

Adaptive Sensor Fusion for Real-Time Detection of Exercise-Induced Cardiovascular Responses

Kenneth M. Wood

Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, University of Missouri,
Columbia, MO, USA.

kennethwood@missouri.edu

Gerald Norris

Department of Computer Science, University of North Texas, Denton, TX, USA.

gerald1970@unt.edu

Abstract

Exercise-induced cardiovascular responses are inherently dynamic, heterogeneous, and subject to considerable interindividual variability. Real-time detection of these responses through wearable sensing requires not only robust physiological signal acquisition but also adaptive fusion mechanisms capable of reconciling noisy, asynchronous, and context-dependent data streams. This paper presents a system-level analysis of adaptive sensor fusion for the continuous assessment of cardiovascular responses during physical activity. The discussion addresses architectural design choices, including centralized, distributed, and hybrid fusion topologies, and examines the trade-offs among latency, interpretability, energy consumption, and resilience to motion artifacts. A central argument is that real-time cardiovascular monitoring should be treated as a socio-technical infrastructure rather than a narrowly defined signal processing problem. Consequently, the paper integrates perspectives from systems engineering, artificial intelligence, biomedical signal processing, and governance. It evaluates data acquisition, preprocessing, feature extraction, adaptive inference, uncertainty management, and deployment in real-world settings. The analysis further considers fairness, privacy, regulatory compliance, and long-term sustainability as first-class design constraints. By connecting sensor fusion architectures with infrastructure governance and policy implications, the paper offers a forward-looking research agenda for dependable, equitable, and scalable cardiovascular monitoring systems. The proposed framing emphasizes that adaptive fusion is not merely a computational optimization task but an ongoing orchestration of sensing resources, learning processes, and institutional oversight in the presence of physiological and environmental uncertainty.

Keywords

adaptive sensor fusion; cardiovascular monitoring; wearable sensors; physiological signal processing; real-time inference; health governance; system architecture.

1. Introduction

Cardiovascular responses to exercise involve coordinated changes in heart rate, stroke volume, peripheral resistance, respiratory modulation, and thermoregulatory activity. These responses emerge from multiple interacting physiological control loops and can shift rapidly with changes in posture, intensity, hydration, emotional state, and environmental conditions. Real-time detection of such responses is therefore not reducible to the analysis of a single signal. Multisensor data fusion has long been recognized as a principled approach for integrating

heterogeneous observations into coherent state estimates under uncertainty [1]. In the context of exercise monitoring, wearable photoplethysmography, electrocardiography, accelerometry, skin temperature, and galvanic skin response each provide partial and imperfect views of the underlying cardiovascular state [2]. The challenge is to combine these views reliably during movement, when signal quality degrades and the relationship between local sensing and systemic cardiovascular function becomes more difficult to infer.

Wearable technologies for athletic and clinical monitoring have advanced rapidly, enabling continuous collection of physiological and biochemical information outside controlled laboratory settings [3]. Yet the proliferation of sensors has intensified rather than resolved the integration problem. Heterogeneous sampling rates, uneven data quality, missing channels, and dynamic contextual factors create a fusion environment that differs fundamentally from static clinical monitoring. Conventional fusion approaches often assume relatively stable sensor characteristics or fixed weighting schemes. In contrast, exercise contexts demand adaptation at multiple timescales, from beat-to-beat adjustments against motion artifacts to longer-term recalibration based on user-specific physiological baselines. A broader systems perspective is therefore necessary. State-of-the-art fusion architectures increasingly include feedback loops, contextual gating, and learning mechanisms that modify sensor contributions according to real-time reliability estimates [4]. Recursive estimation techniques, originating in control engineering, remain foundational for this task because they support continuous updating under noisy observations [5]. However, modern adaptive fusion extends beyond filtering to encompass attention mechanisms, anomaly detection, and personalized model adaptation.

This paper examines adaptive sensor fusion as a system-level problem. It considers not only algorithmic performance but also architecture, deployment, robustness, fairness, governance, and sustainability. The goal is to move the discourse from isolated signal processing advancements toward an integrated understanding of how real-time cardiovascular detection systems can be designed, evaluated, and governed responsibly. Although specific sensing modalities are discussed, the emphasis remains on structural trade-offs and systemic implications rather than on narrowly technical derivations. The paper builds on established fusion theory while incorporating emerging directions in wearable sensing, machine learning, and digital health infrastructure.

