

RBDAct: Home screening of REM sleep behaviour disorder based on wrist actigraphy in Parkinson's patients.

Flavio Raschellà¹, Stefano Scafa^{2,3,4}, Alessandro Puiatti⁴, Eduardo Martin Moraud^{2,3*} and Pietro-Luca Ratti^{5*}

¹ Onera Health, 5617 BD Eindhoven, The Netherlands

² Defitech Centre for Interventional Neurotherapies (.NeuroRestore), Lausanne University Hospital and Ecole Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne (EPFL), Switzerland

³ Department of Clinical Neurosciences, Lausanne University Hospital (CHUV), Lausanne, Switzerland

⁴ Institute of Digital Technologies for Personalized Healthcare (MedITech), University of Applied Sciences and Arts of Southern Switzerland, Lugano, Switzerland

⁵ Neurocenter of Southern Switzerland, Ente Ospedaliero Cantonale, Lugano, Switzerland.

* These authors contributed equally to this work

Correspondence to

Pietro Luca Ratti
Neurocenter of Southern Switzerland
Ente Ospedaliero Cantonale
via Tesserete, 46
CH-6903 Lugano, Switzerland
e-mail: pietroluca.ratti@gmail.com

Word count (excluding title page, abstract, references, figures and tables): **3488**

ABSTRACT

Background:

REM sleep behaviour disorder (RBD) is a disabling, often overlooked sleep disorder affecting up to 70% of patients with Parkinson's disease. Identifying and treating RBD is critical to prevent severe sleep-related injuries, both to patients and bedpartners. Current diagnosis relies on nocturnal video-polysomnography, which is an expensive and cumbersome exam requiring specific clinical expertise.

Objectives:

To design, optimise, and validate a novel home-screening tool, termed RBDAct, that automatically identifies RBD in Parkinson's patients based on wrist actigraphy only.

Methods:

Twenty-six Parkinson's patients underwent two-week home wrist actigraphy worn on their more affected arm, followed by two non-consecutive in-lab evaluations. Patients were classified as RBD versus non-RBD based on dream enactment history and video-polysomnography. We characterised patients' movement patterns during sleep using raw tri-axial accelerometer signals from wrist actigraphy. Machine learning classification algorithms were then trained to discriminate between patients with or without RBD using actigraphic features that described patients' movements. Classification performance was quantified with respect to clinical diagnosis, separately for in-lab and at-home recordings.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

47

48 **Results:**

49 Classification performance from in-lab actigraphic data reached an accuracy of 92.9±8.16% (sensitivity
50 94.9±7.4%, specificity 92.7±13.8%). When tested on home recordings, accuracy rose to 100% over the two-
51 week window. Features showed robustness across tests and conditions.

52

53 **Conclusions:**

54 RBDAct provides reliable predictions of RBD in Parkinson's patients based on home wrist actigraphy only.
55 These results open new perspectives for faster, cheaper and more regular screening of sleep disorders, both
56 for routine clinical practice and for clinical trials.

57

58 **Keywords:** REM sleep behaviour disorder; Parkinson's disease; Actigraphy; Machine learning; Home
59 screening tool.

60

61 **INTRODUCTION**

62 REM sleep behaviour disorder (RBD) is a sleep disorder affecting up to 70% of patients with Parkinson's
63 disease (PD)¹. Patients with RBD exhibit movements and dream enactment behaviours during sleep which
64 can be vigorous, sometimes violent and harmful². Diagnosing and treating RBD is of pivotal importance to
65 prevent severe injuries to patients and their bedpartners.

66 Isolated RBD represents an early stage of PD or other synucleinopathies³, and can precede for several years
67 more overt clinical manifestations of these disorders^{4,5}. Its early diagnosis offers a unique window to evaluate
68 disease-modifying effects of upcoming treatments⁶. Additionally, PD phenotypes that are associated with
69 RBD tend to be more aggressive and to exhibit more motor complications. They are also more often
70 accompanied by cognitive, behavioural and dysautonomic symptoms⁷. Identifying RBD in PD can thus
71 provide fundamental insights to inform clinical practice, both from a therapeutical and prognostic point of
72 view⁸.

73 RBD remains an overlooked and underrecognized phenomenon even among movement disorders specialists.
74 RBD diagnosis requires nocturnal video-polysomnography (VPSG)², which is a costly, time-consuming exam
75 that is only accessible in specialised centres and can be burdensome for patients.

76 Current screening tools rely on questionnaires or interviews. However, these approaches are often subjective,
77 and can either not be available for community-dwelling individuals⁹ or require the presence of a bedpartner¹⁰.
78 In Parkinson's patients, their reliability to capture RBD is not well established¹¹⁻¹³. Little progress has been
79 made in the development of objective screening tools for RBD diagnosis in everyday life settings. This would
80 be a mainstay to better understand RBD manifestations and their changes over time, and to assess treatment
81 efficacy during clinical trials and clinical routine⁶.

82 In this study, we designed and validated a novel, wearable approach for identifying RBD automatically at
83 home in PD patients. We combined actigraphic technology and state-of-the-art machine learning algorithms
84 that were optimised in controlled clinical settings and translated to home environments.

85

86 PATIENTS AND METHODS

87 Study design and population

88 *Ethical considerations*

89 The study was conducted in the framework of the *Awake & Move study*^{14 15}. It was approved by the Ethics
90 committee of the Canton of Ticino, Switzerland (Ref. 2016-00056) and conducted in accordance with the
91 Declaration of Helsinki. Written consent was provided by all participants. Participation in this study was on a
92 voluntary basis and proposed to all patients meeting the eligibility criteria who were attending the outpatient
93 department of the Movement Disorder Unit of the Neurocenter of Southern Switzerland in Lugano,
94 Switzerland. Additional patients volunteered to participate after advertisements in the magazine of the Swiss
95 Parkinson's association, and in public conferences organised by the same association.

