ECG ARTEFACT DETECTION ALGORITHM

An Algorithm to Improve Long-term ECG Analysis

Susana Brás1,2, Nuno Ferreira3 and João Paulo Silva Cunha1,2
1Institute of Electronics and Telematics Engineering of Aveiro (IEETA), Aveiro University
Campus Universitário de Santiago, Aveiro, Portugal
2Departamento de Engenharia Electrónica, Telecomunicações e Informática, Universidade de Aveiro
Campus Universitário de Santiago, Aveiro, Portugal
3Biodevices S.A., Rua 5 de Outubro, Porto, Portugal

Keywords: Electrocardiogram, Artefact detection, Threshold analysis.

Abstract: Newly devices allow the analysis and collection of very long-term electrocardiogram (ECG). However, associated with this devices and long-term signal, are artefacts that conduce to misleading interpretations and diagnosis. So, new developments over automatic ECG classification are needed for a reliable interpretation. The feasibility of the cardiac systems is one of the main concerns, once they are currently used as diagnosis or help systems. In this project, an artefact detection algorithm is developed, dividing the time-series in intervals of signal and artefact. The algorithm is based on the assumption that, if the analysed frame is signal, there is not an abrupt alteration over consecutive short windows. So, the time-series is divided in consecutive nonoverlapped short windows. Over these windows, it is calculated the time-series standard deviation, the maximum and minimum slope. A threshold-based rule is applied, and the algorithm reveals that, in mean, it is verified a 99.29% of correctly classified signal and only 0.71% of signal erroneously classified. Over the results obtained, the algorithm seems to present good results, however it is needed its validation in a wider and representative sample with segments marked as artefact by multiple specialists.

1 INTRODUCTION

The electrocardiogram (ECG) studies started with visual inspection of the wave morphology alterations (Malik, 2003). Due to the introduction of long-term ECG devices, the visual inspection became time consuming. To address this shortcoming, automatic systems and algorithms were presented for a fast and efficient analysis. The scientific community proposed algorithms for the delineation and identification of the complexes that compose the heartbeat (P, QRS and T) (Pan, 1985); (Hamilton, 1986); (Almeida, 2010); (Vila, 2000); (Martinez, 2004). The analysis of different ECG characteristics allowed the evaluation of specific pathologies, e.g., arrhythmias (Chin, 2010); (Tsipouras, 2002); or ventricular repolarization abnormalities (Malik, 2003).

All the advances on the ECG analysis and classification introduce a high necessity of new developments in this area to obtain the most feasible results. In rest ECG analysis (Stern, 1975), the patient cardiac function is evaluated, studying the alterations to normal under a resting condition. In this kind of analysis, the ECG time-series is almost noise free. In Holter analysis (Gibson, 2007), physicians are interested in the analysis of long-term ECG. The purpose is the evaluation of cardiac function during daily routine activities, usually in a 24h or 48h exam. Since the Holter is a long-term exam with the goal to evaluate specific alterations or abnormalities, the presence of artefacts could mask important events. Nowadays, very long-term ECG monitoring is used as telemetric medicine (Mittal, 2011), or for online and real-time evaluation of patient cardiac function. The Vital Responder project is an example of such long-term ECG monitoring. The main goal of the project is to develop a system able to identify fatigue/stress, during firefighters daily routine activities, focusing on the cardiovascular analysis. Between first responder professionals, firefighters registered the
highest number of deaths on duty; some of them associated with cardiac complications, which could be consequence of exposure to stressful events.

The ECG based algorithms sometimes produce misleading interpretation due to artefacts presented in the time-series. Thus, algorithm for artefact detection is of upmost importance that will allow rejecting anomalous information, which induces in error the automatic algorithms. The goal of this paper is to present new algorithm for artefact detection for very long-term ECG monitoring. Basically, the algorithm evaluates the alterations of the wave over consecutive windows. The entire algorithm development was focused on the assumption that ECG time-series have not abrupt alterations between consecutive windows, if they are considered sufficiently shorter. The long term ECG could present differences along the exam, however, they are gradually inspected. Therefore, if the windows are sufficiently short, i.e., 2 or 3 seconds, the alterations should not be significant if no artefact is present.