2. System Architecture for Adaptive Fusion

The architecture of an adaptive fusion system determines how sensing, communication, inference, and actuation are distributed across body-worn devices, edge nodes, and remote services. A centralized architecture collects raw or lightly processed signals at a single node, simplifying model training and decision logic but increasing communication overhead and creating a single point of failure. In contrast, a fully distributed architecture processes data locally and exchanges compact state summaries or model updates, preserving privacy and reducing latency, but it complicates consistency and global optimization. Hybrid architectures attempt to balance these factors by placing preliminary fusion at the edge and higher-level adaptation in nearby infrastructure. The choice of topology affects not only technical performance but also regulatory obligations, energy consumption, and user autonomy.

Within these topologies, adaptive fusion can be conceptualized as a closed-loop system that continuously compares expected cardiovascular behavior with observed signal patterns. The loop includes acquisition, preprocessing, reliability estimation, weighted combination, inference, and feedback to adjust sensor selection or model parameters. Emerging opto-

physiological monitoring methods have illustrated how joint attention mechanisms can dynamically privilege task-relevant physiological features during physical activity [6]. Such mechanisms are particularly valuable in wearable settings because they allow the fusion system to suppress channels that are momentarily corrupted while preserving sensitivity to subtle cardiovascular changes. The same principle extends to other modalities. For example, sweat-based chemical sensors can provide metabolic context that complements optical or electrical signals [7]. Noncontact or imaging-based photoplethysmography can enrich spatial information when contact sensors are displaced [8]. Heart rate variability analysis, in turn, offers a window into autonomic regulation that is not directly visible in instantaneous heart rate alone [9].

Architectural decisions must also account for the timescales of physiological adaptation. Exercise-induced cardiovascular adjustments occur across seconds, minutes, and longer training periods. A system designed only for acute detection may fail to capture gradual changes in baseline autonomic tone. Conversely, a system optimized for long-term trend analysis may be too sluggish for safety-critical events such as sudden hypotension or arrhythmia. Adaptive architectures therefore benefit from layered temporal modeling, in which fast loops respond to immediate signal degradation and slower loops update individualized baselines, calibration parameters, or decision thresholds. This layering creates structural tension between responsiveness and stability. Overly aggressive adaptation can amplify noise and produce unstable estimates, while overly conservative adaptation may preserve outdated assumptions under changing conditions. The governance of these trade-offs is a design activity, not merely a post hoc performance adjustment.

3. Multi-Sensor Data Acquisition and Preprocessing Infrastructure

Exercise monitoring operates within a challenging acquisition environment. Motion artifacts, sensor displacement, sweat, ambient light variation, and tissue perfusion changes can all degrade signal quality. Photoplethysmographic signals are especially susceptible to movement, while electrocardiographic recordings may be contaminated by muscle activity. Accelerometer data can help identify periods of high motion and inform artifact rejection or quality weighting. The infrastructure must therefore support synchronized acquisition, dynamic signal quality assessment, and context-aware preprocessing. Data acquisition is not a neutral front end; it shapes which cardiovascular features remain recoverable in downstream inference.

A useful systems perspective treats preprocessing as an adaptive resource allocation problem rather than a fixed pipeline. When signal quality is high, the system may prioritize fine-grained waveform features that reveal contractility or vascular tone. When quality is low, the system may shift toward robust aggregate features such as trend direction, variability ranges, or accelerometer-confirmed activity intensity. This shift requires the fusion architecture to maintain multiple interpretation pathways and to switch among them without destabilizing the overall state estimate. Exercise physiology provides a conceptual foundation for these choices because cardiovascular control during physical activity integrates central command, arterial baroreflexes, muscle mechanoreceptors, and metabolic feedback [10]. A preprocessing system that treats these interactions as context rather than as noise is better positioned to preserve meaningful physiological information.

Data quality estimation deserves particular attention. Simple thresholding on signal amplitude or movement indices is often insufficient because failures are multimodal and can be transient. Machine learning methods have been increasingly applied to classify signal segments as

usable or corrupted, but their integration into real-time fusion requires careful latency management. Quality estimators must operate with strict computational budgets and must themselves be updated as sensor hardware changes. Furthermore, preprocessing infrastructure must handle missing data gracefully. In exercise settings, sensors may disconnect, become saturated, or be removed temporarily. Imputation strategies should avoid fabricating high-confidence observations from low-confidence inputs. Adaptive fusion systems therefore need explicit uncertainty representations that propagate through preprocessing and influence the weight assigned to each stream.

