Detecting slow wave sleep using a single EEG signal channel
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HIGHLIGHTS

• Detecting slow wave sleep by using one channel of electroencephalography signal.
• The proposed features are insensitive to signal differences of different individuals.
• The impacts of the SWS ratio and sleep apnea severity have been investigated.
• The proposed approach was tested with 1003 subjects.
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ABSTRACT

Background: In addition to the cost and complexity of processing multiple signal channels, manual sleep staging is also tedious, time consuming, and error-prone. The aim of this paper is to propose an automatic slow wave sleep (SWS) detection method that uses only one channel of the electroencephalography (EEG) signal.

New Method: The proposed approach distinguishes itself from previous automatic sleep staging methods by using three specially designed feature groups. The first feature group characterizes the waveform pattern of the EEG signal. The remaining two feature groups are developed to resolve the difficulties caused by interpersonal EEG signal differences.

Results and comparison with existing methods: The proposed approach was tested with 1,003 subjects, and the SWS detection results show kappa coefficient at 0.66, an accuracy level of 0.973, a sensitivity score of 0.644 and a positive predictive value of 0.709. By excluding sleep apnea patients and persons whose age is older than 55, the SWS detection results improved to kappa coefficient, 0.76; accuracy, 0.963; sensitivity, 0.758; and positive predictive value, 0.812.

Conclusions: With newly developed signal features, this study proposed and tested a single-channel EEG-based SWS detection method. The effectiveness of the proposed approach was demonstrated by applying it to detect the SWS of 1003 subjects. Our test results show that a low SWS ratio and sleep apnea can degrade the performance of SWS detection. The results also show that a large and accurately staged sleep dataset is of great importance when developing automatic sleep staging methods.

© 2015 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Human sleep can be divided into rapid-eye movement (REM) sleep and nonrapid eye movement (NREM) sleep. NREM sleep can be further classified into Stage 1 (S1), Stage 2 (S2) and Slow Wave Sleep (SWS). Among these sleep stages, SWS has been considered to be the most restorative sleep stage (Van Cauter et al., 2008). However, as sleep quality declines with aging, the total amount of SWS decreases drastically (Van Cauter et al., 2000). In addition, abnormal SWS has also been found to be correlated with a variety of clinical problems including acute-phase immune system response (Majde and Krueger, 2005), diabetes risk (Tasali et al., 2008), memory consolidation (Diekelmann and Born, 2010), psychiatric disorders (Kuong Lee and Douglass, 2010), and hypertension (Fung et al., 2011).

In-depth understanding of these SWS-related problems can be gained by performing long-term sleep architecture monitoring on a large population. Conventionally, sleep stages are scored using
Table 1
Clinical characteristics of the test subjects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clinical characteristics</th>
<th>Learning set</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of persons</td>
<td>1003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age, yr</td>
<td>44.2 ± 14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI, kg/m²</td>
<td>26.5 ± 4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHI event/hour</td>
<td>31.7 ± 28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleep efficiency %</td>
<td>80.2 ± 15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWS %</td>
<td>4.4 ± 7.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the electroencephalogram (EEG), electromyogram (EMG) and electrooculogram (EOG) signals obtained by a polysomnography (PSG) study. Thus, a large scale sleep architecture monitoring study would require an intensive amount of work. In addition to the cost and complexity of measuring and processing multiple signal channels, manual sleep staging is also tedious, time consuming, and error-prone. In response to these challenges, many automatic sleep staging methods using statistical learning or artificial intelligence techniques have been developed (Park et al., 2000; Agarwal and Gotman, 2001; Caffarel et al., 2006; Porée et al., 2006; Taglu et al., 2010; Liang et al., 2012; Pan et al., 2012). The complexity of the sleep staging problems can be further alleviated by extracting features from fewer signal channels (Agarwal et al., 2005; Berthomier et al., 2007; Virkal et al., 2007a,b; Malinowska et al., 2009; Güneş et al., 2010; Levendowski et al., 2012; Stepnowski et al., 2013).

In addition to cost and complexity, the other challenge for sleep staging is accounting for differences between individual subjects. In general, human physiological signals are qualitatively similar but not quantitatively identical. For example, SWS is characterized by its high-voltage slow-oscillation EEG waveform pattern. However, the actual magnitude and frequency band of the SWS EEG signal depend on the individual being measured.

