Traditionally, behaviours of laboratory mice have been assessed by snapshots of
74 home cage behaviours or out-of-cage (and everyday life context) testing, these approaches
75 may not substitute well for cumulative unsupervised monitoring of behavioural alteration
76 over time. Efforts to solve this shortcomings dates more than a century back[1], however,
77 due to technical obstacles it was not until the late 20th century that such systems evolved
78 (e.g. [2, 3]) and later became commercially available (e.g. Intellicage by TSE, Metris by
79 Labora, ActiMot by TSE, and Pheno typer by Noldus; see e.g. [4-8]). Still, these systems are
80 lab-bench type of equipment and not possible to integrate in standard holding systems of
81 the [laboratory animals'] vivarium. More recently novel and scalable HCM systems using
82 different monitoring techniques [9, 10] have been developed for automated non-intrusive
83 24/7 cumulative monitoring of home-cage activity (home-cage monitoring, HCM) e.g. [11,
84 12] suitable for a vivarium of small rodents. As recently reviewed [13-15], such HCM systems
85 provide an excellent opportunity to collect cumulative unsupervised records of in-cage rest
86 and PA on a large scale.

87 The purpose of this study was to characterize spontaneous in-cage activity and rest across
88 the circadian cycle and cycles of recurrent husbandry routines over multiple weeks to
89 provide base line data on duration and frequency of bouts of rest and [physical] activity (PA),
90 and how the animals use the cage floor as well as rhythmicity of rest and PA. For this
91 purpose, we recorded cumulative data with a home-cage monitoring system (DVC®
92 Tecniplast SpA) of C57BL/6J mice in standard IVC cages (GM500), kept either in isolation (x1)
93 or in groups at different densities (x2, x3, x4). The DVC® system is based on twelve planar
94 capacitance sensing electrodes situated outside and beneath the cage in a standard cage
95 rack. The electrode array defines the spatial resolution and electrode samples are collected
96 at 4 Hz[12, 15, 16]. The 24/7 flow of electrode reads (raw data) is processed to provide
97 spatial and temporal information on electrode activations which is used to delineate bouts
98 of in-cage PA and rest. With animals kept in isolation the data can be used to track the

99 animals' position and to monitor the animals' in-cage movements. These capacities of the
100 system have previously been validated towards CCD recordings[16].

101 In this report we present data on frequency and duration of bouts of rest and PA, across the
102 cage floor, circadian cycle and across weeks of observation. PA bouts are split into bouts of
103 movements on the spot (MOTS)[17, 18] and bouts of locomotion based on distance made
104 during the bout[17, 19]. Bouts of rest were divided into short and long (≥ 40 s) because long
105 bouts of rest correlates closely with sleep[20-24]. Furthermore, we used electrode activation
106 density (EAD)[12, 16] do assess the impact on in-cage synchronized-rest and PA of male and
107 female mice housed at different densities (x1, x2, x3, and x4).

108 With standard desk top computers, the metrics presented herein can be extracted 24/7 in
109 near-real time (≤ 1 h) for all cages in a 60-slot IVC rack using a desktop computer. Since mice
110 mainly are used as models for human conditions in experimental work, this set of
111 information about in-cage life may not only be of value to the those that care or use the
112 mice but may prove to translate well to corresponding assessments made in humans.

113

114 **Materials and methods**

115 **Mouse strain, sex, and age**

116 Cohorts of specific pathogen free (SPF, according to FELASAs exclusion list[25, 26]) male (m)
117 and female (f) C57BL/6J mice were delivered by car from Charles River, Germany, (Table 1).
118 Upon arrival subjected to a brief health check, at 6-8 weeks of age mice were randomly
119 allotted to cages and either grouped 2 (x2), 3 (x3), 4 (x4) per cage or kept in isolation (x1).

120 **Holding and husbandry conditions**

121 Mice were kept in individually ventilated caged (IVC) of type GM500 (Tecniplast SpA, Italy) in
122 a DVC system (Tecniplast SpA) (Table 1). IVC cages are ventilated with 75 HEPA14 filtered air
123 exchanges per hour, the air is taken from the holding room and let out through a separate
124 outlet. The holding room has a 12-12h dark/light cycle (DL; Zeitgeber time (ZT) 0-12 (L) and
125 12-24(D)) with white light level at 15-40 Lux inside the cage. Cohort Fx1, Fx3 and Mx3 had
126 had lights on/ lights off with dawn and dusk of 60 min, while cohorts Mx2, Mx4 and Fx4 had
127 sudden change of the lightning conditions in the vivarium.

128 All cages had 100g aspen chips 2 or 5 mm (Tapvei, Finland) as bedding, nestlets, Bed-r'Nest
129 or sizzle nest and several (Fx3, Mx3, and Fx1; see Table 1) of the cohorts also had a red
130 polycarbonate mouse house (Tecniplast SpA) as enrichment. The husbandry routines
131 included bi-weekly (see Table 1) cage change (whole cage was changed but red house and
132 some of the soiled beddings were moved along with the animals to the new cage) and also
133 body weighing (Table 1).

134 Handling of the mice by staff was either by using cupped hand or by forceps at the tail root,
135 all mice in the different groups were subjected to both handling routines. The holding units
136 were subject to health inventories according to FELASA's recommendation for a sentinel
137 reporting system (i.e. the subjects of the study were not directly affected by the health
138 inventory) four times a year[25, 26] and during the study period the output from the sentinel
139 system used met the FELASA exclusion list for specific pathogen free animals (SPF).

140 Surveillance of health and welfare included daily check-ups and bi-weekly individual
141 examination during the cage-change and weighing. Health is assessed according to a scoring
142 list deployed at all facilities on Karolinska Institutet and Stockholm University, amended by
143 special requirements stated in the ethic permit. When we weighed the animals, these
144 metrics along with the scoring list formed the basis of the welfare and health check-ups. As
145 needed the designated veterinarian of the facility was consulted.

146 -----insert Table 1 about here-----

147 **Ethical considerations**

148 Both husbandry routines and applied procedures followed applicable guidelines and were
149 agreed upon, reviewed, and approved by the Regional Ethics Council, Stockholms Regionala
150 Djurförsökssetiska nämnd; project licenses N116-15, N184/15 plus amendments and project
151 license 9467-2020 with addendum 12337-2021. No special requirements for health and
152 welfare checks beyond those already implemented at the facility (see above) were required
153 by the permits. DVC records of animals kept in isolation derived from 10 cages serving as
154 control animals for an unrelated experiment granted in permit 9467-2020 with addendum
155 12337-2021.

156 **DVC recordings**

157 In total, recordings were collected from 60 cages arranged by sex and housing density in 6
158 cohorts (Table 1) maintained at the Wallenberg Laboratory on Karolinska Institutet or ECF at
159 Stockholm University both in Stockholm, Sweden. Here we have collected new but have also
160 re-analysed previous [27] cumulative DVC recordings for the purpose of revealing patterns of
161 rest and activity. In doing so we reduced number of animals needed for the study.

162 The core of the DVC system is an electronic sensor board installed externally and below each
163 standard IVC cage of a rack. The sensor board is composed of an array of 12 electrodes and
164 employs a capacitive-based sensing technology (CST). A proximity sensor measures the
165 electrical capacitance of each of the 12 electrodes at 4 Hz (i.e., every 250 msec). The
166 electrical capacitance is influenced by the dielectric properties of matter close to the
167 electrode, leading to measurable capacitance changes due to the presence/ movement of
168 animals in the cage above. Thus, movements across the electrode array are detected and
169 recorded as alterations in capacitance[12, 16]. In this study we used two different analytical
170 approaches based on the CST to reveal pattern of rest and activity in single housed animals.

171 **REM unit**

172 At the ECF facility, the DVC rack was equipped with a REM unit (Tecniplast SpA) which record
173 24/7 noise (audible range), vibrations (acceleration), light level (Lux) and presence of
174 humans in front of the rack. Temperature and humidity were regulated by the Scanclime
175 airflow unit modulating these parameters of the air in-flow. At the Wallenberg facility, the
176 air-flow unit uses the air of the holding room, and records of temperature and humidity are

177 those of the holding room. Light level in front of the cages across the DL cycle applicable to
178 cohorts x1 and x3 is shown in Supporting information (Fig. S1).

179 **Tracking rest and movements**

180 For detailed description of metrics we refer to the manufacturer (tracking) and previous
181 publications (EAD; [12, 16]). Both of these metrics have been validated towards video
182 tracking[16]. Briefly, and as described by the manufacturer the mouse position on the cage
183 floor is determined by estimating a short-period baseline $R_k(t)$ per each electrode k and per
184 each time t as the maximum capacitance measurement within a 1-minute moving window.
185 $d_k(t)$ is the difference between the estimated baseline $R_k(t)$ and the current capacitance
186 measurement $c_k(t)$ of each electrode. The mouse position is determined as the centroid of
187 the coordinates of the 12 electrodes weighed by their corresponding signal drop $d_k(t)$ with a
188 resolution of ~1mm [15, 16]. A Gaussian filter is applied across time and space to smooth the
189 trajectory.

190 -----Insert Fig 1 about here-----

191
192 The tracking algorithm was used to differentiates between the mouse being still (resting), i.e.
193 no change in x, y position of the centroid between successive samples, and in motion where
194 x, y position change between successive samples (Fig. 1). For practical reasons, cut off point
195 for motion was set when the difference in successive samples of x, y [in Euclidian distance] \geq
196 1 mm between sample. Based on previous records of step length for this strain and sex,
197 motion-episodes were divided into local movement (movement-on-the-spot, MOTS)[17]
198 being less than one average stride length (65 mm) in radial distance from the starting point
199 and locomotion when the trajectory covered at least one full stride length[19]. Tracking of
200 individual animals is possible only when animals are kept in isolation and were thus executed
201 on cages in cohort Fx1 only (Table 1).

202 The locomotor records covering 6 weeks for each cage, are time-series with bouts of motion
203 (locomotion and MOTS) interrupted by bouts where the animal was still. The duration and
204 frequency of bouts (still, MOTS and locomotion) were calculated, including distance (m) and
205 speed (ms^{-1}) along with other metrics when the animal moved. Bouts of being still were
206 subdivided into short and long bouts of rest, based on bout duration. Earlier studies of mice
207 and rats have shown that periods of rest lasting 40s or longer correlate closely with sleep

208 [20-23, 28]. This was used as cut point between long and short rest. The composition of
209 bouts for each cage was compared as aggregated values, light vs dark (night time) hrs.,
210 circadian cycle and days, and across weeks, including impact by husbandry routines[12, 16,
211 27]

212 Rest and physical activity (PA) derived from EAD

213 An alternative to tracking is to extract the spatial and temporal pattern of CST activations as
214 previously described in [12, 16]. With group housed animals rest and PA assessed by EAD
215 does not apply to individual animals only to the group. Rest assessed by EAD is there for
216 referred to as synchronized-rest and, moreover, PA cannot be divided into MOTS and
217 locomotion. In cooperation with the DVC team at Tecniplast, CST activations was extracted
218 from the raw data by taking the average of two consecutive capacitance readings and
219 calculate the difference with the average of the following two readings (two windows, W2)
220 and compared the absolute value of the capacitance change to the lowest possible threshold
221 (λ) that did not pass-through noise generated in empty cages as activity ($\lambda = 1.25$). The
222 output is binary from the comparison of successive samples, either an electrode is activated
223 (1) or not (0). The method has previously been validated against CCD-tracking[16].

224 The output was averaged s^{-1} and referred to as electrode activation density s^{-1} (EAD). The
225 average read s^{-1} (average global activation) from all 12 electrodes have been used in most of
226 the analyses of this study. In addition, the density of activations in the front (electrodes 7 to
227 12) and rear (electrodes 1-6) of the cage was compared to assess polarity of rest and activity,
228 and as a proxy for the spatial extent of PA we computed the number of unique electrodes
229 activated s^{-1} (UnEA).

