

MANUSCRIPT

Title: Ventilatory Burden Predicts Change in Sleepiness Following Positive Airway Pressure in Sleep Apnea

Running Head: Ventilatory Burden Predicts Change in Sleepiness

Authors: Eric Staykov^{1,*}, BSc, BEng; Dwayne L. Mann¹, PhD; Samu Kainulainen^{2,3}, PhD; Timo Leppänen^{1,2,3}, PhD; Juha Töyräs^{1,2,4}, PhD; Ali Azarbarzin⁵, PhD; Scott A. Sands^{5,#}, PhD; and Philip I. Terrill^{1,#}, PhD

Affiliations

¹ School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, The University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia

² Department of Technical Physics, University of Eastern Finland, Kuopio, Finland

³ Diagnostic Imaging Center, Kuopio University Hospital, Kuopio, Finland

⁴ Science Service Center, Kuopio University Hospital, Kuopio, Finland

⁵ Division of Sleep and Circadian Disorders, Department of Medicine, Brigham & Women's Hospital & Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA

*Correspondence: Eric Staykov, School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, The University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia. E-mail: e.staykov@uq.edu.au

#These authors contributed equally.

Author Contributions

Study design: ES, PIT, SAS, DLM, JT; algorithm development: ES, AA, SAS, DLM, PIT, SK, TL, JT; data collection, collation, and quality checking: ES, DLM, PIT, SAS; data analysis: ES, PIT, SAS, DLM; interpretation of results and preparation of the manuscript: all authors.

Sources of Support

ES was supported by the National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) of Australia (grant 2001729). **TL** was supported by The State Research Funding for university-level health research, Kuopio University Hospital, Wellbeing Service County of North Savo (project 5041794). **JT** was supported by the NHMRC (grants 2001729 and 2007001), NordForsk (NordSleep project 90458) via Business Finland (5133/31/2018), and Sigrid Jusélius Foundation (decision number 230216), and has received royalties related to Bittium BrainStatus EEG electrode (unrelated to the submitted work). **SAS** has received funding from the American Academy of Sleep Medicine Foundation (228-SR-20) and the National Institute of Health NHLBI (grants R01HL146697 and R01HL168067). SAS has received grant support from Apnimed, Prosomnus, and Dynaflex for unrelated studies, and has received personal fees as a consultant for LinguaFlex, Nox Medical, Merck, Apnimed, Inspire Medical Systems, Eli Lilly, Respicardia, and Forepont (unrelated to the submitted work). SAS has patents on sleep apnea pharmacotherapy and phenotyping from wearable technology and his industry interactions are managed by Brigham and Women's Hospital and Mass General Brigham in accordance with their conflict of interest policies. **SK** has received research funding from The State Research Funding for university-level health research, Kuopio University Hospital, Wellbeing Service County of North Savo (project 5041794), the Finnish Cultural Foundation (Central Fund), and the Research Council of Finland (project 360119). **PIT** was supported by The University of Queensland, Queensland Health Metro North, and NHMRC (grants

2001729 and 2007001). PIT has received honoraria from the University of Adelaide, University of Sydney, and Flinders University (unrelated to the submitted work). **DLM** was supported by the NHMRC (grants 2001729 and 2007001). **AA** has received research funding from the American Academy of Sleep Medicine, American Heart Association, and National Institute of Health. AA has received a grant from Somnifix; consulting fees from Respicardia, Apnimed, LinguaFlex, Eli Lilly, and Inspire; honoraria from University of Alberta for a grant review; honoraria from the American Academy of Orofacial Pain for a lecture; equipment loaned from Philips Respironics; and has a patent pending for phenotyping sleep apnea using wearables (all unrelated to the submitted work).

Abstract

Rationale: Excessive daytime sleepiness, an important symptom of obstructive sleep apnea (OSA), is commonly quantified using the Epworth Sleepiness Scale score (ESS). Baseline OSA severity measures (ventilatory burden, flow limitation, and hypoxemia) provide insights into OSA pathophysiology and could predict changes in sleepiness (i.e. change-in-ESS) following continuous positive airway pressure (CPAP) treatment.

Objectives: We hypothesized that change-in-ESS following CPAP treatment can be predicted from baseline polysomnography.

Methods: Associations between OSA severity measures and ESS were evaluated in 2332 participants, adjusting for age, sex, BMI, and total sleep time. Change-in-ESS prediction was evaluated using 213 CPAP treatment studies (HomePAP, BestAIR, and ABC) in three steps: severity measures were compared (adjusted regression, $n=64$), a prediction model was developed using baseline ventilatory burden and baseline ESS ($n=139$), and then evaluated in holdout participants ($n=74$).

Measurements and Main Results: In cross-sectional analysis, ESS was associated with ventilatory burden (0.45 points/SD; 95% CI 0.23–0.67), hypoxic burden (0.39; 0.17–0.62), the apnea-hypopnea index (AHI) (0.36; 0.14–0.59), and flow limitation severity (0.22; 0.01–0.43). Comparison analysis revealed that change-in-ESS was most strongly associated with baseline ventilatory burden (-1.08 points/SD; -2.13 to -0.05) and baseline ESS (-2.75; -3.83 to -1.69); the AHI association was weaker (-0.97; -2.01–0.05). Predicted change-in-ESS and actual change-in-ESS were correlated in holdout participants (adjusted $R^2=0.313$); median [IQR] actual change-in-ESS of predicted responders (≥ 2 -point ESS improvement, $n=54$, 73.0%) was -5.0 [-10.0 to -2.0] and non-responders was 0.0 [-1.0–1.0] ($P<0.001$).

Conclusions: Baseline ventilatory burden and baseline ESS were independently associated with change-in-ESS and could be used together to inform clinicians whether CPAP treatment will likely improve a patient's sleepiness.

Keywords: ventilation; flow limitation; hypoxemia; Epworth Sleepiness Scale; machine learning

Introduction

Worldwide, almost 425 million adults aged 30 to 69 years have moderate to severe obstructive sleep apnea (OSA), for which treatment is recommended (1). Excessive daytime sleepiness (hypersomnia) is an important symptom of OSA and is associated with adverse consequences such as increased risk of driving accidents (2). The Epworth Sleepiness Scale score (ESS) is the most common quantification of sleepiness in OSA, and is measured from 0 to 24 points using 8 questions on a 0- to 3-point Likert scale (3). Continuous positive airway pressure (CPAP) is the first-line treatment for OSA. Meta-analyses report that CPAP improves ESS by an average of 2.4–2.9 points more than placebo (4, 5). However, 28% of all treated patients and 19% of optimally treated patients (≥ 7 hours/night CPAP use) have residual sleepiness (ESS >10) (6, 7). Enabling clinicians to accurately predict a patient's change-in-ESS following CPAP treatment using baseline data may improve CPAP prescription and patient uptake decisions.

Several studies have examined the relationship between baseline polysomnographic characteristics and change in sleepiness following CPAP treatment, with conflicting results. Bhat *et al.* found significant correlations between change-in-ESS and baseline apnea-hypopnea index (AHI) and baseline time below 90% oxygen saturation (T90) in severe OSA (8). However, Kingshott *et al.* reported no significant correlations between change-in-ESS and baseline AHI, arousal index, oxygen desaturation index (ODI), or minimum oxygen saturation in severe OSA (9). Another study showed that baseline AHI was not a predictor of change-in-ESS, but paradoxically lower baseline AHI was associated with greater improvement in the Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index (PSQI) (10). Balakrishnan *et al.* demonstrated that baseline OSA severity category (mild, moderate, and severe) and a composite metric named the Sleep Apnea Severity Index (SASI) were both associated with CPAP-related change in PSQI (11). Several algorithms have recently been developed that quantify different domains of OSA pathophysiology from diagnostic polysomnography (Figure 1), i.e. ventilatory burden (12, 13), flow limitation severity and frequency (14, 15), and hypoxemia severity (16, 17). These measures have demonstrated stronger associations with outcomes such as sleepiness, vigilance, cardiovascular disease, and all-cause mortality than conventional clinical metrics such as the AHI (18-20). To date, the potential to predict CPAP-related change-in-ESS using advanced measures from baseline polysomnography has not been evaluated.

