

1 **Screening COVID-19 by Swaasa AI Platform using cough sounds: A cross-**  
2 **sectional study**

3 P Padmalatha<sup>1</sup>, Gowrisree Rudraraju\*<sup>2</sup>, Narayana Rao Sripada<sup>2</sup>, Baswaraj Mamidgi<sup>2</sup>, Charishma  
4 Gottipulla<sup>2</sup>, Charan Jalukuru<sup>2</sup>, ShubhaDeepti Palreddy<sup>2</sup>, Nikhil kumar Reddy Bhoge<sup>2</sup>, Priyanka  
5 Firmal<sup>2</sup>, Venkat Yechuri<sup>2</sup>, PV Sudhakar<sup>1</sup>, B Devimadhavi<sup>1</sup>, S Srinivas<sup>1</sup>, K K L Prasad<sup>4</sup>, Niranjana  
6 Joshi<sup>3</sup>

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](mailto: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

## 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**

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

51 symptoms, which can ultimately result in death. Many people are also experiencing post-  
52 covid acute symptoms which affects their overall health status [3, 4]. The containment of  
53 COVID-19 outbreaks became very difficult because of the unavailability of quick and  
54 effective pre-screening techniques. Most of the viral and serological testing methods  
55 available are very expensive, time consuming, require technical expertise and are not always  
56 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  
60 SARC-CoV-2 infection, which results in the dissemination of airborne infectious aerosols  
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.

68 In the past few years, a substantial increase in the studies has been observed in terms of  
69 exploring Artificial Intelligence (AI)-based algorithms in the field of medicine, including the  
70 analysis of cough sound data for determining various respiratory diseases [15, 16]. Various  
71 groups have highlighted the importance of machine-learning techniques in detecting COVID-  
72 19 using cough as opposed to pre-screening methods such as, RT-PCR [17–21]. Despite so  
73 much of investigation for developing a desired AI-based tool, no such device is available in  
74 the market yet. The main factors being the acquisition of cough sound data from crowdsorce

75 open access datasets and lack of proper technical/clinical validations to scale up these tools  
76 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**

95 According to the sample size calculation, a total of 1152 comprising 40% COVID-19 positive  
96 cases and 60% control subjects was appropriate for validating if the device could detect  
97 COVID-19 with a 90% sensitivity on considering a 2.5% error for a 95% confidence interval  
98 (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  
107 technology - Swaasa AI, as an auxiliary to COVID-19 Rapid test”, “COVID-19 Cough Sound  
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).

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

124 asymptomatic patients attending isolation ward for COVID testing and (d) Pregnant females  
125 were completely excluded from the current study. COVID precautionary and infection  
126 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.

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

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

138 **Phase 2:** Clinical validation to quantify the performance of the device against clinical  
139 diagnosis based on reference standard test.

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

146 **Phase 3:** Pilot test to quantify the effectiveness of the device when deployed as a screening  
147 tool prior to diagnosis.

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

### 150 **Data analysis**

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

### 158 **Event Extraction**

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

### 165 **Feature Extraction**

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

168 were considered. Mel-frequency cepstrum (MFC), Spectral centroid, Spectral bandwidth, and  
169 Spectral roll off were the frequency domain features that were used for the data analysis [22].

170 The features were extracted from each frame of the cough signal. The average frame time  
171 was typically 20 milliseconds long. The coughing period can last anywhere from 200 to 700  
172 milliseconds.

### 173 **Prediction Model**

174 Coughs were converted to Mel-frequency cepstral coefficient (MFCC) spectrograms to  
175 construct a multimodal architecture based on Convolutional Neural Network (CNN) and  
176 tabular features. Spectrogram images were fed as input to a CNN classifier for classification.  
177 At the same time, a tabular model was trained using features extracted from the frequency  
178 and time domains. Feature selection techniques have been used to remove redundant features  
179 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



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

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

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

#### 204 **LIME Representation**

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

#### 211 **Statistical significance**

212 A comprehensive assessment of model performance on the test set includes accuracy,  
213 sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value (PPV), negative predictive value (NPV), and  
214 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  
216 screening COVID-19 subjects, we also calculated the confusion matrix across the test set.

## 217 **Results**

### 218 **Performance parameters in Model derivation phase**

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

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

238 performance parameters for the same are listed in Table 4. In both the cases an AUC value of  
239  $> 0.85$  AUC has been achieved.

