medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.08.23289682; this version posted June 27, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Personalizing the Pressure Reactivity Index for Neurocritical Care Decision Support

Jennifer K. Briggs[1*], J.N. Stroh[2], Brandon Foreman[3], Soojin Park[4,5], the TRACK-TBI Study Investigators , Tellen D. Bennett[†2,6], David J. Albers[†1,2,5]

[1]Department of Bioengineering, University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus, Aurora, CO.

[2]Department of Biomedical Informatics, University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus, Aurora, CO.

[3]Department of Neurology and Rehabilitation Medicine, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH.

[4]Department of Neurology, Columbia University Irving Medical Center, New York-Presbyterian Hospital, New York, NY.

[5]Department of Biomedical Informatics, Columbia University Irving Medical Center, New York-Presbyterian Hospital, New York, NY.

[6]Department of Pediatrics (Critical Care Medicine), University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus, Auror, CO.

*Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s): Jennifer.briggs@cuanschutz.edu;

Abstract

Neurocritical care patients may benefit from personalized treatment based on their cerebral autoregulatory function. The pressure reactivity index is an important, prevalent metric used to estimate the state of a patient's cerebral autoregulation and guide clinical decision-making. However, the pressure reactivity index is highly sensitive to hyperparameter choices and intrapatient variability. In this manuscript, we develop a new personalized pressure reactivity index methodology (pPRx) that increases robustness and reduces the noise of the pressure reactivity index calculation. Using data from traumatic brain injury patients and simulated data, we first show that pressure reactivity index sensitivity to hyperparameters and interpatient variability is large enough to influence clinical interpretation of cerebral autoregulatory function. We identify that patient heart rate is closely related to errors in the pressure reactivity index, which has vital implications for extending the use of PRx to patients with different regular heart rates, such as pediatric populations. We then remove this heart rate-specific sensitivity in the pPRx methodology by adjusting for patient heart rate at resolutions of single heartbeats. Implementing the pPRx methodology decreases error, noise, and sensitivity, and allows the pressure reactivity index to be more robust to variability across patient populations. We also leverage our data and analysis to identify ideal averaging windows in the standard method.

1 Introduction

Neurological injuries are a prevalent cause of long-term disability and death. In the United States, there are approximately 64,000 traumatic brain injury (TBI)-related deaths[1] and 160,000 stroke-related deaths[2] annually. Poor patient outcomes often result from secondary perfusion insults following initial neurological injury. Therefore, optimizing perfusion to reduce secondary injury is a key goal in clinical decision support.

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.08.23289682; this version posted June 27, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Cerebral perfusion, typically represented by its proxy, cerebral blood flow (CBF), depends on cerebral vascular resistance (CVR) and cerebral perfusion pressure (CPP). CPP is the pressure gradient formed between mean intracranial pressure (mICP) and mean arterial blood pressure (mABP) (eq. 1). Current clinical guidelines recommend targeting mICP below 22 mmHg to mitigate the risk of secondary injuries[3]. However, a precision medicine approach that considers the state of the patient's vasculature may improve patient outcomes.

$$CBF = \frac{CPP}{CVR} = \frac{mABP - mICP}{CVR} \tag{1}$$

Cerebral autoregulation (CA) is an intrinsic mechanism of the cerebral vasculature that maintains adequate CBF over large pressure gradients by altering CVR[4, 5]. CA can be impaired in patients with neurological injuries. Retrospective studies have shown that patients have better functional outcomes when their CPP is close to a value that optimizes CA function, known as CPPopt[6, 7]. Therefore, in contrast to current population-wide ICP-guided therapy, patients may benefit from patient-specific therapy where a patient's CPP is targeted to their CPPopt[8–11]. Proper evaluation of CA function is crucial for accurately estimating CPPopt.

CA function can be estimated using various metrics, including transfer function analysis and the pressure reactivity index (PRx)[5, 6, 12]. PRx is the metric commonly used in CPPopt-guided therapy. PRx is calculated by first taking a non-overlapping moving average of ICP and ABP time series over a specific window size and then calculating the Pearson correlation coefficient between a given number of these averaged ABP and ICP samples[13]. A graphical depiction of the PRx calculation is shown in **Fig. 1**. The primary reason for averaging is to remove frequencies that occur faster than CA operates[14–16]. Correlation is calculated with the assumption that intact CA should be able to buffer changes in ABP before they are transmitted into ICP. Thus, a low correlation coefficient indicates functioning CA. The size of the averaging and correlation window are hyperparameters in the PRx calculation because they are chosen *a priori*[17, 18]. Values for these hyperparameters vary in literature (see **Table 1**) and the impact of hyperparameter choice is not well understood. When discussing hyperparameter pairs, we will use the notation Avg: x seconds, Corr: y samples, to indicate the hyperparameter pair with an averaging window of x seconds and correlation window of y samples.

It is important to understand the impact of these hyperparameters on the clinical interpretation of PRx. Typically, PRx >0.25 indicates that CA is highly impaired or absent and is predictive of a higher risk of mortality[28, 35], while PRx <0 indicates that CA is intact. Therefore, 0.25 is the critical threshold of PRx that distinguishes between 'functional' CA and 'absent' CA. If uncertainty or error in the PRx estimate is larger than this critical threshold, the clinical interpretation of the functionality of CA based on this PRx estimate could be completely incorrect. If uncertainty or error in the PRx estimate is close to this critical threshold, the interpretation of CA functionality could be mostly incorrect (e.g. CA is thought to be impaired when it is absent or functional when it is impaired).

Averaging Window (Seconds)	*Correlation Window (Samples)*
10	40[19]
10	*30* (most common)[20–28]
5	40[12, 13, 29–31]
15	30[32]*
6	40[6, 33, 34]

Table 1 Common hyperparameters used to calculate PRx

The purpose of this manuscript is threefold. *First*, we quantify PRx estimation sensitivity to hyperparameters and patient variability. *Second*, we test the hypothesis that a personalized parameterization of the PRx algorithm will provide a more robust and stable estimation of functionality. *Third*, we investigate ideal hyperparameters for improving the robustness of PRx estimation in the standard method.

*Howells recommends using 15-50 second averages but does not use any correlation window. For consistency, we chose correlations that would result in the same amount of data captured in [24, 25](5 minutes)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.08.23289682; this version posted June 27, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 1 Standard Algorithm for Calculating PRx. a: ABP (blue) and ICP (red) are averaged over a non-overlapping averaging window. b: A given number of these averaged samples are collected, and the Pearson correlation coefficient is calculated (c) on a 4/5 overlap sliding window.

2 Methods

Data

Patient Data Patient data were taken from patients enrolled in the Transforming Research and Clinical Knowledge in Traumatic Brain Injury (TRACK-TBI) study[36], a prospective, multicenter study of patients with traumatic brain injury. Written informed consent was obtained and the study was approved by the institutional review boards of enrolling sites. We extracted two datasets which we term "development" and "validation" datasets respectively. We used the development dataset for the initial investigation and the development of our techniques and the validation dataset for validating our findings. The development dataset, included patients from a single center to ensure standardized physiological measurements and clinical practice. We extracted 21 four-hour windows of data (which is the time recommended to calculate a target cerebral perfusion pressure (CPPopt)[30]) from 11 patients. The validation dataset included 10 four-hour windows from 8 additional patients from two separate centers to ensure that our results were not dependent on the hospital. Patient demographics are shown in **Table 2**.