In section 2, the Methods are described divided in: Evaluated Database characteristics, ECG Preprocessing, Artefact Detection Algorithm and the Performance Evaluation. The Results are presented in section 3 and in section 4 conclusions are drawn.

2 METHODS

The ECG was collected using the VitalJacket® (Figure 1). The VitalJacket® is a wearable very long-term ECG monitoring device composed by microelectronics embedded into the textile manufactured in the form of a simple t-shirt (Cunha, 2010). The VitalJacket® is a comfortable t-shirt and consequently does not collide with mobility. It can record 5 lead ECG and accelerometry during up to 5 days in a single battery charge. It is equipped with a memory card, where the data is recorded. Also, the communication by Bluetooth in real time to a computer or smartphone is possible, allowing the real time analysis of data and algorithms implementation. Biodevices S.A. has successfully concluded the certification process according to the standards ISO9001 and ISO13485 and the approval of Vital Jacket® as a medical “Ambulatory ECG device” according to the MDD directive 42/93/CE that regulates medical devices in Europe. Vital Jacket® has been granted with the CE1011 mark (Cunha, 2010).

In section 2, the Methods are described divided in: Evaluated Database characteristics, ECG Preprocessing, Artefact Detection Algorithm and the Performance Evaluation. The Results are presented in section 3 and in section 4 conclusions are drawn.

2.1 Evaluated Database

The data was collected from 8 individual divided in segments of noise and signal. The segments of consecutive epochs were validated by a senior cardiologist. Over the very long-term ECG data, the specialist chose ECG segments where the time series is not corrupted by artefact. On the other hand, there are also chosen segments of the time series, clearly marked by artefacts. Since, sometimes, the artefact is not persistent, in some of the cases was not possible to obtain a segment only marked by artefact. So, it is important to point out that the data contained in the signal segment is free of artefacts; nevertheless the data in the noise segment is not 100% artefact.

The algorithm was validated not in all collected signal, but in the segments chosen by the specialist, and described in table 1. The signal (noise) segments correspond to 0.25% (0.10%) of the total exams. Since the data was collected in a non-controlled scenario, it is contaminated by artefacts. Therefore, consecutive segments of signal (noise) in each exam have small duration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example #</th>
<th>Fs (Hz)</th>
<th>Exam duration (h:m:s)</th>
<th>Signal segment (h:m:s)</th>
<th>Noise segment (m:s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>24:46:50</td>
<td>13:03</td>
<td>10:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>31:33</td>
<td>7:36</td>
<td>1:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>24:27:42</td>
<td>20:06</td>
<td>8:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>491:27:53</td>
<td>10:54</td>
<td>1:48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>165:46:01</td>
<td>21:09</td>
<td>8:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>165:00:09</td>
<td>17:39</td>
<td>0:27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>9:23:20</td>
<td>22:39</td>
<td>8:24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 937:11:50 2:18:15 56:21 0.25% 0.10%
2.1.1 ECG Pre-processing

Once the used ECG corresponds to segments of very long-term ECG collected during normal daily routine activities of different individuals, there is high frequency noise in the records. As described by Sornmo and Laguna (Sornmo, 2006) after the 40Hz there is no information about the P, QRS or T complexes. Furthermore, the information after 30Hz has a low power spectrum. Considering this information a Butterworth low pass filter of order 3 with 30Hz cutoff frequency was applied to the data. The filtered output signal is used in the artefact detection algorithm.

2.2 Artefact Detection Algorithm

The algorithm development was based on the assumption that in the presence of signal there are not abrupt alterations between consecutive windows. When an interval contains artefact, the cardiologists rejects the information in an interval of approximately 10 seconds, because they do not trust in that information. Therefore, the proposed method analyse the information in 12 seconds divided in consecutive nonoverlapped windows of three seconds.