96

97 *Inclusion and exclusion criteria*

98 Eligibility criteria were: mild to moderate idiopathic PD (no atypical parkinsonism)¹⁶ (Hoehn & Yahr stage >1
99 and ≤3)¹⁷, no cognitive impairment (Mini-Mental State Examination score ≥26/30)¹⁸, no active depression
100 (Beck Depression Inventory score < 14/63)¹⁹, no deep brain stimulation.

101 Study procedures

102 *Patients' participation and workload*

103 An initial recruitment visit (V0) was organised at the hospital by a senior neurologist, expert in sleep medicine
104 and movement disorders, who performed a thorough medical and neurological examination. Evaluations
105 included sleep history and the Movement Disorders Society Unified Parkinson's Disease Rating Scale (MDS-
106 UPDRS), with the motor part (III) performed during the "on" phase in patients with motor fluctuations.

107 In each recruited patient, sleep and wake patterns were profiled by means of continuous actigraphy
108 monitoring, recorded at home over a 2-week period, coupled with an electronic sleep diary. Sleep and wake
109 routines were recorded by means of a proprietary application for tablets, *SleepFit*²⁰.

110 At the end of this period, a full in-lab video-polysomnography (VPSG) was performed. The times of "lights-
111 out" and "lights-on" were set for each subject according to their usual bed- and wake-time schedules,
112 mirroring sleep habits of the previous 2 weeks. Habitual hypnotic medications and other psychotropic agents
113 were allowed during the subjects' participation in the study. Alcoholic, caffeinated or other stimulant
114 beverages, as well as tobacco smoking, were not permitted 4 hours prior to bedtime. A second VPSG was
115 performed 7 to 14 days after the first one. Between the first and the second VPSG recordings, the patients
116 were asked to keep their routines and daily medications unchanged.

117

118 *Wrist actigraphy*

119 *GENEActiv Original* wrist actigraph (GENEActiv™, Activinsight Ltd., Kimbolton, Cambridgeshire, UK)²¹, worn
120 on the more affected arm, was employed during the 2-week home recordings. It recorded tri-axis arm
121 accelerations (a_x, a_y, a_z) and environmental light. Signals were acquired at 40 Hz sampling frequency, to
122 maximise battery duration. In parallel to the in-lab VPSG recordings, continuous recordings of motor activity
123 were acquired using the same *GENEActiv Original* devices, set to record at a 100-Hz sampling frequency,
124 and worn on both wrists.

125

126

127

128 *Video-polysomnography*

129 VPSG recordings were performed according to the American Academy of Sleep Medicine standards^{22 23},
130 including scalp electroencephalography, electro-oculogram, surface electro-myogram of the chin, lower
131 limbs electromyograms²⁴⁻²⁶, nasal and oral flow, respiratory effort sensors, pulse oximeter and
132 electrocardiogram. Synchronised digital infrared video tracks and ambient sound recordings were also
133 acquired (**Fig. 1**). Visual analysis of PSG recordings were performed by a trained sleep and movement
134 disorder expert (PLR) according to standard criteria^{22 23}, taking into account previously published
135 recommendations and suggestions for sleep scoring in PD^{2 27}.

136 137 *Clinical classification of patients with vs. without REM sleep behaviour disorder*

138 RBD diagnosis was established based VPSG recordings from two consecutive nocturnal recordings to
139 improve diagnostic power²⁸, and the medical history of each patient. The presence or absence of RBD was
140 established according to standard criteria². Tonic and phasic muscular activity of REM sleep without atonia
141 (RWSA) were defined according to the international scoring rules²². To have a more refined categorisation,
142 we established a probability score for the presence or absence of RBD in every individual patient, based on
143 both video-PSG recordings of each patient, as follows: a) “definite RBD” (score=1): clear-cut complex dream
144 enactment behaviours and both tonic and phasic RWSA from VPSG; b) “probable RBD” (score=0.75): history
145 of complex dream enactment behaviours and both tonic and phasic RWSA, but not of complex dream
146 enactment behaviours observed at the VPSG; c) “probable no-RBD” (score=0.25): no history of dream
147 enactment behaviour and evidence of only tonic or only phasic RWSA at the VPSG; d) “definite no-RBD”
148 (score=0): no history of dream enactment behaviour and no evidence of RWSA at the VPSG; e) “doubtful
149 RBD” (score=0.5): history of dream enactment behaviour and evidence of only tonic or only phasic RWSA at
150 the VPSG; f) “doubtful no-RBD” (score=0.5): no history of dream enactment behaviour and evidence of both
151 tonic and phasic RWSA at the VPSG.

152 Each patient was then labelled as “RBD” or “no-RBD” according to the mean of the two individual VPSG
153 scores: “RBD” when the mean score > 0.5, “no-RBD” when the mean score < 0.5. Patients whose score was
154 equal to 0.5 were excluded to ensure that only patients with clear-cut diagnoses were considered. If only one
155 VPSG was available for analyses, the labelling was established based on that one only. Sleep-related
156 respiratory events and periodic limb movements (PLMs) were scored and accounted for (Table 2). We did not
157 find significant different between groups.

158
159 We used the STARD checklist when writing our report²⁹.
160

161 **Data processing**

162 *Pre-processing and features extraction*

163 Tri-axial accelerometer signals were segmented for each night, defined as the periods of low illuminance
164 (<200 lux) minus 10 minutes at the beginning and the end. Night-activity tri-axial signals were then combined
165 into a single magnitude vector $\|a\| = (a_x^2, a_y^2, a_z^2)^{1/2}$, high-pass filtered (4th-order Butterworth, cut-off
166 frequency of 0.1Hz), and used to compute features about movement patterns. These features accounted for
167 both (i) the characteristics of isolated, single movement episodes, as well as (ii) global movement patterns
168 over the course of each night (**Fig. 2A,B**).