The aim of this study is to introduce an automatic single EEG channel SWS detection method. This study has several features which distinguish it from previous work. First, the proposed method is less sensitive to the uncertainty caused by individual differences. Second, we address the influence of both the SWS ratio and AHI value, whose impacts on the efficacy of sleep staging have rarely been investigated.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Study subjects and polysomnography

We recruited 1003 patients from China Medical University Hospital Sleep Centers. Table 1 shows the means and standard deviations of the age, BMI, AHI (apnea-hypopnea index), sleep efficiency and SWS percentage of the test subjects. Note that AHI is defined as the number of apneas and hypopneas per hour of sleep and is often used as a metric to characterize the severity of sleep apnea. PSG data were recorded using a computerized polysomnographic system (Alice 4; Healthdyne, Atlanta, GA, USA). The proposed features were extracted from the C3–M2 EEG channel. The sampling rate for the EEG recording was 100 Hz. A high pass filter of 0.3 Hz and a low pass filter of 35 Hz were used to preprocess the EEG signal. The data were reviewed by an experienced doctor and scored by a sleep technician certified by the Taiwan Sleep Medicine Society. Every 30-second epoch was scored according to the criteria of Rechtschaffen and Kales (Rechtschaffen and Kales, 1968).

2.2. A neural network based SWS detector

This study formulates the SWS detection problem as a binary classification problem whose goal is to distinguish SWS and non-SWS (NSWS) on an epoch-by-epoch basis. In particular, our binary classifier employs a supervised learning strategy that uses the manually scored sleep staging results as the desired outputs for a neural network model. Specifically, with the 1003 subjects as the training set, this study uses the conventional back-propagation method to determine the optimal connection weights of a multilayer perceptron (MLP) neural network model by minimizing the mean square output error of the MLP.

2.3. Features for sleep staging

The type and number of EEG features are critical to the efficacy of the SWS detection method. This work proposes nine EEG features which can be divided into three groups, each of which consists of three features. The first group is used to characterize the EEG waveform pattern. Developed from the first feature group, the second and third feature groups are used to overcome the problem of signal differences among individuals. For the sake of convenience, x, y, and z will represent the features of the first, second, and third feature groups, respectively. The following three subsections introduce these three feature groups in sequence.

2.3.1. Zero-crossing point features

The first feature group is derived from the zero-crossing points. To generate these features, an epoch is first divided into thirty one-second intervals. For each interval, after subtracting the interval mean from the signal, the zero-crossing points (ZCPs) are located by finding the points where the signal changes sign. With these ZCPs, the time history of a signal is divided into a number of segments, hereafter referred to as “ZCP segments.” Since the speed of the signal is closely correlated with the lengths of the ZCP segments, the mean and standard deviation of the ZCP segment lengths are chosen as the first and second features of the first feature group.

For a given epoch, the third feature can be written as:

\[ x_3 = \sum_{i=1}^{I} (e_{i+1} - e_i) \int_{e_i}^{e_{i+1}} |s(t)| \, dt \]  

(1)

where \( e_i \) is the ith ZCP, \( I \) is the number of ZCP segments and \( s(t) \) denotes the EEG signal. Note that the integral in Eq. (1) is the absolute value of the area under the response curve of EEG signal \( s(t) \) and can be numerically determined from the discrete sampled EEG signal. Apparently, increasing the amplitude of \( s(t) \) enlarges this area, and decreasing the speed of \( s(t) \) results in a larger \( e_{i+1} - e_i \) difference. Together, these two properties characterize the large-voltage low-oscillation EEG signal pattern of SWS.

2.3.2. Features of relative probability density

As addressed in the previous section, one of the fundamental difficulties of physiological signal processing is the variability caused by the differences between individual subjects. The second and third feature groups are proposed to resolve such a difficulty. In particular, for a given first group feature \( x \), the probability density function (PDF) \( p(x) \) associated with the training set can be represented as:

\[ p(x) = C p_s(x) + (1 - C) p_n(x) \]  

(2)

where \( p_s \) and \( p_n \) are the training set PDFs of \( x \) for the SWS and NSWS, respectively. In addition, \( C \) and \( 1 - C \) are the ratios of the training set SWS and NSWS, respectively.

