

1 **Passive smartphone-based assessment of cognitive changes in neurosurgery**

2 Kevin Akeret<sup>1#</sup>, Flavio Vasella<sup>1,2#</sup>, Olivia Zindel-Geisseler<sup>3</sup>, Noemi Dannecker<sup>3</sup>, Peter Brugger<sup>4</sup>, Luca  
3 Regli<sup>1</sup>, Peter Young<sup>5</sup>, Martin N. Stienen<sup>1#</sup> and Arko Ghosh<sup>6#</sup>

4 *# Authors contributed equally*

5 **Affiliations**

6 <sup>1</sup> Department of Neurosurgery, University Hospital Zurich & Clinical Neuroscience Center, University  
7 of Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland

8 <sup>2</sup> Laboratory of Molecular Neuro-Oncology, Clinical Neuroscience Center, Department of Neurology,  
9 University Hospital Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland

10 <sup>3</sup> Neuropsychology Unit, Department of Neurology, University Hospital Zurich, University of Zurich,  
11 Zurich, Switzerland

12 <sup>4</sup> University Hospital of Psychiatry, Zurich, Switzerland and Valens Rehabilitation Centre,  
13 Valens, Switzerland

14 <sup>5</sup> Lancaster Environment Centre and the Data Science Institute, Lancaster University, United  
15 Kingdom

16 <sup>6</sup> Cognitive Psychology Unit, Institute of Psychology, Leiden University, Leiden, The Netherlands

17 **Running title** Smartphone tracking in neurosurgery

18 **Corresponding address**

19 Arko Ghosh  
20 Cognitive Psychology Unit, Institute of Psychology  
21 Leiden University  
22 Wassenaarseweg 52, 2333 AK Leiden  
23 The Netherlands. [a.ghosh@fsw.leidenuniv.nl](mailto:a.ghosh@fsw.leidenuniv.nl)

24

25 **Conflict of interest**

26 Arko Ghosh is a co-founder of QuantActions Ltd, Lausanne, Switzerland. This company focuses on  
27 converting smartphone taps to mental health indicators. Software and data collection services from  
28 QuantActions were used to monitor smartphone activity. All other authors have no other potential

29 **conflicts of interest to declare** that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

30

31 **Abstract**

32 Clinical observations suggest dynamic alterations in behavior after brain surgery. While some  
33 alterations reportedly occur within days others gradually develop over several months. These  
34 alterations can be attributed to the pre-surgical impact of the diseased tissue, neuronal damage  
35 caused by the surgery, and subsequent plasticity. A key step towards a systems-level understanding  
36 of the brain-behavior relationships is to capture the dynamics of the cognitive alterations. Here, we  
37 first established in 38 healthy individuals that the day-to-day smartphone interactions can be used to  
38 inform on cognitive processing speed. Next, we analyzed the smartphone interactions in 12 patients  
39 undergoing intracranial tumor surgery, with postsurgical follow-up of up to a year. In healthy  
40 individuals, the speed of the touchscreen interactions was highly correlated to choice reaction times  
41 ( $R^2 = 0.71$ ) but less so to simple reaction times ( $R^2 = 0.15$ ) on Deary-Liewald tests. Touchscreen  
42 interactions slowed immediately after surgery but the post-surgical changes varied between patients.  
43 Data-driven models revealed the time-constant of the short-term postsurgical changes and the time  
44 taken to stabilize after the surgery. Furthermore, by using conceptually distinct types of touchscreen  
45 interaction speeds – i.e. unlocking time and app locating speed – we established that the post-surgical  
46 changes are domain-specific. Interestingly, in this small sample, the pre-surgical smartphone speeds  
47 were highly related to the speeds post-stabilization ( $R^2 = 0.75$  to  $0.95$ ). The proxy measures of  
48 cognition seamlessly captured on the smartphone can reveal postsurgical dynamics inaccessible to  
49 conventional testing. We propose that the transient cognitive alterations indicate the time-  
50 constrained influence of distinct neuronal mechanisms triggered by the surgery.