Figure 2 Simulated Data Set Development. Step 1 shows the power spectrum of the six base frequencies (Table 3) used to create ICP and ABP. Blue shows a representative ABP waveform. Red indicates three ICP waveforms created from combinations of the base frequencies. Three CA phenotypes were created: Functional CA, Impaired CA, and Absent CA. The frequencies used to create each ICP waveform are given above the red arrows

To mitigate the impact of missing data on our analyses, datasets were only chosen if missing or erroneous data made up less than 10% of the four-hour time series. Missing data comprised $1.7\% \pm 1.7\%$ of the development data set and $0.5\% \pm 0.7\%$ of the validation data set. Physiologically implausible values >400 or <0 for ABP and >100 or <0 for ICP were set to null. Segments of null data shorter than one second were linearly interpolated to fill in a portion of the pressure waveform. This interpolation did not notably impact PRx estimate. When missing data segments were longer than one second, we omitted the averaging and correlation calculations that would have included these missing data segments so that these missing data segments would not affect the final PRx estimate.

Simulated Data Continuous evaluation of global CA function in humans is not currently possible. Therefore, validating which hyperparameter would give the true PRx estimate and calculating PRx estimation error is infeasible for patient data. To quantify PRx estimation error, we created simulated data based on physiologically relevant signals. **Fig. 2** shows a graphical description of simulated data creation. For the development data set, we created 200 simulated datasets, each containing ABP and ICP for three CA phenotypes: "Functional CA," "Impaired CA," and "Absent CA," resulting in 600 time series. For the validation dataset, we created an additional 20 simulated datasets containing the same three CA phenotypes

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.08.23289682; this version posted June 27, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Variable[†]	*All, n=19*	*Development Cohort, n=11*	*Validation Cohort, n=8*	*p-value*
		Demographics		
Age, years	44.45±15.68	41.8±16.5	48±14.76	0.04
Sex, male	14 (74%)	9 (82%)	5 (62.5%)	0.67
		Injury Characteristics		
Injury Cause				
- Traffic Incident	12 (63%)	6 (55%)	6 (75%)	0.20
- Fall	4 (21%)	4 (36%)	0	
- Other	3 (16%)	1 (9%)	2 (25%)	
Admission time after injury (hrs)	0.8 [0.67,1.30]	1 [0.7,1.5]	0.68 [0.58,0.85]	0.16
Admission GCS	3 [3,11]	3 [3,5]	8 [3,14]	0.13
Admission mGCS	1 [1,5]	1 [1,3]	6 [2.25,6]	0.05
Decompressive Hemicraniectomy	6 (31%)	5 (45%)	1 (13 %)	0.3
		Monitoring Data		
Injury to Monitor Time (hrs)	7.78 [6.47, 19.6]	7.3 [6.0, 16.5]	15.12 [6.64, 20.92]	0.32
CNS Data Duration (days)	4 [1.63, 13.46]	1.64 [1.34, 4.20]	13.46 [4.04, 18.37]	0.08
ICP Monitor Type				
- IPM	11 (57%)	9 (81%)	2 (25%)	
- EVD	4 (21%)	0	4 (50%)	
- Both	4 (21%)	2 (20%)	2 (25%)	
		Outcome		
Hospital Length of Stay (days)	22.3 [13.22, 27.92]	15.1 [14.2-22.3]	27.9 [14.52, 35.76]	0.36
In-Hospital Mortality	8 (42%)	6 (55%)	2 (75%)	0.41
6-Month Mortality	10 (52%)	8 (73%)	2 (25%)	0.11
6-Month GOSE	1 [1.0, 3.5]	1 [1, 2]	3 [1,6]	0.24

Table 2 Patient Characteristics and Monitoring Data. The injury was closed for all patients. GCS stands for Glasgow Coma Scale and mGCS stands for motor Glasgow Coma Scale. IPM stands for Intraparenchymal Monitor. EVD stands for External Ventricular Drain. GOSE stands for Glasgow Outcome Scale-Extended. P-value was calculated using Chi-squared (categorical data), Kruskal–Wallis (non-normal distributions), or t-test (normal distributions) to ensure statistical similarity between groups. All data reported as mean+/-standard deviation, median [interquartile range], or proportion (%) as appropriate

resulting in 60 time series. CA phenotypes were based on studies showing that as CA becomes impaired, slower frequencies of ABP are translated from to ICP[24, 37, 38].

Five different four-hour 125 Hz waveforms were created (**Fig. 2.1**). These waveforms were based on frequencies present in documented patient waveforms defined in (**Table 3**). Heart rate was randomly chosen between 40-140 beats per minute to emulate many possible average heart rates. ABP was created by summing all frequencies except for F4, which represent frequencies only present in ICP[40]. Three ICP waveforms corresponding to functional, impaired, and absent CA were then created (**Fig. 2.2a**). For functional CA, ICP should reflect fast frequencies ($F1$, $F2$), and frequencies only present in ICP ($F4$)[12, 24, 37, 41]. Therefore, $ICP_{CAFunctional} = F1 + F2 + F4$. For impaired CA, ICP should reflect frequencies used in intact CA, and dampened slower frequencies ($F3/1000, F5/1000$) [24, 37, 38]. Therefore, $ICP_{CAImpaired} = F1 + F2 + F3/1000 + F4 + F5/1000$. The assumption underlying PRx is that when CA is absent, ICP and ABP are highly correlated, indicating that most frequencies present in ABP will be reflected in ICP: therefore $ICP_{CAabsent} = F1 + F2 + F3 + F4 + F5$.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.08.23289682; this version posted June 27, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

ICP waveforms are induced by traveling ABP waves, which causes ICP to lag behind ABP by approximately 6.8 seconds[42]. Therefore, ICP waveforms were shifted by 6.8 seconds. The amplitudes of ICP and ABP were then rescaled according to a randomly selected patient from the TrackTBI cohort. PRx is meant to capture the correlation between ABP and ICP after removing the effects of heart rate ($F1$) and respiration ($F2$). Therefore, 'true' PRx was defined as the correlation coefficient between $F3$ and $F5$ in ABP and all frequencies slower than $F2$ in ICP.

Analysis

Interpretations of the metrics we used to quantify error and sensitivity of the PRx calculation are given in **Table 4**.

PRx Calculation: To quantify the sensitivity of PRx to hyperparameters, we calculated PRx for every combination of averaging windows between 1 and 30 seconds and correlation windows between 2 and 65 averaged samples. We chose this broad range to capture every methodology presented in the literature. According to standard methods, averaging windows did not overlap and correlation windows overlap by 4/5[24]. Unless otherwise noted, the reported PRx value is the median PRx across the four-hour dataset. Median was used because the PRx calculation has a high variance.

