Identification of Veterans With PTSD Based on EEG Features Collected During Sleep
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Background: Previously, we identified sleep-electroencephalography (EEG) spectral power and synchrony features that differed significantly at a population-average level between subjects with and without posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD). Here, we aimed to examine the extent to which a combination of such features could objectively identify individual subjects with PTSD.

Methods: We analyzed EEG data recorded from 78 combat-exposed Veteran men with (n = 31) and without (n = 47) PTSD during two consecutive nights of sleep. To obviate the need for manual assessment of sleep staging and facilitate extraction of features from the EEG data, for each subject, we computed 780 stage-independent, whole-night features from the 10 most commonly used EEG channels. We performed feature selection and trained a logistic regression model using a training set consisting of the first 47 consecutive subjects (18 with PTSD) of the study. Then, we evaluated the model on a testing set consisting of the remaining 31 subjects (13 with PTSD).

Results: Feature selection yielded three uncorrelated features that were consistent across the two consecutive nights and discriminative of PTSD. One feature was from the spectral power in the delta band (2–4 Hz) and the other two were from phase synchronies in the alpha (10–12 Hz) and gamma (32–40 Hz) bands. When we combined these features into a logistic regression model to predict the subjects in the testing set, the trained model yielded areas under the receiver operating characteristic curve of at least 0.80. Importantly, the model yielded a testing-set sensitivity of 0.85 and a positive predictive value (PPV) of 0.31.

Conclusions: We identified robust stage-independent, whole-night features from EEG signals and combined them into a logistic regression model to discriminate subjects with and without PTSD. On the testing set, the model yielded a high sensitivity and a PPV that was twice the prevalence rate of PTSD in the U.S. Veteran population. We conclude that, using EEG signals collected during sleep, such a model can potentially serve as a means to objectively identify U.S. Veteran men with PTSD.
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INTRODUCTION

Sleep disturbances are a hallmark of posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) (1). For this reason, previous studies have analyzed electroencephalography (EEG) data from overnight sleep-polysonomography (PSG) recordings to identify differences in sleep patterns between groups of subjects with and without PTSD (2–5). Motivated similarly, but with the intent to find differences that are reproducible, we recently identified EEG spectral powers that discriminate combat-exposed Veterans with and without PTSD at the group-average level (6). Specifically, we split the sleep-study data into a set for initial discovery and a set for testing reproducibility of our findings. In that study, we found that the features that showed group-level differences were consistent across two consecutive nights in the initial discovery set and, importantly, that these findings were largely reproducible on the held-out test set. More recently, analyzing the data from the same study using a similar procedure, we found that the synchrony of EEG signals between channel pairs [the average phase difference between two time-series signals over a given time interval (7)] could also significantly discriminate the two groups (8). Another recent study by Modarres et al. (9)—the only publication to date that investigated synchrony between EEG channels in PTSD subjects during sleep—also reported group-level differences, although they did not assess the reproducibility of their results across multiple nights or in an independent dataset. Together, these findings suggest that EEG spectral power and synchrony features can distinguish differences between groups of subjects with and without PTSD (2–5).

The natural next step is to investigate whether these and similar features can be used to diagnose PTSD at the individual level. Current methods of PTSD diagnosis are subjective, relying on a clinician's judgement and a patient's self-report in questionnaires, such as the clinician-administered PTSD scale (CAPS) (10) and the insomnia severity index (ISI) (11). In contrast, an objective means to identify subjects with PTSD would aid clinicians in adjudicating true cases with increased specificity and enable them to track the responses of patients to treatment, while providing the opportunity to shed light on the neurophysiological mechanisms of PTSD (12).

Here, encouraged by the promising findings in the above-mentioned group-difference studies (6, 8), we aimed to assess whether a multivariate classifier, developed using EEG spectral power and synchrony features, could objectively identify individual subjects with PTSD. To this end, we analyzed EEG data recorded from 78 combat-exposed Veteran men with \( n = 31 \) and without \( n = 47 \) PTSD during two consecutive nights of sleep. Following our recent work, we developed a multivariate classifier using a training set, which consisted of the first 47 consecutive subjects (18 with PTSD) of the study, and evaluated the classifier on the test set, which consisted of the remaining 31 subjects (13 with PTSD), in order to assess the reproducibility of our findings. In this procedure, we used stage-independent, whole-night features computed on data from the 10 most commonly used EEG channels to facilitate comparison of results across laboratories, because most PSG studies record EEG data from 10 or fewer channels.

