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Abstract: Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis (ALS) is a neurodegenerative disease characterized by motor neurons degeneration, which reduces muscular force, being very difficult to diagnose. Mathematical methods, such as Coherence, Phase Locking Factor (PLF), Fractal Dimension (FD), Lempel-Ziv (LZ) techniques, Detrended Fluctuation Analysis (DFA) and Multiscale Entropy (MSE) are used to analyze the surface electromyographic signal's chaotic behavior and evaluate different muscle groups' synchronization. Surface electromyographic signal acquisitions were performed in upper limb muscles, being the analysis executed for instants of contraction recorded from patients and control groups. Results from LZ, DFA and MSE analysis present capability to distinguish between the patient and the control groups, whereas coherence, PLF and FD algorithms present results very similar for both groups. LZ, DFA and MSE algorithms appear then to be a good measure of corticospinal pathways integrity. A classification algorithm was applied to the results in combination with extracted features from the surface electromyographic signal, with an accuracy percentage higher than 70% for 118 combinations for at least one classifier. The classification results demonstrate capability to distinguish both groups. These results can demonstrate a major importance in the disease diagnose, once surface electromyography (sEMG) may be used as an auxiliary diagnose method.

1 INTRODUCTION

ALS is a fatal and very progressive disease, characterized by both upper and lower motor neurons degeneration, involving brainstem and also multiple spinal cord innervation regions. This disorder is responsible for abnormal motor activity. ALS patients typically present fatigue, quickly progressive weakness and reduced exercise capacity with loss of voluntary movement, spasticity, fasciculations, dysphagia (difficulty in swallowing), dyspnea (difficulties in breathing) and dysarthria (difficulties in speaking). After the first symptoms, death may occur within 3 – 5 years for most of the patients. ALS is very difficult to diagnose, since there isn’t available a reliable biomarker of disease activity and progression (Kiernan et al., 2011; Mitchell and Borasio, 2007).

Upper motor neuron integrity can be evaluated through the investigation of oscillatory activity propagation. The motor cortex activity can be recorded, and both alpha (8 – 12Hz) and beta (15 – 30Hz) frequency bands can be analyzed via coherence and PLF (Farmer et al., 2007).

This work explores the analysis of ipsilateral acquisitions, which was presented with promissory preliminary results in (Camara, 2013), using different approaches.

Motor unit recruitment patterns complexity can be quantified using FD. However, the strength of a muscle’s contraction is better estimated based on Maximum Fractal Length (MFL), even for very small muscle contraction strength, rather than FD (Poosapadi Arjunan and Kumar, 2012).

The LZ measure is a well suited feature regard-
2 METHODS

2.1 Coherence

Coherence function estimates values from 0 to 1, assuming the value 0 if there is no association between two signals at a certain frequency, and the value 1 if there is a perfectly linear association between them (Farmer et al., 2007).

2.2 Phase Locking Factor (PLF)

PLF is a measure of synchronization between two signals, in which the frequencies of interest are isolated by the application of a narrow band-passed filter. Then, the relationship between the phases of the two signals, $\phi_j(t)$ and $\phi_k(t)$ are analyzed (Almeida et al., 2011):

$$\rho_{jk} = \frac{1}{T} \left| \sum_{t=1}^{T} e^{i(\phi_j(t) - \phi_k(t))} \right|$$

where $\rho_{jk}$ is the PLF and $T$ is the number of discrete samples.

PLF ranges from 0 to 1. While $\rho_{jk} = 0$ corresponds to asynchronous signals (their phases are not correlated), $\rho_{jk} = 1$ is attained if the two signals are in perfect synchronization (Almeida et al., 2011).

2.3 Fractal Dimension (FD)

FD is one of the most used measurements for the evaluation of the dynamics of complex systems. A non-integer FD usually indicates a chaotic behavior, and the smallest integer bigger than FD is considered the minimum number of independent variables capable to describe this behavior (West, 1994).

For physiological signals, FD can be estimated using Higuchi algorithm, since it is suitable for non-periodic and irregular time series.