PRx Estimation Error: To assess the PRx estimation error calculated with a given hyperparameter pair, we calculated the statistical estimator bias, which is the difference between the estimated PRx value and the true PRx value. Because each hyperparameter results in different time windows, the output of each PRx method was interpolated to compare values directly. The PRx estimation error for each hyperparameter and dataset was calculated according to equations 2 and 3. For patient data, where true PRx is not known, we calculated empirical error, and set the "true value" of PRx as the average PRx ($\overline{PRx}$) from a range of the common hyperparameters (Avg: 5-20 seconds and Corr: 20-50 samples). For simulated data where the true value of PRx is known, the error was calculated using equation 2 but $\overline{PRx_{t_n}}$ is replaced with the predefined true PRx value.

Signal Name	*Interpretation*	*Timescale*	
$F1$	Heart Rate	40-140 beats/minute	Scaled in frequency and amplitude to match randomly selected patient
$F2$	Respiration	10 breaths/minute	
$F3$	Random	30 second period	Random external changes to the patient[38, 39]
$F4$	Waves only present in ICP	90 second period	Found only in ICP[40]
$F5$	Random	16-minute period	Slow random external changes to the patient

Table 3 Physiologically relevant frequencies used in simulated data

$$\text{Empirical Error}_j = \frac{1}{T_N}\sum_{n=1}^{T_N}(PRx(t_n)_j - \overline{PRx_{t_n}}) \tag{2}$$

$$\overline{PRx(t_n)} = \frac{1}{J}\sum_{j=1}^{J} PRx(t_n)_j \tag{3}$$

Here, t_n is a time point, T_N is the total time, j is the hyperparameter pair, J is the total number of hyperparameters analyzed, and $PRx(t_n)_j$ is the estimated PRx at time t_n for hyperparameter j.

Standard Deviation of Empirical Error: To assess whether the impact of intrapatient variability on PRx estimation error using a given hyperparameter (j), we calculated the standard deviation (SD) of empirical error across all datasets (d) for a specific hyperparameter j (equation 4).

$$\text{SD of Empirical Error}_j = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{d=1}^{D}(\text{Empirical Error}_{j,d} - \overline{EE})^2}{D-1}} \tag{4}$$

Calculating PRx Estimation Sensitivity: To assess the PRx estimation sensitivity to hyperparameters, we iterated through every hyperparameter pair and calculated the percent difference between the PRx

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.08.23289682; this version posted June 27, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

value estimated using the hyperparameter pair and the PRx value estimated a small change in hyperparameter pairs (e.g., ±1 second or ±1 sample). Sensitivity is interpreted as the average percent change in PRx value given a small change in hyperparameter choice.

Noise: To assess the uncertainty or noise for an individual dataset, we calculated the standard deviation of PRx over time.

Correlating PRx estimation error and sensitivity with average heart rate: To investigate whether average heart rate was associated with PRx estimation error and sensitivity, we used all 31 four-hour datasets (from 19 patients) to compute linear regressions between average heart rate and median PRx, range of PRx values, and empirical error.

Evaluation Metric	Interpretation
PRx Estimation Error	Difference between PRx estimate from a single hyperparameter compared to true PRx
Standard Deviation (SD) or range of Error	How much patient variability influences error
Sensitivity ΔPRx/Δwindow	PRx sensitivity to hyperparameters or missing data (see discussion)
Range of PRx values	How much PRx can change across the five common hyperparameters
Noise	Noise in PRx estimate

Table 4 Interpretation of Metrics Used to Evaluate PRx Performance

Developing Personalized Algorithm for PRx Estimation

To investigate our hypothesis that personalizing the PRx algorithm by averaging over patient heartbeats would provide a more robust and stable estimation of CA, we first identified all heartbeats in ABP signals. Heartbeats were found using a sliding peak identification method. Data were segmented into one-minute and one-second windows with one-second overlap. In each window, the beginning of each systolic phase was identified using Matlab's *findpeaks* function on the inverted ABP segment. To ensure the dicrotic notch was not mistaken as a peak, the minimum peak prominence was set as half of the range of max ABP to min ABP during the minute window (see **Fig. 5a.** for example heartbeat identification). PRx was calculated as before, but the averaging window width was set as a given number of heartbeats rather than seconds.

Identifying Ideal Hyperparameters

Hyperparameters were identified as 'ideal' if they minimized error and SD of error in PRx estimate for both patient and simulated data.

All calculations were done in Matlab and are publically available at: https://github.com/jenniferkbriggs/PRx.

3 Results

PRx is Sensitive to Hyperparameters

Using the development dataset, we calculated PRx for every combination of averaging windows between 1 and 30 seconds and correlation windows between 2 and 65 samples. To validate our PRx calculation, we computed the lagged cross-correlation between the PRx estimate present in the TrackTBI dataset and our PRx estimation using hyperparameters Avg: 10 sec, Corr: 30 samp. (**Supp Fig. 1**). We used a lagged cross-correlation because the PRx calculation is sensitive to the starting time, which is not recorded in the clinical dataset. The average lagged cross-correlation was 0.89, with a standard deviation of 0.05 and an average lag of -0.02 seconds. The primary reasons the cross-correlation was not =1 were this time lag and differences in quality control and artifact removal.

We first compared PRx estimation empirical error using the five common hyperparameters given in **Table 1**. The hyperparameter pair Avg: 10 sec, Corr: 40 samp had the lowest average empirical error and smallest SD of empirical error compared to the five common hyperparameters (**Fig. 3a**). Overall, shorter averaging windows (5-6 seconds) were positively biased (hyperparameter overestimates PRx), whereas longer averaging windows were negatively biased (hyperparameter underestimates PRx). These results indicate that hyperparameter choice impacts PRx estimation.

Clinical decision-making is often based on CPP values that correspond to the minimization of PRx[9]. We next investigated if hyperparameters influence the occurrence and value of the minimum estimated PRx.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.08.23289682; this version posted June 27, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 3 PRx Estimate is Highly Sensitive to Hyperparameters. a) Violin plots showing the PRx estimate empirical error using five common hyperparameters. Data points indicate a four-hour dataset. b) Time courses of PRx for three representative datasets using the five common hyperparameters. The datasets **i**, **iii**, **v** correspond to datasets in c. Black circles indicate the minimum PRx estimate. For patient **v**, the PRx estimate is shown on the left y-axis and the CPP corresponding to the minimum PRx estimate is shown on the right axis. CPP bars are colored according to the hyperparameter pair resulting in the corresponding PRx minimum. The dashed line indicates the range of CPP values where PRx was minimized. c) The top panel shows 3D contour plots for patient **i** (left) and **v** (right). Differences in contour plot topography indicate that PRx estimation is sensitive to intrapatient variability. The scatter plot shows sensitivity (left y-axis) and range of PRx values over the five common hyperparameters (right y-axis) for all datasets, with black circles outlining five datasets corresponding to contour plots. The bottom panel shows 2D contour plots from five representative datasets. The color indicates the PRx estimate for each hyperparameter.

