



The University of Manchester Research

## Performance of a digital signal processing algorithm for the accurate quantification of cough frequency

DOI: 10.1183/13993003.04271-2020

### **Document Version**

Accepted author manuscript

### Link to publication record in Manchester Research Explorer

**Citation for published version (APA):** Smith, J. A., Holt, K., Dockry, R., Sen, S., Sheppard, K., Turner, P., Czyzyk, P., & Mcguinness, K. (2021). Performance of a digital signal processing algorithm for the accurate quantification of cough frequency. *European* Respiratory Journal, 2004271. https://doi.org/10.1183/13993003.04271-2020

**Published in:** 

European Respiratory Journal

### Citing this paper

Please note that where the full-text provided on Manchester Research Explorer is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Proof version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version.

### General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Explorer are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

### **Takedown policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please refer to the University of Manchester's Takedown Procedures [http://man.ac.uk/04Y6Bo] or contact uml.scholarlycommunications@manchester.ac.uk providing relevant details, so we can investigate your claim.





# EUROPEAN RESPIRATORY journal

FLAGSHIP SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL OF ERS

Early View

**Research** letter

## Performance of a digital signal processing algorithm for the accurate quantification of cough frequency

Jaclyn A. Smith, Kimberley Holt, Rachel Dockry, Shilpi Sen, Kitty Sheppard, Philip Turner, Paul Czyzyk, Kevin McGuinness

Please cite this article as: Smith JA, Holt K, Dockry R, *et al.* Performance of a digital signal processing algorithm for the accurate quantification of cough frequency. *Eur Respir J* 2021; in press (https://doi.org/10.1183/13993003.04271-2020).

This manuscript has recently been accepted for publication in the *European Respiratory Journal*. It is published here in its accepted form prior to copyediting and typesetting by our production team. After these production processes are complete and the authors have approved the resulting proofs, the article will move to the latest issue of the ERJ online.

Copyright ©The authors 2021. For reproduction rights and permissions contact permissions@ersnet.org

## Performance of a digital signal processing algorithm for the accurate quantification

### of cough frequency.

Jaclyn A. Smith<sup>1,2</sup>, Kimberley Holt<sup>1,2</sup>, Rachel Dockry<sup>1,2</sup>, Shilpi Sen<sup>2</sup>, Kitty Sheppard<sup>2</sup>, Philip Turner<sup>2</sup>, Paul Czyzyk<sup>2</sup>, Kevin McGuinness<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup>Division of Infection, Immunity and Respiratory Medicine, University of Manchester,

Manchester, UK

<sup>2</sup>Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust, Manchester, UK

Correspondence:

Jacky Smith, Education and Research Centre, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust, Southmoor Rd, Wythenshawe, Manchester M23 9LT, United Kingdom Telephone +44 161 291 5879 Fax +44 161 291 5730 Email: jacky.smith@manchester.ac.uk

**Financial Support:** This work was jointly funded by NIHR Manchester Biomedical Research Centre (JAS, KH, KMcG) and Wellcome Investigator Award (RD, KMcG) (207504/B/17/Z). JAS is an NIHR Senior Investigator.

**Conflicts of Interest:** KMcG invented the VitaloJAK filtering algorithm which has been licensed by Manchester University Foundation Trust and the University of Manchester to Vitalograph Ltd and Vitalograph Ireland (Ltd). MFT receives royalties which may be shared with KMcG as the inventor and the clinical division in which JAS works.

### Manuscript Word count: 1178

**Author Contributions:** JAS drafted the manuscript and analysed the data; KM<sup>c</sup>G developed the algorithm; KH, RD were involved in data collection and cough counting; SS, KS, PT, PC performed cough counting. All authors reviewed and contributed to the final manuscript.

**Study Message:** The VitaloJAK filtering algorithm has undergone the most extensive testing of any cough monitoring software and is sensitive/efficient across a range of diagnoses, age groups, and in recordings containing a wide range of cough counts.

