

**Title:** Towards long term monitoring: Seizure detection with reduced electroencephalogram channels

**Authors:** Christina Maher<sup>1,2,3\*</sup>, Yikai Yang<sup>1,2</sup>, Nhan Duy Truong<sup>1,2</sup>, Chenyu Wang<sup>3,5</sup>, Armin Nikpour<sup>4,5,†</sup>, Omid Kavehei<sup>1,2,†\*</sup>

1. School of Biomedical Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, The University of Sydney, NSW 2006, Australia.
  2. Australian Research Council Training Centre for Innovative BioEngineering, Faculty of Engineering, The University of Sydney, NSW 2006, Australia.
  3. Brain and Mind Centre, The University of Sydney, NSW 2006, Australia.
  4. Comprehensive Epilepsy Service and Department of Neurology at the Royal Prince Alfred Hospital, NSW 2050, Australia.
  5. Faculty of Medicine and Health, Central Clinical School, The University of Sydney, NSW 2006, Australia.
- † These authors contributed equally to this work

**Correspondence:** christina.maher@sydney.edu.au; Tel.: +61-2-8627-6812

First author's ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6023-9457>

Last author's ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2753-5553>

Number of manuscript text pages: 11

Number of words: 3178

Number of references: 66

Number of figures: 7

Number of tables: 1

# Towards long term monitoring: Seizure detection with reduced electroencephalogram channels

Christina Maher<sup>1,2,3\*</sup>, Yikai Yang<sup>1,2</sup>, Nhan Duy Truong<sup>1,2</sup>, Chenyu Wang<sup>3,5</sup>, Armin Nikpour<sup>4,5,†</sup>, Omid Kavehei<sup>1,2,†\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> School of Biomedical Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, The University of Sydney, NSW 2006, Australia.

<sup>2</sup> Australian Research Council Training Centre for Innovative BioEngineering, Faculty of Engineering, The University of Sydney, NSW 2006, Australia.

<sup>3</sup> Brain and Mind Centre, The University of Sydney, NSW 2006, Australia.

<sup>4</sup> Comprehensive Epilepsy Service and Department of Neurology at the Royal Prince Alfred Hospital, NSW 2050, Australia.

<sup>5</sup> Faculty of Medicine and Health, Central Clinical School, The University of Sydney, NSW 2006, Australia.

\* Correspondence: {christina.maher; omid.kavehei}@sydney.edu.au; Tel.: +61-2-8627-6812

† These authors contributed equally to this work.

**Abstract:** Epilepsy is a prevalent condition characterised by recurrent, unpredictable seizures. The diagnosis of epilepsy is by surface electroencephalography (EEG), a time-consuming and uncomfortable process for patients. The diagnosis of seizures using EEG over a brief monitoring period has variable success, dependent on patient tolerance and seizure frequency. Further, the availability of hospital resources, and hardware and software specifications inherently limit the capacity to perform long-term data collection whilst maintaining patient comfort. The application and maintenance of the standard number of electrodes restrict recording time to a maximum of approximately ten days. This limited monitoring period also results in limited data for machine learning models for seizure detection and classification. This work examines the literature on the impact of reduced electrodes on data accuracy and reliability in seizure detection. We present two electrode ranking models that demonstrate the decline in seizure detection performance associated with reducing electrodes. We assert the need for further research in electrode reduction to advance solutions toward portable, reliable devices that can simultaneously provide patient comfort, long-term monitoring and contribute to multimodal patient care solutions.

**Keywords:** electrode; electroencephalogram; epilepsy; seizure; seizure detection; machine learning; patient care

## 1. Introduction

Epilepsy is a severe neurological condition that affects millions of people worldwide. The main symptoms are recurrent seizures that can be a traumatic experience for the individual [1]. Epilepsy diagnosis requires attendance at a specialised epilepsy clinic or hospital. The lengthy process involves multiple tests, continuous electroencephalography (EEG) and video EEG (vEEG) monitoring, and if no seizures are recorded, may result in misdiagnosis. Currently, this process is conducted either in a hospital ward or via an ambulatory service by wearing the EEG device at home for several days. Additionally, a carer is usually required to be present for ward testing.

EEG data analysis is a lengthy process, mainly if seizures are not immediately evident on the surface EEG or vEEG. There may be no or little surface EEG change during focal seizures without impaired awareness. The incidence of false-positive diagnosis reportedly ranges from 2%-71% [2]. EEG monitoring is costly in financial, mental, physical and time resources. In 2016, the global prevalence of active epilepsy was 45.9 million individuals with 126, 055 epilepsy-related deaths, 13.5 million disability-adjusted-life-years, 5.9 million years of life lost (YLL), and 7.5 million years of life with a disability

33 (YLD) [3]. The risk of misdiagnosis must be weighed against that of a false positive  
34 diagnosis [2]. Therefore, improving EEG device portability and automated detection  
35 represents an essential advancement to facilitate effective diagnosis and treatment and  
36 enhance the patient journey.


37 This work serves to explain the routine clinical seizure detection process and present  
38 two channel selection algorithms developed in our lab. Our channel selection algorithms  
39 were applied to publicly available datasets, highlighting the difficulty in achieving high  
40 seizure detection performance with a lower number of channels. We discuss previous  
41 work that attempted to reduce the number of electrodes used in automated seizure  
42 detection models, and suggest their applications for improving long term monitoring  
43 solutions.

#### 44 *1.1. The need for electrode reduction*

45 Several factors support the focus on reducing the number of electrodes used in  
46 seizure detection. Technological advances have made automated seizure detection  
47 and device portability a near reality. Currently, the longest non-invasive surface EEG  
48 recording using wet or dry electrodes is around ten days. Applying abrasive gel to the  
49 scalp can irritate and damage the skin, yet it is compulsory for standard EEG electrodes.  
50 Mobile EEG systems must be comfortable and appealing to wear. Thus the portability  
51 of EEG systems represents a trade-off between electrode count and the quality of the  
52 signal. Achieving this balance in a portable EEG system would enable home EEG  
53 monitoring, potentially greatly improving patient comfort during the diagnosis process.  
54 Fig. 1 depicts the patient journey through the healthcare system from the first seizure  
55 through to epilepsy diagnosis.

