Title: Towards long term monitoring: Seizure detection with reduced electroencephalogram channels

Authors: Christina Maher^{1,2,3*}, Yikai Yang^{1,2}, Nhan Duy Truong^{1,2}, Chenyu Wang^{3,5}, Armin Nikpour^{4,5,†}, Omid Kavehei^{1,2,†*}

1. School of Biomedical Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, The University of Sydney, NSW 2006, Australia.
 2. Australian Research Council Training Centre for Innovative BioEngineering, Faculty of Engineering, The University of Sydney, NSW 2006, Australia.
 3. Brain and Mind Centre, The University of Sydney, NSW 2006, Australia.
 4. Comprehensive Epilepsy Service and Department of Neurology at the Royal Prince Alfred Hospital, NSW 2050, Australia.
 5. Faculty of Medicine and Health, Central Clinical School, The University of Sydney, NSW 2006, Australia.
- † These authors contributed equally to this work

Correspondence: christina.maher@sydney.edu.au; Tel.: +61-2-8627-6812

First author's ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6023-9457>

Last author's ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2753-5553>

Number of manuscript text pages: 11

Number of words: 3178

Number of references: 66

Number of figures: 7

Number of tables: 1

Towards long term monitoring: Seizure detection with reduced electroencephalogram channels

Christina Maher^{1,2,3*}, Yikai Yang^{1,2}, Nhan Duy Truong^{1,2}, Chenyu Wang^{3,5}, Armin Nikpour^{4,5,†}, Omid Kavehei^{1,2,†*}

¹ School of Biomedical Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, The University of Sydney, NSW 2006, Australia.
² Australian Research Council Training Centre for Innovative BioEngineering, Faculty of Engineering, The University of Sydney, NSW 2006, Australia.
³ Brain and Mind Centre, The University of Sydney, NSW 2006, Australia.
⁴ Comprehensive Epilepsy Service and Department of Neurology at the Royal Prince Alfred Hospital, NSW 2050, Australia.
⁵ Faculty of Medicine and Health, Central Clinical School, The University of Sydney, NSW 2006, Australia.
* Correspondence: {christina.maher; omid.kavehei}@sydney.edu.au; Tel.: +61-2-8627-6812
† These authors contributed equally to this work.

Abstract: Epilepsy is a prevalent condition characterised by recurrent, unpredictable seizures. The diagnosis of epilepsy is by surface electroencephalography (EEG), a time-consuming and uncomfortable process for patients. The diagnosis of seizures using EEG over a brief monitoring period has variable success, dependent on patient tolerance and seizure frequency. Further, the availability of hospital resources, and hardware and software specifications inherently limit the capacity to perform long-term data collection whilst maintaining patient comfort. The application and maintenance of the standard number of electrodes restrict recording time to a maximum of approximately ten days. This limited monitoring period also results in limited data for machine learning models for seizure detection and classification. This work examines the literature on the impact of reduced electrodes on data accuracy and reliability in seizure detection. We present two electrode ranking models that demonstrate the decline in seizure detection performance associated with reducing electrodes. We assert the need for further research in electrode reduction to advance solutions toward portable, reliable devices that can simultaneously provide patient comfort, long-term monitoring and contribute to multimodal patient care solutions.

Keywords: electrode; electroencephalogram; epilepsy; seizure; seizure detection; machine learning; patient care

1. Introduction

Epilepsy is a severe neurological condition that affects millions of people worldwide. The main symptoms are recurrent seizures that can be a traumatic experience for the individual [1]. Epilepsy diagnosis requires attendance at a specialised epilepsy clinic or hospital. The lengthy process involves multiple tests, continuous electroencephalography (EEG) and video EEG (vEEG) monitoring, and if no seizures are recorded, may result in misdiagnosis. Currently, this process is conducted either in a hospital ward or via an ambulatory service by wearing the EEG device at home for several days. Additionally, a carer is usually required to be present for ward testing.

EEG data analysis is a lengthy process, mainly if seizures are not immediately evident on the surface EEG or vEEG. There may be no or little surface EEG change during focal seizures without impaired awareness. The incidence of false-positive diagnosis reportedly ranges from 2%-71% [2]. EEG monitoring is costly in financial, mental, physical and time resources. In 2016, the global prevalence of active epilepsy was 45.9 million individuals with 126, 055 epilepsy-related deaths, 13.5 million disability-adjusted-life-years, 5.9 million years of life lost (YLL), and 7.5 million years of life with a disability

(YLD) [3]. The risk of misdiagnosis must be weighed against that of a false positive diagnosis [2]. Therefore, improving EEG device portability and automated detection represents an essential advancement to facilitate effective diagnosis and treatment and enhance the patient journey.

This work serves to explain the routine clinical seizure detection process and present two channel selection algorithms developed in our lab. Our channel selection algorithms were applied to publicly available datasets, highlighting the difficulty in achieving high seizure detection performance with a lower number of channels. We discuss previous work that attempted to reduce the number of electrodes used in automated seizure detection models, and suggest their applications for improving long term monitoring solutions.

1.1. The need for electrode reduction

Several factors support the focus on reducing the number of electrodes used in seizure detection. Technological advances have made automated seizure detection and device portability a near reality. Currently, the longest non-invasive surface EEG recording using wet or dry electrodes is around ten days. Applying abrasive gel to the scalp can irritate and damage the skin, yet it is compulsory for standard EEG electrodes. Mobile EEG systems must be comfortable and appealing to wear. Thus the portability of EEG systems represents a trade-off between electrode count and the quality of the signal. Achieving this balance in a portable EEG system would enable home EEG monitoring, potentially greatly improving patient comfort during the diagnosis process. Fig. 1 depicts the patient journey through the healthcare system from the first seizure through to epilepsy diagnosis.

