1	Screening COVID-19 by Swaasa AI Platform using cough sounds: A cross-		
2	sectional study		
3	P Padmalatha ¹ , Gowrisree Rudraraju* ² , Narayana Rao Sripada ² , Baswaraj Mamidgi ² , Charishma		
4	Gottipulla ² , Charan Jalukuru ² , ShubhaDeepti Palreddy ² , Nikhil kumar Reddy Bhoge ² , Priyanka		
5	Firmal ² , Venkat Yechuri ² , PV Sudhakar ¹ , B Devimadhavi ¹ , S Srinivas ¹ , K K L Prasad ⁴ , Niranjan		
6	Joshi ³		
7	1 Andhra Medical College, Visakhapatnam, India		
8	2 Salcit Technologies, Jayabheri Silicon Towers, Hyderabad India		
9	3 C-CAMP		
10	4 Guntur Medical College, India		
11	*Corresponding author: gowri@salcit.in		
12			
13	Keywords: COVID-19, Cough signature, Convolutional Neural Network (CNN), Tabular		
14	model, Machine learning		
15			
16	Acknowledgement		
17	This study is supported by the UK Government (British High Commission, New Delhi). This		
18	is a commissioned research report on commercial terms between C-CAMP and the UK		
19	Government (British High Commission, New Delhi). We would also like to acknowledge the		
20	team from Andhra Medical College Visakhapatnam for all the support provided		
21			
22	Conflict of interest		
23	The authors declare no commercial or financial conflict of interest.		
24			
25			
23			

26 Abstract

27 The Advent of Artificial Intelligence (AI) has led to the use of auditory data for detecting 28 various diseases, including COVID-19. SARS-CoV-2 infection has claimed more than 6 29 million lives till date and hence, needs a robust screening technique to control the disease 30 spread. In the present study we developed and validated the Swaasa AI platform for screening 31 and prioritizing COVID-19 patients based on the signature cough sound and the symptoms 32 presented by the subjects. The cough data records collected from 234 COVID-19 suspects 33 were subjected to validate the convolutional neural network (CNN) architecture and tabular 34 features-based algorithm. The likelihood of the disease was predicted by combining the final 35 output obtained from both the models. In the clinical validation phase, Swaasa was found to 36 be 75.54% accurate in detecting the likely presence of COVID-19 with 95.45% sensitivity 37 and 73.46% specificity. The pilot testing of Swaasa was carried out on 183 presumptive 38 COVID subjects, out of which 82 subjects were found to be positive for the disease by 39 Swaasa. Among them, 58 subjects were truly COVID-19 positive, which corresponds to a 40 Positive Predictive Value of 70.73%. The currently available rapid screening methods are 41 very costly and require technical expertise, therefore a cost effective, remote monitoring tool 42 would be very beneficial for preliminary screening of the potential COVID-19 subject.

43

44 Introduction

The SARS-CoV-2 infection first surfaced at the end of December 2019, affecting nearly 600 million people till now across the globe [1]. The virus transmission begins once a healthy individual is exposed to the respiratory droplets originated from an infected person. The average incubation period for the disease symptoms to manifest varies from 2-14 days [2]. The early symptoms comprise dry cough, fever, fatigue, loss of smell and taste. In a few cases the patient may experience shortness of breath, cardiac issues, and pneumonia like

symptoms, which can ultimately result in death. Many people are also experiencing postcovid acute symptoms which affects their overall health status [3, 4]. The containment of COVID-19 outbreaks became very difficult because of the unavailability of quick and effective pre-screening techniques. Most of the viral and serological testing methods available are very expensive, time consuming, require technical expertise and are not always reliable, especially in detecting the new SARC-CoV-2 variants [5, 6].

57 Cough has been presented as a common symptom of COVID-19 [7], which is mainly 58 responsible for removing any obstruction in the airways via explosive expulsion of the air [8]. 59 Cough is a common decipher of various respiratory diseases, including tuberculosis and now SARC-CoV-2 infection, which results in the dissemination of airborne infectious aerosols 60 61 into the environment [9, 10]. It has already been reported that a characteristic glottis 62 movement is observed under specific diseased conditions, which can be utilized to 63 differentiate the origin of coughs in different circumstances such as pertussis, bronchitis, and 64 asthma [11, 12]. As cough is the main classifier of the presence of COVID-19, there are 65 various reports which suggest that it could be used for mass screening of the disease [13, 14]. 66 Still a thorough investigation is needed to make use of cough sound analysis as a determinant 67 of the presence or absence of SARC-CoV-2 infection.

In the past few years, a substantial increase in the studies has been observed in terms of exploring Artificial Intelligence (AI)-based algorithms in the field of medicine, including the analysis of cough sound data for determining various respiratory diseases [15, 16]. Various groups have highlighted the importance of machine-learning techniques in detecting COVID-19 using cough as opposed to pre-screening methods such as, RT-PCR [17–21]. Despite so much of investigation for developing a desired AI-based tool, no such device is available in the market yet. The main factors being the acquisition of cough sound data from crowdsource

open access datasets and lack of proper technical/clinical validations to scale up these tools
for mass screening of COVID subjects [22, 23].