230 Having both the tracking (still-movement) and the EAD (still-PA) records from the animals
231 kept in isolation, allowed us to assess to what extent these two metrics co-variates. The
232 tracking and EAD files for each animal were aligned using the time stamps and compared.
233 Our data confirms previous observations of a close correlation between EAD and tracking
234 distance per hour[16] (Supportive information (Fig. S2)) and the correlation is very close
235 ($\sim r_s > 0.95$; *idem*). The correlations between distance made during a locomotor or a MOTS
236 bout, on the one hand, and EAD per bout, on the other, revealed that the relationship
237 between made distance and EAD was different between MOTS and locomotor bouts
238 (Supportive information (Fig. S4)) reflecting the different contents of these two bout types.
239 The correlation between locomotor bout distance and EAD was still significant in each

240 animal, however, less close than the cumulative distance per unit time vs. sum EAD per unit
241 time (Supportive information (Fig. S4)). Although the covariation between the EAD and
242 tracking metrics appears to be solid also over an extended period of time (c.f. [16]) and both
243 metrics indicates that animals kept in isolation are at rest on average 77%-80% of the time
244 (see below), there remain some discrepancies when the two data files are compared (Table
245 2). During 4% of the file time, the tracking coordinates do not change but EADs are recorded
246 (~18% of all EADs in file across 6 weeks; Table 2). Thus, there is a close but not perfect match
247 between the two metrics.

248 -----Insert Table 2 about here-----

249 Data processing

250 Data were processed through scripts in R (version 4.0.3). The following libraries were used
251 and are hereby acknowledged: broom (ver 0.7.4), compositions (ver 2.0-0), CRamisc (ver
252 0.5.0.9001), data.table (ver 1.13.6), DescTools (ver 0.99.39), dplyr (ver 1.0.2), filesstrings (ver
253 3.2.2), ggplot2 (ver 3.3.3), gvlma (ver 1.0.0.3), labelled (ver 2.7.0), microbenchmark (ver 1.4-
254 7), nparLD (ver 2.1), purr (ver 0.3.4), RColorBrewer (ver 1.1-2), readr (ver 1.4.0), stringr (ver
255 1.4.0), tibble (ver 3.0.4), tidyR (ver 1.1.2), tidyverse (ver 1.3.0), trajar package (ver 1.4.0), zoo
256 (ver 1.8-8), Mixed Effects Models (nlme) library version 3.2.152 on R version 3.5.3.

257 Time-series of motion and rest (Fx1 cohort only, n=10) and time series of rest and PA of each
258 cage (all cages, n=60; Table 1) generated as described above were used to analyse the
259 distribution of activity and rest by sex and housing density. In animals kept isolated,
260 movement and rest were analysed as aggregated values or segmented into bouts as
261 described above. The data set was then compared to the data set of EAD, i.e. activations and
262 rest [of the same cage], matching the time-series by the time-stamps (s^{-1}) to reveal the
263 extent of covariation of metrics among isolated animals (see also [16]). While the
264 locomotion files were divided into bouts of rest and locomotion, and further subdivided into
265 MOTS and locomotion (see above) as well as short and long rest, respectively; the EAD time
266 series files were divided into rest when no electrode was activated (<0.02 average
267 activations s^{-1} ; i.e., <1 electrode activation s^{-1}) and ≥ 1 electrode activation(s) (≥ 0.02
268 activations s^{-1}). As with the tracking time-series, episodes (bouts) of activations are
269 intervened by episodes (bouts) of rest. Rest episodes were further subdivided into bouts of
270 short and long rest ($\geq 40s$; see above).

271 Frequency and duration of bouts were saved along with average and cumulative PA during a
272 bout. The records were used to analyse bout duration and frequency in relation to
273 established rhythmicities [of in-cage behaviours] e.g. day vs. night, circadian, and recurring
274 husbandry routines[10, 12, 29-34].

275

276 Statistical analyses

277 Aggregated data usually had a normal distribution (Kolmogorov-Smirnoff test of normality)
278 and were analysed by linear-regression, or ANOVA or mixed model ANOVA including post
279 hoc testing. Paired and unpaired samples with a normal distribution were tested with two-
280 sided t-test (equal or unequal variance). Effect size for variables having a normal distribution
281 have been indicated by Hedge's q , or as the coefficient of variation (r^2)[35]. For parametric
282 statistics we used either R scripts or the plug-in XLSTAT module running on MS Excel.

283 However, several metrics showed large deviations from a normal distribution and could not
284 be normalized by Box-Cox transformation. We therefore choose to test differences across
285 cages, housing densities and/or sexes, cage-change cycles, and days, and across weeks, by
286 nonparametric repeated measures analysis, using the rank-based analysis of variance-type
287 statistic (ATS), as implemented in the nparLD R Software package [36, 37]. Cages are
288 subjects; housing density, time, event, and observation-order are within-subject factors
289 ("sub-plot" repeated factors), and sex and housing density are between-subject factors
290 ("whole-plot" factor) in the models used. The statistical analysis of time-series with nparLD is
291 based on rank-order of the observed data, with the relative effect size (p_s) as effect size
292 measure [37]. The difference towards parametric tests being that instead of the mean
293 difference between observations, the rank-order is used to assess the probability that two
294 sets of observations differ ($p_s=0.5$ means that there is no difference in rank-order), and/or if
295 the relative effect size varies across the time-series within the sets of observations.

296 Comparison of two independent samples, and paired samples, were conducted using
297 nonparametric Mann-Withney U statistics (U-test and Wilcoxon's test for matched pairs). In
298 these instances, we used the common language (CL) effect size statistics [38-41]. The CL
299 effect size is based on the rank-order (rank sum) of the observed values and indicates the
300 relative frequency with which the rank sum from one set of observations will be larger than
301 the rank sum of a second set of observations. Correlation between metrics with unknown or

302 a non-normal distribution was done using the nonparametric Spearman rank correlation.
303 The Spearman correlation coefficient (ρ , r_s) indicates the effect size with a range from a
304 perfect inverse covariation ($r_s = -1$), through no covariation ($r_s = 0$) to a perfect positive
305 covariation ($r_s = 1$) of the ranks for two parameters.
306 We used R scripts or XLSTAT to run the nonparametric statistical tests. Box plots indicate
307 median, 25%-75% quartiles with max and min as bars. In addition, circular symbols indicate
308 mean values.

309 **Results**

310 **Tracking of home-cage rest and movements in isolated female mice (Fx1)**

311 For single housed female mice (Fx1, n=10) the total file time of 6 weeks was decomposed
312 into bouts of rest and PA. PA bouts were further segmented in locomotor and MOTS bouts
313 (see Material and methods and [17, 18]). During the observation period, female mice spent
314 80% of the time at rest with rather small difference between animals (Fig. 2). Sixty-seven
315 percent of the file time were bouts of rest lasting at least 40s. The remaining ~20% of the
316 time, the animals were engaged in PA split equally between MOTS and bouts of locomotion
317 (*idem*).

318 -----Insert Fig 2 about here-----

319 **Density and duration of bouts (Fx1 cohort)**

320 A day in life of these ten mice is composed of a string of 4000-8000 bouts (~0.05-0.1 Hz) of
321 which 18% are rest bouts with median duration of 9s (Table3, Fig 3A-B). Two-point-five
322 percent are long rest bouts with a median duration of 79s (mean duration: 350s; Table 3).
323 Eighty-two percent are bouts of PA (Table 3) and ¾ of these PA bouts are short MOTS bouts
324 (median duration 1.6 s) while 25% are locomotor bouts with a median duration of 5s (Table
325 3, Fig. 3). Of the daily number of PA bouts, ~2/3^{rds} occur during lights off when PA bouts are
326 2.5 more frequent than rest bouts. Thus, of all bouts in file ~82% are PA bouts with a
327 duration of ≤10s making up <20% of the file time, with MOTS bouts being more than twice
328 as frequent as locomotor bouts (Fig. 3A-B).

329 -----Insert Fig 3 about here-----

330 -----Insert Table 3 about here-----

331 We confirm previous observations[12, 27] that the time in PA bouts decreases significantly -
332 30 to -40% (p=2E-9; Fig. 4A) across the cage change cycle, while cycle-to-cycle variation was
333 small (*idem*). Conversely, the time in rest bouts drops initially followed by an increase by
334 ~30% (p=2.8E-11; Fig. 4B). The cage change also upsets the pattern of long rest bouts during
335 daytime (lights on) (Fig. 5; see also Supportive information (Fig S6)). Days before a cage-
336 change, long rest usually occurs as 4-6 bouts during day light [intercalated by bouts of PA
337 and short rest] a pattern that is substantially fragmented by this intervention (*idem*).

338 -----Insert Fig 4 about here-----

339 **Distance and speed of bouts of motion**

340 Bouts of MOTS are local and usually cover a Euclidian distance of less than 2cm and motion
341 is at low speed (Table 4). Locomotion usually covers 0.1 to 0.2 m, i.e., the distance from one
342 side to the other of a cage and less than 1% of the locomotor bouts are longer than 1m
343 (Table 4).

344 -----Insert Table 4 about here-----

345 -----Insert Fig 5 about here-----

346 Distance made per day is about 250m during the dark hours and about 80m during daytime,
347 except for the day of the cage change (Fig. 6A). The animal-to-animal variation in distance is
348 larger during the dark vs. the light period of the day (*idem*; and Supportive information (Fig.
349 S7)). However, the average speed during locomotion is very similar ($\sim 2.8 \text{ cm s}^{-1}$) in darkness
350 and day light (Fig. 6B).

351 -----Insert Fig 6 about here-----

352 Locomotor bouts covering longer distance ($>1\text{m}$; Fig. 7A-F and Supportive information (Fig
353 S8)) illustrates the variability of in-cage trajectories (Fig. 7 A-C) and the speed dynamics of
354 locomotor bouts (Fig. 7 D-F). Speed ranges from a low of 0.01 m/s to 0.1m/s, and
355 occasionally even higher speeds. Tracks also reveal occurrence of abnormal behaviours e.g.,
356 recursive locomotor activity (Fig. 7B, E).

357 -----Insert Fig 7 about here-----

358 **Spatial distribution of bouts' starting point**

359 The starting coordinates for rest and PA bouts were analysed to explore how the cage floor
360 is used and to compare the day of the cage change (dp0) with the final day of the cage-
361 change cycle (dp13)(Fig. 8 and Supportive information (Fig S9)). There is a considerable
362 variability within and between mice, across a cage cycle and between cycles. Overall, there is
363 a significant decrease by $\sim 40\%$ ($p < 0.002$; Table 5) in total number of bouts/day across the
364 cage-change cycle, while the variation in bout reduction between cycles was not significant
365 (Table 5).

366 -----Insert Table 5 about here-----

367 In some cases (Fig. 8 and Supportive information (Fig S9)) there is an even distribution across
368 the cage floor of the starting points on both the day of the cage-change and at the end of
369 the cage change cycle although number of bouts and their relative abundance changes (see
370 also below). In other cases, bout initiation tended to be more clustered, and this changed
371 during as well as between cycles of the same mouse (e.g., case S7 in Fig. 8).

372 There was no clear preference for initiating bouts in the frontal vs rear area of the cage floor
373 (Fig. 9 A-C; for definition of the cage floor sub fields see Fig. 1), the distribution is close to
374 even except for the few long rest bouts which tended to be more frequent in the rear (Fig
375 9B). In contrast, bout initiation was infrequent in the central area of the cage floor (~25%; Fig
376 9 D-F), regardless of the bout being rest or a movement.

377 -----Insert Fig 8 about here-----

378 -----Insert Fig 9 about here-----

379 Rhythmicity of rest and locomotion of single-housed mice

380 Mice follow a circadian rhythm of rest and PA, entrained to lights on and lights off in the
381 laboratory environment (see Supportive information (Fig S1)). There is nocturnal peak of PA
382 while daytime holds the highest density of long periods of rest (Fig. 10 A, C). This pattern of
383 rest and PA reproduces closely across cages (Fig. 10 A, C) and between metric used (tracking,
384 Fig. 10A; EAD, Fig. 10B) across the LD cycle.