56 Herta [4] and colleagues emphasised the value of fewer electrodes in circumstances  
57 where a 10-20 EEG system cannot be applied, such as in intensive care units (ICUs).  
58 Ambulatory monitoring is a potential beneficiary of reduced electrodes through auto-  
59 mated seizure logging, which is currently achieved through either ward monitoring or  
60 self-report. However, the accuracy of self-report is highly dependent on seizure-type,  
61 and patient ability [34]. Inaccurate seizure reporting impacts patient treatment and  
62 conflates reporting on the efficacy of treatments such as medication. Under-reporting of  
63 seizures is a long-standing and significant clinical problem [34–42]. Sub scalp electrodes,  
64 if shown to be a reliable method for recording EEG, can replace the need for patients  
65 to regularly attend clinics to have electrodes re-applied. Moreover, subcutaneous elec-  
66 trode systems purport to have a high agreement with surface EEG recordings [5]. Yet  
67 the number of electrodes in subcutaneous systems remains restricted; more than four  
68 electrodes are not ideal. Hence, improving automated seizure detection performance  
69 using a reduced number of surface electrodes is the first step towards reliable, long-term  
70 EEG monitoring solutions that can improve the patient journey.


71 Furthermore, patient-specific electrode reduction would improve recording of  
72 their specific seizure semiology. The number of required electrodes and electrode  
73 placement can be guided by a patient’s magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) scan and  
74 EEG. We recently examined the role of structural connectivity in seizure propagation  
75 in focal epilepsy patients [6]. Diffusion MRI can be a valuable aid for patient-specific  
76 determination of electrode placement. This paper is intended to extend our previous  
77 work by examining the best automated method for electrode based on EEG signals.  
78 Taken together, the individualised MRI data combined with the automated ranking  
79 of EEG signals can provide a patient-specific pipeline for seizure onset zone selection,  
80 which would indicate the optimal electrode placement and the number of electrodes to  
81 optimise automated seizure detection. Fig. 2 portrays a theoretical process for using both  
82 EEG and MRI to obtain the optimal electrode placement. Items (a) and (b) were explored  
83 in our previous work [6] whilst (c) and (d), circled in red, are examined in Section 4 of  
84 this paper.



**Figure 1.** Patient journey - two scenarios. This figure depicts the process and various settings where seizure detection and logging may take place. In the hospital setting (a, Journey A), a carer accompanies the patient. Patient comfort, mobility, and limited hospital resources restrict the length of time a patient can spend in the hospital. Conversely, the home setting (b, Journey B) facilitates patient comfort and mobility. Patients can continue their daily activities while being monitored for an extended duration. Unfortunately, improving patient comfort and mobility through home monitoring comes at the cost of diminished EEG recordings due to limitations imposed by the individual and their environment. For example, electrodes do not last long on the scalp, and the patient must inevitably return to the hospital or have a technician visit them to adjust or remove the electrodes. Avenues for improving this imperfect process lie in advancing the research in electrode reduction to enable long-term wearable solutions for the patient.

85 **2. Manual seizure detection**

86 Seizures are detected by monitoring the EEG signals. EEG is the gold standard used  
 87 to detect interictal, ictal and subclinical epileptic activity. This includes critical condi-  
 88 tions like status epilepticus [7,8]. Changes in EEG signals could represent spontaneous  
 89 electrical brain activities that exhibit dynamic, stochastic, nonlinear, non-stationary, and




**Figure 2.** MRI and EEG for optimal electrode placement. The MRI scans (T1 and diffusion) (a) are processed through an imaging pipeline to obtain tractography and tract-weighted tensor metrics (b). The EEG signals (c) are read and seizures detected using machine learning (ML) (d) and the most important electrodes per patient are selected (e). Lastly, the output of both the tract-weighted tensor metrics and the EEG electrode selection can be used by the clinicians to select the optimal placement for a wearable or implantable electrode.

90 complex behaviour with high temporal resolution. Typical EEG monitoring requires  
 91 up to 19 head, and two reference electrodes, based on the international 10–20 electrode  
 92 placement system [9]. This standard electrode placement is applied in a variety of set-  
 93 tings, including for inpatients in the hospital. In the context of ambulatory monitoring in  
 94 the home setting, a device with up to 19 electrodes may be used. For seizure monitoring  
 95 in neonates in the ICU, four electrodes are considered sufficient. The routine practice of  
 96 continuous EEG monitoring in ICUs affords a consensus on the reliability of a reduced  
 97 number of electrodes [10].

98 Electrode positioning and a typical ictal event are demonstrated in Fig. 3. Here, an  
 99 interictal period precedes an ictal event (red highlighted section), shown on a montage  
 100 of five channels out of the standard 21. In routine clinical practice, seizure onset and  
 101 type are identified, labelled and classified. Human experts (“expert”) may be nurses,  
 102 EEG technicians, neurophysiologists and neurologists, trained to detect seizures on the  
 103 EEG. The expert then labels the EEG with the seizure time, length and location. Usually,  
 104 EEG data recorded over an extended period yields reliable, interpretable EEG that can  
 105 inform clinical decisions.

### 106 3. Automated seizure detection

107 Computer-automated techniques, such as ML algorithms, can detect and label  
 108 seizures. EEG signal recordings and the amount of EEG recorded play a fundamental  
 109 role in the outcome of the seizure detection model [11]. Channel selection involves  
 110 reducing the number of electrodes to be analysed or utilising a range of feature selection  
 111 and classification techniques, or a combination of both [44,45,49,60]. The model is  
 112 trained either on individual patients or across all patients and then tested on the dataset  
 113 of interest [12,13].



**Figure 3.** EEG signals are recorded from electrodes placed on the scalp in the 10-20 format (a). The signals are then displayed on readout software. An EEG technician or neurologist then visually identifies and labels the interictal, pre-ictal and ictal phases (b).