Fig. 3b shows one-hour windows when PRx reached a minimum (Roman numerals correspond to datasets in **Fig. 3c**). For dataset **i** (**Fig. 3b**), the value of minimum PRx remained consistent across hyperparameters. Further, the PRx calculation from each hyperparameter estimated that minimum PRx would occur within a few minutes of each other. This represents the ideal situation. For dataset **iii**, the PRx calculation from each hyperparameter still estimated that minimum PRx would occur at roughly the same time, but the estimated PRx value ranged between *functional CA (PRx = -0.6) and absent CA (PRx = 0.25)*. In dataset **v**, the time when the PRx estimates reached their respective minimum varied by up to 30 minutes depending on the hyperparameter. Additionally, the CPP (right y-axis in blue bars) corresponding to the minimum PRx ranged from 50-59 mmHg. Therefore, the estimated minimum PRx value and the CPP value corresponding to minimum PRx are sensitive to hyperparameter choice. These results indicate that PRx estimation sensitivity to hyperparameters may be large enough to directly influence the clinical interpretation of a patient's CA functionality and clinical decision-making.

We quantified the global sensitivity to hyperparameters at a granular level using the average percent change in PRx estimate given a small change in hyperparameter (**Fig 3c** left y-axis of scatter plot). Results ranged from **1.6**% **- 213**% depending on the patient, indicating that a small change in hyperparameters could have a large impact on the PRx estimate. For example, for patient **ii**, using 18 correlation samples and 5, 6, or 7-second averaging windows results in median PRx values of 0.31, 0.28, and 0.17, respectively. These

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.08.23289682; this version posted June 27, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

PRx estimates cross the critical threshold of PRx (=0.25) and will result in different clinical interpretations of the patient's CA functionality.

We also examined if PRx estimation was variable across the common hyperparameters. Using all hyperparameters analyzed, the PRx estimate ranged between **0.32 and 1.57**. Considering the maximum possible range of PRx values is 2 (PRx can range from -1 and 1), these results correspond to a PRx estimation uncertainty between 16% - 79% (**Supp. Fig. 2**). Restricted to the common hyperparameters, the range of the PRx estimate was between **0.05 and 0.34** (**Fig. 3c** right y-axis of scatter plot). This large uncertainty compared to the critical threshold of PRx (=0.25) further indicates that the PRx sensitivity to hyperparameters is large enough to interfere with clinical decision-making.

PRx estimation is sensitive to intrapatient variability

The large uncertainty in the value of PRx empirical error for each hyperparameter (**Fig. 3a**) indicates that error is influenced by patient variability. Uncertainty in the empirical error was smallest when PRx was estimated using large averaging windows (e.g. empirical error for PRx calculated using Avg: 10 sec, Corr 40 samp had a range of 0.09) and was the largest when PRx was estimated using small averaging windows (e.g. empirical error for PRx calculated using Avg: 5 sec, Corr: 40 samp had a range of 0.45). Therefore, when calculating PRx using small averaging windows ($<$ 10 sec), this patient-dependent uncertainty in PRx is larger than the critical threshold and therefore could impact the clinical interpretation of CA functionality.

We further quantified PRx estimation sensitivity to patient variability. **Fig. 3c** shows contour plots of PRx calculated using all hyperparameter combinations for five representative datasets. The different colors on a single contour plot, corresponding to different PRx estimates, indicate that PRx is sensitive to hyperparameters, as shown previously. The different types of contours (e.g., horizontal (**ii.**) or diagonal and curved (**iv.** and **v.**)) indicate that the extent and behavior of PRx sensitivity are heterogeneous across patients.

Together, these results indicate that PRx is sensitive to hyperparameters and variability across patients. *Therefore, a patient-specific adjustment to the PRx algorithm may be necessary for ensuring accuracy in PRx estimate for all patients.*

PRx, PRx Error, and PRx Sensitivity is Associated with Heart Rate

We sought to identify a source of this patient-dependent PRx sensitivity. Averaging in the PRx algorithm was originally meant to remove the influence of heart rate and respiration[12]. Therefore, we explored if heart rate was associated with sensitivity and error in the PRx estimate. By visual inspection, there is a relationship between average heart rate and error in the simulated dataset (**Fig. 4a**). For patient data, median PRx from all common hyperparameters had a linear relationship with average heart rate (**Fig. 4b**). The range of common hyperparameters was also related to average heart rate (**Fig. 4c**). Finally, while there was a nearly significant linear relationship (p=0.08) between average heart rate and PRx for hyperparameter pair Avg: 5 sec, Corr: 40 samp, this relationship was not present for other hyperparameter pairs (e.g. Avg: 10 sec, Corr: 40 samp) (**Fig. 4d,e**). These results imply that heart rate is related to intrapatient variability and sensitivity to hyperparameters in the PRx estimate, indicating that there may be a way to reduce error by reparameterizing PRx based on heartbeats.

Personalized PRx Algorithm (pPRx) Results in Reduced Error, Sensitivity to Hyperparameters, and Noise

To test the hypothesis that accounting for heart rate while keeping algorithmic efficiency high would reduce error and sensitivity in PRx, we first identified all heartbeats in the patient and simulated data and averaged over heartbeats rather than seconds (**Fig. 5a**). For example, if the original hyperparameter pair was Avg: 5 sec, Corr: 40 samp, we instead averaged over five heartbeats and then correlated over 40 of these averaged samples (**Fig. 5a**). After identifying all heartbeats, we calculated PRx for all hyperparameters in both patient and simulated data. We call this new algorithm the personalized heartbeat-based PRx algorithm, **pPRx**, and the standard seconds-based algorithm **sPRx**. The pPRx calculation did not notably impact computation time, which is required for real-time computation of PRx in operational settings.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.08.23289682; this version posted June 27, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 4 PRx Estimate Depends on Heart Rate. a) Scatter plot showing that error in median PRx depends on heart rate for three levels of CA function - intact CA (blue), impaired CA (red), and absent CA (yellow) in simulated data. b-e show scatter plots relating average heart rate to different PRx evaluation metrics. The black line indicates linear regression with 95% confidence intervals shown as dashed lines. Bolded p-values indicate statistical significance or near significance. b) There is a linear relationship between average heart rate and median PRx (Avg: 10 sec, Corr: 30 Samp). c) There is a linear relationship between average heart rate and the range of the five common hyperparameters. d) There is no relationship between average heart rate and empirical error in PRx (Avg: 10 sec, Corr: 40 samp), e) There is a nearly linear relationship between average heart rate and empirical error in PRx (Avg: 5 sec, Corr: 40 Samp).

We compared the performance of sPRx and pPRx using simulated and patient data in the development and validation datasets. For simulated data, the pPRx calculation was less sensitive to hyperparameters and intrapatient variability and had a lower average estimation error than sPRx (**Fig. 5b**, **Table 5**). For patient data, the pPRx calculation decreased noise of PRx estimation for both datasets (**Table 5**, **Fig. 5c,d**,). The pPRx calculation was less sensitive to hyperparameters than pPRx (**Fig. 5e**, **Table 5**) and did not have a notable impact on average empirical error (**Fig. 5f**, **Table 5**). The pPRx calculation decreased the standard deviation of empirical error for patient data for both datasets (**Table 5**). The standard deviation of empirical error is indicative of patient variability across the population. Therefore, the pPRx estimate reduces patient-dependent error compared to sPRx.