77 In the current study we have adopted a different approach. Our data comprises a good amount 78 of COVID-19 positive coughs, coughs from healthy subjects and coughs from patients 79 suffering with various respiratory conditions. We did carry feature analysis of COVID-19 and 80 non-COVID-19 coughs. Our analysis shows that COVID-19 related cough has a unique 81 signature, which can be identified by a machine learning model. Further we used a unique 82 multimodal architecture based on CNN and tabular features. The coughs are converted to 83 Mel-frequency cepstral coefficient spectrograms, the spectrogram images are fed as inputs to 84 CNN classifier for classification. Simultaneously, a tabular model is trained using features 85 extracted from frequency domain and time domain. The output from these two models is 86 combined to detect the likely presence of COVID-19 (yes/no/inconclusive). We obtained a 87 96% accuracy on the test dataset in the derivation and 76% in the validation phase. 88 Additionally, the tool has been thoroughly validated in the clinical settings and has proved to 89 have a positive prediction value of 70.73% in the real time scenario. This remote tool is 90 highly desired for rapid and cost-effective non-invasive screening of COVID-19 cases. 91 However, a large-scale validation study is needed for improvising the accuracy of the tool for 92 making it more accessible for diverse ethnicities located worldwide.

93 Methods and Materials

94 Sample size estimation and Data Collection

According to the sample size calculation, a total of 1152 comprising 40% COVID-19 positive
cases and 60% control subjects was appropriate for validating if the device could detect
COVID-19 with a 90% sensitivity on considering a 2.5% error for a 95% confidence interval
(CI) and a prevalence of 0.75%. Considering all the conditions, we pooled the data collected

99 from four individual clinical trial studies for developing and evaluating our model. We 100 considered a total of 1052 participants in the present study, out of which 62% were controls. 101 Control subjects comprise healthy individuals as well as subjects who were displaying 102 various respiratory disease symptoms and came out positive for conditions such as asthma, 103 Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (COPD), Interstitial lung disease (ILD), pneumonia 104 but were negative for COVID-19 via RT-PCR.

105 The cough data was collected at Andhra Medical College, Visakhapatnam, India as a part of 106 individual studies entitled "Development, Validation, Pilot Deployment of an ultra-scalable technology - Swaasa AI, as an auxiliary to COVID-19 Rapid test", "COVID-19 Cough Sound 107 108 Analysis Using Swaasa Artificial Intelligence Platform". The studies were registered under 109 Clinical Trials Registry- India CTRI/2021/09/036489, CTRI/2021/07/035096, and were 110 begun after getting the approval from the AMC- Institutional Ethics Committee (IEC). The 111 methodologies performed throughout the study were in accordance with the set guidelines. A 112 duly signed written informed consent was also collected from all the enrolled subjects before 113 starting the trial, which was followed by collection of the demographic details and the vital 114 signs. Patients were then interviewed for the Part I of the St. George's Respiratory 115 Questionnaire (SGRQ) and COVID-19 symptoms in order to gather their symptoms [24]. 116 Next, the cough sound was collected by a trained health care personnel. Each subject 117 recorded multiple coughs (3-4 times), taking a breath in between every 15 seconds record 118 interval. Following the cough sample collection, the patients were subjected to a reference 119 standard test (RT-PCR).

The inclusion criteria for the enrolment are that the Patients must be (a) male and female patients age \geq 18 years, who were (b) recently diagnosed with COVID 19 (for validation phase only) and were (c) able to read, understand and sign the informed consent form. Whereas male and female patients age < 18 years, who were (b) on ventilators support, (c)

asymptomatic patients attending isolation ward for COVID testing and (d) Pregnant females
were completely excluded from the current study. COVID precautionary and infection
control measures were followed strictly.

127 Study design and Patient recruitment

128 The cross-sectional studies were undertaken in three phases. In the derivation phase (Phase 1)

129 multiple data points (cough recordings) were collected from every subject to develop a robust

- 130 model. Whereas, in the Phase 2 (validation) and Phase 3 (pilot test) only one data point (one
- 131 cough recording) was collected.

Phase 1: Derivation with an objective to quantify the technical / analytical performance of
the device by establishing a unique cough signature for COVID-19.

Sample size: For derivation phase, a total of 642 subjects were considered, which were part of two separate derivation studies. Out of which 252 subjects were tested positive for COVID-19 by RT-PCR. Figure 1 shows the age and gender distribution of the recruited subjects.

Phase 2: Clinical validation to quantify the performance of the device against clinicaldiagnosis based on reference standard test.