114 Digital signal processing allows the extraction of common features of an EEG signal.  
115 Prior human studies examine engineered features such as relative average amplitude,  
116 relative scale energy, average cross-correlation function, relative power, bounded vari-  
117 ation [14], phase-amplitude coupling [15], root mean square [16], energy [17], median  
118 frequency [18], entropy [19,20], correlation dimension [21,22], maximal Lyapunov expo-  
119 nent [23], and skewness and kurtosis [24]. These features may be the sole focus of the  
120 model [20] or combined and applied to a selected EEG frequency band [25–27]. There  
121 are also options for direct extraction of features from raw EEG, or after a filter such as  
122 short-time Fourier transform (STFT) or wavelet transform is applied to the EEG.

123 In conventional ML methods, such as convolutional neural networks (CNN), the  
124 aim is to classify EEG signals [27,28]. EEG features are fed into the model, and addi-  
125 tional threshold mechanisms are then applied to the output of the training model via  
126 a “classifier” technique [29]. Common classifier techniques include but are not limited  
127 to Bayesian, K-nearest neighbours (KNN), decision tree, random forest, and support  
128 vector machine (SVM) classifiers [11]. Biomarkers for seizure susceptibility may help  
129 improve automated seizure detection models, yet tools for such exploration are limited.  
130 Our recent work examined biomarkers for seizure susceptibility using a Bayesian CNN  
131 based tool [31]. We showed interictal slowing activity was a promising feature for the  
132 investigation of seizure susceptibility prediction.

133 The reliance of automated seizure detection models on engineered features em-  
134 phasises the vulnerability of the model to changes in the electrode count, EEG artefacts  
135 and noise [30]. Individual human characteristics, such as hair and scalp thickness, and  
136 pathological state, also influence EEG recordings. Reducing electrodes whilst maintain-  
137 ing the fidelity of recordings demands the ML model and the electrode placement be  
138 patient-specific. Therefore electrode reduction is currently considered problematic and  
139 receives little enthusiasm in the clinical setting. The increased availability of sufficient  
140 and reliable EEG data is critical to the acceptance and translation of automated seizure  
141 detection into the clinical realm. The need for increased data can be met through a  
142 reduced electrode, long-term, implantable device.

## 143 4. Methods

### 144 4.1. Channel Selection Method 1

145 Our group previously used this random forest classifier method on the Kaggle  
146 iEEG dataset to rank channels in order of their contribution to the detection of a given  
147 seizure [50]. Here we apply it to the EPILEPSIAE scalp EEG dataset to test its utility on a

**Table 1:** Seizure detection with reduced channels, channel selection models, and/or reduced electrodes.

Reference	Dataset	No. E/C §	Patient specific	No. patients	Age group £	Total no. seizures	Sensitivity	Specificity
Birjandtalab <i>et al.</i> 2017 [43]	CHB-MIT	18 E	Y	23	P	–	80.87% (avg)	47.45%
Selvakumari <i>et al.</i> 2019 [44]	CHB-MIT	12 E	Y	23	P	–	95.70%	96.55%
Pisano <i>et al.</i> 2020 [45]	EPILEPSIAE (surface)	11 C	N	3	A	28	94%	95%
Herta <i>et al.</i> 2017 [4]	General Hospital Vienna †	6 E	N	83	–	–	84.99–93.39%	90.05–95.6%
Bhattacharyya <i>et al.</i> 2017 [46]	CHB-MIT	5 C	N	23	P	–	97.91%	99.57%
Moctezuma <i>et al.</i> 2020 [47]	CHB-MIT	4-6 C	Y	23	P	–	–	–
Shah <i>et al.</i> 2017 [48]	TUH EEG Seizure Corpus (TUSZ)	4-2 C	N	–	–	–	–	–
Kjaer <i>et al.</i> 2017 [49]	Rigshospitalet and Northzealand Hospital ‡	3 E	N	6	P	~8.75/pat.	98.40%	100%
Maher <i>et al.</i> 2021 (current paper)	EPILEPSIAE (surface)	6 C	Y	30	A	–	92.25(AUC)	
	TUH	5 C	Y	249	A	–	2.04%	

£ A for adult; P for pediatric.

§ E for electrodes; C for channels.

‡ This dataset is from Rigshospitalet and Northzealand Hospital.

† This group reported 9 electrodes had the highest sensitivity, but 6 electrodes performed best on their “RDA” model.


148 different dataset. The descriptive statistics of the EPILEPSIAE dataset are shown in Fig.  
149 4. The channel selection was patient-specific, meaning the channels selected as the best  
150 channels differed from patient to patient. The pseudo-code for the automatic channel  
151 selection (ACS) algorithm is shown below.

152 For the current paper, the ACS algorithm was used to select the 10 most important  
153 channels per patient on the EPILEPSIAE surface EEG dataset (on 30 patients). Next, the  
154 top 10 channels across the entire group of 30 patients were selected and fed into our  
155 seizure detection model. To test the performance of the 6 channels, we chose a subset  
156 of the top 6 channels from the top 10. The seizure detection model was then applied  
157 to the 6 channels. The average AUC score for 19, 10, and 6 channels was 98.03, 91.57,  
158 92.25, respectively. With just 6 channels, we observed an encouraging trend of improved  
159 performance on some patients; yet the number of false positives remained a challenge.

#### 160 4.2. Channel Selection Method 2

161 For this method of channel selection, we performed seizure detection on a subset of  
162 the TUH dataset. Descriptive statistics for the TUH dataset are shown in Fig. 5.

163 Channel selection for this method involves a combination of two approaches:



**Figure 4.** Descriptive statistics from the EPILEPSIAE dataset [51,52]. Gender is shown in (a), seizure type, and the number of seizures per patient is shown in (b). Age distribution (c) includes a shaded portion, which represents the number of years living with epilepsy. The seizure length and frequency of that seizure length is depicted in the heat-map in (c). Seizure frequency is shown in the colour bar, where darker colours represent a higher number of seizures and lighter colours represent a lower number of seizures.

164 **Approach 1.** Information from a single electrode was fed into a simple and fast  
 165 CNN structure (EEGNet, as seen in [53]), which has been widely used in the brain-  
 166 computer interface domain. Channels were then selected by ranking valuation accuracy.  
 167 The final channel selection decision was based on the ranking results of the two channels.  
 168 A further experiment on the high-ranking channels was also conducted (Approach 2).  
 169 The procedures are shown in Fig. 6.