51

52 **Keywords:** Neurosurgery, Smartphone behavior, Processing speed, Cognitive testing, Inductive  
53 model, Postsurgical recovery

54

55

56

## 57 Introduction

58

59           The functional outcome after neurosurgery is difficult to predict. This uncertainty can be  
60 attributed to the complex mapping between brain functions and behavior, as well as the diverse ways  
61 in which the diseased tissue and its removal influence brain functions (Kiecolt-Glaser et al., 1998).  
62 Thus, intact brain areas may help compensate for the brain tissue damaged by the surgery itself  
63 (Duffau et al., 2006; Sokolov et al., 2014). Furthermore, the disease itself introduces substantial  
64 functional alterations that may already be evident in the presurgical period. For instance, 80% of the  
65 patients suffer from some neurocognitive deficits at diagnosis, and these are related to tumor location  
66 and elevated intracranial pressure (Habets et al., 2014; Hendrix et al., 2017; Liouta et al., 2016; Satoer  
67 et al., 2012; Talacchi et al., 2011). Routine clinical observations suggest that cognitive performance  
68 fluctuates after the surgery. An objective assessment of the cognitive fluctuations is a necessary step  
69 towards empirical and theoretical development on how the brain responds to invasive perturbation.  
70 How quickly does the brain respond to the surgery? To what extent are the alterations transient vs.  
71 permanent? Addressing these questions may offer crucial insights into the underlying mechanisms.

72

73           Although the post-surgical cognitive dynamics are extremely relevant, patients do only  
74 undergo sparse (1-2) follow-up functional assessments in clinical routine. For instance, in brain tumors  
75 and other intracranial surgeries, such longitudinal functional assessments play a key role in identifying  
76 postsurgical complications (Bartek et al., 2015). However, commonly used functional assessment  
77 instruments, such as the Karnofsky performance (KP) scale, only capture relatively severe changes  
78 because they rely on subjective reports. Their administration is also time-consuming. For instance, the  
79 KP scores are based on the self-reported performance in real-world tasks collected via interviews by  
80 the medical staff (Schag et al., 1984). Moreover, as these assessments are often only conducted  
81 sparsely, they can mostly inform on the inter-individual differences rather than help resolve the  
82 dynamics in a specific patient in the absence of drastic alterations in performance (Meyers & Brown,  
83 2006).

84

85           The temporal course of the pre- and post-surgical changes in function may be non-linear and  
86 fluctuate considerably over various time-scales. While most patients show some improvement over  
87 the weeks following surgery, 20% of the patients deteriorate in the subsequent months (Habets et al.,  
88 2014; Talacchi et al., 2011). Neuropsychological assessments of the functional alterations in the days

89 immediately following the surgery are resource-intensive and time-consuming and, more seriously,  
90 suffer from individual differences in test-retest susceptibility. Also, they are likely biased by surgical  
91 after-effects (e.g. headache, side-effects of anesthesia). Such assessments have, therefore, remained  
92 elusive.

93

94 The day-to-day digital behavior offers a fresh opportunity to capture the dynamic alterations  
95 in neurosurgery. The speed of performance – such as measured in reaction time tasks – is a common  
96 quantitative indicator of cognitive status. Interestingly, activities like typing can act as a proxy measure  
97 of processing speed (Austin et al., 2011). There is emerging evidence that processing speed can be  
98 proxied via the ubiquitous touchscreen smartphone interactions. First, the speed of the day-to-day  
99 smartphone interactions shows strong correlations to the extent of trial-to-trial motor variability on  
100 tactile reaction time tasks (and a weaker correlation to the reaction time itself)(Balerna & Ghosh,  
101 2018). Second, the speed of interactions shows a strong diurnal rhythm akin to the fluctuations in  
102 reaction time performance (Huber & Ghosh, 2020). A straightforward assessment on whether the  
103 interaction speed can faithfully proxy the commonly used visual reaction time task is presented here.

104

105 In this study, we first established which cognitive processes are captured by the background  
106 touchscreen measures. Towards this, we tested the relationship strength between reaction time  
107 performances – in a simple and 4-choice task – with that of the touchscreen measures (Deary et al.,  
108 2011). We anticipated a relationship between the tests and smartphone behavior, but a priori it was  
109 not clear if and how the relationship strength depended on the task used. Next, we deployed the  
110 background touchscreen measures on patients scheduled for tumor resection neurosurgery. While we  
111 did anticipate behavioral fluctuations, we could not anticipate their patterning, and thus relied on  
112 data-driven models to capture and explore the impact of the surgery on the proxy measures of  
113 cognitive performance (Young, 1984).

114

115 **Methods**

116

117 *Participants*

118 This was a prospective observational study approved by the local ethical-committee (KEK-ZH  
119 BASEC 2018-00395) and registered at [www.clinicaltrials.gov](http://www.clinicaltrials.gov) (NCT03516162). Neurosurgical patients  
120 were assessed for eligibility. The inclusion criteria for the patients comprised: Age over 18, fluent  
121 language-skills in German, scheduled for resection of a brain tumor, unshared smartphone use  
122 (Android operating system; >3 months), minimum presurgical baseline recording of 7 days, and  
123 written informed consent. Reasons for exclusion were any neurologic or psychiatric disease other than  
124 a brain tumor, which could potentially influence neurocognition, or foreseeable difficulties in follow-  
125 up (e.g. geographic reasons). Twelve patients were recruited with one patient prematurely dropping  
126 out and so only yielding pre-surgical measurements. The ages ranged from 31 to 72 years, with a  
127 median of 48 years.