385 -----Insert Fig 10 about here-----

386 Decomposing the datafiles into bouts of long and short rest, MOTS and locomotion provide
387 the basis for the observed alteration in travelled distance (or EAD) and EAD across the
388 circadian cycle (compare Fig. 10 A-B with C).

389 Activity and rest by electrode activation density (EAD) in single and group 390 housed mice

391 Consistent with the tracking data reported above, the EAD metric show that 75% of the time
392 spent resting (80% of total file time) among single housed mice are bouts of long rest (≥ 40 s;
393 59% of total time) having an average duration of ~300s (Fig 11 A-C). The discrepancy

394 between the tracking metric and the EAD appears to be due to EAD occurring during bouts
395 when the mouse centroid coordinates does not change (c.f. Tables 2).
396 As expected, increasing housing density decreases the amount of time spent in
397 synchronized long rest (model: long rest ~density * sex; whole model $F=239$, $p<0.0001$; and
398 $p<0.0001$ for density; sex was not a significant factor $p=0.514$), mainly by reducing bout
399 duration (Fig. 11C, $F=130$, $p<0.0001$; effect by density $p<0.0001$ and by sex, $p<0.0001$) but
400 also the frequency (Fig. 11D, $F=69$, $p<0.0001$; effect by density $p<0.0001$ and sex $p=0.0001$).
401 Eighty-two percent of the EAD occurred during bouts of motion, with 2/3rd in locomotor
402 bouts (Table 2). In Fig 12 the impact of housing density and sex on EAD is shown and the
403 effect size (Hedge's q) has been tabulated in Table 6. The stepwise increase in EAD is large
404 (effect size~2) and without any apparent difference between sexes (Table 6) until the density
405 reaches four per cage. The effect size on EAD by increasing density from x3 female or x3
406 male mice up to x4 male mice was 1.4, which is only half of the effect size (~3) recorded for
407 the step up from x3 to x4 female mice (Table 6).

408 **Rest and activity (EAD) across the LD and the cage-change cycle**

409 As previously reported the amount of PA and rest per hour varies systematically across the
410 LD cycle (Fig. 13) and the proportion of synchronized-rest decreases as housing density
411 increases. Above we showed that bouts of rest and PA were impacted by the cage change
412 (Figs 4 and 6) affecting both distance moved and bout composition. When we use EAD as
413 metric (Figs 12, Table 6) we obtained corresponding results for the single housed mice and a
414 stepwise increase of effect size as we increase housing density up to four. In line with the
415 results using aggregated EAD data (Fig. 12 A-B and Table 6), there was a significant
416 difference between sexes at density x4 but not at x3 with respect to both time spent in PA
417 and synchronized rest (Fig. 14 A-B). In all the different housing densities studied here, there
418 was a marked impact by the cage change in both sexes on time spent in PA and
419 synchronized-rest, respectively (*idem*; see also Supportive information (Fig S10) for effect
420 size).

421 -----Insert Fig 11 about here-----

422 -----Insert Fig 12 about here-----

423 -----Insert Table 6 about here-----

424 -----Insert Fig 13 about here-----

425 EAD increases (Fig. 14A, see also Supportive information (Fig S3)) with housing density and in
426 parallel a larger number of unique electrodes are activated during a PA bout (Fig 14C),
427 suggesting that number of unique electrodes involved in a PA bout covariate with EAD.
428 With a housing density of four female or male mice, the relative effect size of days post cage
429 change on PA and rest across the cage change cycle displayed a biphasic trajectory with a
430 second distinct infliction on the day when neighbouring cages were subjected to a cage
431 change. Such inflictions were occasionally also evident in cages with three animals but not a
432 consistent feature through cycles (*idem*) and, furthermore, not seen with lower housing
433 densities (Fig. 15).

434 -----Insert Fig 14 about here-----

435 -----Insert Fig 15 about here-----

436
437 EAD occurrence in the frontal vs the rear part of the cage floor was rather similar with 5%-
438 10% more EADs in the rear of the single-housed mice. In two out of three cycles, the
439 percentage of EADs in the frontal area increased by 5-10% towards the end of the cage
440 change cycle (Table 7).

441 -----Insert Table 7 about here-----

442 Discussion

443 General comments

444 In this study we use decomposition analysis of longitudinal data recorded with a DVC HCM
445 system covering six weeks to assess pattern of rest and PA of single and group housed
446 C57BL/6J mice. The decomposition of the record files was based exclusively on the
447 occurrence or absence of a change between samples of the mouse centroid position (≥ 1
448 mm). Further subdivision of bouts were based on bout duration (short and long rest, split at
449 40s) and with PA bouts into MOTS (local movement) and locomotion (the bouts' radial
450 distance was larger, or equal to, one average stride length for this strain and sex)[17, 19].
451 Thus, the decomposition into bouts did not compromise the resolution of the system. In
452 single housed mice, we extracted both track and EAD metrics from the raw data to assess
453 degree of covariation. As confirmed here (see [16]), EADs and distance by tracking per hour
454 correlate closely but there is not a perfect match (~4% of file time differed) and, further, in
455 bouts of movements the relation between EADs and made distance was different between
456 PA bout types because MOTS of longer duration associated with high EAD despite very short
457 distance made. With tracking it is straight forward to differentiate between MOTS and
458 locomotion, however, associating EAD with number of different electrodes activated and the
459 temporal succession of electrode activations during a bout, may prove useful as guidance to
460 separate locomotor and MOTS bouts with the EAD metric. As with tracking, however, this
461 can only be applied when animals are single-housed [15, 16]. In the discordant segments of
462 the aligned [EAD and tracking] files, electrode activations were recorded during periods
463 when the tracking did not recognize any movement (<1mm, ~resolution of the system [15]),
464 i.e. during bouts of rest. Although this deviation between records is only a few percent of the
465 total file time, the metrics on time spent in long rest differed (EAD: 59% and tracking: 67% of
466 recorded time) while the difference of total time in rest was only ~1%. A plausible
467 explanation is that EAD is a more sensitive metric of PA, possibly responding to changes in
468 body posture and movements of the tail. Such electrode activations may not be sufficient to
469 alter the x, y position of the mouse centroid. This led us to interpret long rest bouts as sleep
470 only if both metrics indicated that the animal did not move (see also [21] on criteria
471 stringency of being still). Thus, the time budget for rest of single housed (C57Bl/6) mice was
472 ~80% considering the two metrics extracted, and sleep (NREM+REM) 59% (based on EAD).

473 With the definition for PA bout types used here, about equal time is used for MOTS and
474 locomotion.

475 With DVC, the tracking metric is more informative than the EAD but we recommend to
476 extract both and to use them in parallel (as we did here to define rest as sleep). EAD can also
477 be used when animals are co-housed to relay information about bouts of synchronized-rest
478 and group PA (density and spatial distribution of activation) of the animals (see also below)
479 and have been used to monitor circadian rhythm, impact by husbandry routines, and
480 progression of biological processes and diseases[12, 27, 29, 33, 42, 43].

481 **Bouts of rest and PA**

482 Single housed mice generate ~6500 bouts of rest and PA per day, this is in agreement with
483 data for C57BL/6 obtained by a HCM system using force plates[44]. Eighty percent are bouts
484 of PA corresponding to only ~20% of the file time (see also [45, 46], while only 2.5% of the
485 bouts are long rest bouts considered sleep episodes making up 59% of the file time. Sleep is
486 divided into non-REM sleep (NREM; in mice >90%) and REM sleep (REM; <10%). The gold
487 standard to decide on state of vigilance is to record gross cortical brain activity by surface
488 electrodes (EEG), eye-movements, and muscle tone (EMG). Pack et al [47] found by
489 comparing EEG and EMG recording with CCD a >90% agreement between long periods of
490 rest (CCD; ≥ 30 s) and EEG-EMG pattern of NREM and REM sleep. These observations were
491 later confirmed and extended by correlative assessment of home-cage periods of long rest
492 using piezo-electric sensor[48], IR-sensor[20, 49], CCD[21, 22], and electric-field sensor [50]
493 based HCM techniques combined with EEG-EMG recordings. The results of these studies
494 show a correlation >0.9 between NREM and REM sleep, on the hand, and the animals being
495 still ≥ 40 s, on the other. This behavioural criterion for sleep has subsequently been used in a
496 number of studies[51-55]. We conclude based on our results and those obtained with other
497 HCM techniques (*idem*) that bouts of inferred sleep (no distinction made here between
498 NREM and REM) in single housed mice of this strain commonly have a duration of 300-400s
499 but can exceed 1000s and occur with an average density of ~120 bouts per day preferentially
500 during lights on. Moreover, our bout actograms revealed that sleep bouts were clustered at
501 4-6 time periods during lights on, and 1-2 episodes during lights off. Interventions like a cage
502 change induces considerable fragmentation of bouts, affecting those considered to be sleep
503 (see also [28, 56-58]).

504 With co-housing the time spent in synchronized long rest (no EAD) decrease, in pair housing
505 to 45-50% of file time, with trios down to ~35% and no difference between sexes. Still at a
506 housing density of four mice per cage ≥25% of the file time is spent in synchronized long
507 rest, inferred to be sleep. At this density, males had significantly shorter synchronized long
508 rest than females.

509 As highlighted by Golani and co-workers [17], bouts of physical activity in mice can be
510 divided into locomotion and local movements (MOTS; see also [44, 45]). Local movements
511 comprise a range of behavioural entities not possible to decode with the DVC system. These
512 entities include feeding, drinking, rearing, and grooming (*idem* and [46]). MOTS make up
513 ~75% of the PA bouts and half of the file time devoted to PA. They are more prevalent
514 during lights off (~65% of all daily MOTS) and in agreement with data recorded with other
515 types of HCM systems[44, 45] they usually have a short duration (≤ 2 s), and cover typically a
516 short distance (< 2 cm) at low speed ($< 0.6 \text{ cm s}^{-1}$). Our data shows that a fraction of the MOTS
517 have a longer duration, and that these bouts associate with high values for EAD. Such bouts
518 may correspond to e.g., eating bouts. MOTS bouts increase in response to a cage change and
519 in the responses to lights on/off during the LD cycle, and cover a cumulative distance of 40-
520 70m per day, i.e. ~15-20% of the daily moved distance (see also[44]).

521 We recorded 1000-2000 bouts of locomotion per day in single housed mice. As expected,
522 few occurs during lights on because mice are nocturnal. The typical locomotor bout covers a
523 distance of 0.1-0.2 m with a speed of $\sim 3 \text{ cm s}^{-1}$, which agrees with previously published data
524 recorded with DVC and other types of HCM systems[53, 56, 59, 60] but lower than those
525 reported by [44, 45]. This discrepancy in average speed may relate to differences in the
526 definition of a locomotor bout (speed or distance). As shown here, speed varies (range ~ 0.01 -
527 0.1 m s^{-1}) during a locomotor bout, and the trajectory and bout speedogram will unmask
528 abnormal recursive motor behaviours (fits of stereotypy). Distance travelled per hour is in
529 the range from $< 1 \text{ m h}^{-1}$ (day time during periods of rest) up to 40 m h^{-1} (in response to lights
530 on, and cage change), decays across days of the cage change cycle and show considerable
531 differences (one fold) between [single housed] mice. The daily average distance covered by
532 the mice was $\sim 330 \text{ m}$ in this study, which is within the range (~ 150 - 750 m 24h^{-1}) of previously
533 published data [16, 44, 45, 56, 59, 60]. The difference noted in average speed between our
534 results, including that we did not find a difference in speed during movements day time vs
535 night time, and those previously published using DVC is due to that we used decomposition

536 into bouts, while Iannello's [16] data is average across all movements and rest per unit time,
537 and Shenk et al.[60] used a different definition of locomotion.

538 **Rest and PA across the LD cycle, and the use of the cage floor**

539 In mammals, the pattern of PA and rest follows different rhythmicities (for references see
540 [29]). Universal is the circadian rhythm which entrains to Earth's Day and Night (*idem*). HCM
541 systems are ideal for the purpose of analysing behavioural rhythmicities over extended
542 periods of time in small rodents [29, 33] and may prove to be a good substitute to the
543 current gold standard of using running wheels in studies of the circadian rhythm[61]. Mice
544 are nocturnal and will rest during day time (lights on) while they are active and feed during
545 night time (lights off). Our data show that across the LD cycle, the driving force is the
546 clustering of long rest bouts to day time, while all other bout types increase in prevalence
547 during night time. We also confirm that the responses to lights on/off appears insensitive to
548 if lightning change suddenly or through a dawn and dusk transition period[27].