Sample size: For validation, 234 subjects were recruited from various locations including, isolation ward, COVID testing centre-King George Hospital, Visakhapatnam, COVID testing centre-GHCCD, Visakhapatnam and were subjected to the screening test using Swaasa AI Platform, as well as to the standard reference testing for diagnosis of COVID-19 i.e., RT-PCR. We compared the results obtained from the Swaasa AI Platform to the standard diagnostic testing.

Phase 3: Pilot test to quantify the effectiveness of the device when deployed as a screeningtool prior to diagnosis.

Sample size: In pilot deployment, we enrolled 183 presumptive COVID-19 cases from aperipheral health care centre, RHC Simhachalam.

150 Data analysis

For phase 1 and phase 2, Swaasa's performance was compared with diagnosis based on RT-PCR test. A consolidated test summary sheet was generated, which contained the results obtained from the classical gold standard diagnosis methods along with the Swaasa output. A statistician then compared both the results. The results obtained from the Swaasa AI platform were not accessible to the Physicians at any stage. For phase 3 the effectiveness of Swaasa was measured using the ratio of patients truly diagnosed as positive to all those who had positive test results based on Swaasa.

Event Extraction

Moving windowed signal standard deviation technique was used for extracting the events from the collected cough records [25]. A cough/non-cough classifier was used to separate the cough recordings collected from 252 COVID-19 positive subjects during the derivation phase into true cough and non-cough events like speech, silence, fan sounds, vehicle horns, and noise. A total of 1946 cough events were extracted at this step from both COVID positive and negative subjects.

165 **Feature Extraction**

Both the temporal and frequency domains of each cough event were used to extract the features. Zero crossing rate (ZCR) and energy are the two critical time domain features that

were considered. Mel-frequency cepstrum (MFC), Spectral centroid, Spectral bandwidth, and
Spectral roll off were the frequency domain features that were used for the data analysis [22].
The features were extracted from each frame of the cough signal. The average frame time
was typically 20 milliseconds long. The coughing period can last anywhere from 200 to 700
milliseconds.

173 **Prediction Model**

Coughs were converted to Mel-frequency cepstral coefficient (MFCC) spectrograms to construct a multimodal architecture based on Convolutional Neural Network (CNN) and tabular features. Spectrogram images were fed as input to a CNN classifier for classification. At the same time, a tabular model was trained using features extracted from the frequency and time domains. Feature selection techniques have been used to remove redundant features and to identify the key features.

180 The total features extracted were 209, that includes age, gender, 120 MFCC (40 MFCC, 40 181 first derivatives of MFCC, 40 second order derivatives of MFCC), 9 spectral features 182 (spectral centroid, spectral roll-off, spectral bandwidth, dominant frequency, spectral 183 skewness, spectral kurtosis, spectral crest, spectral spread and spectral entropy), 33 chroma 184 features (11 chroma, 11 first derivatives of chroma, 11 second derivatives of chroma), 18 185 contrast features (6 contrast, 6 first derivatives of contrast, 6 second derivatives of contrast), 186 15 tonnentz features (5 tonnentz, 5 first derivatives of tonnentz, 5 second derivatives of 187 tonnentz), 3 Zero-crossing rate (ZCR, first derivatives of ZCR, second derivatives of ZCR), 3 188 Energy (Energy, first derivatives of energy, second derivatives of energy), 3 skewness 189 (skewness, first derivatives of skewness, second derivatives of skewness), 3 kurtosis 190 (kurtosis, first derivatives of kurtosis, second derivatives of kurtosis). We performed 191 correlation analysis and recursive feature elimination (RFE) on these traits to rank them

according to importance. As part of feature selection, we removed irrelevant features andreduced the number of features in the tabular model to 170.

The output of CNN and tabular models was merged to detect the presence of COVID-19 (yes/no/inconclusive). When the model is unsure if COVID-19 will be detected as yes/no, it provides an inconclusive output as shown in the block diagram Figure 2.

Spectrograms were given as input to a CNN (convolutional neural network) that was pretrained (using transfer learning (Resnet34) with Imagenet for training. In parallel, a tabular model with primary and secondary characteristics was trained. From each of these two models, the last fully connected layer was removed, combined with a new fully connected layer (connected layer), again passed through the linear layer, the activation layer of the final output layer. We call this approach of combining the last layers of two models as combined logic.

204 LIME Representation

The green portion of the Local interpretable model-agnostic explanations (LIME) representation [27] illustrates instances in which the model responded positively to a given class, whereas the red portion highlights instances in which it responded negatively. To "explain" a prediction, we refer to the display of textual or visual artefacts that give qualitative understanding of the link between the instance's components (such as words in text, patches in a picture, etc.) and the prediction made by the model.

211 Statistical significance

A comprehensive assessment of model performance on the test set includes accuracy, sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value (PPV), negative predictive value (NPV), and ROC. To measure the variability of these parameters, we used the Clopper-Pearson method

215 [28] with 95% confidence intervals. To better understand the model's performance in

screening COVID-19 subjects, we also calculated the confusion matrix across the test set.