The overarching goal of this study was to determine whether baseline polysomnographic characteristics can predict change-in-ESS following CPAP treatment. We hypothesized that: 1) physiology-based measures of OSA severity (ventilatory burden, flow limitation, and hypoxemia severity) would be associated with both baseline ESS and change-in-ESS, independent of confounders and mediators; 2) change-in-ESS can be predicted from baseline polysomnography, and that physiology-based measures of OSA severity would have more predictive ability than conventional measures of OSA severity such as the AHI; and 3) predicted change-in-ESS can be used to stratify responders (≥ 2 -point ESS improvement (21, 22)) from non-responders. Finally, we sought to provide a chart that allows clinicians to use baseline polysomnography and patient characteristics to predict change-in-ESS following CPAP treatment.

Methods

Below are key methodological details. More specific details are provided in the Supplementary Methods. Figure 2 shows a flow chart of the data analysis steps in this study.

Study design and participants

This study used data from MESA ($n=1795$), STAGES ($n=324$), HomePAP ($n=133$), BestAIR ($n=62$), and ABC ($n=18$) studies. MESA is an ethnically diverse community sample of participants without

known cardiovascular disease. The STAGES cohort consists of participants with suspected OSA who underwent diagnostic polysomnography. In MESA and STAGES, participants had a single ESS measurement and polysomnography. HomePAP, BestAIR, and ABC participants had a baseline ESS measurement and diagnostic polysomnography prior to CPAP treatment, and a follow-up ESS measurement after the treatment period. The treatment period varied between participants, with the median [IQR] being 3 [3–6] months. HomePAP participants had baseline $AHI \geq 15$ events/hour and $ESS \geq 12$ points and were randomized to home or in-lab diagnostic/management pathways. The BestAIR study recruited participants with prior cardiovascular disease who were not severely sleepy ($ESS \leq 14$ points) to examine the effect of CPAP treatment on blood pressure. ABC participants had at least one OSA symptom, BMI between 35–45 kg/m², and $AHI \geq 20$ events/hour; and were randomized to CPAP and bariatric surgery groups. Individual study details are reported in respective publications (19, 20, 23–25). Participant exclusion criteria are presented in Figure E1. Analyses were approved by The University of Queensland Research Ethics and Integrity unit (2023/HE000064, 2023/HE001953, and 2021/HE002256).

Quantifications of OSA severity

For each cohort, consistent respiratory and desaturation event criteria were applied before computing OSA severity metrics. OSA severity was quantified using two measures of ventilatory burden (12, 13), two measures of flow limitation (14, 15), two measures of hypoxemia severity (16, 17), the SASI (26), and conventional clinical metrics. “Event-related ventilatory burden” is cumulative lost ventilation per hour during sleep (12), and “breath-related ventilatory burden” is the percentage of breaths during sleep under 50% eupnea, modified from Parekh *et al.* (13).

Cross-sectional and CPAP treatment study analyses

All continuous variables were transformed for normality and standardized (Table E1). To determine which predictor variables are associated with baseline sleepiness and might therefore be predictive of change-in-ESS, associations between predictor variables and ESS were evaluated in 2332 participants across MESA and STAGES cohorts and HomePAP, BestAIR, and ABC studies (using their baseline ESS and diagnostic polysomnography prior to CPAP treatment). Multivariable linear regression models were adjusted for age, sex, BMI, and total sleep time. The significance level threshold was $P < 0.05$.

Change-in-ESS prediction was evaluated in 213 participants across HomePAP, BestAIR, and ABC studies in three steps. First, relationships between baseline OSA severity measures and change-in-ESS were evaluated using multivariable linear regression in the HomePAP home cohort, noting that the polysomnograms from these studies had unfiltered and high signal-to-noise ratio nasal airflow which is needed to confidently compute flow limitation metrics. Linear regression models were adjusted for: 1) baseline ESS; 2) age, sex, and baseline BMI; and 3) age, sex, baseline BMI, total sleep time, baseline ESS, and nightly CPAP use. Next, cross-validated stepwise linear regression was performed using HomePAP home studies to determine the best combination of predictors of change-in-ESS, which were further confirmed using an alternative approach known as LASSO regression. Finally, data from HomePAP, BestAIR, and ABC studies ($n=139$) were used to train linear regression models to predict change-in-ESS using baseline OSA severity measures. These models were tested in holdout participants from these cohorts ($n=74$). Participants were ordered by their identification number and alternately allocated to training and holdout datasets.

Results

Participant characteristics are summarized in Tables 1 and 2. Histograms showing distributions of variables and scatter plots showing relationships between variables for all participants from all

cohorts are presented in Figure E2. In the combined cohort consisting of 2332 participants (Figure 3), increased ESS was associated with increased event-related ventilatory burden (0.45 points/SD; 95% CI 0.23–0.67), hypoxic burden (0.39; 0.17–0.62), AHI (0.36; 0.14–0.59), and flow limitation severity (0.22; 0.01–0.43).

Multivariable linear regression (Figures 4 and E3) revealed that change-in-ESS was most strongly associated with baseline event-related ventilatory burden (-1.08 points/SD; -2.13 to -0.06) and baseline ESS (-2.75; -3.83 to -1.69); the AHI association was weaker (-0.97; -2.01–0.05). Event-related ventilatory burden was significantly associated with change-in-ESS after adjusting for age, sex, and baseline BMI (-1.46; -2.78 to -0.17), and borderline significant after further adjusting for total sleep time, baseline ESS, and nightly CPAP use (-0.99; -2.15–0.15). Variable selection was performed in a subset of the training dataset (HomePAP home studies, $n=64$). Baseline event-related ventilatory burden and baseline ESS was the most frequently selected combination of predictors of change-in-ESS using cross-validated stepwise linear regression (Table E2). They were also the first and only two variables to be selected using cross-validated LASSO selection of variables (Figure E4).

The linear regression model developed using both baseline event-related ventilatory burden and baseline ESS provided an adjusted R^2 (between predicted change-in-ESS and actual change-in-ESS) of 0.484 in the training dataset and 0.313 in the holdout dataset (Figure 5). Heteroscedasticity and bias were absent in Bland-Altman plots. In a comparative analysis, the use of baseline hypoxic burden rather than baseline event-related ventilatory burden provided an adjusted R^2 of 0.296 in the holdout dataset; the use of baseline AHI rather than baseline event-related ventilatory burden provided a value of 0.272; the use of baseline ESS alone provided a value of 0.234; and the use of the SASI provided a value of 0.228 (Table 3). The linear regression model provided a dichotomous prediction of ≥ 2 -point ESS improvement (21, 22) after defining an optimal threshold (receiver operating characteristic curve, see Supplementary Figure E5). In the holdout dataset, predicted responders exhibited a median [IQR] change-in-ESS of -5.0 [-10.0 to -2.0], which was significantly different from predicted non-responders (0.0 [-1.0–1.0], $P<0.001$, Figure 6). The classifier had 91.5% sensitivity, 59.3% specificity, and 79.7% accuracy. In sensitivity analyses, similar performance was observed when the change-in-ESS responder/non-responder threshold was varied from -1 to -9 (Table E3). In a comparative analysis, the use of baseline hypoxic burden rather than baseline event-related ventilatory burden had an accuracy of 77.0% in the holdout dataset; the use of baseline AHI rather than baseline event-related ventilatory burden had an accuracy of 77.0%; the use of baseline ESS alone had an accuracy of 77.0%; and the use of the SASI had an accuracy of 62.2% (Table E4). Higher sensitivities, lower specificities, and lower accuracies were observed when false positives had half the penalty weight of false negatives (Figures E6–E7 and Tables E5–E6).