To the Editor,

The ability to measure cough frequency from sound recordings has changed the standards by which new cough treatments are evaluated and is providing insights into the mechanisms underlying cough in respiratory disease (1-5). Objective measures of the number of coughs over extended time periods can be made using off-the-shelf sound recording devices, with aural counting of cough sounds captured. Although excellent inter-observer agreement can be achieved, this process is extremely laborious and limits the size and scope of possible studies (6, 7), thus, there is a need for more efficient cough quantification methods. Accurate cough detection is however complicated by the substantial variability in cough acoustics both within and between individuals. There is also the challenge of distinguishing cough from large amounts of speech and an infinite array of environmental noises that may be captured during ambulatory sound recordings. Indeed, fully automated cough detection systems have failed to achieve sufficient accuracy to be useful despite apparent success in preliminary tests (8, 9). A semi-automated algorithm is in use in clinical studies but has only undergone preliminary validation, reporting modest sensitivity in small numbers of individuals (82.3-86%) in recordings made by a now obsolete mp3 player/recorder (10, 11). The influence of user input, robustness of this algorithm to detect cough in different respiratory diseases and in recordings made using different recording devices with different acoustic encoding have not been assessed.

The VitaloJAK cough monitoring system has been developed as a collaboration between clinical academic and industrial partners and is currently the only system with the regulatory approvals necessary for use in clinical trials of investigational medicinal products (CE marked, FDA 510k approved). It comprises a digital sound recording device, a web-based portal for data transfer, tracking and storage, and a digital signal processing algorithm (WH03\_V3.0) to remove most non-cough sounds and silence from 24h sound recordings, prior to manual counting of cough sounds by trained analysts. The aim of this evaluation was to assess two key indicators of the performance of the algorithm in patients with a range of different respiratory diseases and in a larger group of patients with refractory chronic cough. These were the efficiency of the algorithm in reducing the length of the recordings to be listened to (an indicator of specificity) and secondly the retention of cough sounds from the original 24h recording after filtering (sensitivity).

We assessed the algorithm performance in recordings from 143 randomly selected subjects participating in clinical studies who had additionally consented to use of their recordings for the development and testing of cough analysis software; these were academic studies in Manchester, Newcastle, London and Cardiff and a single commercial study. Firstly we evaluated different diagnostic groups compromising refractory/unexplained chronic cough (CC n=21), asthma (n=10), chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD n=14), idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis (IPF n=12), bronchiectasis (n=6), children with a range of chronic respiratory diseases (n=10, asthma, cystic fibrosis and primary ciliary dyskinesia) and healthy volunteers (n=10) (ethics no 18/NW/0254). Subject age, gender, diagnosis and lung function data were available in all adult subjects and the associated recordings were 24h in length. Some paediatric subjects wore the device for <24h, median duration 23.1h (IQR 15.3-24). In 11 subjects, repeat recordings on a second occasion were available allowing an assessment of repeatability of the algorithm performance (COPD n=1, bronchiectasis

n=6, CC n=2, IPF n=2). Secondly, we evaluated performance in a larger set of patients with refractory/unexplained chronic cough (CC), recruited to a multi-centre clinical trial with a cough severity VAS >40mm (with permission from Vitalograph Ltd); demographic data was not available for these subjects.

The VitaloJAK cough monitoring system consists of a recording device with two microphones; a free field microphone attached to the lapel and a contact microphone attached to the chest wall over the manubrium. Two versions of the recording device have been produced (mark 1 and mark 2), developed to make recordings to the same digital recording standards. The device records continuously for 24h (8Hz sampling rate, 16-bit). Recordings were transferred to a PC and the explosive part of the cough sounds identified and marked with an electronic tag by trained cough analysts, listening to the sound recordings whilst visualizing the sound waveforms using audio editing software (Adobe Audition version 3.0, Adobe Systems Incorporated) (12). The algorithm was applied to each sound file to remove silence and the bulk of non-cough sounds. Cough sounds are highly variable both within and between subjects. The philosophy behind the filtering algorithm is to recognize these differences and fit the analysis technique to the nature of individual cough sounds. The initial processing identifies the start and end time of all sounds within the 24hour recording, with a particular focus on typical cough sound patterns. All sounds identified are categorised as a potential cough sound or not; potential cough sounds must be confirmed from both microphone recordings to be retained by the filtering. All potential cough sounds are merged and sorted by time position, to produce a reduced length sound file. The performance of the software was assessed by the percentage of original tagged cough sounds retained after filtering (sensitivity) and

the efficiency of the filtering by the length of the filtered sound file, as a percentage of the unfiltered file length.