Average PRx was not noticeably different between the two averaging methodologies (**Fig. 5g.**), indicating that the interpretation of the sPRx likely extends to the pPRx. For simulated data, sPRx had the smallest error for intact CA phenotypes and underestimated the true PRx value for absent and impaired CA phenotypes (**Fig. 4a**, **Table. 5**). The pPRx calculation decreased this CA functionality-specific error in simulated data. A similar trend was present using patient data - for patients absent CA (PRx >0.25), the pPRx calculation yielded a larger PRx value than the sPRx calculation (**Fig. 5g.**).

We evaluated if the pPRx calculation affected the previously observed relationship between PRx and heart rate. The pPRx calculation did remove the relationship between empirical error (using hyperparameters Avg: 5 sec, 40 samp) and average heart rate for PRx (**Fig. 5i.**) and between the range of common hyperparameters and average heart rate (**Fig. 5j.**). The pPRx calculation did not remove the linear relationship between median PRx and average heart rate (**Fig. 5h**). Together, these results indicate that the pPRx calculation removes heart rate-associated PRx sensitivity and error without greatly altering the PRx estimate.

Ideal Hyperparameters in Standard Methodology Improve PRx Estimate

We also investigated if there exist ideal hyperparameter values that decrease sensitivity to patient variability using the standard PRx algorithm. We defined hyperparameter pairs to be 'ideal' if they minimized the standard deviation (SD) of error (or empirical error) and average error in simulated and patient data (**Fig 6a-d**) in the development dataset. The hyperparameter pairs that fit this description were averaging windows between 9-10 seconds and correlation windows between 35-55 samples. The 10-second averaging 40 sample

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.08.23289682; this version posted June 27, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 5 Personalized PRx (pPRx) is More Robust to Hyperparameters and Patient Variability than sPRx. a) Methodological schematic showing representative ABP signal from patient data with black lines indicating heartbeat start times (left). ABP (teal) and ICP (red) are averaged over a given number of these heartbeats (right). b) Violin plots showing that in simulated data, pPRx algorithm (blue) decreases estimation error and uncertainty in estimation error compared to the sPRx (purple). c) Representative time series from patient data showing pPRx (blue) is less variable than sPRx (purple). d-e show a comparison of the performance of the pPRx (blue) and sPRx (purple) for 21 development datasets using one-tailed paired t-tests. Dots indicate a single dataset. d) pPRx estimate has decreased noise. e) pPRx estimate is less sensitive to hyperparameters than sPRx. f) There is no difference in the absolute value of the empirical error of pPRx and sPRx. g) Sorted median PRx estimate for patient data for the pPRx (blue) and sPRx (purple) averaging methods. Arrows indicate that for patients with absent CA, the heartbeat method estimates a higher PRx than the standard method, while the opposite is the case for functional CA. h-j show scatter plots relating average heart rate with different PRx evaluation metrics for the combined development and validation datasets. The black line indicates linear regression with 95% confidence intervals shown as dashed lines. Bolded p-values indicate statistical significance or near significance. We chose these three evaluation metrics because they were shown to have a linear relationship with sPRx in Fig 4. h) There is a linear relationship between the average heart rate for both pPRx (left) and sPRx (right). i) pPRx (left) removes the nearly significant linear relationship between average heart rate and empirical error of sPRx (right). j) pPRx (left) is not linearly related to average heart rate, while pPRx is (right).

correlation hyperparameter pair, which we refer to as *the ideal hyperparameter pair*, was the only common hyperparameter pair (**Table 1**) that fit within this range. This ideal hyperparameter pair significantly decreased the standard deviation of empirical error compared to other common hyperparameters in both the development and validation datasets (**Fig 6e-h**). In the development dataset, the ideal hyperparameter pair improved PRx sensitivity and error compared to other hyperparameter pairs (**Supp. Table 1**).

4 Discussion

Neurological injuries are a leading cause of death throughout the world. The pressure reactivity index (PRx) is a metric used to evaluate cerebral autoregulation (CA) function and guide clinical decision-making for patients in neurocritical care. The hyperparameters in the PRx calculation are the lengths of the averaging and correlation windows. The objectives of this study were: (i) to quantify the sensitivity of the standard PRx algorithm (sPRx) to hyperparameters and intrapatient variability, (ii) to develop a new, personalized

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.08.23289682; this version posted June 27, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

*bold indicates method that performed better between datasets

	sPRx		***pPRx***	
	Development	Validation	Development	Validation
Sensitivity of PRx to Hyperparameters				
Average Range of PRx Error (simulated)	0.17	0.11	**0.06***	**0.08***
— *Intact CA*	*0.15*	*0.07*	***0.00****	***0.00****
— *Impaired CA*	*0.18*	***0.11****	***0.06****	*0.13*
— *Absent CA*	*0.19*	*0.16*	***0.11****	***0.00***
Range of PRx Values (patient)	0.20	0.19	**0.16***	**0.18***
Sensitivity (patient): ΔPRx/Δwindow	74.09%	44.73%	**55.21%***	**39.66%***
Sensitivity of PRx to Patient Variability				
SD of Error (simulated)	0.24	0.19	**0.18***	**0.16***
SD of Empirical Error (patient)	0.06	0.05	**0.05***	**0.04***
PRx Estimation Error				
Average Error (simulated)	-0.23	-0.22	**-0.18***	**-0.19***
— *Intact CA*	*-0.01*	*-0.02*	***0.00****	***0.00****
— *Impaired CA*	*-0.43*	*-0.43*	***-0.41****	***-0.38****
— *Absent CA*	*-0.25*	*-0.38*	***-0.13****	***-0.17****
Max Empirical Error (patient)	0.27	0.27	**0.23***	**0.23***
Average Empirical Error (patient)	**0.03***	0.05	**0.03***	**0.04***
Noise (patient)	0.30	0.31	**0.29***	**0.30***

Table 5 pPRx Calculation Decreases Sensitivity of PRx to Hyperparmaters and to Patient Variability, Error in PRx, and Noise Compared to sPRx Calculation. Bold value* indicates which method had better performance compared within Development or Validation datasets. Numbers represent the average metric value across all datasets and across the five common hyperparameters. For simulated data, the average across all CA phenotypes is given in the top column of the corresponding metric and the average within the three different types of CA is given in italics. SD standards for standard deviation. Max Empirical Error is the maximum *absolute value* of empirical error

PRx algorithm (pPRx) that improves robustness to hyperparameters and intrapatient variability, and (iii) to investigate ideal hyperparameters for sPRx that improve robustness to intrapatient variability.

Recomendations Based on Findings

We developed the personalized pressure reactivity index (pPRx) that personalizes the averaging window based on patient heart rate. *The pPRx algorithm decreased noise and estimation sensitivity to intrapatient variability for two independent datasets, allowing for greater reliability of PRx and its use for clinical decision support (**Fig. 5**, **Table 5**).* The code for this new algorithm will be made publically available (see methods). Additionally, in the standard PRx (sPRx) algorithm, we recommend using averaging windows between 9-10 seconds and correlation windows between 40-55 samples. These ideal hyperparameters decrease PRx estimation error and sensitivity to intrapatient variability in the development and validation datasets (**Fig. 6, Supp. Table 1**).