A chart showing predicted change-in-ESS from baseline ventilatory burden and baseline ESS was created using the final linear regression model trained on all HomePAP, BestAIR, and ABC participants (Figure 7). In secondary exploratory analyses, %change-in-ESS was used as the outcome measure instead of change-in-ESS (Figures E8–E9 and Table E7).

Discussion

The objective of this study was to determine whether characteristics from baseline polysomnography can predict change-in-ESS following CPAP treatment. First, associations between OSA severity measures and baseline ESS were evaluated to determine which variables were associated with sleepiness and might therefore be predictive of change-in-ESS. In 2332 participants, ESS was associated with ventilatory burden, hypoxic burden, AHI, and flow limitation severity, independent of potential confounders. Second, change-in-ESS prediction was evaluated using CPAP treatment

studies (HomePAP, BestAIR, and ABC) in three steps: severity measures were compared (adjusted regression, $n=64$), a regression-based prediction model was developed in training participants ($n=139$), and then tested in holdout participants ($n=74$) to evaluate the model's generalizability. Comparison analysis revealed that change-in-ESS was most strongly associated with baseline event-related ventilatory burden (i.e. cumulative lost ventilation per hour during sleep) and baseline ESS. These two variables were the most frequently chosen combination of predictors of change-in-ESS using cross-validated stepwise and LASSO selection of variables. The prediction model using baseline ventilatory burden and baseline ESS had higher correlation between predicted change-in-ESS and actual change-in-ESS than comparative models using baseline hypoxic burden and ESS; baseline AHI and ESS; baseline ESS only; and the Sleep Apnea Severity Index (SASI). The prediction model distinguished responders (≥ 2 -point ESS improvement with CPAP) from non-responders with high sensitivity, low specificity, and slightly higher accuracy than the models trained using alternative metrics. Finally, the model was presented in the form of a chart designed to allow clinicians to predict change-in-ESS from baseline ventilatory burden and baseline ESS.

Mechanistic insights

In this study, we demonstrated that ventilatory burden was associated with both baseline ESS and CPAP treatment-induced change-in-ESS. Ventilatory burden may contribute to hypersomnia in OSA via two pathways. First, lost ventilation during respiratory events may cause hypercapnia and acute respiratory acidosis leading to daytime sleepiness (27-29). Indeed, patients with OSA treated with CPAP show significant decreases in wake pCO_2 and daytime sleepiness (30). Second, lost ventilation can lead to intermittent hypoxemia and hypoxia, leading to oxidative injury, changes in neuronal connectedness, and increased inflammation in wake-promoting regions of the brain and brainstem (31, 32). We also observed that hypoxic burden was associated with baseline ESS and change-in-ESS, which supports this notion. However, the effect size of ventilatory burden was slightly larger than that of hypoxic burden, possibly because ventilatory burden captures both hypoxemia and hypercapnia aspects of OSA.

Several studies have examined the relationship between baseline polysomnographic characteristics and change-in-ESS following CPAP treatment. Bhat *et al.* reported significant correlations between change-in-ESS and baseline AHI and T90 in severe OSA (8). However, only patients who were adherent (≥ 4 hours CPAP use/night for 60% of nights) and adequately treated (residual AHI ≤ 5 events/hour) were included in their study. The results of our study – which included all individuals regardless of adherence and residual AHI – are in concordance, i.e. higher baseline OSA severity (ventilatory burden) was associated with greater ESS improvement. In contrast, Kingshott *et al.* found no significant correlation between change-in-ESS and baseline AHI, arousal index, ODI, and minimum oxygen saturation in severe OSA (9). They did, however, find that CPAP use (hours/night) was associated with change-in-ESS. Similarly, Otsuka *et al.* showed that baseline AHI was not a predictor of change-in-ESS and that CPAP use was (10). Other studies have demonstrated a dose-response relationship between CPAP usage and improvement in self-reported sleepiness (33, 34). This contrasts with our findings that CPAP use was not significantly associated with the change-in-ESS (Figure E3). Likewise, prior analysis of the HomePAP cohort (35) indicated that CPAP was associated with change-in-ESS, but not after adjusting for baseline AHI, and that higher baseline AHI was associated with ESS normalization. Furthermore, Bonsignore *et al.* showed that change-in-ESS was weakly correlated with CPAP use ($R^2=0.023$), and baseline AHI and oxygen saturation parameters were meaningfully different between patients with and without hypersomnia at baseline and follow-up (7). Thus, there is now considerable evidence that baseline disease severity, as well as adherence, influences the improvement in sleepiness in patients treated with CPAP.

We observed that flow limitation was a significant predictor of ESS in the cross-sectional analysis, which is consistent with earlier studies (18, 20, 36). However, flow limitation severity and frequency

were not significant predictors of change-in-ESS in the HomePAP home cohort. The explanation for this may lie with the severity of OSA; flow limitation appears to be most strongly associated with sleepiness in patients without severe OSA (20), and the HomePAP trial participants had relatively severe OSA. Flow limitation may therefore fail to adequately summarize the severity of breathing disturbance in more severe OSA. Nonetheless, in the absence of more severe OSA, flow limitation appears to contribute to OSA-related symptoms: studies have demonstrated that sustained inspiratory flow limitation from suboptimal CPAP pressure was associated with decreased vigilance (37), and that elimination of residual flow limitation with CPAP improves vigilance (38).

Clinical implications

The American Academy of Sleep Medicine (AASM) International Classification of Sleep Disorders states that to diagnose adult OSA, a patient must have either $AHI \geq 15$ events/hour or $AHI \geq 5$ events/hour and one or more symptoms, e.g. sleepiness (39). AASM guidelines for the treatment of adult OSA recommend that clinicians should use CPAP to treat OSA in adults with hypersomnia (40). The ESS is the most common quantification of sleepiness in OSA, with scores >10 indicating hypersomnia (3). From this guidance, clinicians should prescribe CPAP to patients with $AHI \geq 5$ and $ESS > 10$. However, we found that change-in-ESS following CPAP treatment is modulated independently by baseline ventilatory burden and baseline ESS. From our chart, there may be patients with baseline $ESS \leq 10$ points who may have a clinically meaningful improvement in sleepiness (≥ 2 -point ESS improvement (21, 22)) with CPAP treatment but would not be prescribed CPAP based on clinical guidelines (Figure 7). For example, a patient with baseline $ESS = 8$ points, ventilatory burden = 400 %eupnea*min/hour, and $AHI = 10$ events/hour is expected to have a 2-point ESS improvement. Conversely, there may be patients with $AHI \geq 5$ and $ESS > 10$ who are prescribed CPAP but do not have a meaningful improvement in sleepiness due to low ventilatory burden. For example, a patient with baseline $ESS = 11$ points, ventilatory burden = 30 %eupnea*min/hour, and $AHI = 10$ events/hour is expected to have a 1-point ESS improvement. Therefore, our modeling approach has promise as a means to prescribe CPAP more judiciously than current clinical guidelines.