This algorithm results on a plot of several curve lengths, $L(k)$, for a pre-determined $k_{\text{max}}$, being $k \in [1, k_{\text{max}}]$ (Phinyomark et al., 2011).

2.4 Lempel-Ziv (LZ)

LZ is another tool used to analyze the deterministic complexity of a highly non-linear chaotic setting. To compute LZ, it is necessary to convert the sEMG signal into a symbolic sequence, conventionally a binary sequence, by comparison to a threshold. Next, the number of distinct patterns within a signal is obtained, which is directly related to the complexity of the system (Talebinejad et al., 2011).

2.5 Detrended Fluctuation Analysis (DFA)

The DFA method can be applied to the study of electrophysiological signals, being a modified root mean
square (RMS) analysis of a random walk (Phinyomark et al., 2011).

The outputs of the DFA algorithm are scaling exponents extracted from a log-log graph (for details (Phinyomark et al., 2011)). These exponents assume values between 0 and 2, according to the time series behavior:

- If $0 < \alpha < \frac{1}{2}$ the time series is anti-correlated
- If $\alpha \approx \frac{1}{2}$ the time series is uncorrelated, or indicates White noise (the value at one instant cannot be correlated with any previous value)
- If $\frac{1}{2} < \alpha < 1$ the time series is correlated
- If $\alpha \approx 1$ indicates Pink noise ($\frac{1}{f}$ noise)
- If $1 < \alpha < \frac{3}{2}$ indicates nonstationary or random walk
- If $\alpha \approx \frac{3}{2}$ indicates Brownian noise (i.e. the integration of the White noise)

2.6 Multiscale Entropy (MSE)

Entropy has been often used to quantify complexity, since traditional entropy definitions (e.g. Shannon-entropy) are used to measure disorder and uncertainty, as well as to characterize a systems’ gain of information. Approximate Entropy and its modification Sample Entropy are entropy-based complexity measures with a single scale which are widely used in short and noisy time series. Thus, in MSE one of this approaches is applied to different time scales, resulting on a plot of the entropy value as a function of the factor scale, $\tau$ (Zhang et al., 2013).

2.7 Classification

Classification methods are used to identify the belonging of a novel observation in a set of categories (sub-populations). These categories are obtained with based on a training group of observations, therefore, it is necessary to have previous knowledge of the category membership of each observation of the training group. These observations are then analyzed according to the extrated features. In this project, the used features are: kurtosis, minimum frequency, mean, median frequency, power band, spectral kurtosis, spectral skewness, spectral spread and correlation. There will be also analyzed the results of the previously referred implemented algorithms (coherence, PLF, FD, LZ, DFA and MSE). Classification can be implemented throughout a various number of algorithms, the classifiers (k - Nearest Neighbor, Decision Tree, Random Forest, AdaBoost and Naïve Bayes). Leave-one-out cross validation iterator is used to split data in train/test sets. Hence, all samples except one are used as a train set, being this left out sample tested after (Pedregosa et al., 2011).

3 ACQUISITIONS

3.1 Subjects

Measurements were performed in two different groups of subjects: group of patients, with 21 members presenting ALS, and group of control, with 26 members which do not evidence ALS disease. Therefore, the patients group contains 21 subjects, varying this number according to the analyzed channel (left or right hand or forearm), since some patients presented inability of self-controlled movement for one arm. All participants from the patients group have been diagnosed within less than three years, except two members which have been diagnosed previously. All participants from both groups have ages between 23 and 77 years (mean of 59 years for the patient group and 45 years for the control group).

3.2 Acquisition Protocol

The acquisition protocol is identical to the one in (Camara, 2013). The performed task was repeated for 6 minutes or less according to maximum time borne by the patients. Subjects sat down and placed both hands and forearms on a desk in a parallel position, 10 cm away from each other with hand palms facing one another in 90 degrees flexion with the elbow. While listening to a programmed sound, which guided the movement, subjects were asked to coordinately elevate both index fingers vertically with maximum articular amplitude in an opposite direction from the other fingers position, hold that position for 3 seconds while maintaining a certain force and return to the original position, remaining in that position for 3 seconds while trying to relax the arms muscles as much as possible.