According to Bayes’ theorem, the optimal decision rule for a classification problem depends on the posterior probabilities of the patterns to be classified (Theodoridis and Koutrombas, 2008).
For the SWS detection problem, the two posterior probabilities of interest are:

\[
p(SWS|x) = \frac{p(x|SWS)p(SWS)}{p(x)} = \frac{p_S(x)}{p(x)} C
\]

\[
p(NSWS|x) = \frac{p(x|NSWS)p(NSWS)}{p(x)} = \frac{p_N(x)(1 - C)}{p(x)}
\]

(3)

(4)

Appropriately, these two posterior probabilities depend on the prior probabilities \(p(SWS)\) and \(p(NSWS)\) which are simply \(C\) and \(1 - C\). Considering the fact that these prior probabilities vary from person to person and from night to night, this study introduces the second feature group to account for such a variability.

In this study, MLPs are trained to estimate the posterior probabilities of the training set which consists of multiple PSG records. If \(C_i\) represents the ratio of SWS and \(T_i\) denotes the length of the total sleep time associated with the \(i\)th PSG record of the training set, then the MLP is trained to produce outputs \(f_1\) and \(f_2\) to approximate the following two posterior probabilities (Saerens et al., 2002):

\[
f_1(x) \approx \frac{p_S(x)}{p(x)} C_i
\]

\[
f_2(x) \approx \frac{p_N(x)(1 - C_i)}{p(x)}
\]

(5)

(6)

where the ratio of the SWS of the training set is:

\[
C \approx \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} C_i T_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{N} T_i} (7)
\]

with \(N\) as the number of PSG records of the training set. To achieve Bayes optimality for the \(i\)th PSG record, the outputs the MLP should be:

\[
f_1 \approx \frac{p_S(x)}{p(x)} C_i
\]

\[
f_2 \approx \frac{p_N(x)(1 - C_i)}{p(x)}
\]

(8)

(9)

where \(p_i\) is the PDF of the \(i\)th PSG record and can be written as

\[
p_i(x) = C_i p_S(x) + (1 - C_i) p_N(x)
\]

(10)

Clearly, the Bayes optimality for the entire training set is achieved at a cost: the classification accuracy of individual PSG records is compromised.

To develop features that are adaptive to the variation of SWS ratio, we assume the PDF of a PSG record that awaits staging to be:

\[
q(x) = D p_S(x) + (1 - D) p_N(x)
\]

(11)

Substituting Eqs. (5) and (6) into Eq. (11) to eliminate \(p_S\) and \(p_N\) yields:

\[
\frac{q(x)}{p(x)} \approx \frac{D}{f_1} + \frac{1 - D}{f_2}
\]

(12)

Since \(C_i\) and \(f_2\) can all be derived from the training set, Eq. (12) can be used to estimate \(D\) once \(q(x)/p(x)\) is known. Because accurate computation of the probability density is difficult to achieve, we employ an alternative approach. Specifically, if the value of a first group feature \(x\) is known to be \(a\), then the corresponding second group feature \(y\) is computed from:

\[
y = \frac{\int_{a - \Delta x}^{a + \Delta x} q(x)dx}{\int_{a - \Delta x}^{a + \Delta x} p(x)dx}
\]

(13)

To calculate \(y\), we first determine \(\Delta x\) from the following equality:

\[
\int_{a - \Delta x}^{a + \Delta x} p(x)dx = \epsilon,
\]

(14)

for a small \(\epsilon\). The upper (lower) limit of the above definite integral should be replaced by the maximum (minimum) value of \(x\) if \(a + \Delta x(a - \Delta x)\) is larger (smaller) than the maximum (minimum) value of \(x\). In this study, the value of \(\epsilon\) is chosen as 0.05. With \(\Delta x\) found, the numerator of Eq. (13) and, thus, the value of the second group feature \(y\), can be readily determined. For convenience, feature \(y\) will be referred to as the relative probability density of \(x\) hereafter in this paper.

