



Universiteit
Leiden

The Netherlands

Uncovering the value of autonomic signs and seizure detection in epilepsy care

Westrhenen, A. van

Citation

Westrhenen, A. van. (2023, September 12). *Uncovering the value of autonomic signs and seizure detection in epilepsy care*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3640064>

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3640064>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).



CHAPTER 6

Automated video-based detection of nocturnal motor seizures in children

**van Westrhenen A, Petkov G, Kalitzin SN, Lazeron RHC,
Thijs RD**

ABSTRACT

Introduction

Seizure detection devices (SDDs) can improve epilepsy care, but wearables are not always tolerated. We previously demonstrated good performance of a real-time video-based algorithm for detection of nocturnal convulsive seizures in adults with learning disabilities.

Methods

The algorithm calculates the relative frequency content based on the group velocity reconstruction from video-sequence optical flow. We aim to validate the video algorithm on nocturnal motor seizures in a paediatric population.

Results

We retrospectively analysed the algorithm performance on a database including 1661 full recorded nights of 22 children (age 3-17 years) with refractory epilepsy at home or in a residential care setting. The algorithm detected 54 of 69 convulsions (median sensitivity per participant 54%; overall sensitivity 78%, 95% CI 57.5-100%) and identified 117 of 161 hyperkinetic seizures (overall sensitivity 73%). Most children had no false alarms; 87 false alarms occurred in seven children (median false alarm rate (FAR) per participant per night 0 [range 0-0.53]; overall FAR 0.05 per night). Most false alarms (58%) were behaviour-related (e.g., awake and playing in bed).

Conclusions

Our noncontact detection algorithm reliably detects nocturnal epileptic events with only a limited number of false alarms and is suitable for real-time use.

INTRODUCTION

Nocturnal convulsive seizures, particularly if unwitnessed, pose the highest risk of sudden unexpected death in epilepsy (SUDEP).^{1,2} Nocturnal supervision seems to have a protective effect on SUDEP, likely by permitting an intervention, but the exact protective mechanism is unknown.^{3,4} Seizure detection devices (SDDs) can be used to alert for nocturnal seizures and allow others to intervene. Wearable devices are not always tolerated, especially not by children or those with intellectual disabilities, and may require charging. We previously demonstrated good performance of a remote real-time video-based seizure detection in adults living in a residential care setting.⁵ The algorithm was able to detect all 50 nocturnal convulsive seizures (sensitivity 100%) with a median false alarm rate (FAR) of 0.78 per night and a latency of ≤ 10 seconds in 78% of detections. We aimed to validate the video detection algorithm in a paediatric population.

METHODS

Algorithm adjustment

The methodology used was previously published.⁶ Detection thresholds were recently determined in a training set and the detection performance was validated in a test set of nocturnal video recordings of adults with refractory epilepsy.⁵ The algorithm is composed of different steps to identify specific movement patterns of convulsions in the video image sequence. The first step is to reconstruct spatial movements by creating a vector field of velocities from changes in luminance (optical flow). Secondly, these velocities are grouped into six rates of spatial transformation (translation (horizontal & vertical), rotation, dilatation, and shear rates (horizontal & vertical)). Subsequently, time-frequency spectra of these group velocities are calculated using Gabor aperture functions with central frequencies ranging from 0.5-12.5Hz. The final step is to derive the power in the 2-6Hz frequency range (which is assumed to be the spectrum of convulsive seizures) relative to the total Gabor power.⁶ The relative 2-6 Hz power is expressed as a value between zero and one, thus reflecting the probability of registering a convulsion. If the output signal exceeds the previously determined threshold of 0.51 for more than 4 seconds, an alarm is set.⁵ We made the following adjustments to the original algorithm: (1) the optical flow calculation was extended to the multi-channel (colour) level to avoid potential information loss due to the image interpolation to the greyscale⁷ (2) a

novel algorithm (Global Optical Flow Reconstruction Iterative Algorithm (GLORIA)) was applied to bypass the time-consuming task of first reconstructing the local vector field and subsequently fitting the group transformation templates.⁸ The GLORIA algorithm improves calculation speed by directly reconstructing relevant global group transformation velocities from the image sequences.