Herta [4] and colleagues emphasised the value of fewer electrodes in circumstances where a 10-20 EEG system cannot be applied, such as in intensive care units (ICUs). Ambulatory monitoring is a potential beneficiary of reduced electrodes through automated seizure logging, which is currently achieved through either ward monitoring or self-report. However, the accuracy of self-report is highly dependent on seizure-type, and patient ability [34]. Inaccurate seizure reporting impacts patient treatment and conflates reporting on the efficacy of treatments such as medication. Under-reporting of seizures is a long-standing and significant clinical problem [34–42]. Sub scalp electrodes, if shown to be a reliable method for recording EEG, can replace the need for patients to regularly attend clinics to have electrodes re-applied. Moreover, subcutaneous electrode systems purport to have a high agreement with surface EEG recordings [5]. Yet the number of electrodes in subcutaneous systems remains restricted; more than four electrodes are not ideal. Hence, improving automated seizure detection performance using a reduced number of surface electrodes is the first step towards reliable, long-term EEG monitoring solutions that can improve the patient journey.

Furthermore, patient-specific electrode reduction would improve recording of their specific seizure semiology. The number of required electrodes and electrode placement can be guided by a patient's magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) scan and EEG. We recently examined the role of structural connectivity in seizure propagation in focal epilepsy patients [6]. Diffusion MRI can be a valuable aid for patient-specific determination of electrode placement. This paper is intended to extend our previous work by examining the best automated method for electrode based on EEG signals. Taken together, the individualised MRI data combined with the automated ranking of EEG signals can provide a patient-specific pipeline for seizure onset zone selection, which would indicate the optimal electrode placement and the number of electrodes to optimise automated seizure detection. Fig. 2 portrays a theoretical process for using both EEG and MRI to obtain the optimal electrode placement. Items (a) and (b) were explored in our previous work [6] whilst (c) and (d), circled in red, are examined in Section 4 of this paper.

Figure 1. Patient journey - two scenarios. This figure depicts the process and various settings where seizure detection and logging may take place. In the hospital setting (a, Journey A), a carer accompanies the patient. Patient comfort, mobility, and limited hospital resources restrict the length of time a patient can spend in the hospital. Conversely, the home setting (b, Journey B) facilitates patient comfort and mobility. Patients can continue their daily activities while being monitored for an extended duration. Unfortunately, improving patient comfort and mobility through home monitoring comes at the cost of diminished EEG recordings due to limitations imposed by the individual and their environment. For example, electrodes do not last long on the scalp, and the patient must inevitably return to the hospital or have a technician visit them to adjust or remove the electrodes. Avenues for improving this imperfect process lie in advancing the research in electrode reduction to enable long-term wearable solutions for the patient.

2. Manual seizure detection

Seizures are detected by monitoring the EEG signals. EEG is the gold standard used to detect interictal, ictal and subclinical epileptic activity. This includes critical conditions like status epilepticus [7,8]. Changes in EEG signals could represent spontaneous electrical brain activities that exhibit dynamic, stochastic, nonlinear, non-stationary, and

Figure 2. MRI and EEG for optimal electrode placement. The MRI scans (T1 and diffusion) (a) are processed through an imaging pipeline to obtain tractography and tract-weighted tensor metrics (b). The EEG signals (c) are read and seizures detected using machine learning (ML) (d) and the most important electrodes per patient are selected (e). Lastly, the output of both the tract-weighted tensor metrics and the EEG electrode selection can be used by the clinicians to select the optimal placement for a wearable or implantable electrode.

complex behaviour with high temporal resolution. Typical EEG monitoring requires up to 19 head, and two reference electrodes, based on the international 10–20 electrode placement system [9]. This standard electrode placement is applied in a variety of settings, including for inpatients in the hospital. In the context of ambulatory monitoring in the home setting, a device with up to 19 electrodes may be used. For seizure monitoring in neonates in the ICU, four electrodes are considered sufficient. The routine practice of continuous EEG monitoring in ICUs affords a consensus on the reliability of a reduced number of electrodes [10].

Electrode positioning and a typical ictal event are demonstrated in Fig. 3. Here, an interictal period precedes an ictal event (red highlighted section), shown on a montage of five channels out of the standard 21. In routine clinical practice, seizure onset and type are identified, labelled and classified. Human experts (“expert”) may be nurses, EEG technicians, neurophysiologists and neurologists, trained to detect seizures on the EEG. The expert then labels the EEG with the seizure time, length and location. Usually, EEG data recorded over an extended period yields reliable, interpretable EEG that can inform clinical decisions.

3. Automated seizure detection

Computer-automated techniques, such as ML algorithms, can detect and label seizures. EEG signal recordings and the amount of EEG recorded play a fundamental role in the outcome of the seizure detection model [11]. Channel selection involves reducing the number of electrodes to be analysed or utilising a range of feature selection and classification techniques, or a combination of both [44,45,49,60]. The model is trained either on individual patients or across all patients and then tested on the dataset of interest [12,13].

Figure 3. EEG signals are recorded from electrodes placed on the scalp in the 10-20 format (a). The signals are then displayed on readout software. An EEG technician or neurologist then visually identifies and labels the interictal, pre-ictal and ictal phases (b).

Digital signal processing allows the extraction of common features of an EEG signal. Prior human studies examine engineered features such as relative average amplitude, relative scale energy, average cross-correlation function, relative power, bounded variation [14], phase-amplitude coupling [15], root mean square [16], energy [17], median frequency [18], entropy [19,20], correlation dimension [21,22], maximal Lyapunov exponent [23], and skewness and kurtosis [24]. These features may be the sole focus of the model [20] or combined and applied to a selected EEG frequency band [25–27]. There are also options for direct extraction of features from raw EEG, or after a filter such as short-time Fourier transform (STFT) or wavelet transform is applied to the EEG.