METHODS

We recruited combat-exposed Veterans who provided written informed consent in accordance with the protocol approved by the University of Pittsburgh Institutional Review Board (Pittsburgh, PA) and the U.S. Army Medical Research and Development Command Human Research Protection Office (Pt. Detrick, MD). We excluded subjects with any of the following conditions from the study: a current diagnosis of untreated severe depression, psychotic or bipolar disorder, substance or alcohol abuse in the previous 3 months, or sleep disorders other than insomnia or nightmares. It should be noted that we did not exclude subjects with a prior history of alcohol consumption, because doing so would have greatly reduced the sample size and, importantly, the generalizability of our results to Service member populations, in which alcohol consumption is common. All subjects were free of any sleep-related medication for at least 2 weeks prior to enrollment in the study. Before their arrival at the laboratory, we assessed subjects' habitual sleep patterns for 10 consecutive days using a sleep diary (Table 1). During this time, we also instructed them to take no more than two cups of coffee per day (or the equivalent caffeine dose) and limit their alcohol intake to two drinks per day over a 2-week period before the study. We also assessed the presence and severity of PTSD via the CAPS (10), the presence of alcohol use disorder in the past month, sleep quality via the Pittsburgh sleep quality index (13) and the ISI (11), and self-reported measures of depression via a patient health questionnaire (14).

Subjects spent two consecutive nights and days in the University of Pittsburgh Medical Center's sleep laboratory. On Night 1, they arrived at 20:00 and were fitted with a PSG system, which consisted of a 64-channel high-density-electroencephalography (hd-EEG) montage [HydroCel Geodesic Sensor Net (without sponge inserts); Electrical Geodesics Inc., Eugene, OR] and bipolar channels for submentalis electromyogram signals. Subjects were allowed to sleep undisturbed from 23:00 until 07:00, while we recorded their EEG data. On the morning of the next day, we removed the PSG system and asked the subjects to perform multiple tests to assess daytime alertness and cognitive functions. At 21:00, we refitted the subjects with the PSG system and repeated the same procedures on Night 2 and the following day until their discharge at 20:00.

Among the 85 subjects who completed the study, 37 (six women) met the diagnostic criteria for PTSD and 48 did not (one woman). We excluded all seven women from our analysis to avoid confounding effects due to sex differences (15). The remaining 78 men (31 with PTSD), who ranged from 24 to 51 years of age, comprised our study population (Table 1). We split this sample into a training set comprising the first 47 consecutive subjects of the study (18 with PTSD) for model development and a test set comprising the remaining 31 subjects (13 with PTSD) for assessing model performance.
TABLE 1 | Clinical characteristics and sleep-diary variables for the 78 combat-exposed Veteran men in our study.

| Variable               | PTSD (n = 31) | Non-PTSD (n = 47) | Group comparison | p-value^a |
|------------------------|---------------|-------------------|------------------|----------|
| Age (y)                | 31.3 (4.7)    | 32.8 (6.2)        |                  | 0.358    |
| Sleep diary^b          |               |                   |                  |          |
| Time in bed (min)      | 453.0 (100.6) | 465.0 (65.3)      |                  | 0.590    |
| Total sleep time (min) | 414.3 (77.0)  | 441.4 (62.5)      |                  | 0.035    |
| Sleep efficiency (%)   | 92.8 (9.5)    | 95.6 (9.4)        |                  | 0.004    |
| Sleep latency (min)    | 27.8 (17.1)   | 10.0 (5.9)        |                  | <0.001   |
| CAPS                   | 51.4 (16.8)   | 8.6 (7.9)         |                  | <0.001   |
| Hyperarousal           | 19.0 (7.1)    | 3.3 (4.0)         |                  | <0.001   |
| Intrusion              | 10.7 (5.8)    | 0.6 (1.8)         |                  | <0.001   |
| Avoidance              | 16.9 (8.8)    | 1.7 (3.5)         |                  | <0.001   |
| Current^c AUD (n)      | 2             |                   |                  |          |
| Past^d AUD (n)         | 17            | 10                |                  |          |
| PSQI                   | 8.9 (2.8)     | 4.1 (2.4)         |                  | <0.001   |
| ISI                    | 14.2 (4.8)    | 3.8 (4.2)         |                  | <0.001   |
| PHQ-9                  | 5.8 (2.6)     | 1.4 (2.5)         |                  | <0.001   |