217 **Results**

218 **Performance parameters in Model derivation phase**

Cough sound data was collected from 252 COVID-19 positive subjects in the derivation phase. Data collected from 390 COVID-19 negative subjects in one of our earlier studies was also considered in this phase. Among 252 subjects, 60% were male and 40% were female, with age ranging from 18 years to 64 & above. Subjects were confirmed with COVID-19 by standard diagnosis methods. In this phase multiple data points were collected from the subjects. Each data point was called a record. A total of 803 cough records were collected from 252 patients.

226 The 252 subject data was divided into training (173) and test (79). The training data was 227 internally divided into training and validation as required to build as well as optimize the 228 model performance based on K-fold cross validation technique. All the 252 subject data was 229 annotated with disease condition as COVID-19 i.e., COVID-19 likely as "yes". For COVID 230 unlikely, data representing other disease conditions was added from pre-existing datasets [29] 231 (collected part of earlier studies) in various propositions. A total of 1213 records data was 232 added to various classifiers. The final confusion matrix for derivation phase is represented in 233 Table 1. The performance parameters such as accuracy, sensitivity, specificity, and AUC 234 (area under the curve) of the model in the derivation phase are enlisted in Table 2.

The model was also evaluated on crowdsourced data, which includes COVID-19 Likely "yes" data from EPFL and Cambridge datasets, whereas COVID-19 Likely "no" is the inhouse data. The final confusion matrix for this dataset is presented in Table 3. The

performance parameters for the same are listed in Table 4. In both the cases an AUC value of > 0.85 AUC has been achieved.

The features listed in Table 5 depicts the mean value of the features extracted from individual frames, where we have considered normal as well as respiratory diseases data other than COVID from our previous validation study conducted at Apollo Hospitals, Hyderabad

243 LIME data comparison

Extremely low spectral frequencies have been observed in conditions such as Normal and Pneumonia as compared to asthma, which has an intermediate spectral frequency. On the other hand, we found that the spectral components are very high in diseases in which mucus accumulates in the airways and fluid accumulates in the parenchyma region. High spectral content is the distinguishing feature of COVID-19 cough from other respiratory diseases.

Feature analysis studies of cough sounds have revealed that it could be utilized for distinguishing diseases. The cough duration and frequency distribution has been found to be unique in a specific respiratory disease, including COVID-19 [30, 31].

We compared the LIME maps of various respiratory diseases with COVID-19 which are enlisted in Table 6. It can be seen in the maps that each disease has a unique frequency distribution. Green patches were more dominant for COVID-19 in high frequency regions. Whereas LIME maps for normal subjects were reacting negatively even though it has some green patches present. Similarly, pneumonia maps were also present in the high frequency range but has a stronger predominance in the medium frequency range. Even for Asthma most of the dominant green patches were seen in the medium frequency region.

From the LIME map analysis, we can conclude that COVID-19 related cough has a unique signature. These key signatures are detected by features extracted from coughs that can be further identified and characterized by machine learning models.

262 Performance Parameters of Model in Validation Phase

Out of 234 subjects participated in the validation phase, 22 were found to be COVID-19 positive and 211 COVID-19 negative by standard diagnostic methods such as RT-PCR.

Results of 1 subject remained inconclusive, hence didn't consider that datapoint. In this phase only one cough record was collected from each subject. Confusion matrix for validation phase of Swaasa model is illustrated in Table 7, where the row represents the actual label, and the column represents predicted label. An accuracy of 75.54% with 95.45% sensitivity and 73.46% specificity was achieved for the Validation phase (Table 8).

270 Model Output in the Pilot phase

A total of 183 patients were recruited for the pilot testing phage. Out of these 183 subjects
Swaasa was able to identify 82 subjects as having a likely presence of SARS-CoV-2. Out of
these 82 subjects, 58 truly turned out to be COVID-19 positive with a Positive predictive
value (PPV) of 70.73%. The confusion matrix for this phase is enlisted in Table 9.
The screening of COVID-19 patients by Swaasa is time saving as compared to the currently

used traditional procedures. Additionally, Swaasa does not need any trained professional; a community healthcare worker can also perform the screening. The technician did not need any specialised equipment or supplies. The only prerequisites to complete the exam are a smartphone and a stable internet connection.

280 Discussion

Accelerated research to find the origin, cause and cure for SARS-CoV-2 infection has resulted in controlling the outspread of COVID-19 to some extent [32]. However, the excessive cost of rapid screening diagnostic kits as well as multiple genetic variants of the virus poses a major hindrance in conducting large scale screening operations [33]. Various researchers across the globe are working to find a cost-effective solution to keep a check on the rapidly mutating virus [34, 35].

287 Machine learning (ML) has immense potential for accurate and rapid detection of various 288 medical conditions [36], including COVID-19, using computed tomography (CT), chest 289 radiography (CXR), and even coughing pattern [37, 38]. Numerous studies have been

conducted in the past to use the information in the cough sound to diagnose and predict the
outcome of various diseases, including lung cancer, bronchitis, pneumonia, COPD, and
asthma [39, 40].