169 Movement episodes were identified through thresholding of the acceleration magnitude (threshold = 1*std).
170 We ensured that this value was never below 0.1. Consecutive episodes that were not spaced by at least 1
171 second were merged into a unique movement event. Each episode was then parameterized by quantifying
172 its duration (short: ≤2s, medium: >2s & ≤10s, long: >10s), magnitude (low: ≤3*movement threshold, high:

173 >3*movement threshold), elapsed time since the previous event, and time to the next (close/clustered: ≤ 10 s,
174 medium: >10 s & ≤ 60 s, far/scattered: >60 s).

175 To capture global movement patterns, we additionally computed the rate of activity, defined as the
176 percentage of activity with magnitudes above the predefined threshold within a sliding window (length = 60
177 seconds, step = 1ms). This activity rate conveys the overall amount of movement throughout the night.

178 We then computed a series of statistical metrics for each feature such as mean, standard deviation, skewness
179 or kurtosis.

180 Overall, twenty-nine features were extracted for each night recording (**Supp. Table 1** and **Fig. 2B**). To verify
181 the degree of separability (RBD vs no-RBD patients) captured by the extracted features, we further computed
182 principal component (PC) analysis on this 29-dimensional feature representation.

183 *Model construction*

184 We tested several machine learning classification algorithms and compared their performance for
185 discriminating patients with or without RBD.

186 Prior to model building, a feature selection step was run to reduce the dimensionality of the feature space.
187 Redundant features were first removed if they were not significantly correlated to the subject group
188 (Spearman's, $p > 0.05$). Least absolute shrinkage and selection operator (LASSO) regularisation was then
189 applied over the retained features: A ranking table was deduced from the subset of features withheld by
190 each LASSO model, computed over 4-fold cross-validation (CV) with 10 repetitions and increasing shrinkage
191 regularisation parameter. Features were ranked based on the percentage of times they were selected by a
192 model. Features selected by less than 10% of the models were discarded.

193 Classifiers were first built and tested on the data collected during in-lab recordings, from which we identified
194 the best model type and the subset of features to be used for subsequent home recordings. The ability of
195 models to avoid overfitting was determined using a 4-fold CV with class stratification across folds. CV was
196 repeated 100 times to reduce bias in data splitting. We then compared models built from data recorded from
197 either the more affected, less affected, or dominant arm, as well as both arms. In 50% of the patients the
198 dominant arm was the more affected arm.

199 For home recordings, classifiers were trained on data acquired from three subjects per group (RBD and no-
200 RBD) and tested on all remaining ones ($N=20$), with 100-time repetition to reduce bias in patient selection.
201 Classification performance was evaluated in terms of accuracy, sensitivity, and specificity. For the home
202 recordings, a receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve was additionally computed to observe
203 classification performance depending on the class probability threshold.

204 **Statistical analysis**

205 Differences in population demographics were analysed using the Mann-Whitney U Test, except categorical
206 differences which were investigated using a Chi-squared (χ^2) test. The contribution of individual features to
207 help discriminate between RBD and no-RBD patients was evaluated by relating each feature score to the
208 corresponding patient label. Significance was analysed using linear mixed-effects models, with individuals as
209 random effects (to control for repeated measurements per subject). Homoscedasticity was apparent for all
210 models. Comparisons in performance between machine learning models were evaluated using the Mann-
211 Whitney U Test; all results were corrected for multiple comparisons by means of Tukey-Kramer's correction.
212 All data are reported as mean values \pm standard deviation (SD). Stars *, **, *** indicate a significant difference
213 at $p < 0.05$, $p < 0.01$ and $p < 0.001$ respectively.

214 RESULTS

215 Patients' population

216 Twenty-seven PD patients were enrolled in the study. Eighteen patients were labelled as RBD and eight as
217 no-RBD. One patient had to be excluded as their RBD probability score was 0.5, and based on one VPSG
218 recording only (data loss). Patients' demographic and clinical characteristics are reported in Table 1.

219 Clinical validation of RBDAct methodology

220 *Extraction of features describing RBD movements and behaviours*

221 We first computed mathematical features that captured nocturnal movement patterns from the acceleration
222 signals. We specifically aimed to account for both (i) the characteristics of single, isolated movement
223 episodes, and (ii) global movement patterns over the course of each night. Overall, twenty-nine features were
224 extracted, for each night (**Fig. 3A**). These were then matched with the corresponding clinical label (RBD vs
225 no-RBD) provided by the clinical expert for training the algorithms.

226 To verify the capacity of the identified features to capture key differences between RBD and no-RBD patients,
227 we projected the computed 29-dimensional parameterization into a low-dimensional space using PC analysis
228 (**Fig. 3A**). The first 3 PCs explained 79.7% of the overall variance (PC1: 51.3%, PC2: 14.9%; PC3: 13.5%),
229 and highlighted clear differences in space between the two groups. PC1 specifically segregated patients
230 based on the characteristics of movement episodes, based on their duration and magnitude. A closer analysis
231 of the factor loadings of PC1 emphasised that RBD patients exhibited predominantly short, yet high-
232 magnitude movement episodes that were scattered throughout the night, as reflected by the lower mean
233 activity rate and lower percentage of clustered movements (**Fig. 3B**). Additionally, overall nocturnal activity
234 was higher in RBD than no-RBD patients.

235 We then identified the most meaningful features for classification. A feature selection step was run to extract
236 the ones that maximised the separability between groups. All selected features (N=12) exhibited (i) a high
237 correlation to the patient group (> 10%), (ii) a high occurrence in LASSO regression (> 10%), and (iii) low inter-
238 feature correlation (**Fig. 3C**). As anticipated by the PC analysis, this set of features confirmed that group
239 separability was based on the amount of motor activity throughout the entire night, as well as episode duration
240 and magnitude.