4. Adaptive Fusion and Real-Time Inference

Real-time inference in adaptive fusion systems must reconcile competing demands for accuracy, latency, interpretability, and energy efficiency. Conventional recursive methods offer low computational cost and natural handling of sequential data, but they often rely on simplified assumptions about noise distributions and linear dynamics. Machine learning approaches can model complex nonlinear relationships and adapt to personalized patterns, yet they introduce challenges related to training data, overfitting, and explainability. Decision tree ensembles such as gradient boosting have become practical tools for structured physiological features because they balance predictive power with relative interpretability [11]. Deep attention mechanisms, originally developed for sequence modeling, have also shown value in physiological time series by focusing on salient temporal segments and channel interactions [12]. The selection of inference strategy is therefore intimately linked to fusion architecture.

Adaptive fusion requires more than static model inference. It demands continual learning from streaming data, but this must be managed carefully to avoid catastrophic forgetting or gradual model drift. In many wearable systems, on-device learning is constrained by memory, power, and computational capacity. Edge-based adaptation can update lightweight models or calibration offsets while more computationally intensive retraining occurs in the cloud or in periodic offline cycles. This separation allows the system to remain responsive in the field while benefiting from deeper analysis when connectivity and energy permit. However, such split learning architectures introduce synchronization and versioning challenges. Different components may operate on different model versions, producing inconsistent estimates if the update pipeline is not carefully governed.

The real-time fusion process should also incorporate contextual inputs such as activity type, user goals, fatigue status, and environmental conditions. These inputs can serve as gating variables that modify the fusion logic. For example, during high-intensity interval training, rapid heart rate dynamics may be expected, whereas during recovery, slower autonomic adjustments dominate. A fusion model that is aware of these contexts can adjust its sensitivity and reduce false alarms. The expanded design space of contextual adaptive fusion has stimulated broader interest in machine learning for real-world applications, where static laboratory models frequently fail [13]. The system-level challenge is to ensure that contextual adaptation remains transparent, auditable, and consistent with clinical or athletic decision-making needs.

5. Robustness, Uncertainty, and Privacy in Distributed Learning

Robustness in exercise-induced cardiovascular monitoring extends beyond artifact tolerance. A dependable system must maintain performance under sensor drift, user variability, environmental shifts, and adversarial or erroneous inputs. It must also communicate uncertainty clearly so that downstream decisions can be calibrated. In many health-related

applications, false alarms and missed critical events carry different costs, and the fusion system should support asymmetric loss functions without obscuring the underlying confidence. Uncertainty propagation is particularly important when multiple sensors disagree. A simple averaging of conflicting estimates can produce misleading certainty, whereas a richer fusion approach can represent disagreement as an indicator of degraded measurement conditions or unmodeled physiology.

Distributed and federated learning techniques have emerged as promising strategies for improving robustness while preserving privacy. Federated learning enables model updates to be computed locally on user devices and aggregated without sharing raw physiological data [14]. This approach reduces privacy risks and supports personalization, but it introduces new failure modes such as non-independent data distributions, unreliable client availability, and susceptibility to poisoning attacks. In digital health, federated methods have been explored as a way to train models across institutions while keeping sensitive patient data within local governance boundaries [15]. For exercise monitoring, federated adaptation could allow personalized cardiovascular models to improve over time without continuously transmitting raw waveforms to remote servers. However, robust aggregation requires careful auditing of model updates and secure communication protocols.

Explainability is another dimension of robustness. Stakeholders, including clinicians, coaches, athletes, and regulators, may need to understand why a fusion system produced a particular alert or state estimate. Interpretable models or post hoc explanation methods can help, but real-time constraints often limit the complexity of explanation generation. The broader challenge is to design fusion architectures in which the contribution of each sensor and the influence of adaptation mechanisms are inspectable [16]. This does not necessarily require every internal operation to be human-readable. Rather, it requires that the system can produce meaningful accounts of its reliability, context, and decision boundaries. Such accounts are essential for building trust and for diagnosing failures after adverse events.

6. Governance, Fairness, and Ethical Implications

The deployment of adaptive cardiovascular monitoring systems raises governance questions that extend beyond technical validation. Physiological sensors generate intimate data that can reveal not only fitness status but also medical conditions, stress patterns, and behavioral routines. Ethical frameworks for beneficial artificial intelligence emphasize the need for beneficence, non-maleficence, autonomy, justice, and explicability [17]. Applied to exercise monitoring, these principles require careful attention to data minimization, informed consent, and the prevention of function creep, in which data collected for one purpose is later repurposed for insurance, employment, or surveillance. Regulatory instruments such as the European Union General Data Protection Regulation establish obligations for processing health-related personal data, including requirements for data protection by design and default [18]. System architectures that incorporate privacy-preserving fusion are therefore not only technically appealing but also increasingly aligned with legal expectations.