549 Although less informative than tracking EAD revealed the same pattern of rest and PA and,
550 further, that the amount of time spent in PA bouts increase stepwise up to a density of four
551 mice without any apparent difference between sexes [for the C57BL/6J strain of mice]. We
552 confirm previous observations that mice housed 4 to a cage, the level of PA and rest differ
553 between sexes[12, 27].

554 In a recent publication we showed that male mice housed 4 to a cage tend to constrain the
555 use of the cage floor area across the cage change cycle and that this may be related to the
556 location of the in-cage latrine(s)[27]. Females at the same housing density did not show the
557 same degree of spatial clustering of PA and, importantly, this was not evident when males
558 were housed in pairs (*idem*). Single housed mice, tend to locate long rest into the rear half of
559 the cage (mainly during lights on), while all other bout types (97.5%) were spread across the
560 front and rear of the cage floor but with a significant portion of them (75%) originating (and
561 terminating) in the peripheral part (50% of floor area) of the cage floor. Thus, housing
562 C57BL/6J mice at densities ≥ 4 per cage seems to alter in cage behaviour and induce sex
563 differences, combined this may indicate a crowdedness stress that should be taken into
564 account when designing experiments and comparing study results.

565 **Decomposition of longitudinal HCM records into bouts of rest and PA may
566 have significant value in translational research.**

567 The introduction of small wearable devices (accelerometers, more recently smart watches
568 and similar items) that can be carried on the wrist, thigh, or trunk without disrupting normal
569 activity has made it possible to collect large amounts of longitudinal data on rest and activity
570 from healthy and sick, growing and aging humans, to extract metrics useful as objective
571 biomarkers of development and ageing, disease progression, outcome prediction as well as
572 monitoring impact by intervention [34, 62-75]. So far, only few accelerometer studies on
573 humans encompasses variation in activity and rest bouts across the circadian cycle[34, 63,
574 67, 68, 72]. However, as smart watches and similar devices are likely to replace the older
575 more unpractical accelerometers this will likely change. The number of papers by year
576 presenting accelerometer data in humans has increased x25 from year 2001 to 2020 (source
577 PubMed). Work is ongoing to develop recommendations to standardize accelerometer
578 records as well as new tools by which the data can be analysed [31, 32, 63, 76-82]. Similar
579 initiatives are currently ongoing in the realm of HCM of animal models in the life sciences
580 with a recently started COST action in EU (TeaTime) and the North American 3Rs
581 collaborative (Na3RsC).

582 The most common approach so-far to analyse accelerometer/smartwatch raw data is by
583 decomposition analysis using cut-point values to stratify the data into bouts of sleep (SL) and
584 sedentary behaviour (SB), low-medium and vigorous physical activity (PA) or different
585 combinations of these categories (*idem*). The frequency and duration as well as
586 accumulation pattern of different bout types and the composition of bouts are then
587 compared over time and/or between groups. With GPS tracking becoming a more frequent
588 feature of wearable devices also distance made and speedograms will be possible to retrieve
589 as indices. Similarly, data generated by a variety of HCM systems have recently been used in
590 efforts to identify behavioural indices of ageing[29, 83], impact of disease progression[42,
591 43, 60, 84, 85], genetic modification[44, 48, 51, 53, 86], and insults[59, 60, 87].
592 Since the data generated by wearable devices in humans and by non-intrusive scalable HCM
593 systems in animals essentially overlap, it should be feasible to agree on sets of metrics that
594 will serve as equivalent biomarkers for different conditions and biological process in both
595 humans and small rodent models used to study human conditions.

596 **Limitations of this study**

597 With few exceptions[9, 88, 89] , scalable HCM systems such as the DVC used here can
598 provide detailed metrics only when animals are kept in isolation (for references see
599 Introduction and above). Mice are normally living in groups and as stated in the EU
600 Directive63/2010 there are ethical reasons to avoid single housing of laboratory rodents,
601 since evidence indicate a depreciation of animal welfare and that isolation may alter
602 animals' mental capacity and spontaneous behaviour [90-97]. However, some studies
603 especially on male mice have questioned this and showed that the welfare or behaviour
604 must not always be depreciated and, furthermore, depends on the context [95, 98-102].

605 To enable assessment of data extracted from the raw electrode output of the DVC, we used
606 a cohort of single housed females as the main subjects of this study. Our results indicate that
607 with co-housing, PA (EAD) increased in a stepwise fashion from single housing to pair
608 housing and from pairs up to trios, regardless of sex for this strain of mice. Thus, our data
609 suggests that welfare depreciation experienced due to single housing did not seriously affect
610 the mice's daily amount of PA to a significant degree. It remains roughly proportional to
611 number of animals in the cage up to a density of four animals.

612 Both the spatial (12 electrodes spaced apart) and temporal resolution (4 Hz) of the system
613 are low compared to video-based solutions (usually \geq 15 FPS and HDMI) but has the
614 advantage of low demands on IT infrastructure, data storage and processing capacity. Except
615 for the rather few long bouts of rest, the different bout types had a frequency in the range of
616 0.05- 1 Hz. Thus, the over-sampling at 4 Hz should be sufficient to delineate the bouts
617 accurately. The HCM system is fully automatable, scalable, and non-intrusive. Similar, to
618 RFID (Intellicage, TSE; e.g. [4]), IR-beam (Actimot, TSE; e.g.[8]) and Force plate (Metris,
619 Labora; e.g. [6])-based systems, the output does not have high dimensionality. Thus, this
620 type of system cannot capture behavioural trait details, only basic metrics as animal
621 localisation, rest, and PA. An additional limitation is that recording of PA (and rest) with the
622 DVC system is restricted to the floor of the cage and activities such as e.g. climbing is not
623 recognized. Moreover, it cannot be excluded that data of PA was not picked-up when the
624 animal was on top of shuffled piles of bedding and enrichment materials.

625 Still, as shown here tracking and EADs can be quite informative when the animals are kept in
626 isolation, while housed in groups the information provided (by EAD metric) apply only to the
627 group not individual animals.

628 **Concluding remarks**

629 We show that data on a variety of parameters such as sleep pattern, locomotor activity,
630 bout fragmentation, spatial distribution of rest and PA, the circadian rhythm and changes to
631 these metrics induced by interventions, can be extracted in near real-time from scalable
632 HCM systems like the DVC using standard desk top computers. Longitudinal data can easily
633 be generated and retrieved on a large scale serving both the care and welfare of the
634 experimental animals, and the research conducted on them. The output from these systems
635 compares well with data generated by wearable devices on humans and may, thus, form a
636 basis for translatable behavioural biomarkers.

637 **Cited literature**

638

639 1. Todd JT. A selective look at some pre-skinnerian cumulative recording systems and
640 cumulative records in physiology and psychology. Mexican Journal of Behavior Analysis.
641 2017;43(2):137-63.

642 2. Robinson SF, Pauly JR, Marks MJ, Collins AC. An analysis of response to nicotine
643 infusion using an automated radiotelemetry system. Psychopharmacology (Berl). 1994;115(1-2):115-
644 20. doi: 10.1007/bf02244760. PubMed PMID: 7862882.

645 3. Tamborini P, Sigg H, Zbinden G. Quantitative analysis of rat activity in the home cage
646 by infrared monitoring. Application to the acute toxicity testing of acetanilide and phenylmercuric
647 acetate. Arch Toxicol. 1989;63(2):85-96. doi: 10.1007/bf00316429. PubMed PMID: 2730344.

648 4. Dell'omo G, Shore RF, Lipp HP. An automated system, based on microchips, for
649 monitoring individual activity in wild small mammals. The Journal of experimental zoology.
650 1998;280(1):97-9. PubMed PMID: 9437856.

651 5. Krackow S, Vannoni E, Codita A, Mohammed AH, Cirulli F, Branchi I, et al. Consistent
652 behavioral phenotype differences between inbred mouse strains in the IntelliCage. Genes Brain
653 Behav. 2010;9(7):722-31. Epub 2010/06/10. doi: 10.1111/j.1601-183X.2010.00606.x. PubMed PMID:
654 20528956.

655 6. Altun M, Bergman E, Edstrom E, Johnson H, Ulvhake B. Behavioral impairments of the
656 aging rat. Physiol Behav. 2007;92(5):911-23. Epub 2007/08/07. doi: S0031-9384(07)00263-6 [pii]
657 10.1016/j.physbeh.2007.06.017. PubMed PMID: 17675121.

658 7. Grieco F, Bernstein BJ, Biemans B, Bikovski L, Burnett CJ, Cushman JD, et al. Measuring
659 Behavior in the Home Cage: Study Design, Applications, Challenges, and Perspectives. Front Behav
660 Neurosci. 2021;15:735387. Epub 2021/09/24. doi: 10.3389/fnbeh.2021.735387. PubMed PMID:
661 34630052; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC8498589.

662 8. Fahlstrom A, Zeberg H, Ulvhake B. Changes in behaviors of male C57BL/6J mice across
663 adult life span and effects of dietary restriction. Age (Dordr). 2012;34(6):1435-52. Epub 2011/10/13.
664 doi: 10.1007/s11357-011-9320-7. PubMed PMID: 21989972; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC3528371.

665 9. Redfern WS, Tse K, Grant C, Keerie A, Simpson DJ, Pedersen JC, et al. Automated
666 recording of home cage activity and temperature of individual rats housed in social groups: The
667 Rodent Big Brother project. PloS one. 2017;12(9):e0181068-e. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0181068.
668 PubMed PMID: 28877172.

669 10. Richardson CA. The power of automated behavioural homecage technologies in
670 characterizing disease progression in laboratory mice: A review. Applied Animal Behaviour Science.
671 2015;163:19-27. doi: 10.1016/j.applanim.2014.11.018.

672 11. Bains RS, Cater HL, Sillito RR, Chartsias A, Sneddon D, Concas D, et al. Analysis of
673 individual mouse activity in group housed animals of different inbred strains using a novel automated
674 home cage analysis system. Frontiers in Behavioral Neuroscience. 2016;10(JUN). doi:
675 10.3389/fnbeh.2016.00106.

676 12. Pernold K, Iannello F, Low BE, Rigamonti M, Rosati G, Scavizzi F, et al. Towards large
677 scale automated cage monitoring - Diurnal rhythm and impact of interventions on in-cage activity of
678 C57BL/6J mice recorded 24/7 with a non-disrupting capacitive-based technique. PLoS One.
679 2019;14(2):e0211063. Epub 2019/02/05. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0211063. PubMed PMID:
680 30716111; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC6361443 Buguggiate (Va), Italy) is a commercial
681 company selling the DVC system. However, this does not alter the authors' adherence to all the PLOS
682 ONE policies on sharing data and materials. We have read the journal's policy and the authors of this
683 manuscript have no competing interests.

684 13. Baran SW, Bratcher N, Dennis J, Gaburro S, Karlsson EM, Maguire S, et al. Emerging
685 Role of Translational Digital Biomarkers Within Home Cage Monitoring Technologies in Preclinical

686 Drug Discovery and Development. *Front Behav Neurosci.* 2021;15:758274. Epub 20220214. doi:
687 10.3389/fnbeh.2021.758274. PubMed PMID: 35242017; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC8885444.

688 14. Gaburro S, Winter Y, Loos M, Kim JJ, Stiedl O. Editorial: Home Cage-Based Phenotyping
689 in Rodents: Innovation, Standardization, Reproducibility and Translational Improvement. *Front*
690 *Neurosci.* 2022;16:894193. Epub 20220623. doi: 10.3389/fnins.2022.894193. PubMed PMID:
691 35812217; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC9261870.