2.3.3. Features of percentile rank

In the previous subsection, we assumed that the PDFs of SWS and NSWS were completely known. To further address the issue of individual differences, this subsection assumes that the means of \(p_S\) and \(p_N\) can vary from person to person. Specifically, for the \(i\)th PSG record, the PDFs of the SWS and NSWS are assumed to have the following form:

\[
p_S(x) = p_S(x - m_i)
\]

\[
p_N(x) = p_N(x - m_i)
\]

(15)

(16)

As a result, based on Eq. (10), the PDF for feature \(x\) of the \(i\)th PSG record can be represented as:

\[
p(x) = p_S(x - m_i) = C_ip_S(x - m_i) + (1 - C_i)p_N(x - m_i)
\]

(17)

With Eqs. (10) and (17), the following can be readily shown:

\[
\int_{-\infty}^{a} p(x)dx = \int_{-\infty}^{a - m_i} p(x)dx
\]

(18)

To account for the unknown \(m_i\), for every \(x\) of the first feature group, the corresponding third group feature \(z\) is chosen as the percentile rank of \(x\) within its PSG record. To demonstrate the rationale behind the third feature group, we first assume that when \(x = a\), the corresponding percentile rank is \(z_a\). Based on the definition of cumulative probability, we have:

\[
\int_{-\infty}^{a} p(x)dx = \frac{z_a}{100}
\]

(19)

With Eq. (18), Eq. (19) can be rewritten as

\[
\int_{-\infty}^{a - m_i} p(x)dx = \frac{z_a}{100}
\]

(20)

Hence, with \(z_a\) as a feature, Eq. (20) can be used to estimate \(m_i\). In summary, the proposed feature set consists of three groups. The first feature group is used to characterize the waveform pattern of the SWS EEG signal. By assuming \(p_S(x)\) and \(p_N(x)\) to be invariant, the second feature group is used to account for the uncertainty associated with SWS ratio \(C_i\), which varies from person to person and from night to night. In contrast, by assuming \(C_i\) to be known, we develop the third feature group to help us estimate \(m_i\) which characterizes the variation of the means of the first group features, which is dependent on the individual. The intent of using these features simultaneously as the neural network inputs is to effectively improve the SWS detection efficacy of the proposed approach.

3. Results

The first goal of this experimental study is to apply the proposed approach to automatically detect the SWS of the 1003 subject dataset. Derived from a single EEG channel, the first test used only
the first feature group $\mathbf{x}$, whereas the second test employed feature groups $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}$ and $\mathbf{z}$. Note that $\mathbf{x} = [x_1 \times x_2 \times x_3]^T$ where $x_1$ and $x_2$ are the mean and standard deviation of the ZCP segment lengths of the epoch to be scored, and $x_3$ is defined by equation (3). Similar to $\mathbf{x}$, the second feature group $\mathbf{y}$ and the third feature group $\mathbf{z}$ are also 3 by 1 vectors with $y_i$ as the relative probability density of $x_i$ (Eq. (13)), and $z_i$ is the percentile rank of $x_i$ (Eq. (19)).

In both tests, a single-hidden layer MLP was employed to solve the binary classification problem of SWS detection. The numbers of hidden neurons for these two MLPs were determined based on two criteria. First, to perform a fair comparison, the number of connection weights of the MLPs employed in the two tests should be approximately the same. Second, the SWS detection performance should be optimized with the minimum number of hidden units. Based on these two rules, via a trial-and-error process, the number of MLP hidden units were chosen as 40 and 18 for the first and second tests, respectively. The resulting kappa coefficients, accuracy sensitivity and positive predictive values (PPV) are shown in Table 2. These results clearly show that the addition of the second and third feature groups improves the efficacy of the proposed automatic SWS detection method.

Note that since the number of training examples is much larger than the number of MLP parameters (775,471 epochs versus approximately 200 connection weights), the overfitting problem is unlikely to occur (Amari et al., 1995). This belief has been confirmed by splitting the dataset into training subset (502 subjects) and test subset (501 subjects). The training subset was used to generate optimal connection weights for the MLP whereas the test subset was used to validate the performance of the MLP designed by the training subset. As shown by the results summarized in Table 3, the training and test subsets yield comparable performances which clearly demonstrate the generalization capability of the trained MLP.