293 In a similar study the authors extracted the MFCCs from cough recordings and fed them into a pretrained CNN model, which resulted in an AUC of 97% with a sensitivity and a 294 295 specificity of 94.2% [17]. Another AI-based COVID-19 cough classifier study includes the 296 analysis of cough recorded over a smartphone, which was able to distinguish COVID-19 297 positive cases from both COVID-19 negative and healthy coughs. An AUC of 98% was 298 achieved using the Resnet50 classifier to discriminate between COVID-19 positive and 299 healthy coughs, while to differentiate between COVID-19 positive and negative coughs an 300 LSTM classifier was used with an AUC of 94% [19]. In one of the studies both coughs and 301 breathing sounds were used to identify how distinct COVID-19 sounds were as compared to 302 asthma patients or healthy individuals. They highlighted that how a simple binary machine-303 learning classifier can distinguish COVID-19 cough sounds from healthy subjects by 304 achieving an overall AUC of above 80% [41]. A recent study made use of an ensemble-based 305 multi-criteria decision-making (MCDM) method for detecting COVID-19 from cough sound 306 data and achieved an AUC of 95% [38].

In our study, we developed the Swaasa AI platform by merging the final output layers of the two separate models i.e., the tabular model (training input: primary and secondary features) and CNN model (training input: MFCC spectrograms) because it provides better prediction outcome as compared to the either logical repression or CNN model used alone by other researchers [19, 38, 41]. We conducted the derivation phase, validation phase and pilot screening on a comparatively large cohort, whereas previous studies were performed on either smaller scale or crowdsource datasets which are highly unreliable [38].

Our model achieved an accuracy of 75.54% with 95.45% sensitivity and 73.46% specificity in the clinical validation phase. The pilot testing was undertaken in a real primary care setting to test the accuracy of the tool. Upon deployed as a screening and triaging tool prior to molecular testing, Swaasa was proven statistically effective in prioritizing at-risk patients for confirmatory testing. In the pilot phase also, the model achieved a positive prediction value of 55.24% in a clinical setup at a tertiary care hospital.

Comparing the performance of current rapid diagnostic tests available for COVID-19, Swaasa's technical and clinical validation results indicate that the device is primarily intended to be used as a screening tool and could be utilized to prioritize the at-risk COVID-19 patients for further evaluation.

The pandemic will truly be over only when the entire world's population is vaccinated. In this context, the primacy of access to testing at scale, with instantaneous results becomes key. With its frugal operation mode, the Swaasa AI Platform holds out the promise of filling the grossly unmet need of ubiquitous, cost-effective, instantaneous testing in inaccessible, resource-poor parts of the world.

329 Data availability

330 Due to the nature of this research, participants of this study did not agree for their data to be

shared publicly. However, the detailed analysis can be shared upon reasonable request.

332 Author contributions

333 PL and DM defined study protocol, including the study design and methodology. NR 334 conceptualized the idea of using cough sounds for screening and diagnosing COVID-19. GR 335 performed literature review and data analysis. BM, CJ, SDP and NKB were involved in 336 device development. VY created value proposition for the device. SS assisted in executing 337 the project at AMC by providing all the resources and extending research capabilities. CG 338 and GR performed data analysis, sample size estimation and result analysis. KKP provided 339 subject matter expertise. GR and PF wrote the manuscript. All the authors provided 340 intellectual inputs and helped in preparing the manuscript.

WHO COVID-19 Dashboard. Geneva: World Health Organization, 2020 [Internet]. .

342 **References**

1.

343

344 2.	Ong SWX, Tan YK, Chia PY, Lee TH, Ng OT, Wong MSY, Marimuthu K. Air,
345	Surface Environmental, and Personal Protective Equipment Contamination by Severe
346	Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) from a Symptomatic
347	Patient. JAMA - J. Am. Med. Assoc. 2020; 323:1610–1612.
348	doi:10.1001/jama.2020.3227.
349 3.	Atzrodt CL, Maknojia I, McCarthy RDP, Oldfield TM, Po J, Ta KTL, Stepp HE,
350	Clements TP. A Guide to COVID-19: a global pandemic caused by the novel
351	coronavirus SARS-CoV-2. FEBS J. 2020; 287:3633–3650. doi:10.1111/febs.15375.
352 4.	Nalbandian A, Sehgal K, Gupta A, Madhavan M V., McGroder C, Stevens JS, Cook
353	JR, Nordvig AS, Shalev D, Sehrawat TS, Ahluwalia N, Bikdeli B, Dietz D, Der-
354	Nigoghossian C, Liyanage-Don N, Rosner GF, Bernstein EJ, Mohan S, Beckley AA,
355	Seres DS, Choueiri TK, Uriel N, Ausiello JC, Accili D, Freedberg DE, Baldwin M,
356	Schwartz A, Brodie D, Garcia CK, Elkind MSV, et al. Post-acute COVID-19
357	syndrome. Nat. Med. 2021; 27:601-615. doi:10.1038/s41591-021-01283-z.
358 5.	DU Z, Pandey A, Bai Y, C. Fitzpatrick M, Chinazzi M, Pastore y Piontti A, Lachmann
359	M, Vespignani A, J. Cowling B, P. Galvani A, Meyers LA. Comparative Cost-
360	Effectiveness of SARS-CoV-2 Testing Strategies. SSRN Electron. J. 2020; .
361	doi:10.2139/ssrn.3714642.
362 6.	Tahamtan A, Ardebili A. Real-time RT-PCR in COVID-19 detection: issues affecting
363	the results. <i>Expert Rev. Mol. Diagn.</i> 2020; 20 :453–454.
364	doi:10.1080/14737159.2020.1757437.
365 7.	Alimohamadi Y, Sepandi M, Taghdir M, Hosamirudsari H. Determine the most