692 15. Klein C, Budiman T, Homberg JR, Verma D, Keijer J, van Schothorst EM. Measuring
693 Locomotor Activity and Behavioral Aspects of Rodents Living in the Home-Cage. *Front Behav*
694 *Neurosci.* 2022;16:877323. Epub 20220407. doi: 10.3389/fnbeh.2022.877323. PubMed PMID:
695 35464142; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC9021872.

696 16. Iannello F. Non-intrusive high throughput automated data collection from the home
697 cage. *Heliyon.* 2019;5(4):e01454. Epub 2019/04/19. doi: 10.1016/j.heliyon.2019.e01454. PubMed
698 PMID: 30997429; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC6451168.

699 17. Drai D, Kafkafi N, Benjamini Y, Elmer G, Golani I. Rats and mice share common
700 ethologically relevant parameters of exploratory behavior. *Behav Brain Res.* 2001;125(1-2):133-40.
701 Epub 2001/10/30. doi: 10.1016/s0166-4328(01)00290-x. PubMed PMID: 11682104.

702 18. Drai D, Golani I. SEE: a tool for the visualization and analysis of rodent exploratory
703 behavior. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev.* 2001;25(5):409-26. Epub 2001/09/22. doi: 10.1016/s0149-
704 7634(01)00022-7. PubMed PMID: 11566479.

705 19. Fahlstrom A, Yu Q, Ulfhake B. Behavioral changes in aging female C57BL/6 mice.
706 *Neurobiol Aging.* 2009. Epub 2009/12/17. doi: S0197-4580(09)00362-5 [pii]
707 10.1016/j.neurobiolaging.2009.11.003. PubMed PMID: 20005598.

708 20. Angelakos CC, Watson AJ, O'Brien WT, Krainock KS, Nickl-Jockschat T, Abel T.
709 Hyperactivity and male-specific sleep deficits in the 16p11.2 deletion mouse model of autism. *Autism Res.* 2017;10(4):572-84. Epub 20161014. doi: 10.1002/aur.1707. PubMed PMID: 27739237; PubMed
710 Central PMCID: PMCPMC6201314.

711 21. Fisher SP, Godinho SI, Pothecary CA, Hankins MW, Foster RG, Peirson SN. Rapid
712 assessment of sleep-wake behavior in mice. *J Biol Rhythms.* 2012;27(1):48-58. Epub 2012/02/07. doi:
713 10.1177/0748730411431550. PubMed PMID: 22306973; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC4650254.

714 22. McShane BB, Galante RJ, Biber M, Jensen ST, Wyner AJ, Pack AI. Assessing REM Sleep
715 in Mice Using Video Data. *Sleep.* 2012;35(3):433-42. doi: 10.5665/sleep.1712.

716 23. Brown LA, Hasan S, Foster RG, Peirson SN. COMPASS: Continuous Open Mouse
717 Phenotyping of Activity and Sleep Status. *Wellcome open research.* 2016;1:2-. doi:
718 10.12688/wellcomeopenres.9892.2. PubMed PMID: 27976750.

719 24. Tang X, Xiao J, Parris BS, Fang J, Sanford LD. Differential effects of two types of
720 environmental novelty on activity and sleep in BALB/cJ and C57BL/6J mice. *Physiol Behav.*
721 2005;85(4):419-29. Epub 2005/07/16. doi: 10.1016/j.physbeh.2005.05.008. PubMed PMID:
722 16019041.

723 25. Erratum to "FELASA recommendations for the health monitoring of mouse, rat,
724 hamster, guinea pig and rabbit colonies in breeding and experimental units". *Lab Anim.*
725 2015;49(1):88. Epub 2014/09/04. doi: 10.1177/0023677214550970. PubMed PMID: 25181995.

726 26. Mahler Convenor M, Berard M, Feinstein R, Gallagher A, Illgen-Wilcke B, Pritchett-
727 Corning K, et al. FELASA recommendations for the health monitoring of mouse, rat, hamster, guinea
728 pig and rabbit colonies in breeding and experimental units. *Lab Anim.* 2014;48(3):178-92. Epub
729 2014/02/06. doi: 10.1177/0023677213516312. PubMed PMID: 24496575.

730 27. Ulfhake B, Lerat H, Honetschlager J, Pernold K, Rynekrová M, Escot K, et al. A
731 multicentre study on spontaneous in-cage activity and micro-environmental conditions of IVC housed
732 C57BL/6J mice during consecutive cycles of bi-weekly cage-change. *PLoS One.* 2022;17(5):e0267281.
733 Epub 20220525. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0267281. PubMed PMID: 35613182; PubMed Central
734 PMCID: PMCPMC9132304.

736 28. Saré RM, Lemons A, Torossian A, Beebe Smith C. Noninvasive, High-throughput
737 Determination of Sleep Duration in Rodents. *J Vis Exp.* 2018;(134). Epub 20180418. doi:
738 10.3791/57420. PubMed PMID: 29733321; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC6100687.

739 29. Pernold K, Rullman E, Ulfhake B. Major oscillations in spontaneous home-cage activity
740 in C57BL/6 mice housed under constant conditions. *Sci Rep.* 2021;11(1):4961. Epub 2021/03/04. doi:
741 10.1038/s41598-021-84141-9. PubMed PMID: 33654141; PubMed Central PMCID:
742 PMCPMC7925671.

743 30. Zucker I. Circannual rhythms Mammals. Circannual rhythms Mammals in *Handbook of*
744 *Behavioral Neurobiology] Handbook of Behavioral Neurobiology* Vol 122001. p. 509-29.

745 31. Leroux A, Di J, Smirnova E, McGuffey EJ, Cao Q, Bayatmokhtari E, et al. Organizing and
746 analyzing the activity data in NHANES. *Stat Biosci.* 2019;11(2):262-87. Epub 2020/02/13. doi:
747 10.1007/s12561-018-09229-9. PubMed PMID: 32047572; PubMed Central PMCID:
748 PMCPMC7012355.

749 32. Di J, Spira A, Bai J, Urbanek J, Leroux A, Wu M, et al. Joint and Individual
750 Representation of Domains of Physical Activity, Sleep, and Circadian Rhythmicity. *Stat Biosci.*
751 2019;11(2):371-402. Epub 2020/05/23. doi: 10.1007/s12561-019-09236-4. PubMed PMID: 32440309;
752 PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7241438.

753 33. Bains RS, Wells S, Sillito RR, Armstrong JD, Cater HL, Banks G, et al. Assessing mouse
754 behaviour throughout the light/dark cycle using automated in-cage analysis tools. *J Neurosci*
755 *Methods.* 2018;300:37-47. Epub 20170426. doi: 10.1016/j.jneumeth.2017.04.014. PubMed PMID:
756 28456660; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC5909039.

757 34. Xiao L, Huang L, Schrack JA, Ferrucci L, Zipunnikov V, Crainiceanu CM. Quantifying the
758 lifetime circadian rhythm of physical activity: a covariate-dependent functional approach.
759 *Biostatistics.* 2015;16(2):352-67. Epub 2014/11/02. doi: 10.1093/biostatistics/kxu045. PubMed PMID:
760 25361695; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC4804116.

761 35. Nakagawa S, Cuthill IC. Effect size, confidence interval and statistical significance: a
762 practical guide for biologists. *Biol Rev Camb Philos Soc.* 2007;82(4):591-605. Epub 2007/10/20. doi:
763 10.1111/j.1469-185X.2007.00027.x. PubMed PMID: 17944619.

764 36. Erceg-Hurn DM, Mirosevich VM. Modern robust statistical methods: an easy way to
765 maximize the accuracy and power of your research. *Am Psychol.* 2008;63(7):591-601. doi:
766 10.1037/0003-066X.63.7.591. PubMed PMID: 18855490.

767 37. Noguchi K, Gel, R. L., Brunner, E., Konietzschke, F. *nparLD: An R Software Package for*
768 *the Nonparametric Analysis of Longitudinal Data in Factorial Experiments.* *Journal of Statistical*
769 *Software.* 2012;50(12):1-23.

770 38. Cliff N. Dominance statistics: Ordinal analyses to answer ordinal questions.
771 *Psychological Bulletin.* 1993;114(3):494-509. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.114.3.494.

772 39. McGraw KO, Wong SP. A common language effect size statistic. *Psychological Bulletin.*
773 1992;111(2):361-5. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.111.2.361.

774 40. Vargha A, Delaney HD. A Critique and Improvement of the "CL" Common Language
775 Effect Size Statistics of McGraw and Wong. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics.*
776 2000;25(2):101-32. doi: 10.2307/1165329.

777 41. Grissom RJ, Kim JJ. Review of assumptions and problems in the appropriate
778 conceptualization of effect size. *Psychol Methods.* 2001;6(2):135-46. doi: 10.1037/1082-
779 989x.6.2.135. PubMed PMID: 11411438.

780 42. Golini E, Rigamonti M, Iannello F, De Rosa C, Scavizzi F, Raspa M, et al. A Non-invasive
781 Digital Biomarker for the Detection of Rest Disturbances in the SOD1G93A Mouse Model of ALS.
782 *Front Neurosci.* 2020;14:896. Epub 2020/09/29. doi: 10.3389/fnins.2020.00896. PubMed PMID:
783 32982678; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7490341.

784 43. Vagima Y, Grauer E, Politi B, Maimon S, Yitzhak E, Melamed S, et al. Group activity of
785 mice in communal home cage used as an indicator of disease progression and rate of recovery:
786 Effects of LPS and influenza virus. *Life Sciences.* 2020;258:118214. doi:
787 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lfs.2020.118214>.

788 44. Chaudoin TR, Bonasera SJ. Mice lacking galectin-3 (Lgals3) function have decreased
789 home cage movement. *BMC Neurosci.* 2018;19(1):27. Epub 2018/05/03. doi: 10.1186/s12868-018-
790 0428-x. PubMed PMID: 29716523; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC5930520.

791 45. Knibbe-Hollinger JS, Fields NR, Chaudoin TR, Epstein AA, Makarov E, Akhter SP, et al.
792 Influence of age, irradiation and humanization on NSG mouse phenotypes. *Biol Open.*
793 2015;4(10):1243-52. Epub 20150909. doi: 10.1242/bio.013201. PubMed PMID: 26353862; PubMed
794 Central PMCID: PMCPMC4610222.

795 46. Goulding EH, Schenk AK, Juneja P, MacKay AW, Wade JM, Tecott LH. A robust
796 automated system elucidates mouse home cage behavioral structure. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.*
797 2008;105(52):20575-82. Epub 20081223. doi: 10.1073/pnas.0809053106. PubMed PMID: 19106295;
798 PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC2634928.

799 47. Pack AI, Galante RJ, Maislin G, Cater J, Metaxas D, Lu S, et al. Novel method for high-
800 throughput phenotyping of sleep in mice. *Physiol Genomics.* 2007;28(2):232-8. Epub 20060919. doi:
801 10.1152/physiolgenomics.00139.2006. PubMed PMID: 16985007.

802 48. Lord JS, Gay SM, Harper KM, Nikolova VD, Smith KM, Moy SS, et al. Early life sleep
803 disruption potentiates lasting sex-specific changes in behavior in genetically vulnerable Shank3
804 heterozygous autism model mice. *Mol Autism.* 2022;13(1):35. Epub 20220829. doi: 10.1186/s13229-
805 022-00514-5. PubMed PMID: 36038911; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC9425965.

806 49. Brown LA, Banks GT, Horner N, Wilcox SL, Nolan PM, Peirson SN. Simultaneous
807 Assessment of Circadian Rhythms and Sleep in Mice Using Passive Infrared Sensors: A User's Guide.
808 *Curr Protoc Mouse Biol.* 2020;10(3):e81. doi: 10.1002/cpmo.81. PubMed PMID: 32865891.

809 50. Kloefkorn H, Aiani LM, Lakhani A, Nagesh S, Moss A, Goolsby W, et al. Noninvasive
810 three-state sleep-wake staging in mice using electric field sensors. *J Neurosci Methods.*
811 2020;344:108834. Epub 2020/07/04. doi: 10.1016/j.jneumeth.2020.108834. PubMed PMID:
812 32619585; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7454007.