128 Healthy volunteers were extracted from the database raised via [agestudy.nl](http://agestudy.nl) (a Leiden  
129 University lifespan study), with the data compiled on the 20<sup>th</sup> of October 2020. The data collection  
130 contains a co-registration of smartphone behavior and online cognitive testing. All participants were  
131 recruited online and included self-reported healthy participants. In this collection, we found 38  
132 participants that met the analysis requirements of this study i.e., test administered on a PC and  
133 smartphone behavior logs overlapping in a 24 h window (see below). The ages ranged from 21 to 75  
134 years, with a median age of 50 years. This collection was approved by the Psychology Research Ethics  
135 Committee at Leiden University.

136

137 *Clinical examination for patients*

138 All patients underwent a general functional and neurocognitive examination pre-surgically,  
139 within the first week after surgery; and at 3-months-follow-up, including the KPS and the Montreal  
140 Cognitive Assessment (MoCA). Clinical and magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) examinations were  
141 conducted along the same time-frame to determine tumor location, size, and extent of resection. The  
142 patients self-reported their handedness. On recruitment, patients installed the TapCounter App  
143 (QuantActions, Lausanne) (Balerna & Ghosh, 2018). The T-scores of MoCA were estimated based on  
144 normative data available in the literature (Thomann et al., 2018).

145

146 *Smartphone data recording*

147 Smartphone touchscreen interactions were recorded using the TapCounter App  
148 (QuantActions LTD, Lausanne) (Balerna & Ghosh, 2018). In brief, the touchscreen timestamps were  
149 recorded along with the corresponding App labels. The App operated in the background and the data  
150 were downloaded via taps.ai (QuantActions LTD). Relevant users on taps.ai were identified using  
151 alphanumeric identifiers. The downloaded data were parsed into MATLAB using custom-written  
152 scripts (available on Taps.ai). The additional permission necessary for App labels meant that the  
153 corresponding metrics were not available in one healthy participant.

154

155 *Smartphone data analysis*

156 We extracted three proxy measures of processing speed: (i) Tapping speed (TS): Shortest 25<sup>th</sup>  
157 percentile inter-touch intervals from each session (between screen ON and OFF) collected in 24 h bins.  
158 The median of these measures was used to describe the TS in 24 h bin. (ii) Unlocking speed (US):  
159 Shortest 25<sup>th</sup> percentile inter-event intervals in 24 h bins, between the screen turning ON and the first  
160 touch recorded on the unlocked screen. (iii) App locating speed (ALS): Shortest 25<sup>th</sup> percentile inter-  
161 touch intervals in 24 h bins, occurring between two consecutive touches on the home or launch screen  
162 before an app touch registration. In the patient population, the 24 h bin onset edges were at 00:01,  
163 whereas in the healthy population a 24 h window encompassing the PC-based reaction time testing  
164 was used (so if the test was conducted at 09:00, the bin edges were at 21:01 of the previous day and  
165 21:00 of the same day).

166

167 *The Deary-Liewald reaction time task*

168 The Deary-Liewald visual reaction time tasks – simple and 4 choice – were implemented on  
169 agetstudy.nl running Psytoolkit (Deary et al., 2011; Stoet, 2010, 2017). In brief, a test session contained  
170 50 test trials each for the simple and choice tasks. These test trials were preceded by 8 trials for  
171 adjusting to the task. The task order was set to simple and then choice. The right hand (thumb on  
172 space bar) was used for the simple task. For the choice task, the index and middle fingers of both  
173 hands were in use mapped to the 4 locations on the screen. The test was administered either in Dutch  
174 or English based on the language preference of the user. The code used towards the English version  
175 of the test is shared on Psytoolkit.

176

177 *Data-driven models and statistical tests*

178           The impulse response functions were fitted using the CAPTAIN (Taylor et al., 2007; Young,  
179 1984) toolbox on MATLAB (MathWorks, Natick) and the parameters were selected using the  
180 coefficient of determination based on the model output ( $R_T^2$ ). A robust (bi-square) fitting method was  
181 used in the linear regression analysis (*fitlm* function on MATLAB). The MATLAB codes used this study  
182 are available at the repository link.