366 common clinical symptoms in COVID-19 patients: A systematic review and meta-

analysis. J. Prev. Med. Hyg. 2020; 61:E304–E312. doi:10.15167/24214248/jpmh2020.61.3.1530.

- Chung KF, Pavord ID. Prevalence, pathogenesis, and causes of chronic cough. *Lancet* 2008; **371**:1364–1374. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(08)60595-4.
- Simonsson BG, Jacobs FM, Nadel JA. Role of Autonomic Nervous System and the
 Cough Reflex in the Increased Responsiveness of Airways in Patients with Obstructive
- 373 Airway Disease. J. Clin. Invest. 1967; **46**:1812–1818. doi:10.1172/JCI105671.
- 10. Song W-J, Hui CKM, Hull JH, Birring SS, McGarvey L, Mazzone SB, Chung KF.
- 375 Confronting COVID-19-associated cough and the post-COVID syndrome: role of viral
- neurotropism, neuroinflammation, and neuroimmune responses. *Lancet Respir. Med.*
- 377 2021; **9**:533–544. doi:10.1016/S2213-2600(21)00125-9.
- Higenbottam T. Chronic cough and the cough reflex in common lung diseases. *Pulm. Pharmacol. Ther.* 2002; **15**:241–247. doi:10.1006/pupt.2002.0341.
- 12. Kaplan AG. Chronic Cough in Adults: Make the Diagnosis and Make a Difference.
 Pulm. Ther. 2019; 5:11–21. doi:10.1007/s41030-019-0089-7.
- Ashby AE, Meister JA, Gentzke W. Cough-based COVID-19 detection with audio
 quality clustering and confidence measure based learning. *Proc. Mach. Learn. Res.*2022. p. 1–20.
- Sharma N, Krishnan P, Kumar R, Ramoji S, Chetupalli SR, Nirmala R, Kumar Ghosh
 P, Ganapathy S. Coswara A database of breathing, cough, and voice sounds for
 COVID-19 diagnosis. *Proc. Annu. Conf. Int. Speech Commun. Assoc. INTERSPEECH*
- 388 2020. p. 4811–4815. doi:10.21437/Interspeech.2020-2768.
- The Lancet. Artificial intelligence in health care: within touching distance. *Lancet*2017; **390**:2739. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(17)31540-4.
- 16. Ijaz A, Nabeel M, Masood U, Mahmood T, Hashmi MS, Posokhova I, Rizwan A,

- Imran A. Towards using cough for respiratory disease diagnosis by leveraging
 Artificial Intelligence: A survey. *Informatics Med. Unlocked* 2022; 29:1–28.
 doi:10.1016/j.imu.2021.100832.
- 17. Laguarta J, Hueto F, Subirana B. COVID-19 Artificial Intelligence Diagnosis Using
 Only Cough Recordings. *IEEE Open J. Eng. Med. Biol.* 2020; 1:275–281.
 doi:10.1109/OJEMB.2020.3026928.
- Tena A, Clarià F, Solsona F. Automated detection of COVID-19 cough. *Biomed. Signal Process. Control* 2022; **71**. doi:10.1016/j.bspc.2021.103175.
- Pahar M, Klopper M, Warren R, Niesler T. COVID-19 cough classification using
 machine learning and global smartphone recordings. *Comput. Biol. Med.* 2021; 135:1–
 doi:10.1016/j.compbiomed.2021.104572.
- 20. Chowdhury NK, Kabir MA, Rahman MM. An Ensemble-based Multi-Criteria
 Decision Making Method for COVID-19 Cough Classification. 2021; .
- 405 21. Lella KK, Pja A. Automatic diagnosis of COVID-19 disease using deep convolutional
- 406 neural network with multi-feature channel from respiratory sound data: Cough, voice,
- 407 and breath. *Alexandria Eng. J.* 2022; **61**:1319–1334. doi:10.1016/j.aej.2021.06.024.
- 408 22. Ashby AE, Meister JA, Soldar G, Nguyen KA. A novel cough audio segmentation
 409 framework for COVID-19 detection. 2022. p. 1–8.
- Chang J, Ruan Y, Shaoze C, Yit JST, Feng M. UFRC: A Unified Framework for
 Reliable COVID-19 Detection on Crowdsourced Cough Audio. 2022; :2–5.
- 412 24. Jones PW, Quirk FH, Baveystock CM. The St George's Respiratory Questionnaire.
 413 *Respir. Med.* 1991; **85**:25–31. doi:10.1016/S0954-6111(06)80166-6.
- Barry SJ, Dane AD, Morice AH, Walmsley AD. The automatic recognition and
 counting of cough. *Cough* 2006; 2:8. doi:10.1186/1745-9974-2-8.
- 416 26. Andreani V, Gatti G, Simonella L, Rivero V, Maccioni M. Activation of Toll-like