3.3 Recordings

Contralateral and ipsilateral acquisitions were recorded simultaneously, and 4 signals were acquired from each subject using EMG sensors attached to a bioPlex device. The sensors were placed on the first dorsal interosseus muscle for both left and right hand, and on the extensor digitorum communis muscle for both left and right forearm. Ground was placed on ulna bone inferior extremity, where no
muscle activity is present. Figure 1 shows the surface electrodes placements.

The bioPlux device has eight analog channels with 12-bit resolution and also an external channel to be used as a reference ground. The EMG sensors have second order band pass filter with cutoff frequencies of 25 and 450. EMG signals were recorded using a sampling frequency of 1000 Hz, being the recorded data transmitted via Bluetooth to a computer.

4 SIGNAL PROCESSING

All acquired signals were processed using python language. First, the signals’ Direct Current (DC) component was removed and a third order butter band pass filter of 10 – 500 Hz was applied. From each pair of ipsilateral signals, intervals of common contraction were isolated from intervals of relaxation using the algorithm referred in (Camara, 2013).

All the previously referenced algorithms were applied to moments of contraction. While coherence and PLF were calculated twice for each subject, being calculated for a pair of signals, FD, LZ, DFA and MSE were calculated four times, being applied to each one of the four acquired signals individually. Coherence and PLF were calculated for two common sections of data from an interval of one contraction. This was performed for all contractions, with posterior averaging of all epochs. FD, LZ, DFA and MSE calculus was applied to a concatenation of all contractions.

4.1 Coherence Processing

All EMG signals were full-wave rectified and then, for each contraction, coherence was calculated using python libraries (matplotlib.mlab.cohere tool). Coherence is then averaged for the moments of contraction. The used sampling frequency is 1000 Hz, the Nonequispaced fast Fourier transform (NFFT) is 512 and the value that dictates the dependency between FFT windows is NFFT/2. Coherence was averaged for each frequency among all the subjects within the same group.

4.2 PLF Processing

PLF algorithm was developed in (Camara, 2013). All signals were full-wave rectified and each signal was band pass filtered in order to remove all the other undesirable frequencies. The used filter was \([f - 2, f + 2]\), being \(f\) the analyzed frequency. Therefore, PLF calculus was performed as many times as the number of frequencies to analyze. PLF was obtained with resolution of 1 Hz for all the frequencies within the beta band (15 – 30 Hz). PLF was computed according to equation 1. Hence, a different PLF value is obtained for each contraction of the analyzed signals and, in order to attain a final value for each subject, PLF was averaged among all contractions within the same acquisition. Finally, for each analyzed frequency, PLF was averaged among all members within each group, for the patient and the control groups.

4.3 FD Processing

In the Higuchi fractal dimension algorithm \(k_{\text{max}}\) was defined as 128, as suggested in literature (Phinyomark et al., 2011). The FD coefficient was estimated and averaged among all subjects within each group.

4.4 LZ Processing

The LZ coefficient was calculated for a binary sequence obtained from the rectified filtered used signal with threshold defined as 0.4. Since the LZ coefficient is greatly related to the number of different patterns within each signal, and the number of patterns is related to the length of the signal, all the signals were cut in accordance with the minimum reasonable signal length within both groups. An average of the LZ coefficient was calculated for all members within the patients and the control’s groups.

4.5 DFA Processing

The DFA was applied among all subjects, obtaining two distinct scaling exponents, \(\alpha_1\) and \(\alpha_2\). These scaling exponents were averaged for all members within each group.
4.6 MSE Processing

For MSE, the Sample Entropy was computed for 20 scales. These values were averaged among all subjects within each group, and plotted in a graph for both populations.

4.7 Classification

The feature extraction and the classification algorithms were developed in (Gomes, 2014). The algorithms were adapted for the use of two channels, and the features extracted were selected according to this work objectives.

Features were extracted from a pair of signals (right hand and forearm). The sampling frequency was placed at 1000 Hz, being used a central window with 2000 points. The results obtained from the previously described algorithms were joined to these features.