183

184

185

186

## 187 Results

188

### 189 *Smartphone-based metrics collected in the background reflect choice reaction time performance*

190 We compared the reaction time performance to the background smartphone behavioural  
191 metrics aimed as a proxy measure of cognitive processing speed (**Fig. 1**). Not surprisingly, the choice  
192 reaction times were consistently longer than the simple reaction times (simple Mean = 301 ms; choice  
193 Mean = 511 ms;  $p < 0.001$ ;  $t(59) = -13.2$ , paired t-test). We detected weak but significant correlations  
194 between the simple reaction time vs. some of the smartphone metrics (vs. Tapping speed [TS],  $R^2 =$   
195  $0.147$ ,  $\beta = 52.7$ ,  $t(36) = 2.44$ ,  $p = 0.018$ , bi-square linear regression fit; vs. Unlocking speed [US],  $R^2 =$   
196  $0.003$ ,  $\beta = -5.23$ ,  $t(36) = -0.24$ ,  $p = 0.812$ ; vs. App locating speed [ALS],  $R^2 = 0.112$ ,  $t(35) = 2.09$ ,  $p =$   
197  $0.044$ ). The correlations between the choice reaction time vs. the smartphone metrics were strong  
198 (vs. TS,  $R^2 = 0.71$ ,  $\beta = 277.19$ ,  $t(36) = 9.28$ ,  $p = 4.39 \times 10^{-11}$ ; vs. US,  $R^2 = 0.014$ ,  $\beta = 38.507$ ,  $t(36) = 0.72$ ,  
199  $p = 0.48$ ; vs. ALS,  $R^2 = 0.50$ ,  $\beta = 392.03$ ,  $t(35) = 5.88$ ,  $p = 1.13 \times 10^{-06}$ ). Given the strong correlations for  
200 TS and ALS, we next addressed their separate contribution in explaining the variance in choice reaction  
201 time. The multivariate model between the reaction time vs. smartphone metrics revealed a stronger  
202 relationship with TS than ALS ( $R^2 = 0.73$ ,  $f(33) = 29.6$ ,  $p = 1.77 \times 10^{-9}$ , linear multi-regression model;  $\beta$   
203  $_{TS} = 194.52$ ,  $t = 4.99$ ,  $p = 1.92 \times 10^{-05}$ ;  $\beta_{US} = -18.9$ ,  $t = -0.68$ ,  $p = 0.5$ ;  $\beta_{ALS} = 197.63$ ,  $t = 3.05$ ,  $p = 0.0045$ ).  
204 In sum, smartphone-based metrics captured in the background reflect the reaction time performance  
205 with each metric capturing different aspects of the cognitive test.

206

### 207 *Overview of patients*

208 Key patient and tumour characteristics are described in **Table 1**. Patients were monitored pre-  
209 surgically for 21 d (median, range: 6 to 38 d) and 144 d (median, range: 83 to 388 d) post-surgically.  
210 Pre-surgical smartphone usage was related to the age of the patient but not the tumour diameter ( $n$   
211  $= 12$ ,  $R_2 = 0.52$ ,  $f(9) = 4.8$ ,  $p = 0.038$ , linear multi-regression model;  $\beta_{age} = -0.033$ ,  $t = -3.06$ ,  $p = 0.014$ ;  
212  $\beta_{tumour\ size} = 0.016$ ,  $t = 1.21$ ,  $p = 0.26$ ). All of the users were found to be back on the device within 3 days  
213 post-surgery.

214

### 215 *MoCA performance in patients*

216 There was no consistent pattern of variance introduced by the surgery in the MoCA scores  
217 (**Fig. 1**). Interestingly, the MoCA scores collected at 1 week after surgery were no different from the



218 normative healthy data (T scores, 45.5; 56.2; 50.6; 61.9; 60.5; 62.7; 47.8; 24.7; 49.3; 53.7; 48.7; 47.2).  
219 The KPS showed even less variance than the MoCA scores and were not considered further for in-  
220 depth analysis. The presurgical TS, in terms of inter-touch interval, revealed an anticipated  
221 relationship with age, such that the interval was larger in older individuals ( $n = 12$ ,  $R_2 = 0.67$ ,  $f(9) =$   
222  $9.02$ ,  $p = 0.007$ , linear multi-regression model,  $\beta_{age} = 0.013$ ,  $t = 3.80$ ,  $p = 0.004$ ). The other presurgical  
223 inter-individual differences in processing speed – US and ALS – showed no relationship to age or tumor  
224 diameter. Pooled MoCA measures were related to the processing speed (TS) captured on the  
225 smartphone on the corresponding days; the larger the MoCA score the shorter the inter-touch interval  
226 ( $R_2 = 0.30$ ,  $\beta = -0.064$ ,  $t(30) = -3.53$ ,  $p = 0.001$ ).