Validation in a paediatric population

For validation we used a dataset of all children in the LICSENSE trial (NTR4115). This prospective multicentre study validated a wearable multimodal SDD (NightWatch) combining heart rate and accelerometry. Children with refractory epilepsy were included if they were ≥ 3 years of age and had at least one monthly nocturnal motor seizure (i.e., tonic-clonic (TC), generalized tonic >30 seconds, focal hyperkinetic and a 'remaining' category, consisting of TC-like seizures with atypical semiology and clusters of minor seizures lasting >30 minutes). Exclusion criteria comprised frequent non-epileptic movement patterns (e.g., choreatiform movements, sleep walking) and only minor motor seizures. They were monitored for a period of two to three months in their home or in a residential care setting. All recorded sequences of digital images had an H.264 (MPEG-4) format with a resolution of 640(H) x 480(V) pixels, 24-bit RGB colour encoding and a constant frame rate of 32 frames per second. Experienced epilepsy nurses analysed all alarms generated by the wearable device together with caregiver's seizure diaries and screened 10% of all recorded nights for possibly missed seizures. Events were annotated as 'seizure' or 'no seizure' and seizure type was specified (e.g., convulsive, hyperkinetic). Isolated minor seizures were annotated as 'no seizure' and classified as false alarms. In case of doubt, annotations were discussed with a neurologist.

We retrospectively analysed the detection performance of the algorithm on the annotated LICSENSE video database. All timestamps of the video alarms were compared with the annotations of the LICSENSE database. If the algorithm detected a clinical event also reported by the caregiver or coincided with a NightWatch alarm, the video detection was labelled with the same annotation. All other video alarms were designated as 'new alarms' and annotated by experienced epilepsy nurses, and in case of doubt discussed with a neurologist. Detection performance was evaluated as sensitivity for the detection of convulsive seizures per participant and FAR per participant and as overall sensitivity for the detection of all seizures of a specific seizure type (i.e., TC,

generalized tonic >30 seconds, focal hyperkinetic and ‘remaining’) and overall FAR (i.e., total number of false alarms divided by total number of recorded nights). We restricted sensitivity analysis to those who had motor seizures during the trial period, false alarm rate was calculated for the entire dataset. False alarms were categorized as (1) Awake and playing or moving in the bed; (2) Rhythmic movement disorder (e.g., body rocking); (3) Rhythmically moving object in the room; (4) Another person in the room. For the generalizability of the results, we also calculated the F_1 -score for the detection of convulsive seizures.⁹

The study protocol of LICSENSE was approved by a regional ethics committee and written consent was provided by participants or their guardians provided ascent were applicable. Data were handled anonymously.




Figure 1 (A) Distribution of video alarms (true and false) and missed seizures among all 22 participants. True alarms are defined as convulsive and hyperkinetic seizures. **(B)** Categorization of false alarms.

RESULTS

The dataset included 1661 full recorded nights of 22 children (13 male) with a median age of 9 years [range 3-17 years]. Sixteen children were monitored in a residential care setting, three at home and three between home and in a residential care setting. We analysed 69 convulsive seizures in six children. The video detection algorithm was able to detect 54 out of 69 convulsive seizures (median sensitivity per participant 54% [range 0-100%]; overall sensitivity 78% [95% CI 57.5-100%]; F_1 -score = 0.51; Figure 1A). The algorithm also detected 117 of 161 hyperkinetic seizures (mean sensitivity 86% SD 19.6; overall sensitivity 73%) occurring in two children. The overall sensitivity of the algorithm for the detection of generalized tonic seizures >30 seconds was 9.8% and 1.0% for the detection of the 'remaining' major seizures. Median FAR was 0 per participant per night [range 0-0.53] (overall FAR 0.05/night). All 87 false alarms were clustered in seven children (Figure 1A). Most false alarms (58%) were behaviour-related (awake and playing in bed; Figure 1B).

