

# BMJ Open

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email [info.bmjopen@bmj.com](mailto:info.bmjopen@bmj.com)

# BMJ Open

## Using sensor-fusion and machine-learning algorithms to assess acute pain in nonverbal infants: a study protocol

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2020-039292
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	14-Apr-2020
Complete List of Authors:	Roué, Jean-Michel; CHRU de Brest, Neonatal & Pediatric Intensive Care Unit, Brest University Hospital; Université de Brest, Faculté de Médecine et des Sciences de la Santé, EA 4685 LIEN, University of Western Brittany, Brest Morag, Iris; Tel Aviv University Sackler Faculty of Medicine, Shamir Medical Center (Assaf Harofeh), Neonatal Intensive Care Unit Haddad, Wassim H.; Georgia Institute of Technology, School of Aerospace Engineering Gholami, Behnood; Autonomous Healthcare, Inc., Hoboken, NJ, USA Anand, Kanwaljeet J. S.; Stanford University School of Medicine
Keywords:	NEONATOLOGY, PAIN MANAGEMENT, PAEDIATRICS

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our [licence](#).

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which [Creative Commons](#) licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

1  
2  
3 **Title:** Using sensor-fusion and machine-learning algorithms to assess acute pain in nonverbal  
4 infants: a study protocol  
5

6  
7 Roué JM,<sup>1</sup> Morag I,<sup>2</sup> Haddad WM,<sup>3</sup> Gholami B,<sup>4</sup> Anand KJS<sup>5</sup>  
8  
9

10  
11 <sup>1</sup> Neonatal & Pediatric Intensive Care Unit, Brest University Hospital, University of Western  
12 Brittany, Brest, France  
13

14  
15 <sup>2</sup> Shamir Medical Center (Assaf Harofeh), Neonatal Intensive Care Unit, Sackler School of  
16 Medicine, Tel Aviv University, Israel  
17

18  
19 <sup>3</sup> School of Aerospace Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA  
20

21  
22 <sup>4</sup> Autonomous Healthcare, Inc., Hoboken, NJ, USA  
23

24  
25 <sup>5</sup> Professor of Pediatrics, Anesthesiology, Perioperative & Pain Medicine, Stanford University  
26 School of Medicine  
27

28  
29  
30  
31  
32 **Corresponding author:**

33  
34 Jean-Michel Roué,

35  
36 Neonatal & Pediatric Intensive Care Unit, Brest University Hospital, 2 Avenue Foch, 29200,  
37 Brest, France  
38

39  
40 Email: jean-michel.roue@chu-brest.fr

41  
42 Phone: + 33 2 98 22 36 67, Fax: + 33 2 98 22 37 67  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 **Word count:** 3095 out of 4000  
4

5 **ABSTRACT** 271 words out of 300  
6

7 **Introduction:**  
8

9  
10 Objective pain assessment in non-verbal populations is clinically challenging due to their  
11 inability to express their pain via self-report. Repetitive exposures to acute or prolonged pain  
12 lead to clinical instability, with long-term behavioral and cognitive sequelae in newborn infants.  
13  
14 Strong analgesics are also associated with medical complications, potential neurotoxicity and  
15 altered brain development. Pain scoring performed by the bedside nurses not only increases  
16 nursing workload, but also provides subjective, observer-dependent assessments, rather than  
17 objective data for infant pain management. Multimodal pain assessment, using sensor fusion and  
18 machine learning algorithms, can provide a patient-centered, context-dependent, observer-  
19 independent, and objective pain measure.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

30 **Methods and analysis:**  
31

32  
33 In newborns undergoing painful procedures, we use facial electromyography (EMG) to record  
34 facial muscle activity associated with infant pain, electrocardiography (ECG) to examine heart  
35 rate (HR) changes and HR variability (HRV), electrodermal activity (skin conductance) to  
36 measure catecholamine-induced palmar sweating, changes in oxygen saturations and skin  
37 perfusion, and electroencephalography (EEG) using active electrodes to assess brain activity in  
38 real-time. This multimodal approach has the potential to improve the accuracy of pain assessment  
39 in non-verbal infants and allow continuous pain monitoring at the bedside. The feasibility of this  
40 approach will be evaluated in an observational prospective study of clinically required painful  
41 procedures in 60 preterm and term newborns, and infants aged 6 months or less.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