227

### 228 *Behavioral dynamics after the surgery*

229 Concerning the continuously measured smartphone parameters in the patients, we  
230 anticipated that fluctuations after the surgery are not simply linear and, therefore, used an inductive  
231 modeling approach to capture the surgical after-effects in the form of transient impulse response  
232 functions. This allowed for the construction of model systems that can be systematically explored and  
233 attached to this report. Here we describe the key features of the model. The models captured the  
234 diverse behavioral patterns, time-locked to the surgery, for the three different smartphone  
235 parameters (**Fig. 2**). Interestingly, the captured patterns varied both across the patients and the  
236 parameter used to capture processing speed. The response functions used to model the continuous  
237 measures as impulse responses (with the surgery time modelled as an impulse) revealed that some  
238 instances were dominated by rapid processes governed by a time-constant of 7 days (median, Q1 1.5  
239 d – Q3 46.5 d). The period for the parameters to stabilize (proxied by using the settling time of the  
240 function) was 51.5 days (median, Q1 14.7 d – Q3 136.2 d). Notably, the slower the time-constant  
241 underlying the rapid behavioural change immediately after the surgery, the more delayed was the  
242 stabilization in the long-term ( $R_2 = 0.23$ ,  $\beta = 0.347$ ,  $t(22) = 2.57$ ,  $p = 0.017$ , linear regression, pooled  
243 parameters from fitted models of  $R_2 > 0.15$ ). We finally addressed whether pre-surgical behavior was  
244 correlated to the performance in the final seven days of the observation (i.e., post stabilization). The  
245 values were highly correlated for all of the smartphone parameters (TS,  $R_2 = 0.85$ ,  $\beta = 0.87$ ,  $t(9) = 7.01$ ,  
246  $p = 6.26 \times 10^{-5}$ ; US,  $R_2 = 0.93$ ,  $\beta = 1.15$ ,  $t(9) = 10.74$ ,  $p = 1.97 \times 10^{-6}$ ; ALS,  $R_2 = 0.88$ ,  $\beta = 0.81$ ,  $t(9) = 8.27$ ,  
247  $p = 1.70 \times 10^{-5}$ ).

248

249

250 **Discussion**

251

252 We leveraged smartphone interactions to quantify the dynamic behavioral fluctuations  
253 surrounding intracranial tumor resection. The dense quantification revealed a highly personalized  
254 account of behavioral fluctuations, where changes can be observed immediately after the surgery but  
255 may take months to stabilize. These dynamic fluctuations could not be traced using standard clinical  
256 assessments such as KPS and MoCA scores and offers unique perspectives on the mechanisms  
257 underlying spontaneous recovery.

258

259 Our observations in healthy individuals show that the cognitive processes as captured in  
260 reaction time assessments reflect in smartphone behavior. The finding that visual simple reaction time  
261 is weakly correlated to smartphone tapping speed (TS) is in line with our previous observation on  
262 tactile reaction time (Balerna & Ghosh, 2018). In our previous study, we observed that motor  
263 variability was strongly related to TS raising the possibility that this parameter captures more complex  
264 cognitive processes than input-output operations. This was confirmed here with the finding that visual  
265 choice reaction time is strongly correlated to TS. In sum, the smartphone-based parameters may be  
266 used to proxy higher sensorimotor processes rather than simple sensorimotor computations.  
267 Moreover, according to our observation in the patients, the MoCA scores were moderately correlated  
268 to TS, suggesting that smartphone behavior is loosely linked to the general cognitive status.

269

270 Neither the KPS nor the MoCA scores showed any clear fluctuations induced by the surgery.  
271 This is perhaps not surprising considering that carefully conducted microneurosurgery must not  
272 necessarily lead to measurable alterations of brain function – at least using these conventional  
273 measures of cognitive health status. Notably, in comparison to a healthy database, the MoCA scores  
274 did not offer any decisive information. These observations suggest that although MoCA and KPS scores  
275 may be sensitive to large cognitive alterations as induced by substantial brain injury, they are limited  
276 in their ability to construct individual behavioral dynamics in less invasive neurosurgery as studied  
277 here.