In conventional ML methods, such as convolutional neural networks (CNN), the aim is to classify EEG signals [27,28]. EEG features are fed into the model, and additional threshold mechanisms are then applied to the output of the training model via a “classifier” technique [29]. Common classifier techniques include but are not limited to Bayesian, K-nearest neighbours (KNN), decision tree, random forest, and support vector machine (SVM) classifiers [11]. Biomarkers for seizure susceptibility may help improve automated seizure detection models, yet tools for such exploration are limited. Our recent work examined biomarkers for seizure susceptibility using a Bayesian CNN based tool [31]. We showed interictal slowing activity was a promising feature for the investigation of seizure susceptibility prediction.

The reliance of automated seizure detection models on engineered features emphasises the vulnerability of the model to changes in the electrode count, EEG artefacts and noise [30]. Individual human characteristics, such as hair and scalp thickness, and pathological state, also influence EEG recordings. Reducing electrodes whilst maintaining the fidelity of recordings demands the ML model and the electrode placement be patient-specific. Therefore electrode reduction is currently considered problematic and receives little enthusiasm in the clinical setting. The increased availability of sufficient and reliable EEG data is critical to the acceptance and translation of automated seizure detection into the clinical realm. The need for increased data can be met through a reduced electrode, long-term, implantable device.

4. Methods

4.1. Channel Selection Method 1

Our group previously used this random forest classifier method on the Kaggle iEEG dataset to rank channels in order of their contribution to the detection of a given seizure [50]. Here we apply it to the EPILEPSIAE scalp EEG dataset to test its utility on a

Table 1: Seizure detection with reduced channels, channel selection models, and/or reduced electrodes.

Reference	Dataset	No. E/C §	Patient specific	No. patients	Age group £	Total no. seizures	Sensitivity	Specificity
Birjandtalab <i>et al.</i> 2017 [43]	CHB-MIT	18 E	Y	23	P	–	80.87%(avg)	47.45%
Selvakumari <i>et al.</i> 2019 [44]	CHB-MIT	12 E	Y	23	P	–	95.70%	96.55%
Pisano <i>et al.</i> 2020 [45]	EPILEPSIAE (surface)	11 C	N	3	A	28	94%	95%
Herta <i>et al.</i> 2017 [4]	General Hospital Vienna †	6 E	N	83	–	–	84.99–93.39%	90.05–95.6%
Bhattacharyya <i>et al.</i> 2017 [46]	CHB-MIT	5 C	N	23	P	–	97.91%	99.57%
Moctezuma <i>et al.</i> 2020 [47]	CHB-MIT	4-6 C	Y	23	P	–	–	–
Shah <i>et al.</i> 2017 [48]	TUH EEG Seizure Corpus (TUSZ)	4-2 C	N	–	–	–	–	–
Kjaer <i>et al.</i> 2017 [49]	Rigshospitalet and Northzealand Hospital ‡	3 E	N	6	P	~8.75/pat.	98.40%	100%
Maher <i>et al.</i> 2021 (current paper)	EPILEPSIAE (surface)	6 C	Y	30	A	–	92.25(AUC)	
	TUH	5 C	Y	249	A	–	2.04%	

£ A for adult; P for pediatric.

§ E for electrodes; C for channels.

‡ This dataset is from Rigshospitalet and Northzealand Hospital.

† This group reported 9 electrodes had the highest sensitivity, but 6 electrodes performed best on their “RDA” model.

different dataset. The descriptive statistics of the EPILEPSIAE dataset are shown in Fig. 4. The channel selection was patient-specific, meaning the channels selected as the best channels differed from patient to patient. The pseudo-code for the automatic channel selection (ACS) algorithm is shown below.

For the current paper, the ACS algorithm was used to select the 10 most important channels per patient on the EPILEPSIAE surface EEG dataset (on 30 patients). Next, the top 10 channels across the entire group of 30 patients were selected and fed into our seizure detection model. To test the performance of the 6 channels, we chose a subset of the top 6 channels from the top 10. The seizure detection model was then applied to the 6 channels. The average AUC score for 19, 10, and 6 channels was 98.03, 91.57, 92.25, respectively. With just 6 channels, we observed an encouraging trend of improved performance on some patients; yet the number of false positives remained a challenge.

4.2. Channel Selection Method 2

For this method of channel selection, we performed seizure detection on a subset of the TUH dataset. Descriptive statistics for the TUH dataset are shown in Fig. 5.

Channel selection for this method involves a combination of two approaches:

Figure 4. Descriptive statistics from the EPILEPSIAE dataset [51,52]. Gender is shown in (a), seizure type, and the number of seizures per patient is shown in (b). Age distribution (c) includes a shaded portion, which represents the number of years living with epilepsy. The seizure length and frequency of that seizure length is depicted in the heat-map in (c). Seizure frequency is shown in the colour bar, where darker colours represent a higher number of seizures and lighter colours represent a lower number of seizures.

Approach 1. Information from a single electrode was fed into a simple and fast CNN structure (EEGNet, as seen in [53]), which has been widely used in the brain-computer interface domain. Channels were then selected by ranking valuation accuracy. The final channel selection decision was based on the ranking results of the two channels. A further experiment on the high-ranking channels was also conducted (Approach 2). The procedures are shown in Fig. 6.