Posteriorly several combinations of the extracted features, the developed algorithm results and of both of them were organized and classified.

5 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this section, we show results obtained from right arm signals, being the most relevant conclusions also achieved for left arm analysis.

5.1 Coherence Results

Coherence mean values for the group of patients and the group of control are presented in Figure 2.

By the observation of the graphics presented in Figure 2, coherence mean values are very similar for both the patients and the control groups. Control group mean value for coherence is slightly higher within the alpha band. Coherence pooled value for patients is $0.23 \pm 0.21$ for the right arm. Coherence pooled value for the control group is $0.22 \pm 0.21$ for the right arm. These values are different from those found in literature (Fisher et al., 2012), since slightly higher values of coherence were expected for the control group within the beta band than for the patients group. These differences may be explained by the sampling frequency used, differences in the acquisition protocol, differences in the used algorithm or parameters and the tested subjects themselves (age, gender, lifestyle, etc.). The obtained results are also different from the expected for ipsilateral acquisitions in (Camara, 2013), since only preliminary results were obtained previously.

5.2 PLF Results

PLF mean values depending on frequency for both groups are presented in Figure 3.

By the observation of the graphics presented in Figure 3, PLF values appear to be very similar for both groups. Alpha band appears to demonstrate a higher difference between both groups PLF values. However, since this work proceeds the investigation of PLF within the beta band (Camara, 2013), PLF was only computed for 10 Hz within the alpha band. PLF pooled value for the patients group is $0.237 \pm 0.006$ for the right arm. PLF pooled value for the control group is $0.242 \pm 0.009$ for the right arm. These results are from the right arm.

Observing the graphics presented in Figure 3, PLF values appear to be very similar for both groups. Alpha band appears to demonstrate a higher difference between both groups PLF values. However, since this work proceeds the investigation of PLF within the beta band (Camara, 2013), PLF was only computed for 10 Hz within the alpha band. PLF pooled value for the patients group is $0.237 \pm 0.006$ for the right arm. PLF pooled value for the control group is $0.242 \pm 0.009$ for the right arm. These results are different from the expected for ipsilateral acquisitions in (Camara, 2013), since only preliminary results were obtained previously. Differences in results may also be explained by the length of the used signal and the sampling frequency used, and characteristics such as age, gender and lifestyle may influence this analysis.
5.3 FD Results

FD coefficient mean and standard deviation values are presented in Table 1, for the group of patients and the group of control. Table 2 represents the MFL (the point of lowest scale) values for each group.

Table 1: Mean and standard deviation values of FD coefficient for patients and control group for the right arm.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Patients group</th>
<th>Control group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Right hand</td>
<td>$-1.985 \pm 0.008$</td>
<td>$-1.983 \pm 0.008$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right forearm</td>
<td>$-1.983 \pm 0.013$</td>
<td>$-1.984 \pm 0.006$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: MFL values for patients and control group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Patients group</th>
<th>Control group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Right hand</td>
<td>3.72 ± 0.39</td>
<td>3.99 ± 0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right forearm</td>
<td>3.72 ± 0.47</td>
<td>3.80 ± 0.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the observation of Table 1 FD coefficient is almost identical for both groups. Therefore, FD coefficient is not a good measure of distinction between patients and control group. However, the obtained FD values are very similar to the results obtained from different upper limb activities in (Phinyomark et al., 2011). Observing Table 2, MFL is always slightly higher for the control group.

5.4 LZ Results

Table 3 shows the LZ coefficient mean value and standard deviation for a binary sequence.

Table 3: LZ coefficient for a binary sequence obtained from the rectified filtered used signal with threshold defined as 0.4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Patients group</th>
<th>Control group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Right hand</td>
<td>0.17 ± 0.13</td>
<td>0.27 ± 0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right forearm</td>
<td>0.27 ± 0.29</td>
<td>0.15 ± 0.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the observation of Table 3, LZ coefficient presents higher values for the control group for the right hand, and higher values for the patients group for the right forearm. Tables 3 presents a good distinction between patient and control groups. Therefore, for a binary sequence obtained from the filtered used signal and for a binary sequence obtained from the rectified filtered used signal, LZ algorithm appears to distinguish subjects between both groups regarding pooled LZ coefficient values, however, with some variance among subjects within each group.