We have addressed several considerations that should be made to develop clinically useful prediction models (41). Our model addresses a clear clinical decision point: whether to prescribe CPAP for OSA. The model outputs expected change-in-ESS with a confidence interval and our easy-to-use chart helps clinicians make this decision. The model's input parameters are baseline ESS and baseline ventilatory burden, which can be calculated from routine polysomnograms using publicly available code (12), making it feasible to integrate into clinical data collection and reporting systems. The AHI could be used in place of ventilatory burden (with a modest loss of performance) when ventilatory burden is unfeasible to calculate. In addition to predicting continuous change-in-ESS, our model can be used to identify likely responders/non-responders with high sensitivity (91.5%) and low specificity (59.3%), which reflects the current clinical practice of prescribing CPAP (35). We showed that 79.6% of predicted responders were actual responders (Figure 6D); if all predicted responders were treated with CPAP there would have been a 44.2% reduction in the rate of non-response compared to treating all patients. If predicted change-in-ESS was available clinically, clinicians and patients could potentially make more informed decisions about the likelihood by which the intervention would improve sleepiness.

Our study implicates ventilatory burden as a candidate measure for OSA severity in place of the AHI. Ventilatory burden is the product of average respiratory event depth, average event duration, and event frequency (Figure 1). Thus, for interpreting the effects of OSA on OSA-related symptoms, respiratory event depth and duration may also be important, beyond event frequency. Ventilatory burden also appeared to perform better than the leading comparator for predicting treatment response, i.e. the "SASI", which has been associated with both change in PSQI and change in Sleep

Apnea Quality of Life Index (11). The SASI is calculated using baseline ESS, AHI, BMI, lowest oxygen saturation, and redundant pharyngeal mucosa (which was not measured and assumed absent for all participants in our study). We found that the SASI was not sufficiently correlated with change-in-ESS (Pearson's $r=-0.52$, Figure E2) to provide a useful cross-validated prediction of change-in-ESS and responders/non-responders. Thus, overall ventilatory burden may be a better disease severity measure of OSA than both the AHI and SASI, passing necessary tests: 1) a cross-sectional association with sleepiness, 2) an association with the treatment-related improvement in sleepiness, and 3) demonstrated ability to predict improvement in sleepiness.

Methodological considerations


This study has several limitations. First, we consider that ventilatory burden may have appeared superior to hypoxemia measures potentially due to heterogeneity in pulse oximetry technology across studies. Thus, the utility of hypoxemia measures as a prediction tool may be somewhat compromised by differences across sites/devices; standardization of technology may improve their predictive ability. Second, the ESS is a subjective measurement of sleepiness. However, in support of the ESS, it has been found to have greater discriminating power than the maintenance of wakefulness test (MWT) and multiple sleep latency test (MSLT) for narcolepsy (42). Additionally, Sun *et al.* observed that functional brain changes after CPAP treatment could only be found by grouping participants based on ESS but not MSLT (43). Furthermore, the ESS is used ubiquitously in sleep medicine, has high internal consistency (44), and the MWT and MSLT were not administered in HomePAP, BestAIR, and ABC studies. Third, baseline ventilatory burden and baseline ESS could not fully explain all variance in change-in-ESS with CPAP treatment. CPAP resolves airway obstruction; however, a patient might be sleepy for reasons other than OSA, e.g. insufficient sleep duration, comorbidities such as obesity and other sleep or circadian disorders, and medications (32, 45). We found that total sleep time and baseline BMI were not significant predictors of change-in-ESS; medication use data was not available in the CPAP treatment studies. Furthermore, heterogeneity in OSA-related neuronal damage via long-term exposure to intermittent hypoxia (46-48) may explain the inability to fully predict change-in-ESS. Fourth, the median follow-up duration in HomePAP was three months; larger ESS improvements may have been observed if the follow-up duration was longer. Indeed, Bonsignore *et al.* reported that the prevalence of hypersomnia decreased as the first follow-up time point after CPAP treatment initialization was extended beyond 3 months (7). Furthermore, change-in-ESS prediction may have been more accurate if the follow-up period was consistent across studies. Fifth, we did not quantify sleep fragmentation and arousal parameters because electroencephalography was not recorded in HomePAP and BestAIR home polysomnograms. However, previous work in a cross-sectional cohort shows that arousal severity was less strongly associated with ESS compared to flow limitation, hypoxemia, and AHI (18). Sixth, no control group was used in this analysis; patient expectation of CPAP benefit can influence change-in-ESS, however, this placebo effect is expected to be approximately -1.2 points (49). Finally, follow-up polysomnograms were either not collected or unusable in the CPAP treatment studies which prevented us from quantifying changes in polysomnography-derived metrics and their relationships with change-in-ESS.

Conclusions

Our work provides novel insight into the polysomnographic measures that are most predictive of the CPAP-related improvement in sleepiness in patients with OSA. Baseline ventilatory burden and baseline ESS were independently associated with change-in-ESS and could be used together to inform clinicians whether CPAP treatment will likely improve a patient's sleepiness.

Figures

Figure 1



B

Metric Name	Equation	Units	Data Required to Compute Metric
Apnea-Hypopnea Index (AHI)	$\frac{\text{Total Apnea Count} + \text{Total Hypopnea Count}}{\text{Total Sleep Time}}$	events/hour	Respiratory events and total sleep time
Event-Related Ventilatory Burden	Average Event Depth \times Average Event Duration \times AHI	%eupnea \cdot min/hour	Nasal airflow signal and AHI
Breath-Related Ventilatory Burden	Percent of Breaths Under 50% Eupnea	%	Nasal airflow signal
Flow Limitation Severity	Median Breath Flow Limitation Severity	%	Nasal airflow signal
Flow Limitation Frequency	Percent of Certain Flow-Limited (FL) Breaths	%	Nasal airflow signal
Hypoxic Burden	Ensemble Averaged Desaturation Area \times AHI	%min/hour	Respiratory events, oxygen saturation signal, and AHI
Desaturation Severity	$\frac{\text{Sum of Desaturation Areas}}{\text{Total Sleep Time}}$	%	Desaturation events, oxygen saturation signal, and total sleep time
Oxygen Desaturation Index	$\frac{\text{Total Desaturation Event Count}}{\text{Total Sleep Time}}$	events/hour	Desaturation events and total sleep time
Lowest O ₂ Saturation	Minimum Oxygen Saturation	%	Oxygen saturation signal

Figure 1. (A) Demonstration of the polysomnographic signals and scored events needed to compute the metrics used in this study, e.g. ventilatory burden, airway flow limitation, and hypoxemia severity. The red horizontal bars represent manually scored arousal, respiratory, or desaturation events. Ventilation and flow limitation were quantified on a breath-by-breath basis, with vertical gray lines denoting the start of automatically detected breaths. “Event-related ventilatory burden” is cumulative lost ventilation per hour during sleep using 90% eupnea as an indication of hypoventilation (12). “Breath-related ventilatory burden” is the percentage of breaths during sleep under 50% eupnea, modified from Parekh *et al.* (13). Where possible, only breaths during sleep excluding arousals were used to compute breath-related metrics (i.e. breath-related ventilatory burden, flow limitation severity, and flow limitation frequency). Airflow shapes were used to estimate flow limitation using continuous (flow limitation severity) and discrete (flow limitation certainty) scales (14, 15). (B) Table of equations, units, and data required to compute the metrics. FL = flow-limited.