^aWilcoxon rank-sum test, bold values indicate p < 0.05; ^bPTSD, n = 30; ^cPresent in the past month; ^dAbsent in the past month; AUD, alcohol use disorder; CAPS, Clinician-Administered PTSD Scale; ISI, Insomnia Severity Index; PHQ-9, Patient Health Questionnaire-9; PSQI, Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index; SD, standard deviation.

TABLE 2 | Sleep architecture measures for subjects with and without PTSD during two consecutive nights of sleep at the University of Pittsburgh sleep laboratory.

| Measure                    | Night 1 | Night 2 |
|----------------------------|---------|---------|
|                            | PTSD (n = 31) | Non-PTSD (n = 47) | PTSD (n = 31) | Non-PTSD (n = 47) |
| Total sleep time (min)     | 406.4 (36.1) | 411.4 (34.3) | 416.5 (27.1) | 428.8 (35.3) |
| Sleep efficiency (%)       | 84.6 (27.8) | 85.7 (7.9) | 86.7 (5.6) | 89.5 (7.4) |
| Stage N1 (%)               | 11.4 (4.8) | 10.9 (5.6) | 9.7 (3.8) | 8.6 (4.6) |
| Stage N2 (%)               | 57.6 (7.4) | 55.7 (7.2) | 55.3 (7.2) | 53.8 (6.5) |
| Stage N3 (%)               | 8.8 (6.8) | 12.6 (7.4) | 10.9 (5.9) | 13.8 (7.2) |
| REM (%)                    | 22.3 (5.7) | 20.8 (5.3) | 24.2 (5.6) | 24.3 (5.9) |

Values within parentheses denote standard deviations. REM, rapid eye movement sleep; N1, N2, and N3, non-REM stages of sleep. None of the Wilcoxon rank-sum tests were significant at the p < 0.05 level, when we compared each of the measures between PTSD and non-PTSD, for each night.

EEG Preprocessing and Feature Computation

We recorded hd-EEG data referenced to the linked mastoids at a sampling rate of 250 Hz. We visually scored sleep stages in 30-s epochs according to the criteria of the American Academy of Sleep Medicine (16). Table 2 shows the sleep architecture parameters for the study population.

We applied a band-pass filter to preserve the EEG signals within the bandwidth of interest (0.5–50.0 Hz), while suppressing noise in frequency bands outside this range. Next, to minimize the impact of muscle movement in the EEG data, we segmented the data in each EEG channel into 5-s epochs and rejected transient, high-frequency activity whenever the power in the 26.0–50.0 Hz band of each epoch exceeded its moving median value over a 3-min window by a factor of four, as previously described (17, 18). Further, to eliminate artifacts due to body and head movement as well as poor electrode contact in each EEG channel, we removed the 5-s epochs for which the power in the 4.0–50.0 Hz band exceeded the whole-night median by a factor of six (6).