278

279 A diversity of fluctuations was captured in the smartphone parameters surrounding the  
280 surgery. In all but two patients we observed immediate changes in the proxy cognitive measures.  
281 These initial alterations – governed by a time constant of  $\sim 7$  days – may be driven by mechanical

282 perturbations of brain activity by edema or rapid neuronal adaptations involving excitation-inhibition  
283 modulations. There was substantial diversity in the time constant of these fluctuations indicating that  
284 the underlying mechanisms operate differently across individuals and cognitive processes. Patients #1  
285 and #10 showed no rapid behavioral fluctuations. Notably, both of these patients had smaller tumors  
286 and lower smartphone usage than the rest of the sample. Nevertheless, patient #1 showed a  
287 substantial improvement in one of the parameters two months after the surgery.

288

289 In addition to the rapid smartphone parameter fluctuations, we also captured slower changes  
290 with a time constant of  $\sim 50$  days. These slower fluctuations may result from gradual forms of neuronal  
291 plasticity for instance via use-dependent structural alterations. Interestingly, the time taken for the  
292 parameters to stabilize were strongly related to the time taken for the initial fluctuations. This raises  
293 two distinct possibilities. One, that the late changes in cognition are triggered by the early  
294 mechanisms. Two, that surgical features – such as the extent of the mechanical perturbation - dictate  
295 both the early and late alterations. Perhaps a combination of the two is as likely, and further  
296 exploration is needed where the background measures are combined with longitudinal neuroimaging  
297 to help resolve this.

298

299 An important question here is, what determines the long-term behavioral outcomes (after  
300 stabilization of the post-surgical behavioral dynamics)? One possibility is that the factors such as the  
301 location of the surgery or extent of tissue damage are the main determinants. Another possibility is  
302 that the long-term consequences are determined by the pre-surgical state. In our limited sample, we  
303 found a strong relationship between the pre-surgical smartphone parameters and post-stabilization  
304 performances. Essentially, people largely return to their pre-surgical performance levels rather than  
305 obtaining an entirely different level of performance. This raises the interesting possibility that despite  
306 the turbulent behavioral dynamics stable attractors are guiding behavioral outputs in the long-term.

307

308 The fast and the putative, slow responses were not simply linear, which indicates that the  
309 sparse measurements employed in routine clinical practice may lack the necessary temporal  
310 resolution to adequately capture postsurgical outcomes (Meyers & Brown, 2006). While the clinical  
311 relevance of these fluctuations remains to be established, it is conceivable that the identification of  
312 specific patterns could lead to improved patient care, be it through early recognition of complications,  
313 or evaluation of rehabilitation progress. The inter-individual differences in the behavioral patterns

314 may be explained by the various locations of the lesions and their corresponding neurocognitive  
315 function, resulting in different surgical approaches, patient age, post-surgical treatments, pre-surgical  
316 state, and the nature of the tumor itself (Liouta et al., 2016). Addressing these parameters is a logical  
317 next step.

318

319         Taken together, we demonstrate that smartphone interactions, collected from everyday  
320 usage, can be utilized to monitor the cognitive status in the perioperative setting of brain tumor  
321 surgery. Not only did all the patients quickly return to their smartphones after the surgery but the  
322 continued usage allowed for near-continuous monitoring. Moreover, the objective, telemetric  
323 monitoring is unobtrusive and inexpensive. This study may serve as a proof-of-concept towards  
324 leveraging smartphones as medical sensors in neurology, to complement conventional testing of  
325 functional and neurocognitive function. Importantly, the new technology used here raises fresh lines  
326 of interrogation on how the brain adapts to the abrupt surgical intervention.

327

328 **Author Contributions**

329 AG and MS conceived the study. KA, FV and MS recruited the subjects and gathered clinical and  
330 neuroimaging data. OZG, ND and PB gathered the neuropsychological data. AG analysed the data  
331 aided by PY. AG drafted the figures aided by KA. KA, FV, MS and AG drafted the manuscript text. LR,  
332 OZG, NG, PB and PY edited the manuscript text.

333

334 **Funding**

335 Arko Ghosh was supported by research grants from VELUX STIFTUNG Switzerland (AG), Holcim  
336 Stiftung Switzerland (AG) and intramural funding from the Institute of Psychology at Leiden University  
337 (AG) during the study period.