813 51. Saré RM, Harkless L, Levine M, Torossian A, Sheeler CA, Smith CB. Deficient Sleep in
814 Mouse Models of Fragile X Syndrome. *Front Mol Neurosci.* 2017;10:280. Epub 20170901. doi:
815 10.3389/fnmol.2017.00280. PubMed PMID: 28919851; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC5585179.

816 52. Saré RM, Lemons A, Song A, Smith CB. Sleep Duration in Mouse Models of
817 Neurodevelopmental Disorders. *Brain Sci.* 2020;11(1). Epub 20201230. doi:
818 10.3390/brainsci11010031. PubMed PMID: 33396736; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7824512.

819 53. Schirmer C, Abboud MA, Lee SC, Bass JS, Mazumder AG, Kamen JL, et al. Home-cage
820 behavior in the Stargazer mutant mouse. *Sci Rep.* 2022;12(1):12801. Epub 20220727. doi:
821 10.1038/s41598-022-17015-3. PubMed PMID: 35896608; PubMed Central PMCID:
822 PMCPMC9329369.

823 54. Siedhoff HR, Chen S, Balderrama A, Sun GY, Koopmans B, DePalma RG, et al. Long-
824 Term Effects of Low-Intensity Blast Non-Inertial Brain Injury on Anxiety-Like Behaviors in Mice:
825 Home-Cage Monitoring Assessments. *Neurotrauma Rep.* 2022;3(1):27-38. Epub 20220111. doi:
826 10.1089/neur.2021.0063. PubMed PMID: 35141713; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC8820222.

827 55. Angelakos CC, Tudor JC, Ferri SL, Jongens TA, Abel T. Home-cage hypoactivity in mouse
828 genetic models of autism spectrum disorder. *Neurobiol Learn Mem.* 2019;165:107000. Epub
829 20190220. doi: 10.1016/j.nlm.2019.02.010. PubMed PMID: 30797034; PubMed Central PMCID:
830 PMCPMC6913530.

831 56. Qu W, Liu NK, Xie XM, Li R, Xu XM. Automated monitoring of early neurobehavioral
832 changes in mice following traumatic brain injury. *Neural Regen Res.* 2016;11(2):248-56. doi:
833 10.4103/1673-5374.177732. PubMed PMID: 27073377; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC4810988.

834 57. Robinson-Junker AL, O'Hara B F, Gaskill BN. Out Like a Light? The Effects of a Diurnal
835 Husbandry Schedule on Mouse Sleep and Behavior. *J Am Assoc Lab Anim Sci.* 2018;57(2):124-33.
836 Epub 2018/03/21. PubMed PMID: 29555001; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC5868378.

837 58. Tang X, Liu X, Yang L, Sanford LD. Rat strain differences in sleep after acute mild
838 stressors and short-term sleep loss. *Behav Brain Res.* 2005;160(1):60-71. Epub 2005/04/20. doi:
839 10.1016/j.bbr.2004.11.015. PubMed PMID: 15836901.

840 59. Urban R, Scherrer G, Goulding EH, Tecott LH, Basbaum AI. Behavioral indices of
841 ongoing pain are largely unchanged in male mice with tissue or nerve injury-induced mechanical
842 hypersensitivity. *Pain*. 2011;152(5):990-1000. Epub 20110121. doi: 10.1016/j.pain.2010.12.003.
843 PubMed PMID: 21256675; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC3079194.

844 60. Shenk J, Lohkamp KJ, Wiesmann M, Kilian AJ. Automated Analysis of Stroke Mouse
845 Trajectory Data With Traja. *Front Neurosci*. 2020;14:518. Epub 2020/06/12. doi:
846 10.3389/fnins.2020.00518. PubMed PMID: 32523509; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7262161.

847 61. Pritchett D, Jagannath A, Brown LA, Tam SKE, Hasan S, Gatti S, et al. Deletion of
848 Metabotropic Glutamate Receptors 2 and 3 (mGlu2 & mGlu3) in Mice Disrupts Sleep and Wheel-
849 Running Activity, and Increases the Sensitivity of the Circadian System to Light. *PLOS ONE*.
850 2015;10(5):e0125523. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0125523.

851 62. Júdice PB, Hetherington-Rauth M, Northstone K, Andersen LB, Wedderkopp N,
852 Ekelund U, et al. Changes in Physical Activity and Sedentary Patterns on Cardiometabolic Outcomes
853 in the Transition to Adolescence: International Children's Accelerometry Database 2.0. *J Pediatr*.
854 2020. Epub 2020/06/20. doi: 10.1016/j.jpeds.2020.06.018. PubMed PMID: 32553870.

855 63. Varma VR, Dey D, Leroux A, Di J, Urbanek J, Xiao L, et al. Re-evaluating the effect of
856 age on physical activity over the lifespan. *Prev Med*. 2017;101:102-8. Epub 2017/06/06. doi:
857 10.1016/j.ypmed.2017.05.030. PubMed PMID: 28579498; PubMed Central PMCID:
858 PMCPMC5541765.

859 64. Oikawa SY, Holloway TM, Phillips SM. The Impact of Step Reduction on Muscle Health
860 in Aging: Protein and Exercise as Countermeasures. *Front Nutr*. 2019;6:75. Epub 2019/06/11. doi:
861 10.3389/fnut.2019.00075. PubMed PMID: 31179284; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC6543894.

862 65. Palmberg L, Rantalainen T, Rantakokko M, Karavirta L, Siltanen S, Skantz H, et al. The
863 Associations of Activity Fragmentation with Physical and Mental Fatigability among Community-
864 Dwelling 75-, 80- and 85-Year-Old People. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci*. 2020. Epub 2020/07/03. doi:
865 10.1093/gerona/glaa166. PubMed PMID: 32614396.

866 66. Smirnova E, Leroux A, Cao Q, Tabacu L, Zipunnikov V, Crainiceanu C, et al. The
867 Predictive Performance of Objective Measures of Physical Activity Derived From Accelerometry Data
868 for 5-Year All-Cause Mortality in Older Adults: National Health and Nutritional Examination Survey
869 2003-2006. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci*. 2020;75(9):1779-85. Epub 2019/09/11. doi:
870 10.1093/gerona/glz193. PubMed PMID: 31504213; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7494021.

871 67. Šteflová N, Dygrýn J, Hron K, Gába A, Rubín L, Palarea-Albaladejo J. Robust
872 Compositional Analysis of Physical Activity and Sedentary Behaviour Data. *Int J Environ Res Public
873 Health*. 2018;15(10). Epub 2018/10/17. doi: 10.3390/ijerph15102248. PubMed PMID: 30322203;
874 PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC6210094.

875 68. Hamer M, Stamatakis E, Chastin S, Pearson N, Brown M, Gilbert E, et al. Feasibility of
876 Measuring Sedentary Time Using Data From a Thigh-Worn Accelerometer. *Am J Epidemiol*.
877 2020;189(9):963-71. Epub 2020/03/29. doi: 10.1093/aje/kwaa047. PubMed PMID: 32219368;
878 PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7443760.

879 69. Fishman EI, Steeves JA, Zipunnikov V, Koster A, Berrigan D, Harris TA, et al. Association
880 between Objectively Measured Physical Activity and Mortality in NHANES. *Med Sci Sports Exerc*.
881 2016;48(7):1303-11. Epub 2016/02/06. doi: 10.1249/mss.0000000000000885. PubMed PMID:
882 26848889; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC4911242.

883 70. Nastasi AJ, Ahuja A, Zipunnikov V, Simonsick EM, Ferrucci L, Schrack JA. Objectively
884 Measured Physical Activity and Falls in Well-Functioning Older Adults: Findings From the Baltimore
885 Longitudinal Study of Aging. *Am J Phys Med Rehabil*. 2018;97(4):255-60. Epub 2017/09/16. doi:
886 10.1097/phm.0000000000000830. PubMed PMID: 28915202; PubMed Central PMCID:
887 PMCPMC5851797.

888 71. Wanigatunga AA, Di J, Zipunnikov V, Urbanek JK, Kuo PL, Simonsick EM, et al.
889 Association of Total Daily Physical Activity and Fragmented Physical Activity With Mortality in Older
890 Adults. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2019;2(10):e1912352. Epub 2019/10/03. doi:

891 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2019.12352. PubMed PMID: 31577355; PubMed Central PMCID: 892 PMCPMC6777397.

893 72. Merikangas KR, Swendsen J, Hickie IB, Cui L, Shou H, Merikangas AK, et al. Real-time 894 Mobile Monitoring of the Dynamic Associations Among Motor Activity, Energy, Mood, and Sleep in 895 Adults With Bipolar Disorder. *JAMA Psychiatry*. 2019;76(2):190-8. Epub 2018/12/13. doi: 896 10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2018.3546. PubMed PMID: 30540352; PubMed Central PMCID: 897 PMCPMC6439734 commissioner of Australia's National Mental Health Commission; being a 898 codirector of Health and Policy at the Brain and Mind Centre, University of Sydney; leading 899 community-based and pharmaceutical industry-supported (Wyeth, Eli Lilly, Servier, Pfizer, and 900 AstraZeneca) projects focused on the identification and better management of anxiety and 901 depression; being a member of the Medical Advisory Panel for Medibank Private until October 2017; 902 being a board member of Psychosis Australia Trust and a member of the Veterans Mental Health 903 Clinical Reference group; and being the Chief Scientific Advisor to and an equity shareholder in 904 Innowell. No other disclosures were reported.

905 73. Schrack JA, Kuo PL, Wanigatunga AA, Di J, Simonsick EM, Spira AP, et al. Active-to- 906 Sedentary Behavior Transitions, Fatigability, and Physical Functioning in Older Adults. *J Gerontol A 907 Biol Sci Med Sci*. 2019;74(4):560-7. Epub 2018/10/26. doi: 10.1093/gerona/gly243. PubMed PMID: 908 30357322; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC6417447.

909 74. Lamers F, Swendsen J, Cui L, Husky M, Johns J, Zipunnikov V, et al. Mood reactivity and 910 affective dynamics in mood and anxiety disorders. *J Abnorm Psychol*. 2018;127(7):659-69. Epub 911 2018/10/20. doi: 10.1037/abn0000378. PubMed PMID: 30335438.

912 75. Melin M, Hagerman I, Gonon A, Gustafsson T, Rullman E. Variability in Physical Activity 913 Assessed with Accelerometer Is an Independent Predictor of Mortality in CHF Patients. *PLoS One*. 914 2016;11(4):e0153036. Epub 2016/04/08. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0153036. PubMed PMID: 915 27054323; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC4824362.

916 76. Forkosh O, Karamihalev S, Roeh S, Alon U, Anpilov S, Touma C, et al. Identity domains 917 capture individual differences from across the behavioral repertoire. *Nat Neurosci*. 918 2019;22(12):2023-8. Epub 2019/11/07. doi: 10.1038/s41593-019-0516-y. PubMed PMID: 31686022.

919 77. Cain KL, Sallis JF, Conway TL, Van Dyck D, Calhoun L. Using accelerometers in youth 920 physical activity studies: a review of methods. *J Phys Act Health*. 2013;10(3):437-50. Epub 921 2013/04/27. doi: 10.1123/jpah.10.3.437. PubMed PMID: 23620392; PubMed Central PMCID: 922 PMCPMC6331211.

923 78. Bao W, Sun Y, Zhang T, Zou L, Wu X, Wang D, et al. Exercise Programs for Muscle Mass, 924 Muscle Strength and Physical Performance in Older Adults with Sarcopenia: A Systematic Review and 925 Meta-Analysis. *Aging Dis*. 2020;11(4):863-73. Epub 2020/08/09. doi: 10.14336/ad.2019.1012. 926 PubMed PMID: 32765951; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7390512.

927 79. Varma VR, Dey D, Leroux A, Di J, Urbanek J, Xiao L, et al. Total volume of physical 928 activity: TAC, TLAC or TAC(λ). *Prev Med*. 2018;106:233-5. Epub 2017/10/31. doi: 929 10.1016/j.ypmed.2017.10.028. PubMed PMID: 29080825; PubMed Central PMCID: 930 PMCPMC5897896.