A central challenge in studying PRx is that it cannot be directly validated due to the invasive requirements of ICP measurement and the lack of a 'gold standard' global continuous CA evaluation metric. Previous studies have shown that PRx is a more successful predictor of mortality than other CA metrics[43] and is a good predictor of the lower limit of autoregulation in animals [44, 45]. However, quantifying true PRx error is not possible with patient data. Therefore, we took two approaches to evaluate the PRx estimation. For patient data, we quantified PRx sensitivity using multiple empirical metrics (**Table 4**). We also created simulated data that allowed us to quantify PRx estimation error directly. Using these approaches, we quantified two types of PRx estimation sensitivity: sensitivity to hyperparameters and sensitivity to intrapatient variability.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.08.23289682; this version posted June 27, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 6 10 Second Averaging Window and 40 Sample Correlation Window Improves sPRx Estimate. a) Contour plots showing standard deviation (SD) of error in sPRx for simulated data for many hyperparameter pairs. Black shading indicates hyperparameter pairs resulted in a minimum SD of error. b) Contour plots showing average error in simulated data. White indicates hyperparameter pairs resulted in a minimum error. c) As in a but for patient data. d) As in c but for patient data. e) One-hour time series of the standard deviation of empirical error across all patients in the development data set for the five common hyperparameters. The hyperparameter pair that minimizes the standard deviation of empirical error is bolded (red). f) Comparison between the standard deviation of empirical error across all patients in the development data set for each time point. The averaging window of 10 seconds and correlation window of 40 samples had a significantly smaller error ($p<0.0001$) than other common hyperparameters. g) As in e for the validation dataset. h) As in f for the validation dataset. Analysis was paired one-way ANOVA with multiple comparisons.

Our results indicate that sPRx sensitivity to hyperparameter choice is large enough to impact clinical decision-making. The average uncertainty (quantified as the range over all PRx estimates from many hyperparameter pairs: Avg 1-30 sec, Corr 2-65 samp) was 0.93, which is much greater than the PRx critical threshold that distinguishes between 'intact' CA and 'absent' CA ($\approx$0.25). Additionally, on average, these results indicate that the sPRx estimate can range nearly 50% of all possible values by changing the hyperparameters (**Supp. Fig. 2**). The average uncertainty in the sPRx estimate using only common hyperparameters found in the literature (**Table 1**) was 0.20, which is very close to the critical threshold (**Fig 3c**, **Table 5**). Therefore, on average, the sPRx estimation sensitivity to hyperparameters is large enough that clinical decision-making and CA interpretation may be impacted by changing hyperparameters (even when using common hyperparameter pairs).

Our results also indicate that sPRx is highly sensitive to intrapatient variability. The range of empirical error, which indicates how much patient variability influences error, was near to, or larger than, the critical threshold for the five different hyperparameters (**Fig 3a**), indicating that patient variability may influence sPRx enough to interfere with its clinical interpretability.

We identified heart rate as a major variable related to sPRx estimation sensitivity (**Figs 3, 4**). Heart rate variability and average resting heart rate are associated with age, ethnicity, and sex even after controlling for other health factors[46, 47]. Therefore, sPRx may result in larger errors for certain patient demographics, particularly pediatrics who are known to have much higher resting heart rates than the adult population. By personalizing PRx to heart rate, we remove this algorithmic bias.

We developed the personalized pressure reactivity index (pPRx) by reparameterizing the averaging window to heartbeats rather than seconds. On average, the pPRx calculation was less sensitive to hyperparameters and intrapatient variability and had lower estimation noise compared to the sPRx calculation (**Fig. 4**, **Table 5**). There are likely two reasons that the pPRx calculation improved performance. First, computed averages depend on sample size. In the PRx algorithm, the samples are individual heartbeats. In the sPRx calculation, which is parameterized by time, the heart rate directly affects the number of samples in the averaging window, and by extension, the computed average. Second, if there are a non-integer number

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.08.23289682; this version posted June 27, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

of heartbeats within a fixed time averaging window, each window will have a variable ratio of the high and low portions of the pressure waveforms, causing instability in the computed average. The pPRx calculation ensures that each window contains an equal number of complete pressure waveforms.

The pPRx calculation is more robust than sPRx to changes in patient state and CA fuctionality. Patient state, including heart rate, can change rapidly. Since our results indicate that error in the sPRx calculation is heart rate dependent, a sudden change in patient state could increase estimation error. Alternatively, since the pPRx identifies heart rates in real time, a change in the patient's state will be immediately accounted for. Our results from simulated data indicate the sPRx calculation underestimates true PRx for patients with impaired and absent CA (**Fig. 4a, Table 5**). For simulated data, the pPRx calculation was more accurate for all phenotypes of CA functionality (**Table 5**). Further, for patient data, the pPRx calculation yielded a larger PRx estimate than the sPRx calculation for patients with impaired CA. The larger PRx estimate from the pPRx calculation is likely a more accurate assessment of CA functionality (given our results showing that the sPRx calculation underestimates true PRx).

One response to the finding that sPRx calculation is highly sensitive to hyperparameters is to agree on a single, ideal hyperparameter pair to use across all applications. Using the development dataset, we found that PRx calculated using the ideal hyperparameter pair of Avg: 10 sec, Corr: 40 samp was the most robust to intrapatient variability (**Fig. 6f**). These findings were confirmed in the independent validation dataset (**Fig. 6g**). Correspondingly, there was not a linear relationship between heart rate and PRx empirical error calculated using this ideal hyperparameter pair, whereas there was a nearly significant relationship for other hyperparameter pairs (e.g. Avg: 5 sec, Corr: 40 samp) (**Fig. 4d,e**). This finding supports our hypothesis that variability in heart rate is a factor underlying the sensitivity of the sPRx calculation to intrapatient variability.

Defining an ideal hyperparameter pair does not remove the fact that the sPRx calculation is very sensitive to hyperparameters. Sensitivity to hyperparameters also indicates that the sPRx estimation is sensitive to missing data. For example, assume the averaging window for sPRx is set to ten seconds but there are two seconds of data missing. This ten second averaging window will only contain eight seconds worth of data and will result in the same computed average as an eight second averaging window. Therefore, in the sPRx algorithm, missing data has a similar effect as changing hyperparameters.

Missing data are common in clinical settings, so a substantial sensitivity to missing data will be clinically impactful. For example, in **Fig. 3c patient ii**, changing the averaging window by one second, which corresponds to missing one second of data per averaging window changes the median PRx estimation from 0.17 to 0.28, which crosses the critical threshold and changes the clinical interpretation of CA functionality. More broadly, in real clinical settings missing data are common, highly complex, and are often a function of the external environment via the healthcare process [48, 49]. The examples above do not represent a full characterization of pPRx and sPRx robustness to data missingness. Such an analysis is an important topic for future work. As our sample size was relatively small in this study (19 patients total), and we did not include time series with large amounts of missing data, our results are likely a conservative estimate of the possible error and sensitivity of PRx (because the prevalence of outliers generally increases as sample size increases). Further analysis should be done on larger cohorts.