170 **Approach 2.** A fast single electrode training was conducted to rank the channels.  
 171 The classifier was trained to feed one electrode one time and rank channels based on the  
 172 valuation accuracy. To make this method less time-costly, we trained only one epoch for  
 173 comparison as there were a total of 21 electrodes to test. Unlike previously mentioned  
 174 methods which use frequency information in training, this approach trains the raw EEG  
 175 directly. The final channel ranking heat-map is shown in Fig. 7.

176 We combined the results of the two electrode ranking methods based on (1) The  
 177 importance value from approach one, which reflects how often it is used during training  
 178 in the random forest classifier; (2) The valuation accuracy from approach two, which  
 179 reflects the first epoch results when we put a signal electrode into a fast structure training.



---


**Algorithm 1** Automatic channel selection

---

**Require:**  $X$ : FFT of 1-s EEG windows, size of  $(n_{\text{samples}}, n_{\text{features}}, n_{\text{channels}})$ ;  $y$ : label, ictal or interictal

- 1:  $X_r = \text{Reshape}(X, (n_{\text{samples}}, n_{\text{features}} \times n_{\text{channels}}))$
- 2: *Maintain order so that Reshape function is reversible*
- 3: Train a Random Forest classifier to fit  $(X_r, y)$
- 4: Store the frequencies of being used by the RF classifier for each feature in an array  $I$  with a shape of  $(n_{\text{features}} \times n_{\text{channels}})^\dagger$ .
- 5:  $I_r = \text{Reshape}(I, (\text{features}, n_{\text{channels}}))$
- 6:  $I_s = \text{Sum}(I_r, \text{along } n_{\text{channels}} \text{ axis})$
- 7:  $I_s$  has a shape of  $(n_{\text{channels}})$
- 8: Sort  $I_s$  in descending order.
- 9: Indices of top values are indices of the most important EEG channels

$^\dagger$  This can be achieved via method `feature_importances_()` if using scikit-learn (tested with version 0.24.0). The method returns an array with a shape of  $(n_{\text{features}} \times n_{\text{channels}})$ .




**Figure 5.** Descriptive statistics from the TUH dataset. Gender distribution is shown in (a), and total number of seizures per patient is shown in (b). The seizure length and frequency of a specific seizure length is depicted in the heat-map in (c). Seizure frequency is shown in the colour bar, where darker colours represent higher number of seizures and lighter colours represent a lower number of seizures.

180 **5. Results**


181 As seen in Fig. 7, the five electrodes F3, F7, P3, O1, and O2 ranked the highest. The  
 182 electrodes were paired in the format F3-F7 and P3-O1 as these were two pairs of nearby  
 183 electrodes, to give the two-channel format that was fed into the model. The purpose  
 184 of the two approaches for channel selection was to make the selection more reliable.  
 185 Interestingly, literature shows that left temporal lobe epilepsy is a common epilepsy  
 186 type, with focal seizures in the left temporal lobe being the most common seizure type.  
 187 Our model achieved a sensitivity score of 2.04, which reaches 0.17 FA/24 hrs using only  
 188 two channels. The modest results highlight the challenges in EEG seizure detection  
 189 with a minimal number of electrodes.

190 **6. Discussion**

191 Given the challenges in automated seizure detection and logging, a portable, re-  
 192 duced electrode device would be invaluable for patients. Such a device could materialise  
 193 as a sub scalp implant with as little as three electrodes tailored to patient-specific seizure  
 194 detection. A sub scalp implant would address the long-term monitoring needs of indi-



**Figure 6.** Channel ranking and selection procedure.



**Figure 7.** Channel ranking heat-map. Color changing from blue to red indicates increasing ranking of the electrodes.

195 viduals with intractable epilepsy who are unsuitable for surgery. The device could act as  
196 a monitor to guard against sudden unexpected death in epilepsy (SUDEP), prevalent  
197 in low resource countries [54,55]. However, the reduced electrode device must record  
198 EEG signals and detect and log seizures reliably to be clinically useful. Unfortunately,  
199 research into incumbent devices has yielded mixed results [56]. A summary of prior  
200 research is in Table 1.

201 A foundational study by Shih *et al.* used a greedy backward elimination algorithm  
202 to select a subset of seven features that produce the lowest false positive rate from  
203 each channel [61]. The reduced number of channels was between 18 and 4.6, achieving  
204 improvement in false-positive rate (FPR), from 0.35/hr to 0.19/hr, yet sensitivity and  
205 detection delay worsened, from 99% to 97% and 7.8 s to 11.2 s, respectively. More  
206 recently, Moctezuma and Molinas compared the popular backward greedy elimination  
207 algorithm with two versions of the nondominated sorting genetic algorithm (NSGA),  
208 NSGA-II and NSGA-III [47]. They achieved an accuracy ranging between 0.98 and 1  
209 using one to two channels, comparable to their detection result with the full electrode  
210 count (accuracy ranged from 1 to 0.97).

211 The role of variance contributed by individual channels has been widely explored.  
212 Duun-Henriksen *et al.* reduced channels by selecting the largest variance in channels,  
213 achieving a detection performance on three channels near equivalent to a clinical neuro-  
214 physiologist's review on the same dataset EEG [62]. Birjandtalab *et al.* used a random  
215 forest algorithm to determine which channels contributed the most variation to dis-  
216 crimination of seizure versus non-seizure events [43]. However, their minimal channel  
217 reduction, from 23 to 18 channels, provides little difference in clinical application where  
218 the patients still wear 18 electrodes. Bhattacharya and colleagues pre-selected 5 out of  
219 23 channels to perform a multivariate analysis of EEG signals [46]. The one channel  
220 that displayed the least standard deviation informed the selection of the remaining four  
221 channels based on their inter-dependency level and similarity to the first channel. The  
222 model's performance ranged from 0.95 to 0.99, making it comparable to other channel  
223 selection methods.