Approach 2. A fast single electrode training was conducted to rank the channels. The classifier was trained to feed one electrode one time and rank channels based on the valuation accuracy. To make this method less time-costly, we trained only one epoch for comparison as there were a total of 21 electrodes to test. Unlike previously mentioned methods which use frequency information in training, this approach trains the raw EEG directly. The final channel ranking heat-map is shown in Fig. 7.

We combined the results of the two electrode ranking methods based on (1) The importance value from approach one, which reflects how often it is used during training in the random forest classifier; (2) The valuation accuracy from approach two, which reflects the first epoch results when we put a signal electrode into a fast structure training.

Algorithm 1 Automatic channel selection

Require: X : FFT of 1-s EEG windows, size of $(n_{\text{samples}}, n_{\text{features}}, n_{\text{channels}})$; y : label, ictal or interictal

- 1: $X_r = \text{Reshape}(X, (n_{\text{samples}}, n_{\text{features}} \times n_{\text{channels}}))$
- 2: *Maintain order so that Reshape function is reversible*
- 3: Train a Random Forest classifier to fit (X_r, y)
- 4: Store the frequencies of being used by the RF classifier for each feature in an array I with a shape of $(n_{\text{features}} \times n_{\text{channels}})^\dagger$.
- 5: $I_r = \text{Reshape}(I, (n_{\text{features}}, n_{\text{channels}}))$
- 6: $I_s = \text{Sum}(I_r, \text{along } n_{\text{channels}} \text{ axis})$
- 7: I_s has a shape of (n_{channels})
- 8: Sort I_s in descending order.
- 9: Indices of top values are indices of the most important EEG channels

† This can be achieved via method `feature_importances_()` if using scikit-learn (tested with version 0.24.0). The method returns an array with a shape of $(n_{\text{features}} \times n_{\text{channels}})$.

Figure 5. Descriptive statistics from the TUH dataset. Gender distribution is shown in (a), and total number of seizures per patient is shown in (b). The seizure length and frequency of a specific seizure length is depicted in the heat-map in (c). Seizure frequency is shown in the colour bar, where darker colours represent higher number of seizures and lighter colours represent a lower number of seizures.

5. Results

As seen in Fig. 7, the five electrodes F3, F7, P3, O1, and O2 ranked the highest. The electrodes were paired in the format F3-F7 and P3-O1 as these were two pairs of nearby electrodes, to give the two-channel format that was fed into the model. The purpose of the two approaches for channel selection was to make the selection more reliable. Interestingly, literature shows that left temporal lobe epilepsy is a common epilepsy type, with focal seizures in the left temporal lobe being the most common seizure type. Our model achieved a sensitivity score of 2.04, which reaches 0.17 FA/24 hrs using only two channels. The modest results highlight the challenges in EEG seizure detection with a minimal number of electrodes.

6. Discussion

Given the challenges in automated seizure detection and logging, a portable, reduced electrode device would be invaluable for patients. Such a device could materialise as a sub scalp implant with as little as three electrodes tailored to patient-specific seizure detection. A sub scalp implant would address the long-term monitoring needs of indi-

Figure 6. Channel ranking and selection procedure.

Figure 7. Channel ranking heat-map. Color changing from blue to red indicates increasing ranking of the electrodes.

viduals with intractable epilepsy who are unsuitable for surgery. The device could act as a monitor to guard against sudden unexpected death in epilepsy (SUDEP), prevalent in low resource countries [54,55]. However, the reduced electrode device must record EEG signals and detect and log seizures reliably to be clinically useful. Unfortunately, research into incumbent devices has yielded mixed results [56]. A summary of prior research is in Table 1.

A foundational study by Shih *et al.* used a greedy backward elimination algorithm to select a subset of seven features that produce the lowest false positive rate from each channel [61]. The reduced number of channels was between 18 and 4.6, achieving improvement in false-positive rate (FPR), from 0.35/hr to 0.19/hr, yet sensitivity and detection delay worsened, from 99% to 97% and 7.8 s to 11.2 s, respectively. More recently, Moctezuma and Molinas compared the popular backward greedy elimination algorithm with two versions of the nondominated sorting genetic algorithm (NSGA), NSGA-II and NSGA-III [47]. They achieved an accuracy ranging between 0.98 and 1 using one to two channels, comparable to their detection result with the full electrode count (accuracy ranged from 1 to 0.97).

The role of variance contributed by individual channels has been widely explored. Duun-Henriksen *et al.* reduced channels by selecting the largest variance in channels, achieving a detection performance on three channels near equivalent to a clinical neuro-physiologist's review on the same dataset EEG [62]. Birjandtalab *et al.* used a random forest algorithm to determine which channels contributed the most variation to discrimination of seizure versus non-seizure events [43]. However, their minimal channel reduction, from 23 to 18 channels, provides little difference in clinical application where the patients still wear 18 electrodes. Bhattacharya and colleagues pre-selected 5 out of 23 channels to perform a multivariate analysis of EEG signals [46]. The one channel that displayed the least standard deviation informed the selection of the remaining four channels based on their inter-dependency level and similarity to the first channel. The model's performance ranged from 0.95 to 0.99, making it comparable to other channel selection methods.

A unique approach by Shah *et al.* focused on domain knowledge to inform the channel selection [48]. They exploited insights on brain hemisphere function, the proximity of a given electrode to other electrodes, electrode position on the scalp, and the region the electrode covered in terms of signal capture. Their eight electrode montage produced the most favourable results, yet the authors affirmed the scarcity of superior techniques that permit electrode reduction whilst maintaining model sensitivity. A rare prospective study by Kjaer *et al.* investigated automated seizure detection in a paediatric population of six patients aged 7–12 years [49]. Using three electrodes, with respective references, they achieved a mean sensitivity of 98.4%, a specificity of 100% and a mean false detection rate of 5.5 per 24/hr. Their study lacked comparisons to a full set of electrodes, but the prospective study design and facilitation of at home device usage made this an exemplar study. Further efforts in the vein of the discussed fundamental works would be invaluable for the seizure detection community.