We computed three types of frequency domain EEG features—two to capture the mean and the coefficient of variation (the ratio between the standard deviation and the mean) of the log EEG power spectrum for each channel, and a third to capture the phase synchrony between pairs of EEG channels (with 1 denoting perfect synchrony and 0 denoting no synchrony) (7). We computed each of these features over the following 12 frequency bands spanning 0.5 to 40 Hz: 0.5–1 Hz (slow oscillations); 1–2 Hz [low delta (Lδ)]; 2–4 Hz [high delta (Hδ)]; 4–6 Hz [low theta (Lθ)]; 6–8 Hz [high theta (Hθ)]; 8–10 Hz [low alpha (Lα)]; 10–12 Hz [high alpha (Hα)]; 12–14 Hz [low sigma (Lσ)]; 14–16 Hz [high sigma (Hσ)]; 16–24 Hz [low beta (Lβ)]; 24–32 Hz [high beta (Hβ)]; and 32–40 Hz [low gamma (Lγ)].

**Feature Computation**

Our objective was to develop a multivariate classifier that discriminates subjects with and without PTSD. As such, we aimed to reduce false associations due to temporal variations in the aforementioned features over the 8-h sleep period by studying their values averaged across the entire night disregarding sleep-stage specific information. Consequently, the averaged feature values contained the most information from the longest sleep stage, namely, the non-rapid eye movement (NREM) stage, which constituted more than 53% of the 8-h sleep period in both nights (Table 2). Furthermore, to increase the generalizability of our results to other sleep studies, we restricted our analyses to the 10 most commonly used EEG channels that cover the whole brain (Figure 1). Thus, for each subject, we computed a total of 780 whole-night features independent of sleep stage: 120 log powers (LP; 10 channels × 12 frequency bands), 120 coefficients of variation (LCV), and 540 phase synchronies (the weighted phase lag index (W); 10 × 9/2 channel pairs × 12 frequency bands). Henceforth, we used the following naming convention for the features: <feature-type>-<channel or channel pair>-<frequency band>. For example, we denoted the log power in the C3 channel in the low-delta band as LP-C3-Lδ and the phase synchrony between the C3 and F3 channels in the high-beta band as W-C3-F3-Hβ.

**Feature Processing**

We performed the following operations to process the features for use in a multivariate classifier. First, to avoid problems due to heteroscedasticity during classifier development, we log-transformed the synchrony features to scale them similarly to the log features LP and LCV. Second, we used the concordance correlation coefficient (19) to assess the consistency of feature values across the two consecutive nights in the training set, and...
with PTSD could potentially remove disorder-related changes because determining correlation coefficients based on subjects should be noted that we used only subjects without PTSD step 2). Third, to preclude confounding effects due to age (Figure 2, step 3). We performed all of the aforementioned analyses via custom scripts written in MATLAB (The MathWorks Inc., Natick, MA), as well as in Python version 3.5.2 using the numpy, scipy, sklearn, and pandas libraries.

RESULTS

Feature Selection

Of the 780 features computed for each subject, 454 were concordant (i.e., the concordance correlation coefficient exceeded 0.7) across the two consecutive nights of recordings on the training set (Figure 2). Among these, 86 features were significantly correlated with age in subjects without PTSD in the training set (n = 29), which were then corrected to remove
FIGURE 2 | Analysis workflow for feature selection and classifier development. We analyzed three types of sleep-stage independent features, (1) log powers, (2) their coefficients of variation, and (3) the phase synchrony between pairs of electroencephalography channels, averaged across the entire night, in twelve frequency bands of interest. We started with 780 features (120 type 1, 120 type 2, and 540 type 3) and ended up with three features, one of type 1 and two of type 3.

1. Extract stage-independent, whole-night features
2. Select concordant features
3. Remove age correlation
4. Select features whose lower CI of the AUC exceeded 0.5 in both nights
5. Cluster features based on correlations
6. Select features with highest AUC using feature values from both nights
7. Eliminate features recursively
8. Develop logistic regression model

AUC, area under the receiver operating characteristic curve; CI, 95% confidence interval

Model Development and Evaluation
Using the concatenated vectors for the 19 features, we performed recursive feature elimination using the logistic regression model, which resulted in a final model consisting of three features with non-zero model coefficients (Figure 2, step 8). One of the features was LP-C3-Hδ, whereas the other two were phase synchronies in the high-alpha and low-gamma bands. We provide their values and group differences in Supplementary Tables S2–S4. The final model, combining these three features, yielded a training-set AUC of 0.83 on the combined data from the two nights and test-set AUCs of 0.84 for Night 1 and 0.80 for Night 2 (Table 3). These values were considerably larger than the univariate test-set AUCs of any of the three features, which ranged from 0.55 to 0.74 across the two nights (Table 4), indicating superior performance for the multivariate classifier.