Subjects in the different diagnostic categories exhibited a wide range of cough frequencies, with significant differences between groups (p<0.001), see table 1; all patient groups coughed significantly more than healthy volunteers (all p≤0.004) and CC patients coughed significantly more than other groups (all  $p \le 0.038$ ), except for bronchiectasis. The sensitivity of the algorithm was remarkably high for all subject groups (median 100%, IQR 99.5-100) and >90% for all individuals, apart from one healthy volunteer with a sensitivity of 81% (4 coughs missed of a total of 22). Sensitivity was different between diagnostic groups (p=0.001), being lower in COPD patients, but as can been seen from table 1, the absolute difference was small. Equally, the filtering algorithm substantially reduced recording length from a median of 24h to a median of 1h 48.6mins, 7.6% of the original recording. Efficiency of the algorithm was slightly less in paediatric patients and healthy volunteers. In the 11 patients with repeat recordings, the performance of the algorithm was highly consistent [median difference between recordings in sensitivity 0.2% (IQR -4.2 to +2.8) and in efficiency -0.9% (-10 to +0.0)].

In the subjects where demographic data was available, regression analysis suggested sensitivity and efficiency of the algorithm were not influenced by age, gender or lung function. The reduction in length of the recording and sensitivity were not correlated with the number of coughs present.

In conclusion, this is the largest and most comprehensive evaluation of an algorithm to facilitate cough monitoring reported to date. The data suggests the VitaloJAK filtering algorithm is sensitive and efficient across a range of diagnoses, age groups, and in recordings containing a wide range of cough counts. Performance was also high in a large group of patients with refractory/unexplained chronic cough recruited to a clinical trial of a novel therapy, the group currently most studied in the development of novel anti-tussive treatments.

### REFERENCES

1. Abdulqawi R, Dockry R, Holt K, Layton G, McCarthy BG, Ford AP, et al. P2X3 receptor antagonist (AF-219) in refractory chronic cough: a randomised, doubleblind, placebo-controlled phase 2 study. Lancet. 2015;385(9974):1198-205.

2. Smith JA, Kitt MM, Morice AH, Birring SS, McGarvey LP, Sher MR, et al. Gefapixant, a P2X3 receptor antagonist, for the treatment of refractory or unexplained chronic cough: a randomised, double-blind, controlled, parallel-group, phase 2b trial. Lancet Respir Med. 2020.

3. Satia I, Watson R, Scime T, Dockry RJ, Sen S, Ford JW, et al. Allergen challenge increases capsaicin-evoked cough responses in patients with allergic asthma. J Allergy Clin Immunol. 2019;144(3):788-95 e1.

Sumner H, Woodcock A, Kolsum U, Dockry R, Lazaar AL, Singh D, et al.
Predictors of objective cough frequency in chronic obstructive pulmonary disease.
Am J Respir Crit Care Med. 2013;187(9):943-9.

5. Marsden PA, Smith JA, Kelsall AA, Owen E, Naylor JR, Webster D, et al. A comparison of objective and subjective measures of cough in asthma. J Allergy Clin Immunol. 2008;122(5):903-7.

6. Mines D, Bacci E, Nguyen A, Shaffer S, Smith J, M V. Assessment of Inter- and Intra-Rater Reliability of Objective Cough Frequency in Patients with Chronic Cough [abstract]. Eur Respir J. 2019;54 (Suppl. 63):PA4342.

7. Smith JA, Earis JE, Woodcock AA. Establishing a gold standard for manual cough counting: video versus digital audio recordings. Cough. 2006;2:6.

Coyle MA, Keenan DB, Henderson LS, Watkins ML, Haumann BK, Mayleben
 DW, et al. Evaluation of an ambulatory system for the quantification of cough
 frequency in patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. Cough. 2005;1:3.