As opposed to the sPRx calculation, the pPRx calculation did not yield a linear relationship between average heart rate and empirical error of PRx or between average heart rate and range of PRx values (**Fig. 5 h,i**). This is expected because the pPRx accounts for the computational influence of heart rate on the computed average. Alternatively, the pPRx calculation did not remove the relationship between the average heart rate and median PRx, possibly indicating a physiological relationship between PRx and average heart rate. CA function and PRx (calculated using sPRx method) have been associated with heart rate-related factors, such as age, disease state, and vascular comorbidities (see review articles [5, 50]). Therefore, it is not surprising that the average heart rate is related to PRx even after removing the computational influence of heartbeats on the computed average. Further investigation into the physiological relationship between average heart rate and heartbeat method-derived PRx would be very interesting.

5 Conclusion

The pressure reactivity index (PRx) is an important proxy for cerebral autoregulatory function and for aiding clinical decision-making for neurocritical care patients. Here, we show that the PRx calculation is

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.08.23289682; this version posted June 27, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

sensitive to hyperparameters and intrapatient variability, partly due to variability in average heart rate. Reducing this sensitivity is crucial for increasing the usefulness of PRx, particularly when PRx is applied to demographic groups with different average heart rates and heart rate variability. Therefore, we developed a new personalized heartbeat-specific PRx algorithm (pPRx) that *reduces error, noise, patient sensitivity, and hyperparameter sensitivity compared to the standard method.*

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.08.23289682; this version posted June 27, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Supp. 1 Validation of PRx against clinical PRx datasets. Blue indicated our lagged PRx estimate. Red represents PRx estimate output by clinical PRx datasets



Supp. 2 Range of median PRx values over all hyperparameters analyzed

Supplementary Information.

Acknowledgements. We acknowledge National Institutes of Health R01s LM006910 "Discovering and applying knowledge in clinical databases," and "Mechanistic machine learning," LM012734 to DJA, National Science Foundation (NSF) Graduate Research Fellowship DGE-1938058_Briggs to JKB

We thank the following TRACK-TBI Investigators: Neeraj Badjatia, MD, University of Maryland; Ramesh Grandhi, MD MS, University of Utah; Michael McCrea, PhD, Medical College of Wisconsin; Randall Merchant, PhD, Virginia Commonwealth University; Laura B. Ngwenya, MD, PhD, University of Cincinnati; Claudia Robertson, MD, Baylor College of Medicine; David Schnyer, PhD, UT Austin; John K. Yue, MD, University of California, San Francisco

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.08.23289682; this version posted June 27, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

*__bold__ indicates better preformance

	sPRx			***pPRx***		
Averaging (seconds or heartbeats)	10 Sec	10 Sec	5 Sec	10 HB	10 HB	5 HB
Correlation (Samples)	30	40 (*ideal*)	40	30	40	40
Standard Deviation of Error (simulated)	0.21	0.21	0.32	0.18	0.18	**0.16***
Average Error (simulated)	-0.21	-0.22	-0.22	**-0.18***	**-0.18***	-0.19
Standard Deviation of Empirical Error (patient)	0.04	**0.02***	0.12	**0.02***	0.05	0.09
Maximum Absolute Value Empirical Error (patient)	-0.08	**-0.06***	0.27	0.10	-0.08	0.23
Average Empirical Error (patient)	0.002	**-0.0015***	0.11	0.02	-0.006	0.09
Noise (patient)	0.30	0.31	**0.26***	0.29	0.29	**0.26***

Table 1 Comparing the Performance of the Personalized pressure reactivity index (pPRx) and standard pressure reactivity index (pPRx) for three different hyperparameters Bold value* indicates the method and hyperparameter pair that had the best performance. Metrics are assessed for the development dataset only. Numbers represent the average metric value for all datasets.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.08.23289682; this version posted June 27, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

References

[1] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. National Center for Health Statistics. Mortality Data on CDC WONDER. Accessed April 2023 (2023).

[2] Tsao, C. W. *et al.* Heart disease and stroke statistics—2023 update: a report from the american heart association. *Circulation* **147**, e93–e621 (2023).

[3] Stocchetti, N. & Maas, A. I. Traumatic intracranial hypertension. *New England Journal of Medicine* **370**, 2121–2130 (2014).

[4] Lassen, N. A. Cerebral blood flow and oxygen consumption in man. *Physiological reviews* **39**, 183–238 (1959).

[5] Claassen, J. A., Thijssen, D. H., Panerai, R. B. & Faraci, F. M. Regulation of cerebral blood flow in humans: physiology and clinical implications of autoregulation. *Physiological reviews* **101**, 1487–1559 (2021).

[6] Steiner, L. A. *et al.* Continuous monitoring of cerebrovascular pressure reactivity allows determination of optimal cerebral perfusion pressure in patients with traumatic brain injury. *Critical care medicine* **30**, 733–738 (2002).

[7] Donnelly, J. *et al.* Individualising thresholds of cerebral perfusion pressure using estimated limits of autoregulation. *Critical care medicine* **45**, 1464 (2017).

[8] Maas, A. I. *et al.* Traumatic brain injury: integrated approaches to improve prevention, clinical care, and research. *The Lancet Neurology* **16**, 987–1048 (2017).

[9] Stocchetti, N. *et al.* Severe traumatic brain injury: targeted management in the intensive care unit. *The Lancet Neurology* **16**, 452–464 (2017).

[10] Tas, J. *et al.* Targeting autoregulation-guided cerebral perfusion pressure after traumatic brain injury (cogitate): a feasibility randomized controlled clinical trial. *Journal of Neurotrauma* **38**, 2790–2800 (2021).

[11] Beqiri, E. *et al.* Feasibility of individualised severe traumatic brain injury management using an automated assessment of optimal cerebral perfusion pressure: the cogitate phase ii study protocol. *BMJ open* **9**, e030727 (2019).

[12] Czosnyka, M. *et al.* Continuous assessment of the cerebral vasomotor reactivity in head injury. *Neurosurgery* **41**, 11–19 (1997).

[13] Czosnyka, M. *et al.* in *Continuous monitoring of cerebrovascular pressure-reactivity in head injury* 74–77 (Springer, 1998).

[14] Florence, G. & Seylaz, J. Rapid autoregulation of cerebral blood flow: a laser-doppler flowmetry study. *Journal of Cerebral Blood Flow & Metabolism* **12**, 674–680 (1992).

[15] Aaslid, R., Lindegaard, K.-F., Sorteberg, W. & Nornes, H. Cerebral autoregulation dynamics in humans. *Stroke* **20**, 45–52 (1989).

[16] Zeiler, F. A. *et al.* Continuous cerebrovascular reactivity monitoring in moderate/severe traumatic brain injury: a narrative review of advances in neurocritical care. *British journal of anaesthesia* **124**, 440–453 (2020).