We used the ROC curve of the regression model outcome on the training set to search for two thresholds that correspond to sensitivity values above 0.80 and 0.90. This search yielded thresholds of 0.37 and 0.26, which corresponded to training-set sensitivities of 0.81 and 0.92, respectively. At the threshold of 0.37, the model yielded test-set sensitivities that were much lower than the training-set sensitivity (0.62 on Night 1 and 0.54 on Night 2 for the test set vs. 0.81 for the training set; Table 3). In contrast, at the 0.26 threshold, the test-set sensitivity was 0.85 on each of the two nights (Table 3), while the specificities were 18% higher than those of the training set (0.67 on each of the two nights for the test set vs. 0.57 for the training set; Table 3). Importantly, the adjusted PPV was 0.31 for the test set, which was twice the PTSD prevalence value of 0.15 in combat-exposed Veteran men (Table 3).

At thresholds corresponding to a training-set sensitivity of 0.92 for each of the three individual features used in the model, the univariate test-set sensitivities ranged from 0.77 to 1.00 over the two consecutive nights (Table 4), which were comparable to the sensitivity of the regression model (0.85; Table 3). However,
FIGURE 3 | Distance correlation between the 34 stage-independent, whole-night features extracted from 10 electroencephalography channels across both nights of the training set (those obtained after step 4 in Figure 2). Dendrogram clustering revealed seven clusters with correlation values exceeding 0.7 (dark squares in the image, where the curly brackets identify the features within a cluster). Features marked with asterisk and highlighted in bold-face text (one each in clusters 1, 4, and 6) indicate the three features selected via recursive feature elimination. The 12 independent features obtained after step 5 in Figure 2 are located between the seven clusters.

the test-set specificities (range: 0.06–0.33; Table 4) and adjusted PPVs (range: 0.14–0.26; Table 4) were much smaller than the corresponding values for the regression model (specificity = 0.67, adjusted PPV = 0.31; Table 3). These results further underscore the advantage of combining the three features to identify individuals with PTSD.

DISCUSSION

We found that a logistic regression model, using three stage-independent, whole-night features, could discriminate subjects with and without PTSD at an individual level. First, we divided the study data into a training set, consisting of the first 47 consecutive subjects in the study (18 with PTSD), and a testing set, consisting of the next 31 subjects (13 with PTSD). Then, using only the training set, we identified three uncorrelated EEG features that discriminated subjects with and without PTSD in each of the two nights of the study (high-delta power in the C3 channel, phase synchrony between the C4 and P3 channels in the high-alpha band, and phase synchrony between the C4 and F3 channels in the low-gamma band). Using these features, we developed a logistic regression model based on the subjects from the training set. Then, to independently assess the performance of this model, we computed the value of the three features for each
of the subjects in the testing set, and used the model to classify the 31 subjects in this set into PTSD or non-PTSD. Assessment of the logistic regression model on the testing-set data resulted in AUCs above 0.80 for each of the two consecutive nights, a high sensitivity (0.85), a moderate specificity (0.67), and an adjusted PPV of 0.31, which is twice the prevalence of PTSD in combat-exposed Veteran men (Table 3). This means that if the model classifies a combat-exposed Veteran man as having PTSD, the probability that the subject actually has this disorder is twice as large as a random-choice selection.

### Interpretation of the Three Selected Features

The three features used in the logistic regression model were from the delta-, alpha-, and gamma-band clusters (Figure 3; clusters 1, 6, and 4, respectively). Of these, the log powers in the C3 channel in both low- and high-delta bands (Figure 3; clusters 1) were smaller in subjects with PTSD compared to those without PTSD (Supplementary Table 1). This shows the effect sizes for each feature, with negative effect sizes indicating lower feature values in PTSD. These results are similar to those of our prior study, which showed that delta power during NREM is smaller in subjects with PTSD compared to those without PTSD (6). This is not surprising because, as noted in Methods section Feature Computation, sleep predominantly consists of the NREM stage 2 (Table 2) and, hence, any feature based on whole-night, stage-independent averages will contain the most information for this sleep stage. Given that delta power indicates sleep depth (29), it is likely that lower delta power in subjects with PTSD indicates disturbed sleep.