6.1. Limitations of reduced channels

Technological challenges prevail in data collection and hardware design. Stevenson *et al.* [57] found electrode reduction negatively impacted visual interpretation by human experts. They misjudged seizure burden, and seizure annotation was significantly higher when they used 19 rather than eight electrodes. Rubin *et al.* [59] had two epileptologists label cases as seizure or no seizure. When compared to ground truth data, the epileptologists achieved a combined 70% sensitivity and 96% specificity for seizure detection. The reduced arrays were believed to contribute to the inferior sensitivity score. Herta and colleagues compared human expert seizure annotations in ICU EEG recordings with an automated electrode reduction model [4]. They reduced electrodes in a step-wise fashion, calculating sensitivity and specificity for each eliminated electrode.

They deemed a minimum of nine electrodes requisite to detect the ictal patterns that the human experts detected.

Channel selection studies highlight the wealth of possibilities in channel selection model combinations. However model combinations, and the interchangeably used terms “electrode” and “channel,” make delineation, comparison and reproducibility of best-in-class models challenging. The impositions described in the literature illustrate the need for further research.

Since EEG is an established and reliable method for capturing and identifying seizure activity, its utility would be amplified if it were evolved beyond the current non-mobile state. A portable device with only a few electrodes would enable long-term recordings, providing rich neurophysiological data for patient-specific data processing. Greater access to data could increase researchers’ proclivity to upgrade existing EEG solutions. Transforming the existing solutions from a diagnosis-only state to a seizure logging and management aid for clinicians and patients will enhance the patient journey. Neurobehavioural and psychiatric comorbidities of epilepsy might be better understood [63,64]. The diagnosis and treatment pathways for epilepsy comorbidities could be optimised [65,66]. Automated seizure detection models could be refined and enhanced by the addition of selective biomarkers. Although the two electrode selection models proposed by our group were encouraging, they signify the difficulty in achieving optimal performance. Despite the first model producing improved results for some, most patients’ performance declined as electrodes were reduced from 19 to 6. The results from the second model were concurrent with the literature, yet the model’s average false alarm score would be unacceptable in a clinical setting. Further prospective studies that elucidate dependable methods for reducing electrodes can pave the way for improving patient care.

7. Conclusion

The impact of electrode reduction on both human and computer seizure detection performance is problematic. Deterioration in performance is often attributed to the reduced availability and accuracy of the EEG data. We propose that a resurgence of research into electrode reduction in the clinical setting will support the development of portable, reliable devices, thereby enabling long-term monitoring and enhancing patient quality of life.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, C.M. and O.K.; methodology, C.M., Y.Y., N.T., A.N. and O.K.; data analysis, C.M., Y.Y., N.T., and O.K.; investigation, C.M., Y.Y. and N.T.; data curation, C.M., Y.Y. and N.T.; Writing-original draft preparation, C.M., N.T., C.W., A.N., and O.K.; Writing-review and editing, C.M., Y.Y., N.T., C.W., A.N., and O.K.; supervision, C.W., A.N., and O.K.; All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research was funded by a Microsoft AI for Accessibility grant and The University of Sydney SOAR Fellowship.

Acknowledgments: Christina Maher acknowledges the scholarship support from the Nerve Research Foundation. Omid Kavehei acknowledges the partial support provided by The University of Sydney through a SOAR Fellowship and Microsoft’s partial support through a Microsoft AI for Accessibility grant.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

1. Pohlmann-Eden, B.; Beghi, E.; Camfield, C.; Camfield, P. The first seizure and its management in adults and children. *BMJ* **2006**, *332*, 339–342.
2. Oto, M.M. The misdiagnosis of epilepsy: appraising risks and managing uncertainty. *Seizure* **2017**, *44*, 143–146.
3. Beghi, E.; Giussani, G.; Nichols, E.; Abd-Allah, F.; Abdela, J.; Abdelalim, A.; Abraha, H.N.; Adib, M.G.; Agrawal, S.; Alahdab, F.; others. Global, regional, and national burden of