241 *In-lab RBDAct classification performance*

242 To automatically discriminate RBD patients using the selected features, we compared the performance of
243 different classification algorithms. All algorithms consistently yielded a high prediction accuracy (mean
244 performance 89.6%), based on the actigraphic recordings acquired during the two nights spent by the patient
245 at the sleep lab. The best performance was achieved by a support vector machine (SVM) model ($92.9 \pm 8.16\%$
246 accuracy, $94.9 \pm 7.4\%$ sensitivity, $92.7 \pm 13.8\%$ specificity; **Fig. 3D**). This model was then retained as the
247 most suitable algorithm to subsequently test home recordings.

248 We additionally explored if sensor placement had an impact on the features' ability to capture RBD patterns.
249 We compared the performance of models when the wrist actigraph was worn on the (i) more affected side,
250 (ii) less affected side, (iii) dominant side or (iv) both arms. We only considered patients who exhibited
251 asymmetric motor deficits and wore actigraphic sensors on both arms (N=16 RBD, N=5 no-RBD). Maximum
252 performance was systematically obtained using classifiers that were built on data from the more affected
253 arm, as compared to using the dominant or less affected arm (**Fig. 4**). Placing sensors on both wrists did not
254 improve classification performance.

255 **RBDAct performance in home environments**

256 We then tested RBDAct at home. All the patients wore the actigraph during the whole duration of the study
257 (adherence = 100%).

258 We run our SVM algorithm using the selected features on a 2-week home recording set (**Fig. 5A**). We
259 computed the classification accuracy for each individual night (**Fig. 5B**), and derived a diagnosis from the 2-
260 week probability average to account for daily variability in spontaneous occurrence of RBD movements that
261 would affect classification outcome (**Fig. 5C**). Setting a classification threshold between 0.5 and 0.6 revealed
262 an accuracy of 100% after 7 nights. Progressively increasing the number of nights from 7 to 14, accuracy
263 remained stable between 96 and 100%.

264

265 **DISCUSSION**

266 We developed a novel screening tool, termed RBDAct, to automatically identify RBD at home in patients with
267 mild to moderate PD. We first identified features that characterised differences in nocturnal movements and
268 behaviours in RBD vs. no-RBD patients from actigraphic recordings. We then trained various machine
269 learning classification algorithms using in-lab actigraphic data acquired in parallel to VPSG. Classification
270 proved to be highly accurate ($92.9 \pm 8.16\%$). Finally, we tested the performance of the best algorithm on a
271 14-night actigraphic home recording. This out-of-lab validation reached an accuracy of 100% across
272 patients.

273 **Actigraphic features robustly capture RBD movements and behaviours**

274 RBDAct relied exclusively on accelerometer signals to detect movements and behaviours characteristic of
275 RBD. These have been reported to be qualitatively different from controls during wakefulness, and particularly
276 during arousals and awakenings. RBD movements were reported to be faster, more abrupt, jerky, and violent,
277 both when observed in VPSG or by patients' bedpartners³⁰. These observations provided the ground for
278 using acceleration as a marker of RBD among the full range of nocturnal movements. Our automated
279 approach confirms these differences from an objective, quantitative standpoint.

280 Both global night activity patterns, and isolated movement episodes were found to be critical to discriminate
281 between RBD and no-RBD patients, regardless of the analytical methodology employed (i.e. PCA or feature
282 selection algorithms). Features related to global night activity underscored that RBD patients were more
283 active overall, which is in line with VPSG observations^{28 31 32}, and that they exhibited movements that were
284 scattered in time over the course of the night. Instead, patients without RBD moved less frequently and, if
285 they did, their movements were long-lasting and clustered in concise periods of the night. Features related
286 to isolated movement episodes showed that RBD patients exhibit predominantly short, high-magnitude
287 movements compared to no-RBD patients.

288 From a clinical standpoint, RBD movements and behaviours are expected to cluster intermittently, in
289 correspondence to REM sleep periods. Sleep destructuring in PD^{33 34}, with REM sleep exhibiting a non-
290 nycthemeral distribution, might explain why RBD movements detected by means of actigraphy were found
291 to be spread over the course of the night.

292 Regardless of cross-patient differences, all tested classification algorithms systematically achieved high
293 performances, confirming the robustness of the identified features to capture key aspects of RBD movements
294 and behaviours. Similar performance was achieved during home recordings, emphasising their stability on
295 multiple observations from the same subject.

296 **Relevance of the number and location of actigraphic sensors**

297 Maximal classification performance was achieved on average when the sensor was placed on the more
298 affected arm, as compared to the less affected side or the dominant side. This observation suggested that
299 abnormal movements of RBD may be more pronounced on the most affected hemibody. While this may not
300 apply to all individual patients, our experience suggests that the most appropriate *a-priori* placement should
301 be on the most affected arm.

302 Using two sensors (one per wrist) did not improve the ability to discriminate between RBD vs. no-RBD
303 patients. In some cases, it even worsened prediction accuracy. This suggests that movements of the less
304 affected arm are “less abnormal”, thus reducing the separability between RBD and no-RBD measurements.
305 These observations have compelling practical implications: the ability to restrict recordings to one arm
306 simplifies the setup, increasing comfort and decreasing cost. It certainly accounts for the 100% adherence
307 achieved during home recordings.

308 **Relevance of the number of nocturnal recordings**

309 Combining measurements from multiple nights proved to be essential to ensure an accurate identification of
310 RBD. In this study, information from VPSG recordings from two nights was necessary to confirm or rule out
311 RBD diagnosis, in a few patients.

312 An average accuracy of 100% was reached after 7 consecutive nights of actigraphic home recordings. It
313 remained stable between 96-100% when accounting for subsequent nights. Based on these results, we
314 recommend that at least one week of actigraphy data be collected to maximise diagnostic accuracy.