The calculation speed of the algorithm was improved; a video epoch of 366 seconds took 263 seconds to analyse using the old algorithm and 194 seconds with the new GLORIA algorithm (with MatLab 2019b, Windows 10pro, Processor Intel I Core i7 7700 3.5Ghz 32Gb RAM).

DISCUSSION

This phase 2 study (according to the recent SDD guidelines)¹⁰ validated our seizure detection algorithm in children and it showed good performance for the detection of nocturnal convulsions and hyperkinetic seizures. False alarms were mostly behaviour-related during wakefulness. Our adjustments in the processing speed makes the algorithm more suitable for real-time use and ready for clinical implementation.

A limitation of this study is the evaluation of possibly missed seizures since we did not screen all recorded nights. This is almost inevitable for such a long-term follow-up study but may have induced an overestimation of the sensitivity.

Several small phase 1 and phase 2 studies have been performed with various methods for automated video-based seizure detection, including motion tracking, periodicity estimation and optical flow^{11,12} All had acceptable detection rates (overall sensitivity 75-100%), but algorithms were tested and trained using the same dataset, thus posing a risk of overfitting.¹³⁻¹⁶ All studies used retrospectively collected video epochs of infants and children with various

motor seizure types and short selections of other non-epileptic movements but lacked prospective or continuous data. These studies thus demonstrated the feasibility of these techniques but overall performance is uncertain as reliable false alarm rates could not be derived.

Multiple phase 2, 3 and 4 studies on non-EEG based wearable SDDs have demonstrated good performance for the detection of convulsive seizures, with overall sensitivities over 90% and overall FARs ranging from 0.2/day to 1.44/day.¹² Best performance was achieved by multimodal devices combining various sensors including accelerometry, electrodermal activity, surface electromyography and heart rate. Most devices were validated in an epilepsy monitoring unit with relatively short monitoring periods. Our dataset includes long-term (2-3 months) home-based video recordings, which not only resulted in a large number of seizures, but also allowed for a reliable estimate of the FAR. The absence of false alarms in the majority of children despite the long-term follow-up makes our detection algorithm an attractive alternative to wearable SDDs. Most false alarms occurred during wakefulness in the early evening or morning, thus minimizing false alarm impact. Our algorithm detected all hyperkinetic seizures. Other modalities (EMG, accelerometry combined with heart rate) are likely more sensitive to detect a broader range of motor seizures.^{17,18} A further advantage of our method is that it operates remotely without sensors attached to the individual. A survey on first-hand experiences of people with epilepsy using wearable devices during a clinical stay indicated that most participants found the devices convenient.¹⁹ The presence of wires, bulky size discomfort and need for support did, however, moderate experience. Visibility and accuracy were important determinants about wearing them in everyday life. Video systems may raise privacy concerns, but our system generates real-time alarms without requiring video storage or monitoring. Our analysis was restricted to bedtime period. Daytime monitoring is possible but requires multiple cameras or portable video technology (drones, robots) likely to increase false alarm rate due to the more diverse movement patterns and thus require other algorithms. Compared to other remote SDDs using bed sensors, our video algorithm had a lower sensitivity for the detection of convulsive seizures (overall sensitivity 78% vs. 89%), but fewer false alarms (overall FAR 0.05/night vs 0.13/24h).¹⁷