- 299 epilepsy, 1990–2016: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2016. *The*
300 *Lancet Neurology* **2019**, *18*, 357–375.
- 301 4. Herta, J.; Koren, J.; Furbass, F.; Hartmann, M.; Gruber, A.; Baumgartner, C. Reduced electrode
302 arrays for the automated detection of rhythmic and periodic patterns in the intensive care
303 unit: frequently tried, frequently failed? *Clinical Neurophysiology* **2017**, *128*, 1524–1531.
- 304 5. Duun-Henriksen, J.; Baud, M.; Richardson, M.P.; Cook, M.; Kouvas, G.; Heasman, J.M.;
305 Friedman, D.; Peltola, J.; Zibrandtsen, I.C.; Kjaer, T.W. A new era in electroencephalographic
306 monitoring? Subscalp devices for ultra-long-term recordings. *Epilepsia* **2020**, *61*, 1805–1817.
- 307 6. Maher, C.; D’Souza, A.; Zeng, R.; Barnett, M.; Kavehei, O.; Nikpour, A.; Wang, C.
308 White matter changes in focal to bilateral tonic-clonic seizures. *medRxiv preprint*, **2021**,
309 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.21.21265249>.
- 310 7. Benbadis, S.R.; Beniczky, S.; Bertram, E.; MacIver, S.; Moshé, S.L. The role of EEG in patients
311 with suspected epilepsy. *Epileptic Disorders* **2020**, *22*, 143–155.
- 312 8. Radhakrishnan, K. The Role of EEG in the Diagnosis and Classification of Epilepsy Syn-
313 dromes: A Tool for Clinical Practice by the ILAE Neurophysiology Task Force. *Journal of*
314 *Clinical Neurophysiology* **2020**, *37*, 87.
- 315 9. Jurcak, V.; Tsuzuki, D.; Dan, I. 10/20, 10/10, and 10/5 systems revisited: their validity as
316 relative head-surface-based positioning systems. *Neuroimage* **2007**, *34*, 1600–1611.
- 317 10. Caricato, A.; Della Marca, G.; Ioannoni, E.; Silva, S.; Markushi, T.B.; Stival, E.; Biasucci, D.G.;
318 Montano, N.; Gelormini, C.; Melchionda, I. Continuous EEG monitoring by a new simplified
319 wireless headset in intensive care unit. *BMC Anesthesiology* **2020**, *20*, 1–6.
- 320 11. Siddiqui, M.K.; Morales-Menendez, R.; Huang, X.; Hussain, N. A review of epileptic seizure
321 detection using machine learning classifiers. *Brain Informatics* **2020**, *7*, 1–18.
- 322 12. Khan, Y.; Gotman, J. Wavelet based automatic seizure detection in intracerebral electroen-
323 cephalogram. *Clinical Neurophysiology* **2003**, *114*, 898–908.
- 324 13. Varsavsky, A.; Mareels, I. Patient un-specific detection of epileptic seizures through changes
325 in variance. *Proc. IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society* **2006**, pp. 3747–3750.
- 326 14. Kuhlmann, L.; Burkitt, A.N.; Cook, M.J.; Fuller, K.; Grayden, D.B.; Seiderer, L.; Mareels, I.M.
327 Seizure detection using seizure probability estimation: Comparison of features used to detect
328 seizures. *Annals of Biomedical Engineering* **2009**, *37*, 2129–2145.
- 329 15. Edakawa, K.; Yanagisawa, T.; Kishima, H.; Fukuma, R.; Oshino, S.; Khoo, H.M.; Kobayashi,
330 M.; Tanaka, M.; Yoshimine, T. Detection of epileptic seizures using phase–amplitude coupling
331 in intracranial electroencephalography. *Scientific Reports* **2016**, *6*, 25422.
- 332 16. Patnaik, L.M.; Manyam, O.K. Epileptic EEG detection using neural networks and post-
333 classification. *Computer Methods and Programs in Biomedicine* **2008**, *91*, 100–109.
- 334 17. Omerhodzic, I.; Avdakovic, S.; Nuhanovic, A.; Dizdarevic, K. Energy distribution of EEG
335 signals: EEG signal wavelet-neural network classifier. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1307.7897* **2013**.
- 336 18. Wang, N.; Lyu, M.R. Exploration of instantaneous amplitude and frequency features for
337 epileptic seizure prediction. *Proc. Bioinformatics & Bioengineering (BIBE)* **2012**, pp. 292–297.
- 338 19. Kannathal, N.; Choo, M.L.; Acharya, U.R.; Sadasivan, P. Entropies for detection of epilepsy
339 in EEG. *Computer Methods and Programs in Biomedicine* **2005**, *80*, 187–194.
- 340 20. Yuan, Q.; Zhou, W.; Liu, Y.; Wang, J. Epileptic seizure detection with linear and nonlinear
341 features. *Epilepsy & Behavior* **2012**, *24*, 415–421.
- 342 21. Acharya, U.R.; Sree, S.V.; Swapna, G.; Martis, R.J.; Suri, J.S. Automated EEG analysis of
343 epilepsy: a review. *Knowledge-Based Systems* **2013**, *45*, 147–165.
- 344 22. Aarabi, A.; He, B. A rule-based seizure prediction method for focal neocortical epilepsy.
345 *Clinical Neurophysiology* **2012**, *123*, 1111–1122.
- 346 23. Adeli, H.; Ghosh-Dastidar, S.; Dadmehr, N. A wavelet-chaos methodology for analysis of
347 EEGs and EEG subbands to detect seizure and epilepsy. *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical*
348 *Engineering* **2007**, *54*, 205–211.
- 349 24. Aarabi, A.; Fazel-Rezai, R.; Aghakhani, Y. EEG seizure prediction: measures and challenges.
350 *Proc. IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society* **2009**, pp. 1864–1867.
- 351 25. Hopfengärtner, R.; Kasper, B.S.; Graf, W.; Gollwitzer, S.; Kreiselmeyer, G.; Stefan, H.; Hamer,
352 H. Automatic seizure detection in long-term scalp EEG using an adaptive thresholding
353 technique: a validation study for clinical routine. *Clinical Neurophysiology* **2014**, *125*, 1346–
354 1352.
- 355 26. Hassan, A.R.; Siuly, S.; Zhang, Y. Epileptic seizure detection in EEG signals using tunable-Q
356 factor wavelet transform and bootstrap aggregating. *Computer Methods and Programs in*
357 *Biomedicine* **2016**, *137*, 247–259.