315 **Limitations and future improvements**

316 Considering the relatively small cohort of patients (18 RBD and 8 non-RBD patients) that were included in the
317 study, the generalisation of our approach for widespread clinical use requires further validations. Our
318 algorithms were trained and tested only on patients with RBD that was secondary to mild or moderate PD.
319 We did not include neither patients with RBD secondary to disorders other than PD, nor patients with isolated
320 RBD.

321 Similarly, RBDAct did not account for sleep stages in the classification pipeline. Performance may improve
322 by including information about REM or NREM periods. It may be necessary to account for sleep fragmentation
323 and disruption in PD and for the fact that RBD movements may not be exclusively restricted to REM phases,
324 but may also appear at NREM/REM transitions during “covert REM sleep”³⁵ or during “undifferentiated”
325 sleep³⁴.

326 Finally, RBDAct is biased towards identifying patients with RBD characterised by phasic loss of muscle
327 atonia, as only phasic activity can be detected by accelerometers. This is nevertheless more clinically
328 meaningful than tonic RSWA in patient management, to prevent consequences such as injuries to patients
329 or bedpartners. Similarly, RBDAct may have difficulties controlling for RBD-like movements observed on
330 respiratory arousals³⁶ or other sleep-related behaviours. The absence of a control group for these aspects
331 indicates that RBDAct may indeed lead to false positives. Considering that RBDAct is meant to provide a first
332 screening step to guide further in-depth clinical evaluations, our methodology ensures that false negatives
333 are prevented, even at the expense of some false positives.

334 **CONCLUSION**

335 RBDAct is an innovative technological solution to automatically detect RBD in PD patients. Considering the
336 simplicity of manipulation and affordable price of actigraphy, our approach paves the way for widespread
337 screening of large numbers of patients in ecological environments, both for clinical and research purposes.

338 Replacing in-lab VPSG with home recordings holds important implications for patients exhibiting severe
339 motor difficulties or dementia, for whom in-lab VPSG can be complex and bothersome. Its potential may also
340 be meaningful for patients who do not have a bed partner. In research, RBDAct would permit large-scale
341 screening and profiling of PD patients during clinical trials. There is a potential for rapid deployment within
342 commercially available technologies, with the advantage of being an automated procedure that is simple to
343 interpret.

344 RBDAct also has the potential to become a quantitative marker of disease severity, and could be employed
345 to monitor disease progression, to adapt symptomatic treatments, or to evaluate the efficacy of neuro-
346 protective or disease-modifying medications.

347 Further developments should foresee expanding its applicability in other populations (such as isolated RBD,
348 RBD secondary to other synucleinopathies, or acute, non-degenerative RBD) and for discriminating RBD from
349 other sleep-related behaviours (such as NREM parasomnia, nocturnal epilepsy, arousals from phasic
350 respiratory events).

351 **Acknowledgments**

352 We would like to thank all the patients who took part in this study. Thanks to Pr. Alain Kaelin-Lang for his
353 strategic support to the Sleep, Awake & Move project, and, together with Dr. Salvatore Galati and Dr. Claudio
354 Staedler, for patient recruitment.

355 We thank Mr. Paulo-Edson Nunes-Ferreira, Dr. Clara Ferlito, Dr. Sandra Hackethal, Dr. Ninfa Amato, Dr.
356 Serena Caverzasio, Dr. Simona Bonoli, Dr. Lucia Guglielmetti, Dr. Matteo Pereno, Mr. Francesco Mezzanotte
357 for data collection, and Dr. Jihad Louali and Ms. Charlotte Moerman for help with data pre-processing.

358 We also thank all the colleagues and co-workers who gave scientific, technical or logistic support to the
359 Sleep, Awake & Move project and shared our enthusiasm: Engr. Michele Marazza, Engr. Alessandro
360 Mascheroni, Dr. Francesca Dalia Faraci, Engr. Luigi Fiorillo, Pr. Moustapha Dramé, Mr. Pierluigi Lurà, Mrs.
361 Nicole Vago-Caputo, Mrs. Simona Perrotta, Mr. Giuliano Filippini, Mrs. Yasmin Belloni.

364 **Contributors**

365 The RBDAct project was an initiative of PLR. PLR, FR, AP and EMM participated in the design of the study.
366 PLR obtained funding to support the study. PLR was responsible of patients' recruitment and screening and
367 of data collection. FR was the study biostatistician responsible for the statistical analysis. FR, SS, PLR were
368 responsible for processing and analysis of data. FR and SS generated machine learning models. FR was
369 responsible for generating the figures. PLR, AP and EMM were involved in study supervision. All authors were
370 involved in the interpretation of the data and in the manuscript writing. All authors agreed on the content of
371 the manuscript, reviewed drafts, and approved the final version.

373 **Funding**

374 The RBDAct study stemmed from the *Sleep, Awake & Move* project (NSI.LS15.3), that was supported by the
375 Advisory Board of EOC for Scientific Research (ABREOC) and the Swiss Parkinson's Association. EMM was
376 funded by the Swiss National Science Foundation (Ambizione fellowship PZ00P3_180018),

377 **Competing Interests**

379 The authors have no competing interests to declare.

380 **Data availability statement**

381 Data are available with a granted proposal upon reasonable request.

382 **TABLES**

383

384 **Table 1** | Patient’s demographic and clinical characteristics.