Figure 2




Figure 2. Flow chart of the data analysis steps in this study. Note that no HomePAP home participants were included in the holdout dataset because all 64 participants were used for statistical inference and variable selection (Step 3). PSG = polysomnography; ESS = Epworth Sleepiness Scale score.

Figure 3




Figure 3. Association between 1-SD increase in predictor variables and Epworth Sleepiness Scale score (ESS) in cross-sectional cohorts (STAGES and MESA) and HomePAP, BestAIR, and ABC studies (using their baseline ESS and diagnostic polysomnography prior to continuous positive airway pressure treatment). Vertical ticks represent coefficient estimates and horizontal bars represent 95% confidence intervals. The combined cohort ($n = 2332$, orange bars) was composed of $n = 213$ participants from HomePAP, BestAIR, and ABC studies (blue bars); $n = 324$ participants from the STAGES cohort (red bars); and $n = 1795$ participants from the MESA cohort (green bars). Multivariable linear regression models were adjusted for age, sex, BMI, and total sleep time. Flow limitation frequency, desaturation severity, and oxygen saturation index could not be quantified in the STAGES cohort and are not present in this analysis. In HomePAP, BestAIR, and ABC studies, flow limitation severity could only be quantified in the HomePAP home studies ($n = 64$). Hypoxic burden could not be quantified in four MESA participants. One HomePAP in-lab participant and three MESA participants were excluded due to missing BMI data. One STAGES participant was excluded due to missing ESS data.

Figure 4




Figure 4. Association between 1-SD increase in baseline predictor variables and change-in-ESS in the HomePAP home polysomnography cohort. Vertical ticks represent coefficient estimates and horizontal bars represent 95% confidence intervals. (A) Linear regression models were adjusted for age, sex, and baseline BMI (model 0, blue bars); adjusted for baseline ESS (model 1, red bars); and further adjusted for age, sex, baseline BMI, total sleep time, and nightly CPAP use (model 2, green bars). (B) A linear regression model with baseline event-related ventilatory burden and baseline ESS. All analyses had $n = 64$ participants except for those adjusting for nightly CPAP use, which had $n = 63$ due to one participant missing this data. ESS = Epworth Sleepiness Scale score.

Figure 5




Figure 5. Linear regression model change-in-ESS prediction performance in the training ($n = 139$) and holdout ($n = 74$) datasets. (A) and (C) are predicted change-in-ESS vs actual change-in-ESS plots, and (B) and (D) are Bland-Altman plots. Each point represents a single participant. The linear regression model was $Change-in-ESS = Baseline ESS + Baseline Event-Related Ventilatory Burden + Intercept$ and was trained in the training dataset and evaluated in the holdout dataset. ESS = Epworth Sleepiness Scale score; R^2 = coefficient of determination between predicted change-in-ESS vs actual change-in-ESS; RMSE = root-mean-square error (interpreted as average change-in-ESS error per patient).

Figure 6




Figure 6. Boxplots and confusion matrices of results using the linear regression model as a classifier to predict responders in the training ($n = 139$) and holdout ($n = 74$) datasets. The change-in-ESS cut-point used to differentiate responders from non-responders was -2, which is the minimum clinically important difference of ESS in obstructive sleep apnea (21, 22). (A) and (C) are boxplots representing the 25th percentile (lower horizontal line), median (red line), and 75th percentile (upper horizontal line). Each participant is represented as a single point. The Mann-Whitney U-test was performed between predicted responder and non-responder groups. (B) and (D) are confusion matrices with summary performance metrics presented underneath. The model $Change-in-ESS = Baseline ESS + Baseline Event-Related Ventilatory Burden + Intercept$ was developed in the training dataset and the optimal responder threshold was determined by the ROC convex hull method (50). False positives and false negatives were given a penalty weight of 1, and true positives and true negatives were given a penalty weight of 0. The model and optimal threshold were applied in the holdout dataset. ESS = Epworth Sleepiness Scale score; PPV = positive predictive value; NPV = negative predictive value.

Figure 7




Figure 7. (A) Chart showing change-in-ESS predictions made by the final linear regression model trained on all HomePAP, BestAIR, and ABC participants ($n = 213$). Histograms along the top and left represent the distributions of baseline ESS and baseline event-related ventilatory burden in the 213 participants, respectively. The linear regression model was $Change-in-ESS = Baseline ESS + Baseline Event-Related Ventilatory Burden + Intercept$. The black contour lines with adjacent numbers represent change-in-ESS boundaries, and the thick black line represents change-in-ESS of -2 points, which is the minimum clinically important difference of ESS in obstructive sleep apnea (21, 22). As an example, a patient with baseline ESS of 8 points and baseline ventilatory burden of 400 %eupnea*min/hour is predicted to have a change-in-ESS of -2 points following CPAP treatment. **(B)** Scatter plot showing event-related ventilatory burden versus apnea-hypopnea index for 2332 participants from the combined cohort (black regression line with red shading representing 95% CI). The combined cohort consisted of HomePAP, BestAIR, ABC, STAGES, and MESA participants. ESS = Epworth Sleepiness Scale score.

Tables

Table 1

Table 1. Comparison of demographic, polysomnographic, and Epworth Sleepiness Scale score (ESS) characteristics of the STAGES and MESA cohorts.

	STAGES Cohort	MESA Cohort
Participants <i>n</i> (% male)	324 (54.0%)	1795 (46.7%)
Age (years)	42.0 [30.5–56.5]	67.0 [61.0–75.0]
Body Mass Index (kg/m²)	27.2 [23.1–32.0]	27.9 [24.7–31.7]
Depression (dichotomous)	56 (17.3%)	304 (16.9%)
Sleep Apnea Severity Index		
Mild (I)	252 (77.8%)	1498 (83.5%)
Moderate (II)	60 (18.5%)	198 (11.0%)
Severe (III)	11 (3.4%)	96 (5.3%)
Total Sleep Time (hours)	6.4 [4.1–7.6]	6.2 [5.3–7.0]
Apnea-Hypopnea Index (events/hour)	10.3 [4.9–18.3]	19.7 [10.9–34.4]
Nasal Airflow Signal-to-Noise Ratio (dB)	31.4 [29.0–33.4]	37.7 [35.2–40.1]
Flow Limitation Frequency (%)[†]	Not computed	7.9 [2.9–19.3]
Flow Limitation Severity (%)	27.8 [19.9–36.8]	31.9 [24.9–39.2]
Event-Related Ventilatory Burden (%eupnea*min/hour)	89.0 [37.8–213.9]	261.5 [116.4–566.0]
Breath-Related Ventilatory Burden (%)	3.4 [1.9–7.0]	5.8 [2.7–12.8]
Desaturation Severity (%)[‡]	Not computed	0.8 [0.4–1.6]
Hypoxic Burden (%min/hour)	11.8 [4.5–30.6]	39.2 [20.9–74.8]
Oxygen Desaturation Index (events/hour)[‡]	Not computed	24.5 [13.9–42.6]
Lowest Oxygen Saturation (%)	83.0 [78.0–88.0]	76.0 [67.0–81.0]
ESS (points)	8.0 [5.0–12.0]	5.0 [3.0–8.0]

Data are presented as *n* (%) for categorical variables or median [IQR] for untransformed variables.

[†]Flow limitation frequency was not computed using STAGES polysomnograms which had relatively low nasal airflow signal-to-noise ratio and no way of correcting for this like flow limitation severity.