- 417 Receptor 4 on Tumor Cells In vitro Inhibits Subsequent Tumor Growth In vivo.
- 418 *Cancer Res.* 2007; **67**:10519–10527. doi:10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-07-0079.
- 419 27. Ribeiro M, Singh S, Guestrin C. "Why Should I Trust You?": Explaining the
 420 Predictions of Any Classifier. *Proc. 2016 Conf. North Am. Chapter Assoc. Comput.*421 *Linguist. Demonstr.* 2016. p. 1135–1144. doi:10.18653/v1/N16-3020.
- 421 Emguisi. Demonstr. 2010. p. 1135 1144. doi:10.10035/01/1010-5020.
- 422 28. CLOPPER CJ, PEARSON ES. THE USE OF CONFIDENCE OR FIDUCIAL
- 423 LIMITS ILLUSTRATED IN THE CASE OF THE BINOMIAL. *Biometrika* 1934;
 424 26:404–413. doi:10.1093/biomet/26.4.404.
- Rudraraju G, Palreddy SD, Mamidgi B, Sripada NR, Sai YP, Vodnala NK, Haranath
 SP. Cough sound analysis and objective correlation with spirometry and clinical
 diagnosis. *Informatics Med. Unlocked* 2020; **19**:1–11. doi:10.1016/j.imu.2020.100319.
- 30. Turner RD, Bothamley GH. Cough and the Transmission of Tuberculosis. J. Infect.
 Dis. 2015; 211:1367–1372. doi:10.1093/infdis/jiu625.
- 430 31. Belkacem AN, Ouhbi S, Lakas A, Benkhelifa E, Chen C. End-to-End AI-Based Point-431 of-Care Diagnosis System for Classifying Respiratory Illnesses and Early Detection of Theoretical Framework. 432 COVID-19: Α Front. Med. 2021; **8**:1–13. 433 doi:10.3389/fmed.2021.585578.
- Wiersinga WJ, Rhodes A, Cheng AC, Peacock SJ, Prescott HC. Pathophysiology, 434 32. 435 Transmission, Diagnosis, and Treatment of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19): A 436 Review. JAMA J. Am. Med. Assoc. 2020: **324**:782–793. 437 doi:10.1001/jama.2020.12839.
- 33. Schuit E, Venekamp RP, Hooft L, Veldhuijzen IK, van den Bijllaardt W, Pas SD,
 Zwart VF, Lodder EB, Hellwich M, Koppelman M, Molenkamp R, Wijers CJH,
 Vroom IH, Smeets LC, Nagel-Imming CRS, Han WGH, van den Hof S, Kluytmans
 JAJW, van de Wijgert JHHM, Moons KGM. Diagnostic accuracy of covid-19 rapid

442	antigen tests with unsupervised self-sampling in people with symptoms in the omicron