931 80. Byrom B, Stratton G, Mc Carthy M, Muehlhausen W. Objective measurement of 932 sedentary behaviour using accelerometers. *Int J Obes (Lond)*. 2016;40(11):1809-12. Epub 933 2016/08/02. doi: 10.1038/ijo.2016.136. PubMed PMID: 27478922; PubMed Central PMCID: 934 PMCPMC5116050.

935 81. Godfrey A, Vandendriessche B, Bakker JP, Fitzer-Attas C, Gujar N, Hobbs M, et al. Fit- 936 for-Purpose Biometric Monitoring Technologies: Leveraging the Laboratory Biomarker Experience. 937 *Clin Transl Sci*. 2021;14(1):62-74. Epub 2020/08/10. doi: 10.1111/cts.12865. PubMed PMID: 938 32770726; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7877826 owns company stock; J.P.B is a full-time 939 employee at Philips; N.G. is a full-time employee at Samsung NeuroLogica. E.S.I. is an employee of 940 Koneksa Health and owns company stock; C.A.N. is an employee of Pfizer, Inc. and owns company 941 stock; V.P. is a full-time employee at Takeda; W.A.W. is an Advisor of Koneksa and Elektra Labs, a 942 consultant for Best Doctors/Teladoc and has research funding from Genentech and Pfizer; C.F.A. is a

943 full-time employee at Mitsubishi Tanabe Pharma America. All other authors declared no competing
944 interests for this work. As Editor-in-Chief of Clinical & Translational Science, John A. Wagner was not
945 involved in the review or decision process for this paper.

946 82. Karas M, Bai J, Strączkiewicz M, Harezlak J, Glynn NW, Harris T, et al. Accelerometry
947 data in health research: challenges and opportunities. *Stat Biosci.* 2019;11(2):210-37. Epub
948 2019/11/26. doi: 10.1007/s12561-018-9227-2. PubMed PMID: 31762829; PubMed Central PMCID:
949 PMCPMC6874221.

950 83. Baran SW, Lim MA, Do JP, Stolyar P, Rabe MD, Schaevitz LR, et al. Digital biomarkers
951 enable automated, longitudinal monitoring in a mouse model of aging. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci.*
952 2021. Epub 2021/01/26. doi: 10.1093/gerona/glab024. PubMed PMID: 33491048.

953 84. Volker LA, Maar BA, Pulido Guevara BA, Bilkei-Gorzo A, Zimmer A, Bronneke H, et al.
954 Neph2/Kirrel3 regulates sensory input, motor coordination, and home-cage activity in rodents. *Genes*
955 *Brain Behav.* 2018;17(8):e12516. Epub 2018/08/23. doi: 10.1111/gbb.12516. PubMed PMID:
956 30133126.

957 85. Loh DH, Kudo T, Truong D, Wu Y, Colwell CS. The Q175 Mouse Model of Huntington's
958 Disease Shows Gene Dosage- and Age-Related Decline in Circadian Rhythms of Activity and Sleep.
959 *PLOS ONE.* 2013;8(7):e69993. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0069993.

960 86. Bonasera SJ, Chaudoin TR, Goulding EH, Mittek M, Dunaevsky A. Decreased home cage
961 movement and oromotor impairments in adult Fmr1-KO mice. *Genes Brain Behav.* 2017;16(5):564-
962 73. Epub 2017/02/22. doi: 10.1111/gbb.12374. PubMed PMID: 28218824; PubMed Central PMCID:
963 PMCPMC6042514.

964 87. Hasriadi, Dasuni Wasana PW, Vajragupta O, Rojsitthisak P, Towiwat P. Automated
965 home-cage monitoring as a potential measure of sickness behaviors and pain-like behaviors in LPS-
966 treated mice. *PLoS One.* 2021;16(8):e0256706. Epub 20210827. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0256706.
967 PubMed PMID: 34449819; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC8396795.

968 88. Lim MA, Defensor EB, Mechanic JA, Shah PP, Jaime EA, Roberts CR, et al. Retrospective
969 Analysis of the Effects of Identification Procedures and Cage Changing by Using Data from
970 Automated, Continuous Monitoring. *J Am Assoc Lab Anim Sci.* 2019;58(2):126-41. Epub 20190214.
971 doi: 10.30802/aalas-jaalas-18-000056. PubMed PMID: 30764898; PubMed Central PMCID:
972 PMCPMC6433355.

973 89. Marcus AD, Achanta S, Jordt SE. Protocol for non-invasive assessment of spontaneous
974 movements of group-housed animals using remote video monitoring. *STAR Protoc.*
975 2022;3(2):101326. Epub 20220414. doi: 10.1016/j.xpro.2022.101326. PubMed PMID: 35479115;
976 PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC9036393.

977 90. Balcombe JP. Laboratory environments and rodents' behavioural needs: a review. *Lab*
978 *Anim.* 2006;40(3):217-35. Epub 2006/06/29. doi: 10.1258/002367706777611488. PubMed PMID:
979 16803640.

980 91. Liu N, Wang Y, An AY, Banker C, Qian YH, O'Donnell JM. Single housing-induced effects
981 on cognitive impairment and depression-like behavior in male and female mice involve
982 neuroplasticity-related signaling. *Eur J Neurosci.* 2020;52(1):2694-704. Epub 2019/09/01. doi:
983 10.1111/ejn.14565. PubMed PMID: 31471985.

984 92. Škop V, Xiao C, Liu N, Gavrilova O, Reitman ML. The effects of housing density on
985 mouse thermal physiology depend on sex and ambient temperature. *Mol Metab.* 2021;53:101332.
986 Epub 2021/09/04. doi: 10.1016/j.molmet.2021.101332. PubMed PMID: 34478905; PubMed Central
987 PMCID: PMCPMC8463779.

988 93. Hebda-Bauer EK, Dokas LA, Watson SJ, Akil H. Adaptation to single housing is dynamic:
989 Changes in hormone levels, gene expression, signaling in the brain, and anxiety-like behavior in adult
990 male C57BL/6J mice. *Horm Behav.* 2019;114:104541. Epub 2019/06/21. doi:
991 10.1016/j.yhbeh.2019.06.005. PubMed PMID: 31220462; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7466935.

992 94. Nagy TR, Krzywanski D, Li J, Meleth S, Desmond R. Effect of group vs. single housing on
993 phenotypic variance in C57BL/6J mice. *Obes Res.* 2002;10(5):412-5. Epub 2002/05/15. doi:
994 10.1038/oby.2002.57. PubMed PMID: 12006642.

995 95. Kappel S, Hawkins P, Mendl MT. To Group or Not to Group? Good Practice for Housing
996 Male Laboratory Mice. *Animals (Basel)*. 2017;7(12). Epub 20171124. doi: 10.3390/ani7120088.
997 PubMed PMID: 29186765; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC5742782.

998 96. Charlier R, Knaeps S, Mertens E, Van Roie E, Delecluse C, Lefevre J, et al. Age-related
999 decline in muscle mass and muscle function in Flemish Caucasians: a 10-year follow-up. *Age (Dordr)*.
1000 2016;38(2):36. Epub 2016/03/11. doi: 10.1007/s11357-016-9900-7. PubMed PMID: 26961694;
1001 PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC5005902.

1002 97. Clemenza K, Weiss SH, Cheslack K, Kandel DB, Kandel ER, Levine AA. Social isolation is
1003 closely linked to a marked reduction in physical activity in male mice. *J Neurosci Res*.
1004 2021;99(4):1099-107. Epub 20201226. doi: 10.1002/jnr.24777. PubMed PMID: 33368537.

1005 98. Jirkof P, Cesarovic N, Rettich A, Fleischmann T, Arras M. Individual housing of female
1006 mice: influence on postsurgical behaviour and recovery. *Lab Anim*. 2012;46(4):325-34. doi:
1007 10.1258/la.2012.012027. PubMed PMID: 23097566.

1008 99. Mertens S, Vogt M, Gass P, Palme R, Hiebl B, Chourbaji S. Effect of three different
1009 forms of handling on the variation of aggression-associated parameters in individually and group-
1010 housed male C57BL/6NCrl mice. *PLOS ONE*. 2019;14:e0215367. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0215367.

1011 100. Kamakura R, Kovalainen M, Leppäluoto J, Herzig K-H, Mäkelä KA. The effects of group
1012 and single housing and automated animal monitoring on urinary corticosterone levels in male
1013 C57BL/6 mice. *Physiological reports*. 2016;4(3):e12703. doi: 10.14814/phy2.12703. PubMed PMID:
1014 26869685.

1015 101. Hunt C, Hambly C. Faecal corticosterone concentrations indicate that separately
1016 housed male mice are not more stressed than group housed males. *Physiol Behav*. 2006;87(3):519-
1017 26. Epub 20060125. doi: 10.1016/j.physbeh.2005.11.013. PubMed PMID: 16442135.

1018 102. Arndt SS, Laarakker MC, van Lith HA, van der Staay FJ, Gieling E, Salomons AR, et al.
1019 Individual housing of mice--impact on behaviour and stress responses. *Physiol Behav*. 2009;97(3-
1020 4):385-93. Epub 20090318. doi: 10.1016/j.physbeh.2009.03.008. PubMed PMID: 19303031.

1021

1022

1023

1024 Table 1

Cohort-name	Strain & Origin	Sex	Housing density (cage #) and number of animals.	Age (in study)	Cage change intervals	Feed and drink (ad libitum)	Bedding material. Light and dark regime.	Cage enrichment
Fx4 (KI2018)	C57BL/6J Charles River, Germany	Female	4 (N=10) Total: 40	42-129 days (~6-19wks)	Bi-weekly incl. BW	SDS 3RM. Weakly chlorinated tap water.	100g Aspen (5x5x1mm, Tapvei). LON: 4-16 CEST.	Sizzle nest (BEDRNEST 70mm, 8g, Datesand)
Mx4 (KI2018)	C57BL/6J Charles River, Germany	Male	4 (N=10) Total: 40	42-129 days (~6-19wks)	Bi-weekly incl. BW	SDS 3RM. Weakly chlorinated tap water.	100g Aspen (5x5x1mm, Tapvei). LON: 4-16 CEST.	Sizzle nest (BEDRNEST 70mm, 8g, Datesand)
Fx3 (SU2020)	C57BL/6J Charles River, Germany	Female	3 (N=10) Total: 30	38-129 days (~6-19wks)	Bi-weekly incl. BW	1324 P IRR, Altromin. Weakly chlorinated tap water.	100g Aspen (2x2x1mm, Tapvei). LON: 9-21 CEST.	Sizzle nest (BEDRNEST 70mm, 8g, Datesand), red mouse-house (Tecniplast).
Mx3 (SU2020)	C57BL/6J Charles River, Germany	Male	3 (N=10) Total: 30	38-129 days (~6-19wks)	Bi-weekly incl. BW	1324 P IRR, Altromin. Weakly chlorinated tap water.	100g Aspen (2x2x1mm, Tapvei). LON: 9-21 CEST.	Sizzle nest (BEDRNEST 70mm, 8g, Datesand), red mouse-house (Tecniplast).
Mx2 (KI2019)	C57BL/6J Charles River, Germany	Male	2(N=10) Total: 20	97-124 days (~14-18wks)	Bi-weekly incl. BW	SDS 3RM. Weakly chlorinated tap water.	100g Aspen (5x5x1mm, Tapvei). LON: 4-16 CEST.	Sizzle nest (BEDRNEST 70mm, 8g, Datesand)
Fx1 (SU2021)	C57BL/6J Charles River, Germany	Female	1 (N=10) Total: 10	58-100 days (~8-14wks)	Bi-weekly incl. BW	1324 P IRR, Altromin. Weakly chlorinated tap water.	100g Aspen (2x2x1mm, Tapvei). LON: 9-21 CEST.	Sizzle nest (BEDRNEST 70mm, 8g, Datesand), red mouse-house (Tecniplast).