[‡]Desaturation severity and oxygen desaturation index were not computed using STAGES polysomnograms because desaturation scoring was unavailable.

Table 2

Table 2. Comparison of demographic, polysomnographic, and Epworth Sleepiness Scale score (ESS) characteristics of the HomePAP home, HomePAP in-lab, BestAIR, and ABC cohorts.

	HomePAP Home Cohort	HomePAP In-Lab Cohort	BestAIR Cohort	ABC Cohort
Participants <i>n</i> (% male)	64 (67.2%)	69 (53.6%)	62 (71.0%)	18 (55.6%)
Age (years)	50.0 [42.5–58.5]	47.0 [39.0–55.2]	66.5 [60.0–70.0]	48.8 [40.4–55.6]
Baseline Body Mass Index (kg/m²)	37.0 [31.7–43.5]	35.7 [32.1–45.0]	31.2 [26.3–34.5]	39.0 [35.8–40.4]
Follow-up Body Mass Index (kg/m²)	37.2 [31.9–43.3]	35.8 [32.4–44.7]	31.6 [26.6–35.0]	36.5 [35.0–39.8]
Depression (dichotomous)	18 (28.1%)	17 (24.6%)	17 (27.4%)	No data
Sleep Apnea Severity Index				
Mild (I)	11 (17.2%)	9 (13.0%)	42 (67.7%)	7 (38.9%)
Moderate (II)	19 (29.7%)	36 (52.2%)	17 (27.4%)	6 (33.3%)
Severe (III)	34 (53.1%)	23 (33.3%)	3 (4.8%)	5 (27.8%)
Total Sleep Time (hours)	5.7 [5.1–6.1]	5.4 [3.2–6.4]	6.7 [5.7–7.6]	6.6 [5.8–7.2]
Apnea-Hypopnea Index (events/hour)	43.7 [29.0–80.1]	36.1 [22.9–53.8]	32.2 [22.3–38.3]	40.7 [30.6–54.1]
Nasal Airflow Signal-to-Noise Ratio (dB)	41.5 [38.2–45.3]	41.2 [36.8–45.4]	29.4 [23.3–32.9]	25.6 [20.5–27.7]
Flow Limitation Frequency (%)[†]	39.2 [23.1–58.4]	Not computed	Not computed	Not computed
Flow Limitation Severity (%)[†]	35.8 [26.6–49.3]	Not computed	Not computed	Not computed
Event-Related Ventilatory Burden (%eupnea*min/hour)	842.6 [446.4–1998.8]	694.1 [357.2–934.7]	462.5 [346.0–647.3]	621.6 [380.0–907.7]
Breath-Related Ventilatory Burden (%)	15.3 [9.7–39.5]	18.2 [9.7–29.3]	10.4 [6.7–14.1]	17.5 [8.5–22.8]
Desaturation Severity (%)	1.3 [0.7–2.4]	1.6 [1.1–2.1]	0.7 [0.5–1.1]	1.2 [0.8–1.7]
Hypoxic Burden (%min/hour)	129.0 [71.4–201.8]	85.1 [56.9–113.8]	72.2 [58.2–112.9]	78.2 [66.6–115.2]
Oxygen Desaturation Index (events/hour)	45.3 [34.1–83.0]	48.3 [30.4–66.0]	30.0 [25.1–38.1]	47.3 [41.2–61.4]
Lowest Oxygen Saturation (%)	71.5 [61.5–79.0]	77.0 [70.0–82.0]	79.5 [75.0–82.0]	81.0 [74.0–82.0]
Nightly CPAP Use (hours)	5.1 [3.2–6.3]	3.0 [1.4–5.3]	No data	No data
Baseline ESS (points)	14.0 [12.0–16.0]	14.0 [12.0–17.2]	8.0 [5.0–10.0]	9.0 [7.0–14.0]
Follow-up ESS (points)	7.0 [4.0–9.0]	7.0 [4.0–11.0]	6.0 [3.0–8.0]	6.0 [4.0–11.0]
Change-in-ESS (points)	-8.0 [-10.0 to -4.0]	-6.0 [-10.0 to -2.0]	-1.5 [-4.0–0.0]	-2.0 [-6.0–0.0]
Change-in-ESS (%)	-53.3 [-67.4 to -34.8]	-47.1 [-72.9 to -19.2]	-14.3 [-50.0–0.0]	-21.9 [-50.0–0.0]
Follow-up Duration (months)	3.0 [3.0–3.0]	3.0 [3.0–3.0]	6.0 [6.0–6.0]	9.0 [9.0–9.0]

Data are presented as *n* (%) for categorical variables or median [IQR] for untransformed variables. [†]Flow limitation frequency and severity could only be quantified in HomePAP home polysomnograms which had unfiltered and high signal-to-noise ratio nasal airflow data.

Table 3

Table 3. Performance of linear regression models that predict change in Epworth Sleepiness Scale score.

Training Dataset Performance				
Baseline Predictors	Final RMSE	Final Adj. R^2	CV RMSE	CV Adj. R^2
ESS	4.11	0.461	4.20	0.440
Sleep Apnea Severity Index (SASI)	4.84	0.248	4.95	0.214
ESS + Apnea-Hypopnea Index	4.00	0.488	4.10	0.460
ESS + Event-Related Ventilatory Burden	4.01	0.484	4.12	0.455
ESS + Breath-Related Ventilatory Burden	4.07	0.470	4.18	0.440
ESS + Desaturation Severity	4.04	0.478	4.14	0.450
ESS + Hypoxic Burden	4.02	0.483	4.12	0.455
ESS + Oxygen Desaturation Index	4.04	0.477	4.14	0.450
ESS + Lowest Oxygen Saturation	4.11	0.457	4.23	0.426
Holdout Dataset Performance				
Baseline Predictors	Final RMSE	Final Adj. R^2		
ESS	4.55	0.234		
Sleep Apnea Severity Index (SASI)	4.56	0.228		
ESS + Apnea-Hypopnea Index	4.40	0.272		
ESS + Event-Related Ventilatory Burden	4.28	0.313		
ESS + Breath-Related Ventilatory Burden	4.39	0.277		
ESS + Desaturation Severity	4.46	0.254		
ESS + Hypoxic Burden	4.33	0.296		
ESS + Oxygen Desaturation Index	4.51	0.237		
ESS + Lowest Oxygen Saturation	4.55	0.221		

The models to predict change-in-ESS were trained in the training dataset ($n = 139$) and evaluated in the holdout dataset ($n = 74$). Leave-one-out cross-validation (CV) was performed in the training dataset, and final models were trained in the entire training dataset. ESS = Epworth Sleepiness Scale score; R^2 = coefficient of determination between predicted change-in-ESS vs actual change-in-ESS; Adj. R^2 = adjusted R^2 ; RMSE = root-mean-square error (interpreted as average change-in-ESS error per patient).