338

339 **References**

- 340 Austin, D., Jimison, H., Hayes, T., Mattek, N., Kaye, J., & Pavel, M. (2011). Measuring motor speed  
341 through typing: A surrogate for the finger tapping test. *Behavior Research Methods*, *43*(4),  
342 903–909. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-011-0100-1>
- 343 Balerna, M., & Ghosh, A. (2018). The details of past actions on a smartphone touchscreen are  
344 reflected by intrinsic sensorimotor dynamics. *Npj Digital Medicine*, *1*(1), 4.  
345 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-017-0011-3>
- 346 Bartek, J., Sjøvik, K., Förander, P., Solheim, O., Gulati, S., Weber, C., Ingebrigtsen, T., & Jakola, A. S.  
347 (2015). Predictors of Severe Complications in Intracranial Meningioma Surgery: A  
348 Population-Based Multicenter Study. *World Neurosurgery*, *83*(5), 673–678.  
349 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wneu.2015.01.022>
- 350 Deary, I. J., Liewald, D., & Nissan, J. (2011). A free, easy-to-use, computer-based simple and four-  
351 choice reaction time programme: The Deary-Liewald reaction time task. *Behavior Research*  
352 *Methods*, *43*(1), 258–268. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-010-0024-1>
- 353 Duffau, H., Taillandier, L., Gatignol, P., & Capelle, L. (2006). The insular lobe and brain plasticity:  
354 Lessons from tumor surgery. *Clinical Neurology and Neurosurgery*, *108*(6), 543–548.  
355 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clineuro.2005.09.004>
- 356 Habets, E. J. J., Kloet, A., Walchenbach, R., Vecht, C. J., Klein, M., & Taphoorn, M. J. B. (2014).  
357 Tumour and surgery effects on cognitive functioning in high-grade glioma patients. *Acta*  
358 *Neurochirurgica*, *156*(8), 1451–1459. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00701-014-2115-8>
- 359 Hendrix, P., Hans, E., Griessenauer, C. J., Simgen, A., Oertel, J., & Karbach, J. (2017). Neurocognitive  
360 Function Surrounding the Resection of Frontal WHO Grade I Meningiomas: A Prospective  
361 Matched-Control Study. *World Neurosurgery*, *98*, 203–210.  
362 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wneu.2016.10.095>
- 363 Huber, R., & Ghosh, A. (2020). Large cognitive fluctuations surrounding sleep in daily living. *BioRxiv*,  
364 2020.06.18.159517. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.18.159517>

- 365 Kiecolt-Glaser, J. K., Page, G. G., Marucha, P. T., MacCallum, R. C., & Glaser, R. (1998). Psychological  
366 influences on surgical recovery: Perspectives from psychoneuroimmunology. *American*  
367 *Psychologist*, 53(11), 1209–1218. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.53.11.1209>
- 368 Liouta, E., Koutsarnakis, C., Liakos, F., & Stranjalis, G. (2016). Effects of intracranial meningioma  
369 location, size, and surgery on neurocognitive functions: A 3-year prospective study. *Journal*  
370 *of Neurosurgery*, 124(6), 1578–1584. <https://doi.org/10.3171/2015.6.JNS1549>
- 371 Meyers, C. A., & Brown, P. D. (2006). Role and Relevance of Neurocognitive Assessment in Clinical  
372 Trials of Patients With CNS Tumors. *Journal of Clinical Oncology*, 24(8), 1305–1309.  
373 <https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2005.04.6086>
- 374 Satoer, D., Vork, J., Visch-Brink, E., Smits, M., Dirven, C., & Vincent, A. (2012). Cognitive functioning  
375 early after surgery of gliomas in eloquent areas: Clinical article. *Journal of Neurosurgery*,  
376 117(5), 831–838. <https://doi.org/10.3171/2012.7.JNS12263>
- 377 Schag, C. C., Heinrich, R. L., & Ganz, P. A. (1984). Karnofsky performance status revisited: Reliability,  
378 validity, and guidelines. *Journal of Clinical Oncology*, 2(3), 187–193.  
379 <https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.1984.2.3.187>
- 380 Sokolov, A. A., Erb, M., Grodd, W., Tatagiba, M. S., Frackowiak, R. S. J., & Pavlova, M. A. (2014).  
381 Recovery of biological motion perception and network plasticity after cerebellar tumor  
382 removal. *Cortex*, 59, 146–152. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2014.05.012>
- 383 Stoet, G. (2010). PsyToolkit: A software package for programming psychological experiments using  
384 Linux. *Behavior Research Methods*, 42(4), 1096–1104.  
385 <https://doi.org/10.3758/BRM.42.4.1096>
- 386 Stoet, G. (2017). PsyToolkit: A Novel Web-Based Method for Running Online Questionnaires and  
387 Reaction-Time Experiments. *Teaching of Psychology*, 44(1), 24–31.  
388 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0098628316677643>