In each window, it was calculated the time-series standard deviation ($sd_{i}$, $i=1,2,...,n$; $n$ number of windows), the maximum slope ($ms_{i}$, $i=1,2,...,n$) and minimum slope ($ms_{i}$, $i=1,2,...,n$). Over these measures the difference between two consecutive windows is computed ($d1_{i}=sd_{i+1}-sd_{i}$, $d2_{i}=ms_{i+1}-ms_{i}$, $d3_{i}=ms_{i+1}-ms_{i}$, $i=1,...,n-1$).

Briefly, the algorithm will evaluate the four windows and decide if there is artefact, based on a threshold definition. The ECG signal analysis indicates the initial thresholds, after they were tuned according to the improvement of the algorithm performance. If one of the following rules is verified, the evaluated four windows are artefact:

- $\left|\frac{1}{2}(d1_{i}+d1_{i+1}+d1_{i+2})\right| > 0.5$, $i=1,4,7,...,n-1$;
- $\sqrt{\frac{1}{2}[(d1_{i}-d\bar{1})^{2}+(d1_{i+1}-d\bar{1})^{2}+(d1_{i+2}-d\bar{1})^{2}]} > 0.25$, where $d\bar{1}$ is the average $d1_{i}$ ($i=i, i+1, i+2$) value;
- $\left|\frac{1}{2}(d2_{i}+d2_{i+1}+d2_{i+2})\right| > 1$, $i=1,4,7,...,n-1$;
- $\sqrt{\frac{1}{2}[(d2_{i}-d\bar{2})^{2}+(d2_{i+1}-d\bar{2})^{2}+(d2_{i+2}-d\bar{2})^{2}]} > 3$, where $d\bar{2}$ is the average $d2_{i}$ ($i=i, i+1, i+2$) value;
- $\left|\frac{1}{2}(d3_{i}+d3_{i+1}+d3_{i+2})\right| > 1$, $i=1,4,7,...,n-1$;
- $\sqrt{\frac{1}{2}[d3_{i}-d\bar{3}]^{2}+(d3_{i+1}-d\bar{3})^{2}+(d3_{i+2}-d\bar{3})^{2}] > 3.5$, where $d\bar{3}$ is the average $d3_{i}$ ($i=i, i+1, i+2$) value.

If one of the six rules is verified, it is a 12 seconds window of artefact.

2.3 Performance Evaluation

The performance of classification is evaluated in terms of sensitivity ($Sen$) (equation 1). Considering that $ncc_{i}$ is the samples correctly classified in type $i$ ($i=1,2$) and $Ncc_{i}$ is the number of samples classified in type $i$ ($i=1,2$).

$$Sen = \frac{ncc_{i}}{Ncc_{i}} \quad (1)$$

Also the percentage of signal and artefact over the entire segment is calculated as

$$P_{i} = \frac{n_{i}}{N_{i}} \quad (2)$$

where $n_{i}$ is the number of classified samples from type $i$ ($i=1,2$) and $N_{i}$ is the total number of samples in type $i$ ($i=1,2$).

It is important to state that when the sensitivity is evaluated for signal samples detection in the signal segments, the sensitivity will be equal to $P_{i}$ for classified signal samples over this segment. Also, when the artefact detection is evaluated, the sensitivity of the artefact detection in the noise segments will equal the $P_{i}$ for artefact, in this segment.

Usually, the performance in a classifier is accessed by sensitivity and specificity. However, in this study, due to the database characteristics, the true negatives are not demarcated. In that way the specificity of the algorithm could not be accessed.