1025

1026

1027

1028

1029

1030 Table 2

1031

Activity and rest assessed by EAD (s ⁻¹)				
% of total time of file	Median	Mean	Range	
% file time at rest (act < 1 s ⁻¹)	81.3	80.9	77.2	83.9

% of time at rest (act<1 s^{-1}) and bout distance <1mm s^{-1} .	77.0	76.5	72.4	79.7
% of file time in activity (act $\geq 1 sec^{-1}$)	18.7	19.1	16.1	22.8
% of activations in file when the animal is still (< 1 mm s^{-1})	17.6	17.7	12.6	24.6
% of activations in file when the animal moves ($\geq 1 mm s^{-1}$)	82.4	82.3	75.4	87.4

1032

1033

1034

1035

1036

1037

1038 Table 3

1039

Bouts of rest and movements

	Median	Mean	Range	
Duration (s) [All rest bouts]	8.7	57.7	0.25	17165
Frequency of rest bouts (%)	18.4	18.0	16	20
Duration of long bouts (≥ 40 s)	79.4	345.8	40	17165
Frequency of long rest bouts (%)	2.6	2.5	1.8	3.1
Duration of locomotor bouts	4.8	6.2	1.3	112
Frequency of locomotor bouts (%)	21.5	21.1	16	26
Duration (s) of MOTS bouts	1.6	2.1	0.3	91
Frequency of MOTS bouts (%)	60.3	60.9	54	67

1040

1041

1042 Table 4

1043

Speed and distance made during bouts of movement

	Median	Mean	Range	
Locomotor bout distance (m)	0.139	0.174	0.013	3.726
Locomotor bout velocity (m/s)	0.026	0.028	0.002	0.076

MOTS bout distance(m)	0.006	0.015	0.000	0.810
MOTS bout velocity (m/s)	0.004	0.006	0.001	0.006

1044

1045

1046 Table 5

1047

1048

Reduction (%) of bouts dp13 vs dp0				
Cage change cycle	Mean	SD	Median	
Cycle 1	-38.8	4.3	-37.2	n=10
Cycle 2	-44.0	3.5	-43.5	n=10
Cycle 3	-40.0	8.7	-43.9	n=10

Model: bout~cycle; F=2.1, p=0.14

1049

1050

1051

1052

1053

1054

1055

1056

1057 Table 6

1058

Effect size of sex and density on PA as % of file time						
Cohort name	fx1 (n=1)	mx2 (n=2)	mx3 (n=3)	fx3 (n=3)	mx4 (n=4)	fx4 (n=4)
fx1 (n=1) Hedges g		2.01				
mx2 (n=2) Hedges g			2.10	2.22		
mx3 (n=3) Hedges g				0.09	1.40	2.90
fx3 (n=3) Hedges g					1.46	3.05

fx4 (n=4) Hedges g 1.89

1059

1060

1061 Table 7

1062

	Frontality of EAD during and across cage change cycle(s)							
	dp0			dp13			Δ % dp0-dp13	
	Mean	Median	SD	Mean	Median	SD	Mean	n
Cycle 1	41.7	38.4	11.3	48.0	48.6	8.1	6.3	10
Cycle2	44.0	41.6	9.8	52.5	50.6	10.4	8.5	10
Cycle3	47.9	49.9	8.2	45.6	45.7	19.4	-2.3	10

1063

1064

1065 **Fig 1** An electrode capacitance is calculated from the actual reading of the electrode at t and the
1066 base-line value. The values from the 12 electrodes are then used to calculate the x, y position of the
1067 mouse centroid (left panel). A PA bout is initiated when x, y changes in successive samples and
1068 continuous until the mouse is still again (no change in x, y between successive samples). The time-
1069 series of x, y coordinates during a movement bout is used to plot the bout trajectory (right panel)
1070 and to decide if it is a MOTS or locomotor bout. Inserted into the track diagram (right panel) is how
1071 the cage floor was divided into a front(FF)-rear(RF) area (green line and text) and a central(CF)-
1072 peripheral(PF) area of equal size (red line and text), respectively. For further information see text.
1073

1074 **Fig 2** Boxplot showing time spent in rest, long rest, short rest, and PA in MOTS and locomotion as
1075 fraction of total time. Values indicated are mean, 1st and 3rd quartiles and range. Mean value has
1076 been indicated with a blue circle.

1077
1078 **Fig 3** (A) Cumulative plot of fraction of the total number of bouts (ordinate) vs bout duration (s,
1079 abscissa, logarithmic scale) for all bout types (black line with SD as grey shaded area), rest bouts
1080 (black line with blue shaded area indicating SD), MOTS (black line over green area indicating SD), and
1081 locomotion bouts (black line on red shaded area indicating SD). (B) Cumulative percentage of total
1082 time (ordinate) plotted vs. bout duration (s, abscissa, logarithmic scale). Coloured area and code for
1083 bout type are the same as in A. Dotted line in A and B indicates number of bouts (~90% in A) having a
1084 duration <10 s and their combined fraction of total time (~20% in B).

1085
1086 **Fig 4** A and B show impact by day post cage change (dp; abscissa) and cage change cycle (CC 1-3;
1087 colour coded grey, red, and green) of fraction of total time spent in bouts of PA (A) and (B) long rest
1088 (ordinates). The relative effect size of dp and CC is shown in Supplementary information (Fig. S5). In A
1089 (model: PA ~dp * CC), the major impact is by dp (p=2E-9) with only a minor contribution by CC
1090 (p=0.02). B shows that CC has no significant impact on time in long rest (p=0.51) while dp has a
1091 strong effect (p=3.8E-11) (model: long rest~dp*CC).

1092
1093 **Fig 5** Pattern of long-rest episodes during lights on (ZT 0-12) and lights off (ZT 12-24) (DL 12:12) for
1094 the mice S1, S7 and S10 housed in isolation. Long rest bouts indicated by blue colour. Bouts
1095 disrupting long-rest periods in black/green. Ordinate is 12h lights on to the left and 12h lights off to
1096 the right. Columns are day post cage change (dp) where 0 is the day of the cage change (CC; red
1097 arrow indicates the time for CC) for lights on (to the left) and lights off (to the right). Dp1 the day
1098 after CC and dp13 the day before the next CC. See Supplementary information (Fig S6) for
1099 corresponding data of the other 7 mice.

1100
1101 **Fig 6** (A) shows cumulative distance per 12 hrs during lights off (black line) and lights on (blue line),
1102 respectively. Values are average across the 10 animals during ZT 0-12 and ZT 12-24 each day with
1103 standard error indicated by bars. (B) shows corresponding data for average speed (\pm SEM) during
1104 lights on (blue) and lights off (black).
1105
1106 **Fig 7** A-C show longest recorded locomotor bout for mouse S1, S9 and S10, respectively during the
1107 observation period. In D-F, the corresponding speedograms are depicted. Track plots and
1108 speedograms by the trajar package in R. For tracks and speedogram of the other 7 mice see
1109 Supportive information (Fig S8).
1110
1111 **Fig 8** Densitograms showing the distribution of bout starting coordinates during 24h on dp0 and dp13
1112 in cage change cycles 1 – 3 (columns) for the S1, S7 and S8 mouse, respectively (rows). Cage front
1113 and rear and left (L) and right (R) have been indicated. Key to colour: Blue is long rest bout, orange is
1114 short rest bout, green is MOTS, and red is locomotor bout. Please see Supplementary information for
1115 corresponding metrics of the other mice kept in isolation.
1116
1117 **Fig 9** A Boxplot showing the preference for bout initiation in the frontal field of the cage floor on dp0
1118 and dp13 through cage change cycles 1-3. In B and C, the relative frequency of long rest and
1119 locomotor bouts, respectively, starting in the frontal field of the cage floor have been indicated. D-F
1120 show the corresponding boxplots when the cage floor was divided into a central and peripheral field
1121 of equal size (see also Fig. 1).
1122
1123 **Fig 10** A shows fraction of daily distance (m) per hours during the LD cycle for each mouse (thin
1124 coloured lines) and the average across the ten cages (thick black line). B shows the EAD per unit time
1125 when the animals are active during the LD cycle. Individual mice indicated by thin coloured lines,
1126 average across the group is the thick black line. C show the average fraction of each hour the mice
1127 spend in long rest (blue), short rest (orange), MOTS (grey) and in locomotion (yellow) across the LD
1128 cycle. Abscissa is Zeitgeber time with lights on 0-12 and lights off 12-24, the shift on to off is marked
1129 by a red vertical line.
1130
1131 **Fig 11** A-B Boxplots of fraction of total file spent at rest (no electrode activation) (A) and long rest (B)
1132 for the cohorts of female and male mice housed at different density (Fx1, Mx2, Fx3 etc). C-D show
1133 boxplots of duration and density of long rest bouts assessed by the EAD metric. As in A-B, female and
1134 male cohorts housed at different densities have been indicated.

1135

1136 **Fig. 12** A-B Cumulative plots of time in PA assessed by EAD and the number of electrode activations
1137 observed (abscissa) as fraction of file time (ordinate) for each cohort of female (A) and male (B) cages
1138 (starting point of curve represent all bouts of rest (R). Housing density (x1, x2, x3, and x4) has been
1139 colour coded (key in panel A-B). Solid line represents cohort average value across cages and weeks of
1140 recording. The shaded area with the same colour indicates the standard deviation. Interrupted
1141 vertical lines indicate cut point values for rest (R) and fold change in electrode activations s-1.

1142

1143 **Fig 13** Panels show the average fraction of each hour spent in PA (yellow) and at rest (blue) across
1144 the LD cycle for male and female mice housed at different densities. Rest i.e., no electrode activation
1145 and PA when electrode activations occur. Abscissa is Zeitgeber time with lights on 0-12 and lights off
1146 12-24, the shift on to off is marked by a red vertical line.

1147

1148 **Fig 14** A show fraction of file time spent in PA (\geq electrodes activated s-1) across cages per day (dp) of
1149 the cages change cycles 1-3 for male and female mice housed at different densities (x1: n=1, x2 n=2,
1150 x3 n=3 and x4 n=4). Comparison of female and male mice at density n=3 and n=4, respectively,
1151 revealed a significant difference at density n=4 but not when density =3 (model: Time in PA \sim sex *
1152 dp * CC; density =4 F=36.6; n=3 F=0.07). See also Supplementary information (Fig S10) for plot of
1153 relative effect size of dp and CC across.

1154 B show fraction of file time spent in long rest bouts (<1 electrodes activated s-1; \geq 40 s duration)
1155 across cages and cages-change cycles (CC 1-3) per day (dp0-dp13) for male and female mice housed
1156 at different densities (x1 to x4). Comparison of female and male mice at density n=3 and n=4,
1157 respectively, revealed a significant difference in synchronized long rest bout time at density n=4 but
1158 not when n=3 (model: Time in long rest \sim sex * dp * CC; n=4 F=7.6; n=3 F=0.79). See Supportive
1159 information for plot of relative effect size of dp and CC (Fig. S10).

1160 C show average number of unique electrodes activated s-1 across cages per day of the cages change
1161 cycles 1-3 for male (blue) and female (red) mice housed at different densities (x1 to x4). Comparison
1162 of female and male mice (model: No unique electrodes \sim sex * dp * CC) revealed a significant
1163 difference at density =4 (F=41, p=1.9E-5) but not at x3 (F=1; p=0.33). See Supportive information for
1164 plot of relative effect size of dp and CC (Fig. S10).

1165

1166 **Fig 15** The panels left-to-right show relative effect size (RTE, ordinate) on average daily EAD by
1167 housing density (n), days post cage change (abscissa; dp0-13) and cage-change cycle (CC 1-3; colour
1168 coded black, red, and green, in each panel) within sexes (group of panels). Whole model: EAD \sim N *
1169 dp * CC; for females F=163.7, p=7.6E-15; for males F=28, p=3.3E-7. In both sexes, density (n) had the
1170 strongest impact on EAD, followed by dp, while impact by cage change cycle was only significant in

1171 females. NB: In males only two cycles could be compared across densities. Note that at N=x4 EAD
1172 show a biphasic trajectory across all cycles in both sexes (red arrows, for further information see