Fairness is a particular concern because cardiovascular models trained on narrow populations may underperform for groups with different skin pigmentation, body composition, age, sex, or fitness levels. Optical sensing methods can exhibit bias if training data do not represent the full range of tissue optical properties. Adaptive fusion systems can mitigate or amplify such biases depending on how adaptation rewards majority patterns. Fairness must therefore be evaluated not only on aggregate performance but also across subgroups and across the operational conditions likely to be encountered in real exercise settings. Digital biomarker

development increasingly recognizes that algorithmic bias can translate into unsafe or inequitable health decisions if not systematically addressed [19]. For real-time exercise monitoring, fairness may also include equitable access to the computational infrastructure required for high-quality fusion, particularly when edge resources are unevenly distributed.

Institutional oversight is needed to bridge the gap between algorithmic design and public accountability. Hospitals, sports organizations, device manufacturers, and research institutions may share responsibility for monitoring outcomes. Governance mechanisms could include model registries, performance audits, adverse event reporting, and clear allocation of liability. Rather than treating such mechanisms as external constraints, system designers should incorporate them into the architecture from the outset. For example, fusion systems can maintain audit logs that record sensor quality, adaptation events, and confidence levels during critical alerts. These logs can support post hoc review and continuous quality improvement. The success of cardiovascular monitoring infrastructure depends as much on such procedural safeguards as on algorithmic accuracy.

7. Deployment, Sustainability, and Policy Considerations

Deploying adaptive sensor fusion at scale requires sustained attention to infrastructure costs, interoperability, and environmental impact. Wearable devices have limited battery capacity, and continuous sensing with frequent model adaptation can shorten operating life. Energy-aware fusion strategies may reduce sampling rates or input dimensionality when signal quality is sufficient, but these strategies must not compromise safety during high-risk exercise phases. The deployment architecture should therefore support graceful degradation, allowing the system to maintain essential monitoring functions under low-battery or low-connectivity conditions. Operational sustainability also depends on the capacity of edge infrastructure to support software updates, security patches, and model retraining without requiring frequent user intervention.

Interoperability is another practical bottleneck. Cardiovascular monitoring systems often combine sensors and platforms from multiple vendors, each with proprietary data formats, sampling conventions, and synchronization methods. Without common data models and semantic standards, adaptive fusion becomes brittle and difficult to scale. Policy efforts aimed at improving health data interoperability can reduce these frictions, but they also introduce obligations for data portability and transparency. Smartwatch and wearable health applications already illustrate the benefits and limitations of consumer-grade physiological monitoring, where convenience often coexists with variable data quality and unclear clinical validity [20]. Real-time exercise monitoring should be evaluated in the context of this broader consumer health ecosystem, where users may switch devices, share data across platforms, or seek clinical integration.

Sustainability also has a social dimension. The long-term value of cardiovascular monitoring depends on its ability to support behavior change, training adherence, and early clinical intervention without generating alarm fatigue or excessive surveillance. Systems that produce frequent unexplained alerts may be abandoned by users, while systems that under-report may create a false sense of safety. Policy frameworks should therefore encourage transparent performance reporting, realistic expectations, and user-centered design. Regulators may need to define when exercise-induced cardiovascular monitoring constitutes wellness support and when it crosses into medical device territory. This distinction affects approval pathways, liability, and the level of evidence required for claims. A system designed for high-performance athletes may not require the same regulatory burden as one intended for patients

with cardiovascular disease, but both demand rigorous validation under representative conditions.

Conclusion

Adaptive sensor fusion for real-time detection of exercise-induced cardiovascular responses is a multifaceted systems challenge. It requires the coordination of heterogeneous sensors, dynamic reliability estimation, contextual inference, and responsible governance. This paper has argued that progress depends not only on improved algorithms but also on thoughtful architectural design and institutional integration. The tension between fast local adaptation and stable global consistency must be managed through careful abstraction layers and feedback mechanisms. Robustness, fairness, privacy, and interpretability should be treated as first-class properties rather than afterthoughts. The emergence of attention-based physiological monitoring, edge machine learning, and federated personalization provides new technical possibilities, but these approaches introduce new governance demands. Future research should pursue integrated evaluation frameworks that combine signal quality, clinical or athletic utility, user experience, energy efficiency, subgroup fairness, and regulatory readiness. By adopting this broader perspective, adaptive cardiovascular monitoring can evolve from a collection of promising sensing techniques into dependable, equitable, and sustainable infrastructure for health and performance.