- 358 27. Das, A.B.; Bhuiyan, M.I.H. Discrimination and classification of focal and non-focal EEG
359 signals using entropy-based features in the EMD-DWT domain. *Biomedical Signal Processing*
360 *and Control* **2016**, *29*, 11–21.
- 361 28. Zabihi, M.; Kiranyaz, S.; Rad, A.B.; Katsaggelos, A.K.; Gabbouj, M.; Ince, T. Analysis of
362 high-dimensional phase space via Poincaré section for patient-specific seizure detection.
363 *IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering* **2015**, *24*, 386–398.
- 364 29. Alotaiby, T.N.; Alshebeili, S.A.; Alshaw, T.; Ahmad, I.; Abd El-Samie, F.E. EEG seizure
365 detection and prediction algorithms: A survey. *EURASIP Journal on Advances in Signal*
366 *Processing* **2014**, *2014*, 183.
- 367 30. Baumgartner, C.; Koren, J.P.; Rothmayer, M. Automatic computer-based detection of epileptic
368 seizures. *Frontiers in Neurology* **2018**, *9*, 639.
- 369 31. Truong, N.; Yang, Y.; Maher, C.; Kuhlmann, L.; McEwan, A.; Nikpour, A.; Kavehei, O. Seizure
370 susceptibility prediction in uncontrolled epilepsy. *Frontiers in Neurology* **2021**, *12*, 721491.
- 371 32. Bramlett, H.M.; Dietrich, W.D. Long-term consequences of traumatic brain injury: current
372 status of potential mechanisms of injury and neurological outcomes. *Journal of Neurotrauma*
373 **2015**, *32*, 1834–1848.
- 374 33. Kubota, Y.; Nakamoto, H.; Egawa, S.; Kawamata, T. Continuous EEG monitoring in ICU.
375 *Journal of Intensive Care* **2018**, *6*, 39.
- 376 34. Hoppe, C.; Poepel, A.; Elger, C.E. Epilepsy: accuracy of patient seizure counts. *Archives of*
377 *Neurology* **2007**, *64*, 1595–1599.
- 378 35. Tatum IV, W.O.; Winters, L.; Gieron, M.; Passaro, E.A.; Benbadis, S.; Ferreira, J.; Liporace, J.
379 Outpatient seizure identification: results of 502 patients using computer-assisted ambulatory
380 EEG. *Journal of Clinical Neurophysiology* **2001**, *18*, 14–19.
- 381 36. Kerling, F.; Mueller, S.; Pauli, E.; Stefan, H. When do patients forget their seizures? An
382 electroclinical study. *Epilepsy & Behavior* **2006**, *9*, 281–285.
- 383 37. Poochikian-Sarkissian, S.; Tai, P.; del Campo, M.; Andrade, D.M.; Carlen, P.L.; Valiante, T.;
384 Wennberg, R.A. Patient awareness of seizures as documented in the epilepsy monitoring
385 unit. *Canadian Journal of Neuroscience Nursing* **2009**, *31*, 22–23.
- 386 38. Akman, C.I.; Montenegro, M.A.; Jacob, S.; Eck, K.; Chiriboga, C.; Gilliam, F. Seizure frequency
387 in children with epilepsy: factors influencing accuracy and parental awareness. *Seizure* **2009**,
388 *18*, 524–529.
- 389 39. DuBois, J.; Boylan, L.; Shiyko, M.; Barr, W.; Devinsky, O. Seizure prediction and recall.
390 *Epilepsy & Behavior* **2010**, *18*, 106–109.
- 391 40. Fattouch, J.; Di Bonaventura, C.; Lapenta, L.; Casciato, S.; Fanella, M.; Morano, A.; Manfredi,
392 M.; Giallonardo, A. Epilepsy, unawareness of seizures and driving license: the potential role
393 of 24-hour ambulatory EEG in defining seizure freedom. *Epilepsy & Behavior* **2012**, *25*, 32–35.
- 394 41. Cook, M.J.; O'Brien, T.J.; Berkovic, S.F.; Murphy, M.; Morokoff, A.; Fabinyi, G.; D'Souza, W.;
395 Yerra, R.; Archer, J.; Litewka, L.; others. Prediction of seizure likelihood with a long-term,
396 implanted seizure advisory system in patients with drug-resistant epilepsy: A first-in-man
397 study. *The Lancet Neurology* **2013**, *12*, 563–571.
- 398 42. Van Paesschen, W. The future of seizure detection. *The Lancet Neurology* **2018**, *17*, 200–202.
- 399 43. Birjandtalab, J.; Pouyan, M.B.; Cogan, D.; Nourani, M.; Harvey, J. Automated seizure
400 detection using limited-channel EEG and non-linear dimension reduction. *Computers in*
401 *Biology and Medicine* **2017**, *82*, 49–58.
- 402 44. Selvakumari, R.S.; Mahalakshmi, M.; Prashalee, P. Patient-specific seizure detection method
403 using hybrid classifier with optimized electrodes. *Journal of Medical Systems* **2019**, *43*, 121.
- 404 45. Pisano, F.; Sias, G.; Fanni, A.; Cannas, B.; Dourado, A.; Pisano, B.; Teixeira, C.A. Convolutional
405 Neural Network for Seizure Detection of Nocturnal Frontal Lobe Epilepsy. *Complexity*
406 **2020**, *2020*.
- 407 46. Bhattacharyya, A.; Pachori, R.B. A multivariate approach for patient-specific EEG seizure
408 detection using empirical wavelet transform. *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering*
409 **2017**, *64*, 2003–2015.
- 410 47. Moctezuma, L.A.; Molinas, M. EEG Channel-selection method for epileptic-seizure classification
411 based on multi-objective optimization. *Frontiers in Neurology* **2020**, *14*, 593.
- 412 48. Shah, V.; Golmohammadi, M.; Ziyabari, S.; Von Weltin, E.; Obeid, I.; Picone, J. Optimizing
413 channel selection for seizure detection. *Proc. IEEE Signal Processing in Medicine and Biology*
414 *Symposium (SPMB)* **2017**, pp. 1–5.