9. Vizel E, Yigla M, Goryachev Y, Dekel E, Felis V, Levi H, et al. Validation of an ambulatory cough detection and counting application using voluntary cough under different conditions. Cough. 2010;6:3.

10. Birring SS, Fleming T, Matos S, Raj AA, Evans DH, Pavord ID. The Leicester Cough Monitor: preliminary validation of an automated cough detection system in chronic cough. Eur Respir J. 2008;31(5):1013-8.

11. Yousaf N, Monteiro W, Matos S, Birring SS, Pavord ID. Cough frequency in health and disease. Eur Respir J. 2013;41(1):241-3.

12. Kelsall A, Decalmer S, Webster D, Brown N, McGuinness K, Woodcock A, et al. How to quantify coughing: correlations with quality of life in chronic cough. Eur Respir J. 2008;32(1):175-9.

### TABLES

Table 1 Subject demographics and performance of filtering software by diagnosis. All data are median and interquartile ranges. \*n=10 recordings in stable COPD patients, plus n=4 recordings during COPD exacerbations.

Diagnosis	<b>Age</b> (years)	Sex F/M	FEV1 % predicted	FVC % predicted	Number of Coughs in 24h file	Number of Coughs in filtered file	Sensitivity	Length of Filtered File (min)	Filter Efficiency
CC	64.0	16/5	102	101	509	509	99.9%	106.9	7.4%
(n=21)	(54.5-68.5)		(92.0-109.6)	(96.0-117.6)	(249-1046.5)	(249-1025.5)	(99.2-100.0)	(83.0-144.0)	(5.8-10.0)
IPF	67.0	) 1/11	73.5	68.0	193.5	192.5	100%	92.6	6.4%
(n=12)	(66.3-78.5)		(66.3-82.5)	(61.0-79.0)	(110.5-666.8)	(110.5-651.8)	(99.4-100.0)	(48.7-147.2)	(3.4-10.2)
COPD*	73.5	6/8	61.1	95.9	165.5	164.5	97.8%	72.6	5.0%
(n=14)	(69.5-76.5)		(43.0-72.4)	(75.9-110.5)	(27.5-857.0)	(26.8-833.6)	(96.1-99.7)	(58.5-119.1)	(4.1-8.3)
Asthma	26.5	6/4	100.0	106.5	35.0	35.0	100.0%	100.2	7.0%
(n=10)	(21.8-32.0)		(95.8-107.5)	(101.8-117.3)	(13.5-144.0)	(13.5-143.8)	(100.0-100.0)	(70.2-136.2)	(4.9-9.5)
Bronchiectasis	72.0	2/4	59.3	71.9	500.5	492.5	99.3%	55.3	3.8%
(n=6)	(68.8-73.5)		(38.3-71.4)	(59.1-94.1)	(250.0-551.5)	(249.3-523.5)	(93.6-100.0)	(50.6-68.9)	(2.9-7.8)
Paediatric Subjects (n=10)	4.5 (3.5-7.5)	4/6	-	-	86.0 (30.5-423.0)	83.5 (30.5-423.0)	100.0% (100.0-100.0)	130.3 (92.4-248.6)	11.9% (6.6-19.0)
Healthy Volunteers	38.5	3/7	107.0	113.5	13.5	13.5	100%	148.9	10.3%
(n=10)	(27.0-03.3)	(101.0-120.3)	(90.8-123.3)	(2.3-23.3)	(2.3-22.3)	(100-100.0)	(77.7-190.3)	(3.4-13.0)	
Severe CC		-	_	327.0	327.0	100.0%	126.6	8.8%	
(n=60)			_	(157.5-643.8)	(157.5-641.3)	(99.7-100)	(82.2-199.8)	(5.7-13.9)	
<b>Overall</b> (n=143)	-	-	-	-	256.0 (80.0-587.0)	254.0 (77.0-587.0)	100.0% (99.5-100.0)	108.6 (73.1-168.7)	7.6% (5.1-12.1)