References

1. Hall, D. L., & Llinas, J. (1997). An introduction to multisensor data fusion. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 85(1), 6–23. <https://doi.org/10.1109/5.554205>
2. Allen, J. (2007). Photoplethysmography and its application in clinical physiological measurement. *Physiological Measurement*, 28(3), R1–R39. <https://doi.org/10.1088/0967-3334/28/3/R01>
3. Seshadri, D. R., Li, R. T., Voos, J. E., Rowbottom, J. R., Alfes, C. M., Zorman, C. A., & Drummond, C. K. (2019). Wearable sensors for monitoring the physiological and biochemical profile of the athlete. *npj Digital Medicine*, 2(1), 72. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-019-0150-9>
4. Khaleghi, B., Khamis, A., Karray, F. O., & Razavi, S. N. (2013). Multisensor data fusion: A review of the state-of-the-art. *Information Fusion*, 14(1), 28–44. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.inffus.2011.08.001>
5. Kalman, R. E. (1960). A new approach to linear filtering and prediction problems. *Journal of Basic Engineering*, 82(1), 35–45. <https://doi.org/10.1115/1.3662552>
6. Zheng, X., Hu, S., Dwyer, V., Barrett, L., & Derakhshani, M. (2026). Joint attention mechanism learning to facilitate opto-physiological monitoring during physical activity. *Biomedical Signal Processing and Control*, 113, 108949.
7. Gao, W., Emaminejad, S., Nyein, H. Y. Y., Challa, S., Chen, K., Peck, A., Fahad, H. M., Ota, H., Shiraki, H., Kiriya, D., Lien, D.-H., Brooks, G. A., Davis, R. W., & Javey, A. (2016). Fully integrated wearable sensor arrays for multiplexed in situ perspiration analysis. *Nature*, 529(7587), 509–514. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature16521>
8. Sun, Y., & Thakor, N. (2016). Photoplethysmography revisited: from contact to noncontact, from point to imaging. *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering*, 63(3), 463–477. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TBME.2015.2476337>

9. Malik, M., Bigger, J. T., Camm, A. J., Kleiger, R. E., Malliani, A., Moss, A. J., & Schwartz, P. J. (1996). Heart rate variability: Standards of measurement, physiological interpretation, and clinical use. *Circulation*, 93(5), 1043–1065. <https://doi.org/10.1161/01.CIR.93.5.1043>
10. Rowell, L. B. (1993). *Human cardiovascular control*. Oxford University Press.
11. Chen, T., & Guestrin, C. (2016). XGBoost: A scalable tree boosting system. *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, 785–794. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2939672.2939785>
12. Vaswani, A., Shazeer, N., Parmar, N., Uszkoreit, J., Jones, L., Gomez, A. N., Kaiser, Ł., & Polosukhin, I. (2017). Attention is all you need. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 30, 5998–6008.
13. Sarker, I. H. (2021). Machine learning: Algorithms, real-world applications and research directions. *SN Computer Science*, 2(3), 160. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42979-021-00592-x>
14. McMahan, B., Moore, E., Ramage, D., Hampson, S., & Agüera y Arcas, B. (2017). Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data. *Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, 1273–1282.
15. Rieke, N., Hancox, J., Li, W., Milletari, F., Roth, H. R., Albarqouni, S., Bakas, S., Gantenbein, C., Wachinger, C., & others. (2020). The future of digital health with federated learning. *npj Digital Medicine*, 3(1), 119. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-020-00323-1>
16. Lipton, Z. C. (2018). The mythos of model interpretability. *Communications of the ACM*, 61(10), 36–43. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3233231>
17. Floridi, L., Cows, J., Beltrametti, M., Chatila, R., Chazerand, P., Dignum, V., Luetge, C., Madelin, R., Pagallo, U., Rossi, F., Schafer, B., Valcke, P., & Vayena, E. (2018). AI4People—An ethical framework for a good AI society. *Minds and Machines*, 28(4), 689–707. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-018-9482-5>
18. European Parliament and Council of the European Union. (2016). Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 April 2016 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data. *Official Journal of the European Union*, L119, 1–88.
19. Coravos, A., Khozin, S., & Mandl, K. D. (2019). Developing and adopting safe and effective digital biomarkers to improve patient outcomes. *npj Digital Medicine*, 2(1), 14. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-019-0090-4>
20. Reeder, B., & David, A. (2016). Health at hand: A systematic review of smart watch uses for health and wellness. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics*, 63, 269–276. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbi.2016.09.001>