385

Characteristic	RBD (n=18)	no-RBD (n=8)	Difference p-value ¹
Age (year)	69.9±8.2	63.8±13.9	0.29
Sex (M/F)	15/3	4/4	0.07 ²
Headedness (score)	74.2±34.9	80.6±39.7	0.29
More affected side (right/left/symmetrical)	7/9/2	4/2/2	0.43
MDS-UPDRS total score	50.9±23.1	46.6±15.4	0.59
part I	8.8±5.1	10.2±4.8	0.48
part II	9.7±6.2	10.1±4.3	0.65
part III (on)	29.8±14	25.6±12.7	0.54
part IV	2.6±2.8	0.6±1.2	0.07
Hoehn & Yahr stage	2.0±0.4	1.9±0.4	0.44
Disease duration (year)	7.4±5.9	4.9±4.9	0.26
Presence of motor fluctuations (yes/no)	1/17	1/7	0.53 ²
Presence of dyskinesias (yes/no)	10/8	2/6	0.14 ²
Medications			
levodopa daily equivalent dose (mg)	589.7±275.6	655.3±333.8	0.78
benzodiazepines (yes/no)	5/13	1/7	0.39 ²
melatonin (yes/no)	0/0	0/0	
antidepressants (yes/no)	7/11	2/6	0.49 ²
Cumulative illness rating scale - revised (score)	12.9±3.6	21.0±3.6	0.62
Cumulative illness rating scale - musculoskeletal (score)	0.9±0.8	1.4±1.1	0.25
Parkinson’s disease sleep scale (score)	11.8±7.7	14.5±9.8	0.43
Pittsburgh sleep quality index (score)	5.7±2.7	6.0±2.1	0.75

Epworth sleepiness scale (score)	6/12	4/4	0.42 ²
----------------------------------	------	-----	-------------------

386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397

Clinical scores taken as the average per subject over the entire study. Data are reported as mean \pm SD or proportions. ¹Mann-Whitney U Test; ²Chi-squared test.

Table 2 | Video-polysomnographic features.

Characteristic	RBD (n=18)	no-RBD (n=8)	Difference p-value ¹
Total sleep time (min)	297.5 \pm 69.3	316.0 \pm 66.0	0.56
Sleep onset latency (min)	12.0 \pm 8.2	9.5 \pm 8.2	0.52
REM onset latency (min)	177.5 \pm 61.8	201.7 \pm 132.0	0.74
Wake after sleep onset (min)	59.5 \pm 24.1	94.3 \pm 66.5	0.19
Wake (min)	70.0 \pm 26.9	104.0 \pm 73.9	0.25
Stage N1 (min)	55.1 \pm 27.0	70.5 \pm 31.6	0.29
Stage N2 (min)	159.2 \pm 48.9	177.2 \pm 67.4	0.27
Stage N3 (min)	60.8 \pm 23.0	37.0 \pm 16.7	0.02*
REM (min)	22.5 \pm 17.0	25.6 \pm 14.9	0.56
Sleep efficiency (%)	79.7 \pm 7.1	75.8 \pm 14.5	0.8
Apnea index	35.6 \pm 25.3	41.8 \pm 19.6	0.15
Apnea-Hypopnea index	18.1 \pm 14.2	16.2 \pm 18.9	0.7
Respiratory disturbance index	30.2 \pm 26.7	33.8 \pm 25.9	0.81
Periodic limb movement	10.5 \pm 22.4	0.9 \pm 1.5	0.71

398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408

Video-polysomnographic features taken as the average per subject over the entire study. Data are reported as mean \pm SD. ¹Mann-Whitney U Test; *P < 0.05.

409
410

Supplementary Table 1 | Description of features

Feature	Description	Category
Activity	Percentage of overall activity	Global movement patterns
Mov number	Total number of movement episodes	
ActivityRate _{low}	Percentage of activity rate > 0% and ≤ 30%	
ActivityRate _{medium}	Percentage of activity rate > 30% and ≤ 60%	
ActivityRate _{high}	Percentage of activity rate > 60% and ≤ 100%	
mean(ActivityRate)	Mean of the activity rate distribution	
median(ActivityRate)	Median of the activity rate distribution	
std(ActivityRate)	Standard deviation of the activity rate distribution	
skew(ActivityRate)	Skewness of the activity rate distribution	
kurt(ActivityRate)	Kurtosis of the activity rate distribution	
MovDistance _{close}	Percentage of movement episodes that have distance from the previous/next movement ≤ 10 seconds	Movement episodes
MovDistance _{medium}	Percentage of movement episodes that have distance from the previous/next movement > 10 and ≤ 60 seconds	
MovDistance _{far}	Percentage of movement episodes that have distance from the previous/next movement > 60 seconds	
MovDuration _{short}	Percentage of movement episodes that have duration ≤ 2 seconds	
MovDuration _{medium}	Percentage of movement episodes that have duration > 2 and ≤ 10 seconds	
MovDuration _{long}	Percentage of movement episodes that have duration > 10 seconds	
mean(MovDuration)	Mean of the movement duration distribution	
median(MovDuration)	Median of the movement duration distribution	

std(MovDuration)	Standard deviation of the movement duration distribution	
skew(MovDuration)	Skewness of the movement duration distribution	
kurt(MovDuration)	Kurtosis of the movement duration distribution	
MovHighMagnitude	Percentage of movement episodes with magnitude > 3*movement threshold	
MovHighMagnitudeLowDuration	Percentage of movement episodes that have duration ≤ 2 seconds and magnitude > 3*movement threshold	
MovHighMagnitudeLowDistance	Percentage of movement episodes that have distance from the previous/next movement ≤ 10 seconds and magnitude > 3*movement threshold	
mean(MovMagnitude)	Mean of the movement magnitude distribution	
median(MovMagnitude)	Median of the movement magnitude distribution	
std(MovMagnitude)	Standard deviation of the movement magnitude distribution	
skew(MovMagnitude)	Skewness of the movement magnitude distribution	
kurt(MovMagnitude)	Kurtosis of the movement magnitude distribution	

411
412

413 FIGURES AND CAPTIONS

414

415 **Figure 1 | Experimental setup for in-lab recordings and study design.** Video-polysomnography (VPSG)
416 was recorded concurrently to actigraphy (1). All VPSG signals were displayed (2a) and processed by a clinical
417 expert (3a) to perform RBD diagnosis following a standard manual approach (4). In parallel, actigraphic signals
418 (2b) were processed using machine learning algorithms (3b) to generate an automatic diagnosis of RBD. The
419 study timeline displays the chronological series of recordings performed for each patient, which combined
420 both home and in-clinic evaluations.