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

### 243 **LIME data comparison**

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

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

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

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

### 262 **Performance Parameters of Model in Validation Phase**

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

265 Results of 1 subject remained inconclusive, hence didn't consider that datapoint. In this phase  
266 only one cough record was collected from each subject. Confusion matrix for validation  
267 phase of Swaasa model is illustrated in Table 7, where the row represents the actual label, and  
268 the column represents predicted label. An accuracy of 75.54% with 95.45% sensitivity and  
269 73.46% specificity was achieved for the Validation phase (Table 8).

#### 270 **Model Output in the Pilot phase**

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

275 The screening of COVID-19 patients by Swaasa is time saving as compared to the currently  
276 used traditional procedures. Additionally, Swaasa does not need any trained professional; a  
277 community healthcare worker can also perform the screening. The technician did not need  
278 any specialised equipment or supplies. The only prerequisites to complete the exam are a  
279 smartphone and a stable internet connection.

#### 280 **Discussion**

281 Accelerated research to find the origin, cause and cure for SARS-CoV-2 infection has  
282 resulted in controlling the outspread of COVID-19 to some extent [32]. However, the  
283 excessive cost of rapid screening diagnostic kits as well as multiple genetic variants of the  
284 virus poses a major hindrance in conducting large scale screening operations [33]. Various  
285 researchers across the globe are working to find a cost-effective solution to keep a check on  
286 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

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

293 In a similar study the authors extracted the MFCCs from cough recordings and fed them into  
294 a pretrained CNN model, which resulted in an AUC of 97% with a sensitivity and a  
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].

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

314 Our model achieved an accuracy of 75.54% with 95.45% sensitivity and 73.46% specificity  
315 in the clinical validation phase. The pilot testing was undertaken in a real primary care setting  
316 to test the accuracy of the tool. Upon deployed as a screening and triaging tool prior to  
317 molecular testing, Swaasa was proven statistically effective in prioritizing at-risk patients for  
318 confirmatory testing. In the pilot phase also, the model achieved a positive prediction value of  
319 55.24% in a clinical setup at a tertiary care hospital.

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

324 The pandemic will truly be over only when the entire world's population is vaccinated. In this  
325 context, the primacy of access to testing at scale, with instantaneous results becomes key.  
326 With its frugal operation mode, the Swaasa AI Platform holds out the promise of filling the  
327 grossly unmet need of ubiquitous, cost-effective, instantaneous testing in inaccessible,  
328 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  
331 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.

341

342 **References**

- 343 1. WHO COVID-19 Dashboard. Geneva: World Health Organization, 2020 [Internet]. .
- 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. *Expert Rev. Mol. Diagn.* 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-



- 367 analysis. *J. Prev. Med. Hyg.* 2020; **61**:E304–E312. doi:10.15167/2421-  
368 4248/jpmh2020.61.3.1530.
- 369 8. Chung KF, Pavord ID. Prevalence, pathogenesis, and causes of chronic cough. *Lancet*  
370 2008; **371**:1364–1374. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(08)60595-4.
- 371 9. Simonsson BG, Jacobs FM, Nadel JA. Role of Autonomic Nervous System and the  
372 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.
- 374 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  
376 neurotropism, neuroinflammation, and neuroimmune responses. *Lancet Respir. Med.*  
377 2021; **9**:533–544. doi:10.1016/S2213-2600(21)00125-9.
- 378 11. Higenbottam T. Chronic cough and the cough reflex in common lung diseases. *Pulm.*  
379 *Pharmacol. Ther.* 2002; **15**:241–247. doi:10.1006/pupt.2002.0341.
- 380 12. Kaplan AG. Chronic Cough in Adults: Make the Diagnosis and Make a Difference.  
381 *Pulm. Ther.* 2019; **5**:11–21. doi:10.1007/s41030-019-0089-7.
- 382 13. Ashby AE, Meister JA, Gentzke W. Cough-based COVID-19 detection with audio  
383 quality clustering and confidence measure based learning. *Proc. Mach. Learn. Res.*  
384 2022. p. 1–20.
- 385 14. Sharma N, Krishnan P, Kumar R, Ramoji S, Chetupalli SR, Nirmala R, Kumar Ghosh  
386 P, Ganapathy S. Coswara - A database of breathing, cough, and voice sounds for  
387 COVID-19 diagnosis. *Proc. Annu. Conf. Int. Speech Commun. Assoc. INTERSPEECH*  
388 2020. p. 4811–4815. doi:10.21437/Interspeech.2020-2768.
- 389 15. The Lancet. Artificial intelligence in health care: within touching distance. *Lancet*  
390 2017; **390**:2739. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(17)31540-4.
- 391 16. Ijaz A, Nabeel M, Masood U, Mahmood T, Hashmi MS, Posokhova I, Rizwan A,