224 A unique approach by Shah *et al.* focused on domain knowledge to inform the  
225 channel selection [48]. They exploited insights on brain hemisphere function, the prox-  
226 imity of a given electrode to other electrodes, electrode position on the scalp, and the  
227 region the electrode covered in terms of signal capture. Their eight electrode montage  
228 produced the most favourable results, yet the authors affirmed the scarcity of superior  
229 techniques that permit electrode reduction whilst maintaining model sensitivity. A rare  
230 prospective study by Kjaer *et al.* investigated automated seizure detection in a paediatric  
231 population of six patients aged 7–12 years [49]. Using three electrodes, with respective  
232 references, they achieved a mean sensitivity of 98.4%, a specificity of 100% and a mean  
233 false detection rate of 5.5 per 24/hr. Their study lacked comparisons to a full set of  
234 electrodes, but the prospective study design and facilitation of at home device usage  
235 made this an exemplar study. Further efforts in the vein of the discussed fundamental  
236 works would be invaluable for the seizure detection community.

### 237 6.1. Limitations of reduced channels

238 Technological challenges prevail in data collection and hardware design. Stevenson  
239 *et al.* [57] found electrode reduction negatively impacted visual interpretation by human  
240 experts. They misjudged seizure burden, and seizure annotation was significantly higher  
241 when they used 19 rather than eight electrodes. Rubin *et al.* [59] had two epileptolo-  
242 gists label cases as seizure or no seizure. When compared to ground truth data, the  
243 epileptologists achieved a combined 70% sensitivity and 96% specificity for seizure  
244 detection. The reduced arrays were believed to contribute to the inferior sensitivity  
245 score. Herta and colleagues compared human expert seizure annotations in ICU EEG  
246 recordings with an automated electrode reduction model [4]. They reduced electrodes in  
247 a step-wise fashion, calculating sensitivity and specificity for each eliminated electrode.

248 They deemed a minimum of nine electrodes requisite to detect the ictal patterns that the  
249 human experts detected.

250 Channel selection studies highlight the wealth of possibilities in channel selection  
251 model combinations. However model combinations, and the interchangeably used  
252 terms “electrode” and “channel,” make delineation, comparison and reproducibility of  
253 best-in-class models challenging. The impositions described in the literature illustrate  
254 the need for further research.

255 Since EEG is an established and reliable method for capturing and identifying  
256 seizure activity, its utility would be amplified if it were evolved beyond the current  
257 non-mobile state. A portable device with only a few electrodes would enable long-term  
258 recordings, providing rich neurophysiological data for patient-specific data process-  
259 ing. Greater access to data could increase researchers’ proclivity to upgrade existing  
260 EEG solutions. Transforming the existing solutions from a diagnosis-only state to a  
261 seizure logging and management aid for clinicians and patients will enhance the patient  
262 journey. Neurobehavioural and psychiatric comorbidities of epilepsy might be better  
263 understood [63,64]. The diagnosis and treatment pathways for epilepsy comorbidities  
264 could be optimised [65,66]. Automated seizure detection models could be refined and  
265 enhanced by the addition of selective biomarkers. Although the two electrode selection  
266 models proposed by our group were encouraging, they signify the difficulty in achieving  
267 optimal performance. Despite the first model producing improved results for some,  
268 most patients’ performance declined as electrodes were reduced from 19 to 6. The results  
269 from the second model were concurrent with the literature, yet the model’s average false  
270 alarm score would be unacceptable in a clinical setting. Further prospective studies that  
271 elucidate dependable methods for reducing electrodes can pave the way for improving  
272 patient care.

## 273 **7. Conclusion**

274 The impact of electrode reduction on both human and computer seizure detection  
275 performance is problematic. Deterioration in performance is often attributed to the  
276 reduced availability and accuracy of the EEG data. We propose that a resurgence of  
277 research into electrode reduction in the clinical setting will support the development of  
278 portable, reliable devices, thereby enabling long-term monitoring and enhancing patient  
279 quality of life.

280 **Author Contributions:** Conceptualization, C.M. and O.K.; methodology, C.M., Y.Y., N.T., A.N.  
281 and O.K.; data analysis, C.M., Y.Y., N.T., and O.K.; investigation, C.M., Y.Y. and N.T.; data curation,  
282 C.M., Y.Y. and N.T.; Writing-original draft preparation, C.M., N.T., C.W., A.N., and O.K.; Writing-  
283 review and editing, C.M., Y.Y., N.T., C.W., A.N., and O.K.; supervision, C.W., A.N., and O.K.; All  
284 authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

285 **Funding:** This research was funded by a Microsoft AI for Accessibility grant and The University  
286 of Sydney SOAR Fellowship.

287 **Acknowledgments:** Christina Maher acknowledges the scholarship support from  
288 the Nerve Research Foundation. Omid Kavehei acknowledges the partial support provided by  
289 The University of Sydney through a SOAR Fellowship and Microsoft’s partial support through a  
290 Microsoft AI for Accessibility grant.

291 **Conflicts of Interest:** The authors declare no conflict of interest.

## 292 **References**

- 293 1. Pohlmann-Eden, B.; Beghi, E.; Camfield, C.; Camfield, P. The first seizure and its management  
294 in adults and children. *BMJ* **2006**, *332*, 339–342.
- 295 2. Oto, M.M. The misdiagnosis of epilepsy: appraising risks and managing uncertainty. *Seizure*  
296 **2017**, *44*, 143–146.
- 297 3. Beghi, E.; Giussani, G.; Nichols, E.; Abd-Allah, F.; Abdela, J.; Abdelalim, A.; Abraha, H.N.;  
298 Adib, M.G.; Agrawal, S.; Alahdab, F.; others. Global, regional, and national burden of