The first of the two synchrony features, W-C4-P3-H, was the representative of the alpha-band cluster (Figure 3, cluster 6), which mainly consisted of synchronies between EEG channels located on the left hemisphere, save for two synchrony pairs that involved the C4 channel. The synchronies in this cluster were larger in subjects with PTSD compared to those without PTSD (Supplementary Table 1). This is also in line with our prior findings, in which subjects with PTSD showed larger alpha synchrony than subjects without PTSD in the left fronto-parietal regions during NREM sleep (8). The second feature, W-C4-F3-Ly, was the representative of the gamma-band cluster (Figure 3, cluster 4), which mainly consisted of cross-hemisphere synchronies between the frontal and central channels that were larger in subjects with PTSD (Supplementary Table 1). Although the increased synchrony in these bands may reflect impaired sleep processes in PTSD, focused research on this topic will be needed before we can make any conclusive statements regarding the specific underlying neurophysiological mechanisms of these features.

### Model Evaluation Procedure

In general, there are two main approaches to evaluate the performance of classification models. One approach is cross-validation, which entails multiple rounds of model development and evaluation on different partitions of the study data. The other involves splitting the data into a training set and a test set at the outset. The former approach allows for the use of the entire dataset for model development, but because each subject is used in model development in at least one of the cross-validation
rounds, its ability to truly assess model performance on unseen subjects may be reduced. Although the latter approach decreases the sample size available for model development, it allows for independent evaluation of model performance. In this work, we used this approach because it more closely mimics how the results in one study are subsequently validated in future studies using a completely different set of subjects.

**Limitations of the Study**

A limitation of this work is that our study population excluded subjects with PTSD who had comorbid sleep disorders, such as depression (30) or insomnia (31), which share symptoms with PTSD. To test whether the features included in the logistic regression model are specific to PTSD, we would need to test the model in two different populations: one that included sleep disorders other than PTSD and another that included subjects with PTSD and comorbidities. If the features were specific to PTSD, then the model performance would be degraded in the first population and improved in the second. However, the model performance in the second population should not be as good as those of the present study population, which consisted of comorbidity-free subjects with PTSD.

Another potential limitation relates to the use of whole-night averages of the EEG features rather than an approach that considers the time-series nature of the EEG signal. By averaging the features across the entire 8 h of time in bed, it is possible that our analysis excluded alterations in the power or synchrony features in short-length sleep stages, e.g., during REM or NREM stage 3 sleep. However, analyzing time-series features in a naïve manner, i.e., by assuming that the feature value at one time point is independent of that at another time point, could increase the chance of false associations when sample sizes are small, as was the case in this study. A robust analysis of time-series features would require identification of temporal patterns in each feature (32) and, hence, a more elaborate methodology whose results would likely be difficult to compare with other studies.

**CONCLUSION**

In this work, we assessed the ability of a multivariate classifier to diagnose PTSD at an individual level, using whole-night, stage-independent features to obviate the need for laborious manual scoring of sleep. After identifying univariate features associated with PTSD, we combined them into a logistic regression model to test whether the model could discriminate subjects with and without PTSD. We developed the model on an initial training set from consecutive subjects enrolled in the study, and then evaluated its performance on a separate, independent test set from subsequent subjects. Performance on the test set yielded AUCs above 0.80 for each of the two consecutive nights, high sensitivity (0.85), and an adjusted PPV that is twice the prevalence of PTSD in combat-exposed Veteran men. These findings imply that, if the model predicts that a subject has PTSD, the likelihood of that subject actually having PTSD is twice the underlying prevalence rate. Thus, the model provides an objective means to more accurately identify individuals with this disorder.
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