References

1. Benjafield AV, Ayas NT, Eastwood PR, Heinzer R, Ip MSM, Morrell MJ, *et al.* Estimation of the global prevalence and burden of obstructive sleep apnoea: a literature-based analysis. *Lancet Respir Med* 2019; 7: 687-698.
2. Powell NB, Schechtman KB, Riley RW, Li K, Guilleminault C. Sleepy driving: Accidents and injury. *Otolaryngology - Head and Neck Surgery* 2002; 126: 217-227.
3. Johns MW. A New Method for Measuring Daytime Sleepiness: The Epworth Sleepiness Scale. *Sleep* 1991; 14: 540-545.
4. Patel SR, White DP, Malhotra A, Stanchina ML, Ayas NT. Continuous Positive Airway Pressure Therapy for Treating gess in a Diverse Population With Obstructive Sleep Apnea: Results of a Meta-analysis. *Archives of Internal Medicine* 2003; 163: 565-571.
5. Patil SP, Ayappa IA, Caples SM, Kimoff RJ, Patel SR, Harrod CG. Treatment of Adult Obstructive Sleep Apnea With Positive Airway Pressure: An American Academy of Sleep Medicine Systematic Review, Meta-Analysis, and GRADE Assessment. *Journal of Clinical Sleep Medicine* 2019; 15: 301-334.
6. Antic NA, Catcheside P, Buchan C, Hensley M, Naughton MT, Rowland S, *et al.* The Effect of CPAP in Normalizing Daytime Sleepiness, Quality of Life, and Neurocognitive Function in Patients with Moderate to Severe OSA. *Sleep* 2011; 34: 111-119.
7. Bonsignore MR, Pepin JL, Cibella F, Barbera CD, Marrone O, Verbraecken J, *et al.* Excessive Daytime Sleepiness in Obstructive Sleep Apnea Patients Treated With Continuous Positive Airway Pressure: Data From the European Sleep Apnea Database. *Frontiers in Neurology* 2021; 12.
8. Bhat S, Gupta D, Akel O, Polos PG, DeBari VA, Akhtar S, *et al.* The relationships between improvements in daytime sleepiness, fatigue and depression and psychomotor vigilance task testing with CPAP use in patients with obstructive sleep apnea. *Sleep Medicine* 2018; 49: 81-89.
9. Kingshott RN, Vennelle M, Hoy CJ, Engleman HM, Deary IJ, Douglas NJ. Predictors of improvements in daytime function outcomes with CPAP therapy. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2000; 161: 866-871.
10. Otsuka K, Fukunaga K, WakakoYamasawa, Haraguchi M, Tani T, Shirahama R, *et al.* Factors associated with improvements in subjective symptoms of obstructive sleep apnea syndrome after continuous positive airway pressure therapy. *Sleep and Breathing* 2020; 24: 491-498.
11. Balakrishnan K, James KT, Weaver EM. Predicting CPAP Use and Treatment Outcomes Using Composite Indices of Sleep Apnea Severity. *Journal of Clinical Sleep Medicine* 2016; 12: 849-854.
12. Labarca G, Vena D, Hu W-H, Esmaeili N, Gell L, Yang HC, *et al.* Sleep Apnea Physiological Burdens and Cardiovascular Morbidity and Mortality. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2023; 208: 802-813.
13. Parekh A, Kam K, Wickramaratne S, Tolbert TM, Varga A, Osorio R, *et al.* Ventilatory Burden as a Measure of Obstructive Sleep Apnea Severity Is Predictive of Cardiovascular and All-Cause Mortality. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2023; 208: 1216-1226.

14. Mann DL, Terrill PI, Azarbarzin A, Mariani S, Franciosini A, Camassa A, *et al.* Quantifying the magnitude of pharyngeal obstruction during sleep using airflow shape. *Eur Respir J* 2019; 54: 1802262.
15. Mann DL, Georgeson T, Landry SA, Edwards BA, Azarbarzin A, Vena D, *et al.* Frequency of flow limitation using airflow shape. *Sleep* 2021; 44: zsab170.
16. Azarbarzin A, Sands SA, Stone KL, Taranto-Montemurro L, Messineo L, Terrill PI, *et al.* The hypoxic burden of sleep apnoea predicts cardiovascular disease-related mortality: the Osteoporotic Fractures in Men Study and the Sleep Heart Health Study. *Eur Heart J* 2019; 40: 1149-1157.
17. Kainulainen S, Duce B, Korkalainen H, Oksenberg A, Leino A, Arnardottir ES, *et al.* Severe desaturations increase psychomotor vigilance task-based median reaction time and number of lapses in obstructive sleep apnoea patients. *Eur Respir J* 2020; 55: 1901849.
18. Staykov E, Mann DL, Duce B, Kainulainen S, Leppänen T, Töyräs J, *et al.* Increased Flow Limitation During Sleep Is Associated With Increased Psychomotor Vigilance Task Lapses in Individuals With Suspected OSA. *Chest* 2024; 165: 990-1003.
19. Staykov E, Mann DL, Leppänen T, Töyräs J, Kainulainen S, Azarbarzin A, *et al.* Increased flow limitation during sleep is associated with decreased psychomotor vigilance task performance in individuals with suspected obstructive sleep apnea: a multi-cohort study. *Sleep* 2024.
20. Mann DL, Staykov E, Georgeson T, Azarbarzin A, Kainulainen S, Redline S, *et al.* Flow Limitation Is Associated with Excessive Daytime Sleepiness in Individuals without Moderate or Severe Obstructive Sleep Apnea. *Annals of the American Thoracic Society* 2024.
21. Crook S, Sievi NA, Bloch KE, Stradling JR, Frei A, Puhon MA, *et al.* Minimum important difference of the Epworth Sleepiness Scale in obstructive sleep apnoea: estimation from three randomised controlled trials. *Thorax* 2019; 74: 390-396.
22. Patel S, Kon SSC, Nolan CM, Barker RE, Simonds AK, Morrell MJ, *et al.* The Epworth Sleepiness Scale: Minimum Clinically Important Difference in Obstructive Sleep Apnea. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2018; 197: 961-963.
23. Rosen CL, Auckley D, Benca R, Foldvary-Schaefer N, Iber C, Kapur V, *et al.* A Multisite Randomized Trial of Portable Sleep Studies and Positive Airway Pressure Autotitration Versus Laboratory-Based Polysomnography for the Diagnosis and Treatment of Obstructive Sleep Apnea: The HomePAP Study. *Sleep* 2012; 35: 757-767.
24. Bakker JP, Wang R, Weng J, Aloia MS, Toth C, Morrical MG, *et al.* Motivational Enhancement for Increasing Adherence to CPAP: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Chest* 2016; 150: 337-345.
25. Bakker JP, Tavakkoli A, Rueschman M, Wang W, Andrews R, Malhotra A, *et al.* Gastric Banding Surgery versus Continuous Positive Airway Pressure for Obstructive Sleep Apnea: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2018; 197: 1080-1083.
26. Piccirillo JF, Gates GA, White DL, Schectman KB. Obstructive sleep apnea treatment outcomes pilot study. *Otolaryngology - Head and Neck Surgery* 1998; 118: 833-844.
27. Azuma K, Kagi N, Yanagi U, Osawa H. Effects of low-level inhalation exposure to carbon dioxide in indoor environments: A short review on human health and psychomotor performance. *Environment International* 2018; 121: 51-56.