- 299 epilepsy, 1990–2016: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2016. *The*  
300 *Lancet Neurology* **2019**, *18*, 357–375.
- 301 4. Herta, J.; Koren, J.; Furbass, F.; Hartmann, M.; Gruber, A.; Baumgartner, C. Reduced electrode  
302 arrays for the automated detection of rhythmic and periodic patterns in the intensive care  
303 unit: frequently tried, frequently failed? *Clinical Neurophysiology* **2017**, *128*, 1524–1531.
- 304 5. Duun-Henriksen, J.; Baud, M.; Richardson, M.P.; Cook, M.; Kouvas, G.; Heasman, J.M.;  
305 Friedman, D.; Peltola, J.; Zibrandtsen, I.C.; Kjaer, T.W. A new era in electroencephalographic  
306 monitoring? Subscalp devices for ultra-long-term recordings. *Epilepsia* **2020**, *61*, 1805–1817.
- 307 6. Maher, C.; D’Souza, A.; Zeng, R.; Barnett, M.; Kavehei, O.; Nikpour, A.; Wang, C.  
308 White matter changes in focal to bilateral tonic-clonic seizures. *medRxiv preprint*, **2021**,  
309 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.21.21265249>.
- 310 7. Benbadis, S.R.; Beniczky, S.; Bertram, E.; MacIver, S.; Moshé, S.L. The role of EEG in patients  
311 with suspected epilepsy. *Epileptic Disorders* **2020**, *22*, 143–155.
- 312 8. Radhakrishnan, K. The Role of EEG in the Diagnosis and Classification of Epilepsy Syn-  
313 dromes: A Tool for Clinical Practice by the ILAE Neurophysiology Task Force. *Journal of*  
314 *Clinical Neurophysiology* **2020**, *37*, 87.
- 315 9. Jurcak, V.; Tsuzuki, D.; Dan, I. 10/20, 10/10, and 10/5 systems revisited: their validity as  
316 relative head-surface-based positioning systems. *Neuroimage* **2007**, *34*, 1600–1611.
- 317 10. Caricato, A.; Della Marca, G.; Ioannoni, E.; Silva, S.; Markushi, T.B.; Stival, E.; Biasucci, D.G.;  
318 Montano, N.; Gelormini, C.; Melchionda, I. Continuous EEG monitoring by a new simplified  
319 wireless headset in intensive care unit. *BMC Anesthesiology* **2020**, *20*, 1–6.
- 320 11. Siddiqui, M.K.; Morales-Menendez, R.; Huang, X.; Hussain, N. A review of epileptic seizure  
321 detection using machine learning classifiers. *Brain Informatics* **2020**, *7*, 1–18.
- 322 12. Khan, Y.; Gotman, J. Wavelet based automatic seizure detection in intracerebral electroen-  
323 cephalogram. *Clinical Neurophysiology* **2003**, *114*, 898–908.
- 324 13. Varsavsky, A.; Mareels, I. Patient un-specific detection of epileptic seizures through changes  
325 in variance. *Proc. IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society* **2006**, pp. 3747–3750.
- 326 14. Kuhlmann, L.; Burkitt, A.N.; Cook, M.J.; Fuller, K.; Grayden, D.B.; Seiderer, L.; Mareels, I.M.  
327 Seizure detection using seizure probability estimation: Comparison of features used to detect  
328 seizures. *Annals of Biomedical Engineering* **2009**, *37*, 2129–2145.
- 329 15. Edakawa, K.; Yanagisawa, T.; Kishima, H.; Fukuma, R.; Oshino, S.; Khoo, H.M.; Kobayashi,  
330 M.; Tanaka, M.; Yoshimine, T. Detection of epileptic seizures using phase–amplitude coupling  
331 in intracranial electroencephalography. *Scientific Reports* **2016**, *6*, 25422.
- 332 16. Patnaik, L.M.; Manyam, O.K. Epileptic EEG detection using neural networks and post-  
333 classification. *Computer Methods and Programs in Biomedicine* **2008**, *91*, 100–109.
- 334 17. Omerhodzic, I.; Avdakovic, S.; Nuhanovic, A.; Dizdarevic, K. Energy distribution of EEG  
335 signals: EEG signal wavelet-neural network classifier. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1307.7897* **2013**.
- 336 18. Wang, N.; Lyu, M.R. Exploration of instantaneous amplitude and frequency features for  
337 epileptic seizure prediction. *Proc. Bioinformatics & Bioengineering (BIBE)* **2012**, pp. 292–297.
- 338 19. Kannathal, N.; Choo, M.L.; Acharya, U.R.; Sadasivan, P. Entropies for detection of epilepsy  
339 in EEG. *Computer Methods and Programs in Biomedicine* **2005**, *80*, 187–194.
- 340 20. Yuan, Q.; Zhou, W.; Liu, Y.; Wang, J. Epileptic seizure detection with linear and nonlinear  
341 features. *Epilepsy & Behavior* **2012**, *24*, 415–421.
- 342 21. Acharya, U.R.; Sree, S.V.; Swapna, G.; Martis, R.J.; Suri, J.S. Automated EEG analysis of  
343 epilepsy: a review. *Knowledge-Based Systems* **2013**, *45*, 147–165.
- 344 22. Aarabi, A.; He, B. A rule-based seizure prediction method for focal neocortical epilepsy.  
345 *Clinical Neurophysiology* **2012**, *123*, 1111–1122.
- 346 23. Adeli, H.; Ghosh-Dastidar, S.; Dadmehr, N. A wavelet-chaos methodology for analysis of  
347 EEGs and EEG subbands to detect seizure and epilepsy. *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical*  
348 *Engineering* **2007**, *54*, 205–211.
- 349 24. Aarabi, A.; Fazel-Rezai, R.; Aghakhani, Y. EEG seizure prediction: measures and challenges.  
350 *Proc. IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society* **2009**, pp. 1864–1867.
- 351 25. Hopfengärtner, R.; Kasper, B.S.; Graf, W.; Gollwitzer, S.; Kreiselmeier, G.; Stefan, H.; Hamer,  
352 H. Automatic seizure detection in long-term scalp EEG using an adaptive thresholding  
353 technique: a validation study for clinical routine. *Clinical Neurophysiology* **2014**, *125*, 1346–  
354 1352.
- 355 26. Hassan, A.R.; Siuly, S.; Zhang, Y. Epileptic seizure detection in EEG signals using tunable-Q  
356 factor wavelet transform and bootstrap aggregating. *Computer Methods and Programs in*  
357 *Biomedicine* **2016**, *137*, 247–259.