- 443 period: cross sectional study. *BMJ* 2022; **378**:e071215. doi:10.1136/bmj-2022-071215.
- Marino FE, Proffitt E, Joseph E, Manoharan A. A rapid, specific, extraction-less, and
 cost-effective RT-LAMP test for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 in clinical specimens.
- 446 *PLoS One* 2022; **17**:1–15. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0266703.
- 447 35. Filchakova O, Dossym D, Ilyas A, Kuanysheva T, Abdizhamil A, Bukasov R. Review
 448 of COVID-19 testing and diagnostic methods. *Talanta* 2022; 244:123409.
 449 doi:10.1016/j.talanta.2022.123409.
- Aggarwal R, Sounderajah V, Martin G, Ting DSW, Karthikesalingam A, King D,
 Ashrafian H, Darzi A. Diagnostic accuracy of deep learning in medical imaging: a
 systematic review and meta-analysis. *npj Digit. Med.* 2021; 4. doi:10.1038/s41746021-00438-z.
- 454 37. Harmon SA, Sanford TH, Xu S, Turkbey EB, Roth H, Xu Z, Yang D, Myronenko A,
- 455 Anderson V, Amalou A, Blain M, Kassin M, Long D, Varble N, Walker SM, Bagci U,
- 456 Ierardi AM, Stellato E, Plensich GG, Franceschelli G, Girlando C, Irmici G, Labella D,
- 457 Hammoud D, Malayeri A, Jones E, Summers RM, Choyke PL, Xu D, Flores M, et al.
- 458 Artificial intelligence for the detection of COVID-19 pneumonia on chest CT using
- 459 multinational datasets. *Nat. Commun.* 2020; **11**:1–7. doi:10.1038/s41467-020-17971-2.
- 460 38. Chowdhury NK, Kabir MA, Rahman MM, Islam SMS. Machine learning for detecting
 461 COVID-19 from cough sounds: An ensemble-based MCDM method. *Comput. Biol.*462 *Med.* 2022; 145:105405. doi:10.1016/j.compbiomed.2022.105405.
- 39. Swarnkar V, Abeyratne UR, Chang AB, Amrulloh YA, Setyati A, Triasih R.
 Automatic Identification of Wet and Dry Cough in Pediatric Patients with Respiratory
 Diseases. *Ann. Biomed. Eng.* 2013; 41:1016–1028. doi:10.1007/s10439-013-0741-6.
- 466 40. Xu X, Nemati E, Vatanparvar K, Nathan V, Ahmed T, Rahman MM, McCaffrey D,

467	Kuang J, Gao JA. Listen2Cough: Leveraging End-to-End Deep Learning Cough
468	Detection Model to Enhance Lung Health Assessment Using Passively Sensed Audio.
469	Proc. ACM Interactive, Mobile, Wearable Ubiquitous Technol. 2021; 5:1–22.
470	doi:10.1145/3448124.
471 41.	Brown C, Chauhan J, Grammenos A, Han J, Hasthanasombat A, Spathis D, Xia T,
472	Cicuta P, Mascolo C. Exploring Automatic Diagnosis of COVID-19 from
473	Crowdsourced Respiratory Sound Data. Proc. ACM SIGKDD Int. Conf. Knowl.
474	Discov. Data Min. 2020; :3474-3484. doi:10.1145/3394486.3412865.

Table 1: Final Confusion matrix for the derivation phase

	COVID-19 Likely - Yes	COVID-19 Likely - No
COVID-19 Likely - Yes	256 (TP)	11 (FN)
COVID-19 Likely - No	12 (FP)	278 (TN)

Table 2: Performance metrics of the derivation phase

Accuracy	96%
Sensitivity	95.8%
Specificity	95.6%
AUC	0.95

Table 3: Final Confusion matrix for the Crowdsource (test) data during derivation phase

	COVID-19 Likely - Yes	COVID-19 Likely - No
COVID-19 Likely - Yes	527 (TP)	91 (FN)
COVID-19 Likely - No	57 (FP)	443 (TN)

Table 4: Performance metrics of Crowdsource (test) data during derivation phase

Accuracy	86%
Sensitivity	85%
Specificity	88%
AUC	0.855

- **Table 5**: Table showing mean values of the Zero crossing rate (ZCR), spectral centroid and
- 487 dominant frequency of various respiratory disease conditions, including COVID-19

Disease Conditions	ZCR Mean values	Spectral centroid mean values	Dominant Frequency mean values
Normal	0.168	2249	844
ILD	0.099	2053	436
COPD	0.08	1947	393
Asthma	0.112	2093	528
Pneumonia	0.118	2249	546
COVID-19	0.246	3710	1287
COVID-19 (Low severity)	0.203	3300	891



- **Table 6**: List of different respiratory diseases showing characteristic cough signature, cough
- 497 spectrograms and related LIME maps



Table 7: Confusion matrix for the validation phase

	COVID-19 Likely - Yes	COVID-19 Likely - No
COVID-19 Likely - Yes	21 (TP)	1 (FN)
COVID-19 Likely - No	56 (FP)	155 (TN)

Table 8: Performance metrics of the validation phase

Statistic Value 95% CI	
--------------------------------	--

Sensitivity	95.45%	75.16% to 99.88%
Specificity	73.46%	69.96% to 79.29%
Positive Likelihood Ratio	3.60	2.82 to 4.58
Negative Likelihood Ratio	0.06	0.01 to 0.42
Disease Prevalence	9.44%	6.01% to 13.95%
Positive Predicate Value	27.27%	22.74% to 32.33%
Negative Predicate Value	99.36%	95.80% to 99.91%
Accuracy	75.54%	69.50% to 80.91%

502

503 **Table 9**: Confusion matrix for the pilot phase

Age Distribution

	COVID-19 Likely - Yes	COVID-19 Likely - No
COVID-19 Likely - Yes	58 (TP)	47 (FN)
COVID-19 Likely - No	24 (FP)	48 (TN)



Gender Distribution

504

Figure 1: Data distribution in the derivation phase, validation phase and pilot testing.

506

507

- **Figure 2**: Block Diagram illustrating the flow of the COVID-19 prediction model.