- 389 Talacchi, A., Santini, B., Savazzi, S., & Gerosa, M. (2011). Cognitive effects of tumour and surgical  
390 treatment in glioma patients. *Journal of Neuro-Oncology*, *103*(3), 541–549.  
391 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11060-010-0417-0>
- 392 Taylor, C. J., Pedregal, D. J., Young, P. C., & Tych, W. (2007). Environmental time series analysis and  
393 forecasting with the Captain toolbox. *Environmental Modelling & Software*, *22*(6), 797–814.  
394 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2006.03.002>
- 395 Thomann, A. E., Goettel, N., Monsch, R. J., Berres, M., Jahn, T., Steiner, L. A., & Monsch, A. U. (2018).  
396 The Montreal Cognitive Assessment: Normative Data from a German-Speaking Cohort and  
397 Comparison with International Normative Samples. *Journal of Alzheimer’s Disease*, *64*(2),  
398 643–655. <https://doi.org/10.3233/JAD-180080>
- 399 Young, P. C. (1984). *Recursive Estimation and Time-Series Analysis: An Introduction*. Springer-Verlag.  
400 <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-82336-7>  
401  
402



403

ID	Age	♀	Handed	Diagnosis	Tumor side	Affected structure	Discharge (d)
1	35	♀	R	Extraaxial tumor (Planum sphenoidale meningioma)	L	Diencephalon	5
2	40	♂	R	Extraaxial tumor (Vestibular schwannoma)	L	Brainstem	12
3	50	♀	R	Extraaxial tumor (Petrous meningioma)	R	Brainstem	5
4	40	♂	R	Intraaxial tumor (Frontal diffuse oligodendroglioma)	L	Frontal lobe	4
5	70	♀	R	Extraaxial tumor (Atypical convexity meningioma)	R	Frontal and temporal lobes	47
6	55	♀	R	Extraaxial tumor (Petrous meningioma)	L	Brainstem	5
7	35	♀	R	Extraaxial tumor (Planum sphenoidale meningioma)	LR	Frontal lobe	7
8	30	♀	R	Intraaxial tumor (Frontal diffuse glioma)	L	Frontal lobe	10
9	60	♂	L	Extraaxial tumor (Tentorial meningioma)	L	Occipital lobe	3
10	50	♀	R	Extraaxial tumor (Sphenoid wing meningioma)	R	Temporal lobe	3
11	60	♀	R	Extraaxial tumor (Parietal convexity meningioma)	L	Parietal lobe	4
12	60	♀	R	Extraaxial tumor (Parasagittal meningioma)	L	Central lobe	8

404

405 **Table 1. Key patient and tumour characteristics.** The same patient IDs are as used in the figures and  
 406 in the text. L: Left, R: Right. The postoperative day (d) of hospital discharge is reported in the  
 407 'Discharge' column. Ages are rounded to 5 years.

408

409

410 **Figure Legends**

411

412 **Figure 1.** Smartphone behaviour can proxy reaction time performance and standard clinical  
413 assessments of cognitive status in neurosurgical patients. (a') A schematic diagram of the  
414 observational set-up used to link the smartphone parameters and reaction time performance  
415 measured on a PC. (a) Correlation matrix between reaction time performance the smartphone  
416 parameters gathered on the day of the reaction time test. (b) Standard clinical assessments – MoCA  
417 and KP performance scores – were obtained at three different time points. (c) Change in Montreal  
418 Cognitive Assessment (MoCA) and Karnofsky performance scale (KP, insert) scores before and after  
419 the surgery.

420


421 **Figure 2.** Dynamic post-surgical alterations in cognitive speed captured on the smartphone. (a) The  
422 pre- (in green) and postsurgical (in red) smartphone parameters captured in each patient. Transient  
423 impulse response model fitting (blue solid lines) used all of the data points in each patient (the  
424 display is trimmed to 140 days for visualisation). (b) The R2 values of the impulse response fit for all  
425 the patients and parameters. Note, patient ID #4 did not have postsurgical data (marked in pink).  
426 The time-constants underlying the fastest postsurgical fluctuations and the time to stabilize (impulse  
427 response settling times) are reported for only for fits  $R^2 > 0.15$  (under threshold values are marked  
428 in pink).

429


430

**a**


- | Touchscreen touch
- Smartphone metric accumulation window (-12 h to +12 h from PC test)



**a'**




**b**



**c**


$\Delta, M_{\text{pre-surg}} - M_{1\text{W post-surg}}$

$\Delta, M_{1\text{W post-surg}} - M_{3\text{M post-surg}}$



**Figure 1**

a



b




Figure 2