53 **Ethics and dissemination:**  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 The Institutional Review Board of the Stanford University approved the protocol. Study findings  
4 will be published in peer-reviewed journals, presented at scientific meetings, taught via webinars,  
5  
6 podcasts, video tutorials, and listed on academic/scientific websites. Future studies will refine this  
7  
8 approach using the minimum number of sensors required to assess neonatal/infant pain.  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14

15 **Registration number:** ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT03330496  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## **An Article Summary:**

### **‘Strengths and limitations of this study’**

- An innovative and objective approach for continuous pain monitoring in infants including term and preterm neonates is described.
- To discriminate between noxious and non-noxious events, we used sensor fusion and machine-learning algorithms.
- Multimodal assessments may be more sensitive and specific for identifying pain and quantifying its intensity than the currently used subjective assessments from pain scales.
- Accurate, objective pain assessments will help to reduce infant pain and suffering, enhance recovery, avoid untreated pain vs. analgesic overuse, and allow evaluation of newer analgesics or other therapies in randomized clinical trials.
- Multiple sensors are used for the first step of this study, but recording artifacts may require data corrections and sensor variability may generate a need for recruiting more patients.

## INTRODUCTION

Being non-verbal, hospitalized infants are particularly vulnerable to inadequate pain management. Repeated exposures to pain in newborns can lead to short and long-term neurodevelopmental consequences including behavioral and cognitive sequelae [1][2–5].

Conversely, the safety and efficacy of some analgesics in neonates and their negative consequences on the neonatal brain have raised concerns [6][7][8][9]. Objectively assessing the pain responses in infants is thus necessary to assess the efficacy of analgesics in infants in order to avoid over treatment but also undertreatment and the consequences of repetitive pain exposure.

Composite pain scales including behavioral and physiological measures are assumed to be the most accurate surrogate measures of infant pain and are currently recommended for the clinical practice [10]. However, they provide a one-time measurement and their use can be challenging for the bedside staff leading to low interrater reliability, with over or under estimation of pain in neonates [11][12]. Depending on the context, behaviors and physiological responses may mirror non-noxious stimuli, leading to misinterpretation and a lack of specificity of subjective pain scales [13][14][15].

Pain from clinically required invasive procedures leads to well-described neurophysiological responses in term and preterm infants [15]. These responses imply that the central, peripheral, and autonomic nervous systems can be monitored using various behavioral and physiologic modalities [16][17,18][19]. Since pain is a complex process, multimodal measurement may improve the accuracy of pain assessment, also suggested by studies reporting the presence of pain-evoked potentials in some neonates showing no facial expressions of pain or others pointing out different profiles of pain responses [13][20].

Thus, developing new methods to assess the responses to pain in infants deserves a high priority.

Multimodal measurements that provide an objective assessment of real-time and continuous pain



1  
2  
3 monitoring at the bedside will avoid the subjective bias and limitations associated with clinical  
4 pain scales, especially when behavioral assessment is limited by the medical conditions [21].  
5

6  
7 Our study protocol was designed to develop a multimodal pain assessment system, using sensor  
8 fusion and novel machine learning algorithms to provide an objective measure of pain in infants  
9 that is patient-centered, context-dependent, and observer-independent.  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14

## 15 **METHODS AND ANALYSIS**

### 16 **Study design**

17  
18 We designed a prospective observational study enrolling subjects from the Lucile Packard  
19 Children's Hospital at Stanford.  
20  
21  
22

### 23 **Study population**

24  
25 We will collect data from 15 study subjects in each of the following age groups: 1) Preterm  
26 infants (34-37 weeks of corrected gestational age, postnatal age 3-30 days); 2) Term newborns  
27 (37-42 weeks of corrected gestational age, less than 1 month of age); 3) Infants from 1-3 months  
28 age; 4) Older infants from 3-6 months age.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

### 38 **Eligibility criteria**

39  
40 After obtaining parental consent, we will include all infants less than 6 months of corrected  
41 chronological age requiring an acute painful procedure for routine clinical care in the  
42 participating units at Lucile Packard Children's Hospital.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