5.5 DFA Results

Tables 4 and 5 present the DFA coefficients, $\alpha_1$ and $\alpha_2$ mean values for both groups, respectively.

Table 4: DFA $\alpha_1$ coefficient mean and standard deviation values for both groups for the right arm.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Patients group</th>
<th>Control group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Right hand</td>
<td>1.23 ± 0.17</td>
<td>1.35 ± 0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right forearm</td>
<td>1.39 ± 0.09</td>
<td>1.44 ± 0.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: DFA $\alpha_2$ coefficient mean and standard deviation values for both groups for the right arm.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Patients group</th>
<th>Control group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Right hand</td>
<td>0.50 ± 0.12</td>
<td>0.52 ± 0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right forearm</td>
<td>0.62 ± 0.16</td>
<td>0.59 ± 0.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.6 MSE Results

Figure 4 represents the Sample Entropy mean value for each scale for both patient and control groups. Observing Figure 4, patients group exhibit higher entropies for the right hand, whereas control group exhibit higher entropies for the right forearm. Therefore, despite statistically the differences between patients and control’s groups are very small, the MSE tendency appears to be distinct between both groups.

MSE pooled values for the patients and control groups are presented in Table 6. Observing the results presented in Figure 4 and Table 6, MSE algorithm appears to be capable of distinguishing both groups.

Figure 4: Sample Entropy mean value for each scale. The straight line represents the patient group, and the dashed line represents the control group. The errorbars represent the standard deviation. (a) Results for the right hand. (b) Results for the right forearm.
Table 6: MSE mean and standard deviation values, for both patients and control groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Patients group</th>
<th>Control group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Right hand</td>
<td>3.15 ± 0.46</td>
<td>2.77 ± 0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right forearm</td>
<td>3.08 ± 0.49</td>
<td>3.50 ± 0.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.7 Classification Results

Table 7 presents the 14 combinations and the 3 classifiers with better results for the right arm for a Leave-one-out cross validation.

Table 7: Classification results for the right arm for Decision Tree, Random Forest and AdaBoost Classifiers. 1) sum power band + MSE + DFA ($\alpha_1 + \alpha_2$); 2) mean + MSE + DFA ($\alpha_1 + \alpha_2$); 3) mean + MSE + DFA ($\alpha_1 + \alpha_2$) + LZ; 4) spectral skewness + MSE + DFA ($\alpha_1 + \alpha_2$) + LZ; 5) spectral spread + MSE + DFA ($\alpha_1 + \alpha_2$) + LZ; 6) spectral kurtosis + MSE + DFA ($\alpha_1 + \alpha_2$) + LZ; 7) sum power band + MSE + coherence + DF (alpha + alpha); 8) kurtosis + MSE + DFA ($\alpha_1 + \alpha_2$) + LZ; 9) kurtosis + MSE + DFA ($\alpha_1 + \alpha_2$) + LZ; 10) kurtosis + MSE + coherency + PLF + DFA ($\alpha_1 + \alpha_2$); 11) maximum frequencies + MSE + coherence + PLF + DFA ($\alpha_1 + \alpha_2$); 12) spectral skewness + MSE + coherence + DFA ($\alpha_1 + \alpha_2$) + LZ; 13) spectral spread + MSE + coherence + PLF + DFA ($\alpha_1 + \alpha_2$).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combinations</th>
<th>Decision Tree</th>
<th>Random Forest</th>
<th>AdaBoost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td>0.806</td>
<td>0.694</td>
<td>0.722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td>0.806</td>
<td>0.778</td>
<td>0.722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td>0.611</td>
<td>0.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td>0.806</td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td>0.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td>0.806</td>
<td>0.639</td>
<td>0.722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right Forearm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6)</td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td>0.750</td>
<td>0.806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right Arm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7)</td>
<td>0.778</td>
<td>0.750</td>
<td>0.806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8)</td>
<td>0.556</td>
<td>0.750</td>
<td>0.806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9)</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0.806</td>
<td>0.778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10)</td>
<td>0.694</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td>0.694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11)</td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td>0.611</td>
<td>0.806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12)</td>
<td>0.556</td>
<td>0.806</td>
<td>0.639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13)</td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td>0.861</td>
<td>0.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14)</td>
<td>0.694</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td>0.694</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Classification results demonstrate the algorithms distinction capability, since the presented results show the percentage of cases that the algorithm classified correctly (accuracy percentage).