- 415 49. Kjaer, T.W.; Sorensen, H.B.; Groenborg, S.; Pedersen, C.R.; Duun-Henriksen, J. Detection of
416 paroxysms in long-term, single-channel EEG-monitoring of patients with typical absence
417 seizures. *IEEE Journal of Translational Engineering in Health and Medicine* **2017**, *5*, 1–8.
- 418 50. Truong, N.D.; Kuhlmann, L.; Bonyadi, M.R.; Yang, J.; Faulks, A.; Kavehei, O. Supervised
419 learning in automatic channel selection for epileptic seizure detection. *Expert Systems with
420 Applications* **2017**, *86*, 199–207.
- 421 51. Klatt, J.; Feldwisch-Drentrup, H.; Ihle, M.; Navarro, V.; Neufang, M.; Teixeira, C.; Adam,
422 C.; Valderrama, M.; Alvarado-Rojas, C.; Witon, A.; others. The EPILEPSIAE database: An
423 extensive electroencephalography database of epilepsy patients. *Epilepsia* **2012**, *53*, 1669–
424 1676.
- 425 52. Ihle, M.; Feldwisch-Drentrup, H.; Teixeira, C.A.; Witon, A.; Schelter, B.; Timmer, J.; Schulze-
426 Bonhage, A. EPILEPSIAE—A European epilepsy database. *Computer Methods and Programs in
427 Biomedicine* **2012**, *106*, 127–138.
- 428 53. Lawhern, V.J.; Solon, A.J.; Waytowich, N.R.; Gordon, S.M.; Hung, C.P.; Lance, B.J. EEGNet: a
429 compact convolutional neural network for EEG-based brain–computer interfaces. *Journal of
430 Neural Engineering* **2018**, *15*, 056013.
- 431 54. Young, G.B.; Sharpe, M.D.; Savard, M.; Al Thenayan, E.; Norton, L.; Davies-Schinkel, C.
432 Seizure detection with a commercially available bedside EEG monitor and the subhairline
433 montage. *Neurocritical Care* **2009**, *11*, 411.
- 434 55. Muraja-Murro, A.; Mervaala, E.; Westernen-Punnonen, S.; Lepola, P.; Töyräs, J.; Myllymaa,
435 S.; Julkunen, P.; Kantanen, A.M.; Kälviäinen, R.; Myllymaa, K. Forehead EEG electrode set
436 versus full-head scalp EEG in 100 patients with altered mental state. *Epilepsy & Behavior* **2015**,
437 *49*, 245–249.
- 438 56. Brenner, J.M.; Kent, P.; Wojcik, S.M.; Grant, W. Rapid diagnosis of nonconvulsive status
439 epilepticus using reduced-lead electroencephalography. *Western Journal of Emergency Medicine*
440 **2015**, *16*, 442.
- 441 57. Stevenson, N.J.; Lauronen, L.; Vanhatalo, S. The effect of reducing EEG electrode number
442 on the visual interpretation of the human expert for neonatal seizure detection. *Clinical
443 Neurophysiology* **2018**, *129*, 265–270.
- 444 58. Yamaguchi, H.; Nagase, H.; Nishiyama, M.; Tokumoto, S.; Ishida, Y.; Tomioka, K.; Tanaka,
445 T.; Fujita, K.; Toyoshima, D.; Nishimura, N.; others. Nonconvulsive seizure detection by
446 reduced-lead electroencephalography in children with altered mental status in the emergency
447 department. *The Journal of Pediatrics* **2019**, *207*, 213–219.
- 448 59. Rubin, M.N.; Jeffery, O.J.; Fugate, J.E.; Britton, J.W.; Cascino, G.D.; Worrell, G.A.; Hocker, S.E.;
449 Wijdicks, E.F.; Rabinstein, A.A. Efficacy of a reduced electroencephalography electrode array
450 for detection of seizures. *The Neurohospitalist* **2014**, *4*, 6–8.
- 451 60. Alotaiby, T.; Abd El-Samie, F.E.; Alshebeili, S.A.; Ahmad, I. A review of channel selection
452 algorithms for EEG signal processing. *EURASIP Journal on Advances in Signal Processing* **2015**,
453 *2015*, 66.
- 454 61. Shih, E.I.; Shoeb, A.H.; Gutttag, J.V. Sensor selection for energy-efficient ambulatory medical
455 monitoring. *Proc. Mobile Systems, Applications, and Services* **2009**, pp. 347–358.
- 456 62. Duun-Henriksen, J.; Kjaer, T.W.; Madsen, R.E.; Remvig, L.S.; Thomsen, C.E.; Sorensen, H.B.D.
457 Channel selection for automatic seizure detection. *Clinical Neurophysiology* **2012**, *123*, 84–92.
- 458 63. Lin, J.J.; Mula, M.; Hermann, B.P. Uncovering the neurobehavioural comorbidities of epilepsy
459 over the lifespan. *The Lancet* **2012**, *380*, 1180–1192.
- 460 64. Helmstaedter, C.; Aldenkamp, A.; Baker, G.; Mazarati, A.; Ryvlin, P.; Sankar, R. Disentangling
461 the relationship between epilepsy and its behavioral comorbidities—the need for prospective
462 studies in new-onset epilepsies. *Epilepsy & Behavior* **2014**, *31*, 43–47.
- 463 65. Spencer, D.D.; Gerrard, J.L.; Zaveri, H.P. The roles of surgery and technology in understand-
464 ing focal epilepsy and its comorbidities. *The Lancet Neurology* **2018**, *17*, 373–382.
- 465 66. Roach, A.T.I.; Chaitanya, G.; Riley, K.O.; Muhlfhofer, W.; Pati, S. Optimizing therapies for
466 neurobehavioral comorbidities of epilepsy using chronic ambulatory electrocorticography.
467 *Epilepsy & Behavior* **2020**, *102*, 106814.