To further evaluate the performance of the proposed approach, we stratify the results obtained by the proposed approach in Table 2 to different subgroups. In particular, to evaluate the efficacy of the proposed approach for middle-aged or younger healthy persons, the inclusion criteria for the first subgroup are AHI < 5 and age < 55. Note that an AHI of less than 5 is considered normal. To assess the performance of the proposed approach for healthy older persons, the second subgroup requires AHI < 5 and age ≥ 55. As given in Table 4, the SWS ratio of the second (older) subgroup is much smaller than that of the first (younger) subgroup. With an inclusion criterion of AHI ≥ 5, the third subgroup consists of all the sleep apnea patients of our dataset. As shown by Table 4, the comparative results of the first and second subgroups seem to indicate that the reduction of the SWS ratio can deteriorate the performance of the proposed approach. Similarly, from the results of Table 4, we also find that the proposed approach performs considerably better for the healthy persons (first and second subgroups) than the sleep apnea patients (third subgroup). Hence, the next goal of this study is to investigate the influences of SWS ratio and AHI value on the performance of the proposed approach.

To try to understand the difficulty caused by a small SWS ratio, we selected five different SWSK subsets from our training set. With a 5% SWS ratio interval, these subgroups were arranged such that the differences of their AHI means are statistically insignificant at the 5% level. The results in Table 5 show that, in agreement with the results of Table 4, lower SWS ratios lead to poorer SWS detection results. This phenomenon can be explained by the training set imbalance problem (Sun et al., 2009; He and Garcia, 2009; Khoshragha et al., 2010). For a binary classification problem, training set imbalance occurs when the number of examples of one class (the majority class) is considerably larger than the number of examples of the other class (the minority class). As the ratios of these two classes of examples become more extreme, the classifier places more emphasis on the majority class in order to minimize the overall error. Unfortunately, minimizing the overall error is often accomplished at the expense of the classification accuracy of the minority class. As a result, the classifier can easily become one-sided and thus become ineffective in detecting minority class examples. In the present study, SWS is apparently the minority class. Consequently, as the SWS ratio becomes smaller, accurate SWS detection becomes more difficult to achieve.

Based on the PSG recordings of three healthy subjects and three OSA patients, it has been shown that automatic sleep staging methods can be less accurate for the sleep apnea patients than for healthy subjects (Park et al., 2000). However, to the best of our knowledge, this potential problem has never been studied in-depth. Therefore, this study examines the influence of the AHI on the performance of the proposed approach. Toward this goal, based on the degree of severity of sleep apnea, Table 6 presents the training results of four selected subsets of patients (healthy AHI < 5, mild 5 ≤ AHI < 15, moderate 15 ≤ AHI < 30, severe AHI ≥ 30). To eliminate the influence of the SWS ratio, these subsets were chosen such that the

---

**Table 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Kappa</th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
<th>Sensitivity</th>
<th>PPV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\mathbf{x}$</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.972</td>
<td>0.610</td>
<td>0.707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}$</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.973</td>
<td>0.644</td>
<td>0.709</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Table 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset</th>
<th>Kappa</th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
<th>Sensitivity</th>
<th>PPV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.972</td>
<td>0.636</td>
<td>0.715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.973</td>
<td>0.653</td>
<td>0.694</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Table 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroups</th>
<th>AHI &lt; 5 Age &lt; 55</th>
<th>AHI &lt; 5 Age ≥ 55</th>
<th>AHI ≥ 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHI</td>
<td>2.2 ± 1.5</td>
<td>1.9 ± 1.4</td>
<td>36.9 ± 27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWS%</td>
<td>9.1 ± 10.0</td>
<td>2.1 ± 6.0</td>
<td>3.7 ± 6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kappa</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy</td>
<td>0.955</td>
<td>0.988</td>
<td>0.975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>0.753</td>
<td>0.582</td>
<td>0.630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPV</td>
<td>0.745</td>
<td>0.829</td>
<td>0.673</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Table 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SWS ratio%</th>
<th>0–5</th>
<th>5–10</th>
<th>10–15</th>
<th>15–20</th>
<th>&gt;20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean of AHI</td>
<td>5.090</td>
<td>5.041</td>
<td>5.083</td>
<td>5.021</td>
<td>5.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kappa</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy</td>
<td>0.965</td>
<td>0.943</td>
<td>0.937</td>
<td>0.929</td>
<td>0.935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>0.494</td>
<td>0.501</td>
<td>0.605</td>
<td>0.619</td>
<td>0.628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPV</td>
<td>0.316</td>
<td>0.622</td>
<td>0.810</td>
<td>0.876</td>
<td>0.519</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Table 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AHI</th>
<th>&lt;5</th>
<th>5–15</th>
<th>15–30</th>
<th>&gt;30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWS%</td>
<td>5.02%</td>
<td>5.05%</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>5.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kappa</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy</td>
<td>0.955</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.960</td>
<td>0.960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>0.647</td>
<td>0.549</td>
<td>0.484</td>
<td>0.464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPV</td>
<td>0.524</td>
<td>0.506</td>
<td>0.626</td>
<td>0.633</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