421

422 **Figure 2 | Data processing methodology and feature extraction.** **a**, The sleeping period was derived using
423 a light sensor (top), aligned with movement wrist actigraphy recordings (bottom). The night period considered
424 for analyses is shadowed in grey. **b**, Features of nocturnal behaviour were extracted from single movement
425 episodes (top), which characterised behaviour at well-defined isolated times throughout the night, and global
426 movement patterns (bottom).

427

428 **Figure 3 | Features capturing RBD movements and behaviours.** **a**, Representation of each patient in a
429 low-dimensional feature space (principal components PC1 to PC3). RBD patients indicated in red, and no-
430 RBD patients in cyan. The contribution of each individual feature highlights the movement and behaviours
431 that are most meaningful along PC1. Features outlined in green correspond to those shown in panel b. **b**,
432 Barplots showing group-level differences between RBD and no-RBD patients in gait features identified in a.
433 **c**, A feature selection algorithm identified the most discriminant features between groups using Spearman's
434 correlation and LASSO regression. **d**, Classification accuracy for the five machine learning algorithms
435 implemented and confusion matrix for the better performing one (SVM). LDA: linear discriminant analysis;
436 SVM: support vector machine; LR: logistic regression; NN: nearest neighbour; RF: random forest.

437

438 **Figure 4 | Comparison of classification performance depending on actigraphy sensor position.** All
439 algorithms systematically achieved better accuracies when sensors were worn on the most affected side.
440 LDA: linear discriminant analysis; SVM: support vector machine; LR: logistic regression; NN: nearest
441 neighbour; RF: random forest.

442

443 **Figure 5 | Classification performance during home recordings.** **a**, Heatmap of classification probabilities
444 per patient and night (left), and mean probability over the 14-night period aligned to the corresponding clinical
445 diagnosis (right). Probability values range from 0 (cyan, no-RBD) to 1 (red, RBD). **b**, ROC curve to identify the
446 classification threshold (between 0 and 1) that best discriminates RBD vs no-RBD patients across the 14
447 night period. A threshold of 0.5 was identified as providing the best results. **c**, Changes in classification
448 accuracy when accounting for multiple consecutive nights. Using 7 nights or more lead to performances
449 above 96.15% across patients (threshold = 0.5).

450

451 **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

452

- 453 1. Schenck CH, Boeve BF. The strong presence of REM sleep behavior disorder in PD: clinical and research
454 implications. *Neurology* 2011;77(11):1030-2. doi: 10.1212/WNL.0b013e31822e14d7
- 455 2. American Academy of Sleep Medicine. International Classification of Sleep Disorders, 3rd ed. Darien, IL:
456 American Academy of Sleep Medicine 2014.
- 457 3. Högl B, Stefani A, Videnovic A. Idiopathic REM sleep behaviour disorder and neurodegeneration - an
458 update. *Nature reviews Neurology* 2018;14(1):40-55. doi: 10.1038/nrneurol.2017.157 [published
459 Online First: 2017/11/25]
- 460 4. Iranzo A, Molinuevo JL, Santamaria J, et al. Rapid-eye-movement sleep behaviour disorder as an early
461 marker for a neurodegenerative disorder: a descriptive study. *Lancet Neurol* 2006;5(7):572-7.
- 462 5. Schenck CH, Mahowald MW. REM sleep behavior disorder: clinical, developmental, and neuroscience
463 perspectives 16 years after its formal identification in SLEEP. *Sleep* 2002;25(2):120-38.
- 464 6. Videnovic A, Ju YS, Arnulf I, et al. Clinical trials in REM sleep behavioural disorder: challenges and
465 opportunities. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2020;91(7):740-49. doi: 10.1136/jnnp-2020-322875
466 [published Online First: 2020/05/15]
- 467 7. Iranzo A, Santamaria J, Tolosa E. The clinical and pathophysiological relevance of REM sleep behavior
468 disorder in neurodegenerative diseases. *Sleep Med Rev* 2009;13(6):385-401.
- 469 8. Figorilli M, Marques AR, Meloni M, et al. Diagnosing REM sleep behavior disorder in Parkinson's disease
470 without a gold standard: a latent-class model study. *Sleep* 2020;43(7) doi: 10.1093/sleep/zsz323
471 [published Online First: 2020/04/05]
- 472 9. Frauscher B, Ehrmann L, Zamarian L, et al. Validation of the Innsbruck REM sleep behavior disorder
473 inventory. *Mov Disord* 2012;27(13):1673-8. doi: 10.1002/mds.25223 [published Online First:
474 2012/11/30]
- 475 10. Boeve BF, Molano JR, Ferman TJ, et al. Validation of the Mayo Sleep Questionnaire to screen for REM
476 sleep behavior disorder in a community-based sample. *J Clin Sleep Med* 2013;9(5):475-80. doi:
477 10.5664/jcsm.2670 [published Online First: 2013/05/16]
- 478 11. Stiasny-Kolster K, Sixel-Doring F, Trenkwalder C, et al. Diagnostic value of the REM sleep behavior
479 disorder screening questionnaire in Parkinson's disease. *Sleep Med* 2015;16(1):186-9. doi:
480 10.1016/j.sleep.2014.08.014 [published Online First: 2014/12/24]
- 481 12. Halsband C, Zapf A, Sixel-Doring F, et al. The REM Sleep Behavior Disorder Screening Questionnaire is
482 not Valid in De Novo Parkinson's Disease. *Mov Disord Clin Pract* 2018;5(2):171-76. doi:
483 10.1002/mdc3.12591 [published Online First: 2018/07/17]
- 484 13. Nomura T, Inoue Y, Kagimura T, et al. Validity of the Japanese version of the REM Sleep Behavior
485 Disorder (RBD) Screening Questionnaire for detecting probable RBD in the general population.
486 *Psychiatry Clin Neurosci* 2015;69(8):477-82. doi: 10.1111/pcn.12286 [published Online First:
487 2015/03/03]
- 488 14. ClinicalTrials.gov. A service of the U.S. National Institutes of Health. Sleep, Awake & Move - part I
489 (SA&M-I).
- 490 15. ClinicalTrials.gov. A service of the U.S. National Institutes of Health. Sleep, Awake & Move - Part II
491 (SA&M-II) [Available from: <https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT02710487>].
- 492 16. Hughes AJ, Daniel SE, Kilford L, et al. Accuracy of clinical diagnosis of idiopathic Parkinson's disease: a
493 clinico-pathological study of 100 cases. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 1992;55(3):181-4.
- 494 17. Hoehn MM, Yahr MD. Parkinsonism: onset, progression and mortality. *Neurology* 1967;17(5):427-42.
- 495 18. Folstein MF, Robins LN, Helzer JE. The Mini-Mental State Examination. *Archives of general psychiatry*
496 1983;40(7):812.
- 497 19. Beck AT, Ward CH, Mendelson M, et al. An inventory for measuring depression. *Archives of general*
498 *psychiatry* 1961;4:561-71.
- 499 20. Mascheroni A, Choe EK, Luo Y, et al. The SleepFit tablet application for home-based clinical data
500 collection in Parkinson's disease: user-centric development and usability study. *Journal of Medical*
501 *and Internet Research: mHealth and uHealth* 2021
- 502 21. van Hees VT, Sabia S, Anderson KN, et al. A Novel, Open Access Method to Assess Sleep Duration
503 Using a Wrist-Worn Accelerometer. *PLoS one* 2015;10(11):e0142533. doi:
504 10.1371/journal.pone.0142533