[17] Deisenroth, M. P., Faisal, A. A. & Ong, C. S. *Mathematics for machine learning* (Cambridge University Press, 2020).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.08.23289682; this version posted June 27, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

[18] Wilks, D. S. *Statistical methods in the atmospheric sciences* Vol. 100 (Academic press, 2011).

[19] Akhondi-Asl, A., Vonberg, F. W., Au, C. C. & Tasker, R. C. Meaning of intracranial pressure-to-blood pressure fisher-transformed pearson correlation–derived optimal cerebral perfusion pressure: Testing empiric utility in a mechanistic model. *Critical care medicine* **46**, e1160 (2018).

[20] Smielewski, P. *et al.* in *Icm+: software for on-line analysis of bedside monitoring data after severe head trauma* 43–49 (Springer, 2005).

[21] Budohoski, K. P. *et al.* The relationship between cerebral blood flow autoregulation and cerebrovascular pressure reactivity after traumatic brain injury. *Neurosurgery* **71**, 652–661 (2012).

[22] Brady, K. M. *et al.* Continuous measurement of autoregulation by spontaneous fluctuations in cerebral perfusion pressure: comparison of 3 methods. *Stroke* **39**, 2531–2537 (2008).

[23] Bijlenga, P. *et al.* "optimal cerebral perfusion pressure" in poor grade patients after subarachnoid hemorrhage. *Neurocritical care* **13**, 17–23 (2010).

[24] Czosnyka, M., Czosnyka, Z. & Smielewski, P. Pressure reactivity index: journey through the past 20 years. *Acta Neurochirurgica* **159**, 2063–2065 (2017).

[25] Zweifel, C. *et al.* Noninvasive monitoring of cerebrovascular reactivity with near infrared spectroscopy in head-injured patients. *Journal of neurotrauma* **27**, 1951–1958 (2010).

[26] Svedung Wettervik, T., Howells, T., Enblad, P. & Lewén, A. Temporal neurophysiological dynamics in traumatic brain injury: role of pressure reactivity and optimal cerebral perfusion pressure for predicting outcome. *Journal of neurotrauma* **36**, 1818–1827 (2019).

[27] Rozanek, M., Skola, J., Horakova, L. & Trukhan, V. Effect of artifacts upon the pressure reactivity index. *Scientific Reports* **12**, 15131 (2022).

[28] Dias, C. *et al.* Optimal cerebral perfusion pressure management at bedside: a single-center pilot study. *Neurocritical care* **23**, 92–102 (2015).

[29] Depreitere, B. *et al.* Pressure autoregulation monitoring and cerebral perfusion pressure target recommendation in patients with severe traumatic brain injury based on minute-by-minute monitoring data. *Journal of neurosurgery* **120**, 1451–1457 (2014).

[30] Aries, M. J. *et al.* Continuous determination of optimal cerebral perfusion pressure in traumatic brain injury. *Critical care medicine* **40**, 2456–2463 (2012).

[31] Jaeger, M., Schuhmann, M. U., Soehle, M. & Meixensberger, J. Continuous assessment of cerebrovascular autoregulation after traumatic brain injury using brain tissue oxygen pressure reactivity. *Critical care medicine* **34**, 1783–1788 (2006).

[32] Howells, T., Johnson, U., McKelvey, T. & Enblad, P. An optimal frequency range for assessing the pressure reactivity index in patients with traumatic brain injury. *Journal of clinical monitoring and computing* **29**, 97–105 (2015).

[33] Czosnyka, M. *et al.* in *Monitoring and interpretation of intracranial pressure after head injury* 114–118 (Springer, 2006).

[34] Radolovich, D. K. *et al.* Reactivity of brain tissue oxygen to change in cerebral perfusion pressure in head injured patients. *Neurocritical care* **10**, 274–279 (2009).

[35] Sorrentino, E. *et al.* Critical thresholds for cerebrovascular reactivity after traumatic brain injury. *Neurocritical care* **16**, 258–266 (2012).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.08.23289682; this version posted June 27, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

[36] Yue, J. K. *et al.* Transforming research and clinical knowledge in traumatic brain injury pilot: multicenter implementation of the common data elements for traumatic brain injury. *Journal of neurotrauma* **30**, 1831–1844 (2013).

[37] Tan, C. O. Defining the characteristic relationship between arterial pressure and cerebral flow. *Journal of applied physiology* **113**, 1194–1200 (2012).

[38] Zhang, R., Zuckerman, J. H., Giller, C. A. & Levine, B. D. Transfer function analysis of dynamic cerebral autoregulation in humans. *American Journal of Physiology-Heart and Circulatory Physiology* **274**, H233–H241 (1998).

[39] Fraser III, C. D. *et al.* The frequency response of cerebral autoregulation. *Journal of Applied Physiology* **115**, 52–56 (2013).

[40] Lescot, T. *et al.* The relationship of intracranial pressure lundberg waves to electroencephalograph fluctuations in patients with severe head trauma. *Acta neurochirurgica* **147**, 125–129 (2005).

[41] Hamner, J., Cohen, M. A., Mukai, S., Lipsitz, L. A. & Taylor, J. A. Spectral indices of human cerebral blood flow control: responses to augmented blood pressure oscillations. *The Journal of physiology* **559**, 965–973 (2004).

[42] Steinmeier, R. *et al.* Slow rhythmic oscillations of blood pressure, intracranial pressure, microcirculation, and cerebral oxygenation: dynamic interrelation and time course in humans. *Stroke* **27**, 2236–2243 (1996).

[43] Rivera-Lara, L. *et al.* Predictors of outcome with cerebral autoregulation monitoring: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Critical care medicine* **45**, 695–704 (2017).

[44] Zeiler, F. A. *et al.* Validation of pressure reactivity and pulse amplitude indices against the lower limit of autoregulation, part i: experimental intracranial hypertension. *Journal of neurotrauma* **35**, 2803–2811 (2018).

[45] Zeiler, F. A., Lee, J. K., Smielewski, P., Czosnyka, M. & Brady, K. Validation of intracranial pressure-derived cerebrovascular reactivity indices against the lower limit of autoregulation, part ii: experimental model of arterial hypotension. *Journal of neurotrauma* **35**, 2812–2819 (2018).

[46] Hill, L. K. *et al.* Ethnic differences in resting heart rate variability: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Psychosomatic medicine* **77**, 16 (2015).

[47] Ostchega, Y., Porter, K. S., Hughes, J., Dillon, C. F. & Nwankwo, T. Resting pulse rate reference data for children, adolescents, and adults; united states, 1999-2008 (2011).

[48] Hripcsak, G. & Albers, D. J. Next-generation phenotyping of electronic health records. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association* **20**, 117–121 (2013).

[49] Hripcsak, G. & Albers, D. J. Correlating electronic health record concepts with healthcare process events. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association* **20**, e311–e318 (2013).

[50] Batson, C. *et al.* Intracranial pressure–derived cerebrovascular reactivity indices, chronological age, and biological sex in traumatic brain injury: a scoping review. *Neurotrauma Reports* **3**, 44–56 (2022).