48 We will exclude newborns with birth trauma, intrapartum asphyxia (5-minute Apgar Score <4 or  
49 cord pH < 7.01), fetal growth restriction (birth weight < 5<sup>th</sup> percentile for gestation), congenital  
50 anomalies or metabolic disorders, or any kind of brain injury; if their mothers had a history of  
51 heavy smoking or drug abuse (alcohol, cocaine, ketamine, and heroin/other opiates) or  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 psychiatric drugs used during this pregnancy; infants requiring positive pressure ventilation using  
4 a face mask (BiPAP) or endotracheal tube; those receiving continuous infusions of opioid drugs  
5  
6 a face mask (BiPAP) or endotracheal tube; those receiving continuous infusions of opioid drugs  
7  
8 (morphine, fentanyl, and others) and nerve blocks or neuraxial analgesia affecting the site of the  
9  
10 invasive procedure in the 24 hours prior to study entry; infants with facial anomalies (cleft lip),  
11  
12 injuries or other pathologies affecting the facial area; and infants breastfed to alleviate pain  
13  
14 during the painful procedure.  
15  
16  
17  
18

### 19 **Objectives/Outcomes**

#### 20 ***Primary Objective:***

21  
22 Our primary objective is to identify the specific signals and patterns from each sensor that  
23  
24 correlate with the pain stimulus.  
25  
26  
27

#### 28 ***Primary Outcome:***

29  
30 We will extract pain-related information using non-invasive multimodal sensors. Specific  
31  
32 features of the physiological/ behavioral indicators of infant pain will require unique processing  
33  
34 algorithms. We will record pain signals using facial electromyography (EMG),  
35  
36 electrocardiography (ECG), electrodermal activity (skin conductance), oxygen saturation (SpO<sub>2</sub>),  
37  
38 and electroencephalography (EEG) in real-time. Dedicated algorithms for each sensor will extract  
39  
40 pain-related information such as facial grimacing or heart rate variability. The reliability and  
41  
42 validity of these algorithms will be tested prospectively on data from preterm and term neonates,  
43  
44 and 1-6 month-old infants experiencing acute pain during invasive procedures.  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

#### 51 ***Secondary Objectives:***

52  
53 We aim to identify if multiple sensors will provide overlapping information, which a sensor  
54  
55 fusion framework can integrate to identify “pain” and “no pain” related features. These features  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 will be used to train machine learning algorithms that will finally provide reliable, objective  
4 assessments of pain intensity in real-time.  
5

6  
7 We will also study if the pain intensity measured by the sensor fusion framework will show  
8 clinical validity, inter-rater reliability, as well as responsiveness to pain relief using analgesic  
9 drugs or non- pharmacological therapies.  
10  
11  
12  
13

### 14 15 ***Secondary outcomes:***

16  
17 We will develop a sensor fusion framework designed to integrate data from different sensor  
18 modalities. No single sensor is capable of measuring neonatal pain. Rather, skilled clinicians  
19 draw upon multiple sources of information to estimate pain. A machine learning algorithm will  
20 be developed to test if the sensor fusion framework can (i) can “calibrate” itself to the unique  
21 physiology of each newborn, (ii) handle missing (e.g. sensor failure) or unreliable data (e.g.  
22 movement artifact), and (iii) determine specific features from each modality to reach asymptotic  
23 levels of sensitivity and specificity. We hypothesize that this automated sensor fusion approach  
24 will be able to quantify neonatal pain intensity with greater specificity and sensitivity than the  
25 pain scales clinically used at the bedside.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

41 To assess the reliability and validity of the pain intensity measured by this sensor fusion  
42 framework, we will compare the objective pain measure with the pain scores assessed by skilled  
43 research staff. Variations in the objective pain scores before and after the clinical use of analgesic  
44 therapies will also be assessed to explore whether this device can also identify pain relief [22].  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

### 54 **Sample size calculations**

55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 We assume an  $\alpha$ -error =0.05,  $1-\beta$  error =0.8, and a mean:SD ratio of 2:1 for clinical and sensor-  
4 based pain scores (based on prior studies of clinical assessments of procedural pain in infants)  
5 [23,24]. Based on these assumptions, to detect a slope that corresponds to a 0.5-unit change in  
6 the outcome (e.g., sensor pain score) per 1-unit change in the predictor (e.g., clinical pain score)  
7 we will require a minimum of 40 infants in the *training dataset*. For a binary predictor with 25%  
8 or 50% prevalence (e.g., mild vs. moderate pain, or male vs. female neonate), with this sample  
9 size, we will be able to detect a 0.7 or 0.8-unit change in the outcome, respectively. Given the  
10 number of sensors used for the first step of this study, some artifacts may occur requiring data  
11 corrections or greater variability, with a need for recruiting more patients. We plan to recruit 60  
12 patients in this study

### 23 24 25 **Interventions/Experimental design**

26  
27  
28  
29 After applying inclusion/exclusion criteria and parental consent, infants' medical data will be  
30 recorded including: date of birth, perinatal/medical history, birth weight, gestational age, Apgar  
31 scores, congenital anomalies, metabolic defects, other diagnoses, previous surgeries, recent labs,  
32 prior imaging, major physical findings, number and types of painful procedures, and all  
33 medications used in the 24 hours immediately preceding the study. We will document the type of  
34 procedure, time of day, its location and duration, number of attempts and behavioral state of the  
35 infant before and after the procedure.