- 392 Imran A. Towards using cough for respiratory disease diagnosis by leveraging  
393 Artificial Intelligence: A survey. *Informatics Med. Unlocked* 2022; **29**:1–28.  
394 doi:10.1016/j.imu.2021.100832.
- 395 17. Laguarda J, Hueto F, Subirana B. COVID-19 Artificial Intelligence Diagnosis Using  
396 Only Cough Recordings. *IEEE Open J. Eng. Med. Biol.* 2020; **1**:275–281.  
397 doi:10.1109/OJEMB.2020.3026928.
- 398 18. Tena A, Clarià F, Solsona F. Automated detection of COVID-19 cough. *Biomed.*  
399 *Signal Process. Control* 2022; **71**. doi:10.1016/j.bspc.2021.103175.
- 400 19. Pahar M, Klopper M, Warren R, Niesler T. COVID-19 cough classification using  
401 machine learning and global smartphone recordings. *Comput. Biol. Med.* 2021; **135**:1–  
402 10. doi:10.1016/j.compbiomed.2021.104572.
- 403 20. Chowdhury NK, Kabir MA, Rahman MM. An Ensemble-based Multi-Criteria  
404 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.
- 410 23. Chang J, Ruan Y, Shaoze C, Yit JST, Feng M. UFRC: A Unified Framework for  
411 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.
- 414 25. Barry SJ, Dane AD, Morice AH, Walmsley AD. The automatic recognition and  
415 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.
- 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.
- 425 29. Rudraraju G, Palreddy SD, Mamidgi B, Sripada NR, Sai YP, Vodnala NK, Haranath  
426 SP. Cough sound analysis and objective correlation with spirometry and clinical  
427 diagnosis. *Informatics Med. Unlocked* 2020; **19**:1–11. doi:10.1016/j.imu.2020.100319.
- 428 30. Turner RD, Bothamley GH. Cough and the Transmission of Tuberculosis. *J. Infect.*  
429 *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  
432 COVID-19: A Theoretical Framework. *Front. Med.* 2021; **8**:1–13.  
433 doi:10.3389/fmed.2021.585578.
- 434 32. Wiersinga WJ, Rhodes A, Cheng AC, Peacock SJ, Prescott HC. Pathophysiology,  
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.
- 438 33. Schuit E, Venekamp RP, Hooft L, Veldhuijzen IK, van den Bijllaardt W, Pas SD,  
439 Zwart VF, Lodder EB, Hellwich M, Koppelman M, Molenkamp R, Wijers CJH,  
440 Vroom IH, Smeets LC, Nagel-Imming CRS, Han WGH, van den Hof S, Kluytmans  
441 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.
- 444 34. Marino FE, Proffitt E, Joseph E, Manoharan A. A rapid, specific, extraction-less, and  
445 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.
- 450 36. Aggarwal R, Sounderajah V, Martin G, Ting DSW, Karthikesalingam A, King D,  
451 Ashrafian H, Darzi A. Diagnostic accuracy of deep learning in medical imaging: a  
452 systematic review and meta-analysis. *npj Digit. Med.* 2021; **4**. doi:10.1038/s41746-  
453 021-00438-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.compbimed.2022.105405.
- 463 39. Swarnkar V, Abeyratne UR, Chang AB, Amrulloh YA, Setyati A, Triasih R.  
464 Automatic Identification of Wet and Dry Cough in Pediatric Patients with Respiratory  
465 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.

475

476 **Table 1:** Final Confusion matrix for the derivation phase

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

477

478 **Table 2:** Performance metrics of the derivation phase

<b>Accuracy</b>	96%
<b>Sensitivity</b>	95.8%
<b>Specificity</b>	95.6%
<b>AUC</b>	0.95

479

480 **Table 3:** Final Confusion matrix for the Crowdsourc (test) data during derivation phase

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

481

482

483

484 **Table 4:** Performance metrics of Crowdsorce (test) data during derivation phase

<b>Accuracy</b>	86%
<b>Sensitivity</b>	85%
<b>Specificity</b>	88%
<b>AUC</b>	0.855

485

486 **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

<b>Disease Conditions</b>	<b>ZCR Mean values</b>	<b>Spectral centroid mean values</b>	<b>Dominant Frequency mean values</b>
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

488

489

490

491


492

493

494

495

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



498

499 **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)

500

501 **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

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



504

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

506

507

508




509

510

511

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

513



514