3 RESULTS

We started to understand the proposed measure differences between signal and noise segments. Table 2 presents the mean and standard deviation of the three studied measures ($sd$, $Ms$, $ms$) considering signal or noise segments. By the table inspection, it is observed that the mean and standard deviation values in noise segments are significantly higher than in signal segments. This leads to conclude that, in the presence of signal, there are not abrupt alterations between consecutive windows (confirming the initial assumption).
Table 2: Mean and standard deviation (std) over the 3 seconds windows of the three implemented measures used to discern between signal and artefact. Sd corresponds to the standard deviation; Ms is the maximum slope; and ms represents the minimum slope in each window.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Signal segments</th>
<th>Noise segments</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mean std</td>
<td>mean std</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sd</strong></td>
<td>4.680 2.759</td>
<td>24,341 23,985</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ms</strong></td>
<td>4.562 1.988</td>
<td>28,426 50,446</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ms</strong></td>
<td>-7.042 3.620</td>
<td>-31,982 56,861</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once, the goal is to identify artefacts, and following the previous results, the identification is made based on the difference between two consecutive windows that could not exceed predefined thresholds. These thresholds were defined based on the best performance algorithm achieved in these data sample. The algorithm has yet been validated outside the used database in the algorithm training. However, the new data was not validated by a cardiologist.

Table 3 presents the results of the application of the differentiation rule (section 2.3) to the 8 segments of signal. Also, table 4 shows the algorithm performance in the artefact detection, over the 8 segments containing artefacts.

Table 3: Artefact detection algorithm application to signal segments. Sig corresponds to the classified interval as signal, Art to the classified interval as artefact. Sen is the sensitivity in the signal segment. Psp is the percentage of artefact detected in the segment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noise segment (h:m:s)</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>Art</th>
<th>Sen (%)</th>
<th>Psp (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10:45</td>
<td>02:33</td>
<td>23,72</td>
<td>76,28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>01:45</td>
<td>00:51</td>
<td>48,57</td>
<td>51,43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>08:12</td>
<td>01:57</td>
<td>23,72</td>
<td>76,28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>01:38</td>
<td>01:48</td>
<td>100,00</td>
<td>0,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>08:21</td>
<td>07:30</td>
<td>10,18</td>
<td>89,82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>16:39</td>
<td>16:03</td>
<td>3,60</td>
<td>96,40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>00:27</td>
<td>00:27</td>
<td>100,00</td>
<td>0,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>08:24</td>
<td>07:03</td>
<td>83,93</td>
<td>16,07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean 49,22 50,78
Median 36,18 63,82

In a next step, the algorithm should be evaluated in ECG segments where the artefacts are differentiated from signal. In the presented work, it was possible to evaluate the algorithm performance in discerning from signal and artefact. This step is important, because it is wanted an algorithm allowing the evaluation of the maximum amount of data in a segment to obtain the more suitable results.

Figure 2 illustrates the algorithm implementation performance in an ECG time-series containing artefacts and clean signal. In figure 2a), it is presented the entire exam corresponding to an example outside the database used for algorithm training. In figure 2b), a zoom around the 1530 seconds is presented. In this subfigure, it is observed a high amplitude interval in the signal. The algorithm marks this interval as artefact, between intervals of signal.
Figure 2: Artefact detection algorithm implementation in an exam out of the used database. The red line represents the ECG classified as artefacts and the blue the ECG classified as signal. a) Signal classification. b) Zoom around 1530 seconds.

4 CONCLUSIONS

In this work, it is presented an algorithm for artefact detection over long-term ambulatory electrocardiogram (ECG) signal. The algorithm is based on standard deviation, maximum and minimum slope evaluation in short windows, and the imposition of differentiation rules based on thresholds over the previous mentioned measures. The algorithm proved to differentiate between signal and artefact with a high performance considering the percentage of signal correctly classified over eight segments. However, the algorithm should be also validated in a wider and representative sample, with intervals marked as artefact by multiple specialists.

In conclusion, the present algorithm seems to be promising results and in future a great help in cardiac systems, once the misleading interpretation of artefact as signal could conduce the cardiac systems to erroneous outputs.
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