- 505 22. Berry RB, Albertario CL, Harding SM, et al. The AASM Manual for the Scoring of Sleep and Associated
506 Events: Rules, Terminology and Technical Specifications, Version 2.5. Darien, Illinois: American
507 Academy of Sleep Medicine, 2018.
- 508 23. Iber C, Ancoli-Israel S, Chesson ALJ, et al. The AASM Manual for the Scoring of Sleep and Associated
509 Events. Rules, Terminology and Technical Specifications. Westchester, IL: American Academy of
510 Sleep Medicine, 2007.
- 511 24. Frauscher B, Iranzo A, Hogl B, et al. Quantification of electromyographic activity during REM sleep in
512 multiple muscles in REM sleep behavior disorder. *Sleep* 2008;31(5):724-31.
- 513 25. Iranzo A, Frauscher B, Santos H, et al. Usefulness of the SINBAR electromyographic montage to detect
514 the motor and vocal manifestations occurring in REM sleep behavior disorder. *Sleep Med*
515 2011;12(3):284-8.
- 516 26. Frauscher B, Ehrmann L, Hogl B. Defining muscle activities for assessment of rapid eye movement sleep
517 behavior disorder: from a qualitative to a quantitative diagnostic level. *Sleep Med* 2013;14(8):729-33.
518 doi: 10.1016/j.sleep.2012.09.028
- 519 27. Bliwise DL, Williams ML, Irbe D, et al. Inter-rater reliability for identification of REM sleep in Parkinson's
520 disease. *Sleep* 2000;23(5):671-6.
- 521 28. Cygan F, Oudiette D, Leclair-Visonneau L, et al. Night-to-night variability of muscle tone, movements,
522 and vocalizations in patients with REM sleep behavior disorder. *J Clin Sleep Med* 2010;6(6):551-5.
523 [published Online First: 2011/01/06]
- 524 29. Bossuyt PM, Reitsma JB, Bruns DE, et al. STARD 2015: an updated list of essential items for reporting
525 diagnostic accuracy studies. *Bmj* 2015;351:h5527. doi: 10.1136/bmj.h5527 [published Online First:
526 2015/10/30]
- 527 30. Cochen De Cock V, Vidailhet M, Leu S, et al. Restoration of normal motor control in Parkinson's disease
528 during REM sleep. *Brain* 2007;130(Pt 2):450-6.
- 529 31. Consens FB, Chervin RD, Koeppe RA, et al. Validation of a polysomnographic score for REM sleep
530 behavior disorder. *Sleep* 2005;28(8):993-7. doi: 10.1093/sleep/28.8.993 [published Online First:
531 2005/10/13]
- 532 32. Gossard TR, McCarter SJ, Gorres E, et al. Quantitative REM Sleep without Atonia in Parkinson's
533 Disease and Essential Tremor. *Mov Disord Clin Pract* 2021;8(1):37-43. doi: 10.1002/mdc3.13112
534 [published Online First: 2021/01/12]
- 535 33. Diederich NJ, Vaillant M, Mancuso G, et al. Progressive sleep 'destructuring' in Parkinson's disease. A
536 polysomnographic study in 46 patients. *Sleep Med* 2005;6(4):313-8. doi:
537 10.1016/j.sleep.2005.03.011
- 538 34. Compta Y, Santamaria J, Ratti L, et al. Cerebrospinal hypocretin, daytime sleepiness and sleep
539 architecture in Parkinson's disease dementia. *Brain* 2009;132(Pt 12):3308-17.
- 540 35. Nielsen TA. A review of mentation in REM and NREM sleep: "covert" REM sleep as a possible
541 reconciliation of two opposing models. *Behav Brain Sci* 2000;23(6):851-66; discussion 904-1121.
- 542 36. Iranzo A, Santamaria J. Severe obstructive sleep apnea/hypopnea mimicking REM sleep behavior
543 disorder. *Sleep* 2005;28(2):203-6.

544