differences between their SWS ratio means are statistically insignificant at the level of 0.05.

As demonstrated by Table 6, the proposed approach is less effective in dealing with sleep apnea patients. This performance degradation problem also appears in human scoring. Specifically, several inter-scorer reliability studies have found that human sleep staging results for obstructive sleep apnea (OSA) patients have a comparatively lower degree of agreement than do those of healthy subjects (Norman et al., 2000; Collop, 2002; Daneker-Hopfe et al., 2004; Basner et al., 2008). It is possible that the signal indistinctly caused by the increased movement artifacts, arousals, and other apnea symptoms result in the performance degradation of the proposed approach for apnea patients. It is also likely that such a performance drop comes from the imperfect training set that contains incorrect human staging decisions. Unfortunately, the extent of their influence and interactions is unclear. Therefore, a possible future research project is to compare the degree of performance degradation between the proposed approach and the degree of increased inter-scorer disagreement in dealing with apnea patients.

With an imperfect training set, building a “perfect” automatic sleep staging method does not seem to be a realistic expectation. Although PSG has been considered the gold standard in the diagnosis of sleep disorders, for the development of automatic sleep staging methods, we also need a sufficiently large and complete PSG dataset that possesses highly accurate, if not perfect, sleep staging results. Therefore, it is believed that the results reported in this study have been hampered by the imperfection of the training set employed in this study. For the same reason, we also expect better results from the proposed approach if the quality of the training set can be effectively improved.

The results reported in Tables 1–6 are all based on the MLP classifier trained by the entire dataset of 1003 subjects. Considering the impacts of the severity of sleep apnea and ratio of SWS, it seems possible to improve the SWS detection results by tailoring the proposed approach to subgroup of persons that share high degree of similarity in terms of SWS ratio and AH1 value. To demonstrate this potential, a MLP was exclusively designed by using dataset of the first subgroup studied in Table 4. Compared to the results of Table 4 which were obtained by the MLP trained by the entire dataset of 1003 subjects, this specially designed MLP improves kappa coefficient (from 0.72 to 0.76), accuracy (from 0.955 to 0.963), sensitivity (from 0.753 to 0.758) and positive predictive value (from 0.745 to 0.812).

In this study, the proposed approach used features extracted from the C3-M2 channel. Identical experimental studies have also been conducted by using C4-M1 channel. Although not reported here, the results obtained by these two EEG channels are quite comparable. However, considering spatially dependent EEG potentials from the various regions of the scalp, a possible future work is to try to use features extracted from other EEG channels in order to optimize the performance of the proposed approach. For example, in addition to the conventional EEG electrode locations (such as the 10–20 system of electrode placement), one can also try to use signals measured by forehead leads.

4. Conclusion

Based on newly developed signal features, this study proposed and tested a single-channel EEG-based SWS detection method. In addition to introducing a group of features to characterize the high-amplitude low-frequency SWS EEG waveform patterns, two additional groups of features were also developed to resolve the difficulties caused by interpersonal differences of the EEG signals. The effectiveness of the proposed approach was demonstrated by applying it to detect the SWS of 1003 subjects. In addition, this study investigated the influence of the ratio of slow wave sleep and the severity of sleep apnea on the efficacy of the proposed method. Our test results show that a low SWS ratio and sleep apnea can degrade the performance of SWS detection. The results of this study also show that a sufficiently large and accurately staged PSG dataset is of great importance when developing high performance automatic sleep staging methods.
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