28. Wang D, Thomas RJ, Yee BJ, Grunstein RR. Hypercapnia is more important than hypoxia in the neuro-outcomes of sleep-disordered breathing. *Journal of Applied Physiology* 2016; 120: 1484-1484.
29. Mehta V, Vasu TS, Phillips B, Chung F. Obstructive Sleep Apnea and Oxygen Therapy: A Systematic Review of the Literature and Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Clinical Sleep Medicine* 2013; 09: 271-279.
30. Wang D, Piper AJ, Yee BJ, Wong KK, Kim J-W, D'Rozario A, *et al.* Hypercapnia is a Key Correlate of EEG Activation and Daytime Sleepiness in Hypercapnic Sleep Disordered Breathing Patients. *Journal of Clinical Sleep Medicine* 2014; 10: 517-522.
31. Lal C, Weaver TE, Bae CJ, Strohl KP. Excessive Daytime Sleepiness in Obstructive Sleep Apnea. Mechanisms and Clinical Management. *Annals of the American Thoracic Society* 2021; 18: 757-768.
32. Javaheri S, Javaheri S. Update on Persistent Excessive Daytime Sleepiness in OSA. *Chest* 2020; 158: 776-786.
33. Cistulli PA, Armitstead JP, Malhotra A, Yan Y, Vuong V, Sterling KL, *et al.* Relationship between Self-reported Sleepiness and Positive Airway Pressure Treatment Adherence in Obstructive Sleep Apnea. *Annals of the American Thoracic Society* 2023; 20: 1201-1209.
34. Weaver TE, Maislin G, Dinges DF, Bloxham T, George CFP, Greenberg H, *et al.* Relationship Between Hours of CPAP Use and Achieving Normal Levels of Sleepiness and Daily Functioning. *Sleep* 2007; 30: 711-719.
35. Pascoe M, Bena J, Andrews ND, Auckley D, Benca R, Billings ME, *et al.* Dose-response relationship between positive airway pressure therapy and excessive daytime sleepiness: the HomePAP study. *Journal of Clinical Sleep Medicine* 2022; 18: 1027-1034.
36. Hosselet J-J, Ayappa I, Norman RG, Krieger AC, Rapoport DM. Classification of sleep-disordered breathing. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2001; 163: 398-405.
37. Parekh A, Kam K, Mullins AE, Castillo B, Berkalieva A, Mazumdar M, *et al.* Altered K-complex morphology during sustained inspiratory airflow limitation is associated with next-day lapses in vigilance in obstructive sleep apnea. *Sleep* 2021; 44: zsab010.
38. Meurice J, Paquereau J, Denjean A, Patte F, Series F. Influence of correction of flow limitation on continuous positive airway pressure efficiency in sleep apnoea/hypopnoea syndrome. *Eur Respir J* 1998; 11: 1121-1127.
39. International Classification of Sleep Disorders. 3rd ed. Darien, Illinois: American Academy of Sleep Medicine; 2014.
40. Patil SP, Ayappa IA, Caples SM, Kimoff RJ, Patel SR, Harrod CG. Treatment of Adult Obstructive Sleep Apnea with Positive Airway Pressure: An American Academy of Sleep Medicine Clinical Practice Guideline. *Journal of Clinical Sleep Medicine* 2019; 15: 335-343.
41. Markowitz F. All models are wrong and yours are useless: making clinical prediction models impactful for patients. *npj Precision Oncology* 2024; 8: 54.

42. Johns MW. Sensitivity and specificity of the multiple sleep latency test (MSLT), the maintenance of wakefulness test and the Epworth sleepiness scale: Failure of the MSLT as a gold standard. *Journal of Sleep Research* 2000; 9: 5-11.
43. Sun Y, Li T, Li J, Zou K, Tang X. The Epworth sleepiness scale may have more advantages than the multiple sleep latency test in assessing sleepiness in patients with obstructive sleep apnea. *Cerebral Cortex* 2024.
44. Gonçalves MT, Malafaia S, Moutinho dos Santos J, Roth T, Marques DR. Epworth sleepiness scale: A meta-analytic study on the internal consistency. *Sleep Medicine* 2023; 109: 261-269.
45. Lévy P, Kohler M, McNicholas WT, Barbé F, McEvoy RD, Somers VK, *et al.* Obstructive sleep apnoea syndrome. *Nature Reviews Disease Primers* 2015; 1: 15015.
46. Zhu Y, Fenik P, Zhan G, Mazza E, Kelz M, Aston-Jones G, *et al.* Selective Loss of Catecholaminergic Wake-Active Neurons in a Murine Sleep Apnea Model. *The Journal of Neuroscience* 2007; 27: 10060-10071.
47. Dewan NA, Nieto FJ, Somers VK. Intermittent Hypoxemia and OSA: Implications for Comorbidities. *Chest* 2015; 147: 266-274.
48. Douglas RM, Ryu J, Kanaan A, del Carmen Rivero M, Dugan LL, Haddad GG, *et al.* Neuronal death during combined intermittent hypoxia/hypercapnia is due to mitochondrial dysfunction. *American Journal of Physiology-Cell Physiology* 2010; 298: C1594-C1602.
49. Crawford MR, Bartlett DJ, Coughlin SR, Phillips CL, Neill AM, Espie CA, *et al.* The effect of continuous positive airway pressure usage on sleepiness in obstructive sleep apnoea: real effects or expectation of benefit? *Thorax* 2012; 67: 920-924.
50. Bettinger R. Cost-Sensitive Classifier Selection Using the ROC Convex Hull Method. *SAS Institute* 2003: 1-12.

Data sharing statement

This study used data from five published studies that are publicly available from the National Sleep Research Resource website:

- Apnea, Bariatric surgery, and CPAP study (ABC): <https://sleepdata.org/datasets/abc>
- Best Apnea Interventions in Research (BestAIR): <https://sleepdata.org/datasets/bestair>
- Home Positive Airway Pressure (HomePAP): <https://sleepdata.org/datasets/homepap>
- Stanford Technology Analytics and Genomics in Sleep (STAGES): <https://sleepdata.org/datasets/stages>
- Multi-Ethnic Study of Atherosclerosis (MESA): <https://sleepdata.org/datasets/mesa>

Requests for code and processed data should be directed to the corresponding author.

Clinical trial statement

This was a secondary analysis of retrospective data. Some of the data utilized originated from clinical trials registered with www.clinicaltrials.gov (NCT00642486, NCT01261390, and NCT01187771).

Acknowledgements

The authors thank the staff of the National Sleep Research Resource and the researchers and participants of the studies listed below. The National Sleep Research Resource was supported by the U.S. National Institutes of Health, National Heart Lung and Blood Institute (R24 HL114473, 75N92019R002).

The Apnea, Bariatric surgery, and CPAP study (ABC Study) was supported by National Institutes of Health grants R01HL106410 and K24HL127307. Philips Respironics donated the CPAP machines and supplies used in the perioperative period for patients undergoing bariatric surgery.

The Best Apnea Interventions in Research (BestAIR) was supported by the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute (1U34HL105277) and a grant from ResMed Foundation. Equipment was donated by ResMed and Philips Respironics.

The Home Positive Airway Pressure study (HomePAP) was supported by the American Sleep Medicine Foundation 38-PM-07 Grant: Portable Monitoring for the Diagnosis and Management of OSA.

The Multi-Ethnic Study of Atherosclerosis (MESA) Sleep Ancillary study was funded by NIH-NHLBI Association of Sleep Disorders with Cardiovascular Health Across Ethnic Groups (RO1 HL098433). MESA was supported by NHLBI funded contracts HHSN268201500003I, N01-HC-95159, N01-HC-95160, N01-HC-95161, N01-HC-95162, N01-HC-95163, N01-HC-95164, N01-HC-95165, N01-HC-95166, N01-HC-95167, N01-HC-95168 and N01-HC-95169 from the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute, and by cooperative agreements UL1-TR-000040, UL1-TR-001079, and UL1-TR-001420 funded by NCATS.

This research has been conducted using the STAGES (Stanford Technology, Analytics and Genomics in Sleep) Resource funded by the Klarman Family Foundation. The investigators of the STAGES study contributed to the design and implementation of the STAGES cohort and/or provided data and/or collected biospecimens, but did not participate in the analysis or writing of this report.

The full list of STAGES investigators can be found at the project website (<https://sleepdata.org/datasets/stages>).