Classification results were obtained for the right arm for a leave-one-out cross validation tested with k - Nearest Neighbor, Decision Tree, Random Forest, AdaBoost and Naïve Bayes classifiers. In spite of 201 combinations have been arranged, 118 combinations present values higher than 70.0% for at least one classifier, 41 combinations present results higher than 77.8% for at least one classifier, and 14 combinations present results higher than 80.6% for one classifier (Decision Tree, Random Forest or AdaBoost).

The best results include MSE, DFA, LZ, coherence and PLF algorithm results, and also the extracted features mean, maximum frequency, spectral kurtosis, spectral skewness, spectral spread, sum power band and kurtosis, in several different combinations. The top 14 best combinations include the results of both DFA and MSE algorithms. The best obtained combination is spectral skewness + MSE + coherence + PLF algorithm results, and also the extracted features mean, maximum frequency, spectral kurtosis and PLF algorithm results, and also the extracted features mean, maximum frequency, spectral kurtosis, spectral skewness, spectral spread, sum power band and kurtosis, in several different combinations. The top 14 best combinations include the results of both DFA and MSE algorithms. The best obtained combination is spectral skewness + MSE + coherence + PLF algorithm results, with an accuracy percentage of 86%, 1% for a Random Forest Classifier. Therefore, it is proved that in spite of some algorithms may present slender differences between both control and patients groups, the combination of these algorithms with other measures can improve the distinction capability between members of patients and control groups.

### 6 CONCLUSIONS

In this work, methodology was developed to evaluate the complexity of sEMG signal acquired from different muscle groups of healthy subjects and patients with ALS. FD, LZ, DFA and MSE algorithms were implemented and all of these algorithms as well as coherence and PLF algorithms were applied to the acquired filtered signals.

Contrary to the results presented in literature, coherence analysis does not present significant differences between the group of patients and the group of control. PLF analysis also does not present any significant differences between both groups. Results from both algorithms appear to be slightly higher for the control group for the alpha band frequencies. Further work is suggested to compute PLF for all the frequencies within the alpha band with resolution of 1 Hz.

FD analysis results in FD coefficients very similar for all the signals for both patients and control groups. Therefore, this algorithm does not seem good to obtain a distinction between both groups. However, MFL presents slightly higher values regarding the control group, being this a better measure of distinction between both groups than the FD coefficient.

LZ analysis presents better results, being LF coefficient higher for the control group for the right hand, and higher for the patients group for the right forearm. These results are for a binary sequence obtained from the rectified filtered used signal. Therefore, LZ coefficient appears to be a good reflection of neural degeneration. Since the used threshold to obtain the binary sequence was defined as 0.4, it is not adapted
to each individual signal. Therefore, it is suggested for further work a threshold obtained as a percentage of the standard deviation of each signal.

DFA analysis presents higher values for both $\alpha_1$ and $\alpha_2$ DFA coefficients for the control group. Then, this algorithm seems to be a good measure to reflect neural degeneration.

MSE analysis presents higher values for the right hand for the patients group, and higher values for the right forearm for the control group. This algorithm appears to be a good indicator of neural degeneration.

LZ, DFA and MSE analysis have then potential as a quantitative test for upper and lower neural integrity concerning ALS disease.

Classification results demonstrate to provide a good distinction of both groups, being the combination of various algorithms with features proved to be advantageous to improve both groups distinction capability.
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