REFERENCES

1. Harden C, Tomson T, Gloss D, Buchhalter J, Cross JH et al. Practice guideline summary: Sudden unexpected death in epilepsy incidence rates and risk factors: Report of the Guideline Development, Dissemination, and Implementation Subcommittee of the American Academy of Neurology and the American Epilepsy Society. *Neurology*. 2017;88(17):1674-1680.
2. Lamberts RJ, Thijs RD, Laffan A, Langan Y, Sander JW. Sudden unexpected death in epilepsy: people with nocturnal seizures may be at highest risk. *Epilepsia*. 2012;53(2):253-7.
3. Rugg-Gunn F, Duncan J, Hjalgrim H, Seyal M, Bateman S. From unwitnessed fatality to witnessed rescue: Nonpharmacologic interventions in sudden unexpected death in epilepsy. *Epilepsia*, 57(Suppl. 1):26-34, 2016.
4. van der Lende M, Hesdorffer DC, Sander JW, Thijs RD. Nocturnal supervision and SUDEP risk at different epilepsy care settings. *Neurology*. 2018;91(16):e1508-e1518.
5. Geertsema EE, Thijs RD, Gutter T, Vledder B, Arends JB, Leijten FS et al. Automated video-based detection of nocturnal convulsive seizures in a residential care setting. *Epilepsia*. 2018;59 Suppl 1:53-60.
6. Kalitzin S, Petkov G, Velis D, Vledder B, Lopes da Silva S. Automatic segmentation of episodes containing epileptic clonic seizures in video sequences. *IEEE Trans Biomed Eng*. 2012;59:3379-85.
7. Kalitzin S, Geertsema EE, Petkov G. Scale-Iterative Optical Flow Reconstruction from Multi-Channel Image Sequences. *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence and Applications*. 2018;310:302-14.
8. Kalitzin S, Geertsema EE, Petkov G. Optical Flow Group-Parameter Reconstruction from Multi-Channel Image Sequences. *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence and Applications*. 2018;310:290-301.
9. Kuradaa AV, Srinivasanb T, Hammondc S, Ulate-Camposd A, Bidwellc J. Seizure detection devices for use in antiseizure medication clinical trials: A systematic review. *Seizure*. 2019;66:61-69.
10. Beniczky S, Ryvlin P. Standards for testing and clinical validation of seizure detection devices. *Epilepsia*. 2018;59 Suppl 1:9-13.
11. Ramgopal S, Thome-Souza S, Jackson M, Kadish NE, Fernández IS et al. Seizure detection, seizure prediction, and closed-loop warning systems in epilepsy. *Epilepsy & Behavior* 2014;37:291-307.
12. Beniczky S, Jeppesen J. Non-electroencephalography-based seizure detection. *Curr Opin Neurol*. 2019;32(2):198-204.
13. Karayiannis NB, Xiong Y, Frost Jr JD, Wise MS, Hrachovy RA, Mizrahi EM. Automated detection of videotaped neonatal seizures based on motion tracking methods. *J Clin Neurophysiol* 2006;23:521-31.

14. Cattani L, Alinovi D, Ferrari G, Raheli R, Pavlidis E, Spagnoli C, Pisani F. Monitoring infants by automatic video processing: A unified approach to motion analysis. *Comput Biol Med.* 2017;80:158-165.
15. Karayiannis NB, Varughese B, Tao G, Frost JD, Wise MS, Mizrahi EM. Quantifying Motion in Video Recordings of Neonatal Seizures by Regularized Optical Flow Methods. *IEEE Transactions on image processing.* 2005;14(7):890-903.
16. Cuppens K, Lagae L, Ceulemans B, Van Huffel S, Vanrumste B. Automatic video detection of body movement during sleep based on optical flow in pediatric patients with epilepsy. *Med Biol Eng Comput* 2010;48:923-31.
17. Arends J, Thijs RD, Gutter T, Ungureanu C, Cluitmans P et al. Multimodal nocturnal seizure detection in a residential care setting: A long-term prospective trial. *Neurology.* 2018;20;91(21):e2010-e2019.
18. Beniczky S, Conradsen I, Henning O, et al. Automated real-time detection of tonic-clonic seizures using a wearable EMG device. *Neurology* 2018;90:e428-e434.
19. Simblett SK, Biondi A, Bruno E, Ballard D, Stoneman A et al. Patients' experience of wearing multimodal sensor devices intended to detect epileptic seizures: A qualitative analysis. *Epilepsy Behav.* 2019;102:106717.