- 358 27. Das, A.B.; Bhuiyan, M.I.H. Discrimination and classification of focal and non-focal EEG  
359 signals using entropy-based features in the EMD-DWT domain. *Biomedical Signal Processing*  
360 *and Control* **2016**, *29*, 11–21.
- 361 28. Zabihi, M.; Kiranyaz, S.; Rad, A.B.; Katsaggelos, A.K.; Gabbouj, M.; Ince, T. Analysis of  
362 high-dimensional phase space via Poincaré section for patient-specific seizure detection.  
363 *IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering* **2015**, *24*, 386–398.
- 364 29. Alotaiby, T.N.; Alshebeili, S.A.; Alshawi, T.; Ahmad, I.; Abd El-Samie, F.E. EEG seizure  
365 detection and prediction algorithms: A survey. *EURASIP Journal on Advances in Signal*  
366 *Processing* **2014**, *2014*, 183.
- 367 30. Baumgartner, C.; Koren, J.P.; Rothmayer, M. Automatic computer-based detection of epileptic  
368 seizures. *Frontiers in Neurology* **2018**, *9*, 639.
- 369 31. Truong, N.; Yang, Y.; Maher, C.; Kuhlmann, L.; McEwan, A.; Nikpour, A.; Kavehei, O. Seizure  
370 susceptibility prediction in uncontrolled epilepsy. *Frontiers in Neurology* **2021**, *12*, 721491.
- 371 32. Bramlett, H.M.; Dietrich, W.D. Long-term consequences of traumatic brain injury: current  
372 status of potential mechanisms of injury and neurological outcomes. *Journal of Neurotrauma*  
373 **2015**, *32*, 1834–1848.
- 374 33. Kubota, Y.; Nakamoto, H.; Egawa, S.; Kawamata, T. Continuous EEG monitoring in ICU.  
375 *Journal of Intensive Care* **2018**, *6*, 39.
- 376 34. Hoppe, C.; Poepel, A.; Elger, C.E. Epilepsy: accuracy of patient seizure counts. *Archives of*  
377 *Neurology* **2007**, *64*, 1595–1599.
- 378 35. Tatum IV, W.O.; Winters, L.; Gieron, M.; Passaro, E.A.; Benbadis, S.; Ferreira, J.; Liporace, J.  
379 Outpatient seizure identification: results of 502 patients using computer-assisted ambulatory  
380 EEG. *Journal of Clinical Neurophysiology* **2001**, *18*, 14–19.
- 381 36. Kerling, F.; Mueller, S.; Pauli, E.; Stefan, H. When do patients forget their seizures? An  
382 electroclinical study. *Epilepsy & Behavior* **2006**, *9*, 281–285.
- 383 37. Poochikian-Sarkissian, S.; Tai, P.; del Campo, M.; Andrade, D.M.; Carlen, P.L.; Valiante, T.;  
384 Wennberg, R.A. Patient awareness of seizures as documented in the epilepsy monitoring  
385 unit. *Canadian Journal of Neuroscience Nursing* **2009**, *31*, 22–23.
- 386 38. Akman, C.I.; Montenegro, M.A.; Jacob, S.; Eck, K.; Chiriboga, C.; Gilliam, F. Seizure frequency  
387 in children with epilepsy: factors influencing accuracy and parental awareness. *Seizure* **2009**,  
388 *18*, 524–529.
- 389 39. DuBois, J.; Boylan, L.; Shiyko, M.; Barr, W.; Devinsky, O. Seizure prediction and recall.  
390 *Epilepsy & Behavior* **2010**, *18*, 106–109.
- 391 40. Fattouch, J.; Di Bonaventura, C.; Lapenta, L.; Casciato, S.; Fanella, M.; Morano, A.; Manfredi,  
392 M.; Giallonardo, A. Epilepsy, unawareness of seizures and driving license: the potential role  
393 of 24-hour ambulatory EEG in defining seizure freedom. *Epilepsy & Behavior* **2012**, *25*, 32–35.
- 394 41. Cook, M.J.; O'Brien, T.J.; Berkovic, S.F.; Murphy, M.; Morokoff, A.; Fabinyi, G.; D'Souza, W.;  
395 Yerra, R.; Archer, J.; Litewka, L.; others. Prediction of seizure likelihood with a long-term,  
396 implanted seizure advisory system in patients with drug-resistant epilepsy: A first-in-man  
397 study. *The Lancet Neurology* **2013**, *12*, 563–571.
- 398 42. Van Paesschen, W. The future of seizure detection. *The Lancet Neurology* **2018**, *17*, 200–202.
- 399 43. Birjandtalab, J.; Pouyan, M.B.; Cogan, D.; Nourani, M.; Harvey, J. Automated seizure  
400 detection using limited-channel EEG and non-linear dimension reduction. *Computers in*  
401 *Biology and Medicine* **2017**, *82*, 49–58.
- 402 44. Selvakumari, R.S.; Mahalakshmi, M.; Prashalee, P. Patient-specific seizure detection method  
403 using hybrid classifier with optimized electrodes. *Journal of Medical Systems* **2019**, *43*, 121.
- 404 45. Pisano, F.; Sias, G.; Fanni, A.; Cannas, B.; Dourado, A.; Pisano, B.; Teixeira, C.A. Convolutional  
405 Neural Network for Seizure Detection of Nocturnal Frontal Lobe Epilepsy. *Complexity*  
406 **2020**, *2020*.
- 407 46. Bhattacharyya, A.; Pachori, R.B. A multivariate approach for patient-specific EEG seizure  
408 detection using empirical wavelet transform. *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering*  
409 **2017**, *64*, 2003–2015.
- 410 47. Moctezuma, L.A.; Molinas, M. EEG Channel-selection method for epileptic-seizure classification  
411 based on multi-objective optimization. *Frontiers in Neuroscience* **2020**, *14*, 593.
- 412 48. Shah, V.; Golmohammadi, M.; Ziyabari, S.; Von Weltin, E.; Obeid, I.; Picone, J. Optimizing  
413 channel selection for seizure detection. *Proc. IEEE Signal Processing in Medicine and Biology*  
414 *Symposium (SPMB)* **2017**, pp. 1–5.

- 415 49. Kjaer, T.W.; Sorensen, H.B.; Groenborg, S.; Pedersen, C.R.; Duun-Henriksen, J. Detection of  
416 paroxysms in long-term, single-channel EEG-monitoring of patients with typical absence  
417 seizures. *IEEE Journal of Translational Engineering in Health and Medicine* **2017**, *5*, 1–8.
- 418 50. Truong, N.D.; Kuhlmann, L.; Bonyadi, M.R.; Yang, J.; Faulks, A.; Kavehei, O. Supervised  
419 learning in automatic channel selection for epileptic seizure detection. *Expert Systems with  
420 Applications* **2017**, *86*, 199–207.
- 421 51. Klatt, J.; Feldwisch-Drentrup, H.; Ihle, M.; Navarro, V.; Neufang, M.; Teixeira, C.; Adam,  
422 C.; Valderrama, M.; Alvarado-Rojas, C.; Witon, A.; others. The EPILEPSIAE database: An  
423 extensive electroencephalography database of epilepsy patients. *Epilepsia* **2012**, *53*, 1669–  
424 1676.
- 425 52. Ihle, M.; Feldwisch-Drentrup, H.; Teixeira, C.A.; Witon, A.; Schelter, B.; Timmer, J.; Schulze-  
426 Bonhage, A. EPILEPSIAE—A European epilepsy database. *Computer Methods and Programs in  
427 Biomedicine* **2012**, *106*, 127–138.
- 428 53. Lawhern, V.J.; Solon, A.J.; Waytowich, N.R.; Gordon, S.M.; Hung, C.P.; Lance, B.J. EEGNet: a  
429 compact convolutional neural network for EEG-based brain–computer interfaces. *Journal of  
430 Neural Engineering* **2018**, *15*, 056013.
- 431 54. Young, G.B.; Sharpe, M.D.; Savard, M.; Al Thenayan, E.; Norton, L.; Davies-Schinkel, C.  
432 Seizure detection with a commercially available bedside EEG monitor and the subhairline  
433 montage. *Neurocritical Care* **2009**, *11*, 411.
- 434 55. Muraja-Murro, A.; Mervaala, E.; Westernen-Punnonen, S.; Lepola, P.; Töyräs, J.; Myllymaa,  
435 S.; Julkunen, P.; Kantanen, A.M.; Kälviäinen, R.; Myllymaa, K. Forehead EEG electrode set  
436 versus full-head scalp EEG in 100 patients with altered mental state. *Epilepsy & Behavior* **2015**,  
437 *49*, 245–249.
- 438 56. Brenner, J.M.; Kent, P.; Wojcik, S.M.; Grant, W. Rapid diagnosis of nonconvulsive status  
439 epilepticus using reduced-lead electroencephalography. *Western Journal of Emergency Medicine*  
440 **2015**, *16*, 442.
- 441 57. Stevenson, N.J.; Lauronen, L.; Vanhatalo, S. The effect of reducing EEG electrode number  
442 on the visual interpretation of the human expert for neonatal seizure detection. *Clinical  
443 Neurophysiology* **2018**, *129*, 265–270.
- 444 58. Yamaguchi, H.; Nagase, H.; Nishiyama, M.; Tokumoto, S.; Ishida, Y.; Tomioka, K.; Tanaka,  
445 T.; Fujita, K.; Toyoshima, D.; Nishimura, N.; others. Nonconvulsive seizure detection by  
446 reduced-lead electroencephalography in children with altered mental status in the emergency  
447 department. *The Journal of Pediatrics* **2019**, *207*, 213–219.
- 448 59. Rubin, M.N.; Jeffery, O.J.; Fugate, J.E.; Britton, J.W.; Cascino, G.D.; Worrell, G.A.; Hocker, S.E.;  
449 Wijdicks, E.F.; Rabinstein, A.A. Efficacy of a reduced electroencephalography electrode array  
450 for detection of seizures. *The Neurohospitalist* **2014**, *4*, 6–8.
- 451 60. Alotaiby, T.; Abd El-Samie, F.E.; Alshebeili, S.A.; Ahmad, I. A review of channel selection  
452 algorithms for EEG signal processing. *EURASIP Journal on Advances in Signal Processing* **2015**,  
453 *2015*, 66.
- 454 61. Shih, E.I.; Shoeb, A.H.; Gutttag, J.V. Sensor selection for energy-efficient ambulatory medical  
455 monitoring. *Proc. Mobile Systems, Applications, and Services* **2009**, pp. 347–358.
- 456 62. Duun-Henriksen, J.; Kjaer, T.W.; Madsen, R.E.; Remvig, L.S.; Thomsen, C.E.; Sorensen, H.B.D.  
457 Channel selection for automatic seizure detection. *Clinical Neurophysiology* **2012**, *123*, 84–92.
- 458 63. Lin, J.J.; Mula, M.; Hermann, B.P. Uncovering the neurobehavioural comorbidities of epilepsy  
459 over the lifespan. *The Lancet* **2012**, *380*, 1180–1192.
- 460 64. Helmstaedter, C.; Aldenkamp, A.; Baker, G.; Mazarati, A.; Ryvlin, P.; Sankar, R. Disentangling  
461 the relationship between epilepsy and its behavioral comorbidities—the need for prospective  
462 studies in new-onset epilepsies. *Epilepsy & Behavior* **2014**, *31*, 43–47.
- 463 65. Spencer, D.D.; Gerrard, J.L.; Zaveri, H.P. The roles of surgery and technology in understand-  
464 ing focal epilepsy and its comorbidities. *The Lancet Neurology* **2018**, *17*, 373–382.
- 465 66. Roach, A.T.I.; Chaitanya, G.; Riley, K.O.; Muhlhofer, W.; Pati, S. Optimizing therapies for  
466 neurobehavioral comorbidities of epilepsy using chronic ambulatory electrocorticography.  
467 *Epilepsy & Behavior* **2020**, *102*, 106814.