36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47 Prior to a clinically-indicated procedure, we will attach skin conductance (SC) leads to measure  
48 galvanic skin responses either on a hand palm or foot sole, and electromyography (EMG) to  
49 record facial muscle activity from cheek and forehead, and directly obtain recordings from  
50 clinical monitors (electrocardiography (ECG) and oxygen saturation (SpO<sub>2</sub>)). In addition, the  
51 infant will wear a cap with Electroencephalography (EEG) leads. For study procedures, research

1  
2  
3 staff will clinically assess pain using the Neonatal Pain & Sedation Scale (N-PASS) before and  
4 after the procedure, the Premature Infant Pain Profile-Revised (PIPP-R) and the Neonatal Facial  
5 Coding System (NFCS) during the procedure. For older patients, the FLACC (Face, Legs,  
6 Activity, Cry, Consolability) scale or Visual Analogue Scale (VAS) will be scored to assess pain  
7 during the procedure [25,26][27][28]. Physiological recordings as well as audio recording will  
8 start 10-30 minutes before a planned procedure and continue for up to 20-30 minutes after the  
9 procedure. At the completion of recording, all the above sensors will be disconnected from each  
10 patient and study procedures will be terminated. The entire study will last approximately 30-60  
11 minutes; however the study may be stopped earlier if any infant shows signs of distress or if a  
12 bedside nurse or parent has any concerns.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

27 All sensors will be time-locked with an event-marker, to record the exact times of noxious and  
28 non-noxious events.  
29  
30  
31  
32

## 33 **Data analysis**

### 34 **A. Signal-Filtering and Information Extraction from Sensors**

35  
36  
37 For each sensing modality, we will develop a software algorithm to process signals recorded by  
38 sensors and extract the clinically relevant information related to pain. Proof-of-concept  
39 algorithms will be tested using the collected dataset. The feasibility of each sensing modality will  
40 be based on: *i*) sensitivity and specificity of detecting clinically relevant pain-related changes,  
41 and *ii*) robustness of sensor readings in the presence of non-pain related disturbances (e.g.,  
42 movement artifact).  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 **1. Pain Behaviors:** Newborn behaviors (e.g., facial expressions, body movements) are accepted  
4 as the most sensitive and valid indicators of pain [29][13]. Facial expressions like brow bulge,  
5 eye squeeze, nasolabial furrow, and horizontal mouth stretch were verified as the most valid and  
6 discriminative components of neonatal pain scales [30,31][32]. Using facial EMG in real-time,  
7 we will detect the presence of muscle activity in neonatal pain-associated facial regions [33].  
8 Given the multiple layers of facial muscles, facial EMGs record signals from a facial region as  
9 opposed to any specific muscle [33]. Previous studies of startle and blinking in infants used  
10 miniature silver (Ag/AgCl) periorbital surface electrodes for recording EMGs [34–36]. We will  
11 focus on infant forehead and cheek areas to detect EMG activity associated with brow bulge, eye  
12 squeeze and nasolabial furrow [33]. We will iteratively refine our algorithms by using multi-  
13 modality sensing and developing robust feature extraction and classification frameworks that  
14 address the challenges specific to neonatal/infant pain detection. We will exclude mechanically  
15 ventilated infants due to the challenges associated with identifying facial features (occluded by  
16 securing tape, ventilator tubing or devices) and their need for ongoing sedation/analgesia.

17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36 **2. Skin Conductance:** Acute pain stimulates the sympathetic post-ganglionic cholinergic neurons  
37 [37], leading to diaphoresis, palmar sweating and increased skin conductance [38]. Eliminating  
38 painful stimuli results in sweat reabsorption and decreased conductivity. The amplitude of  
39 changes in palmar skin conductance reflect increased sympathetic nervous system activity, which  
40 tracks with pain intensity [39–42]. Skin conductance can change with body temperature [43,44],  
41 but not with the ambient temperatures [44]. Specifically, the number of fluctuations of skin  
42 conductance per second (NFSC) was correlated with pain intensity in children [45], and was  
43 more sensitive than pain scores in preterm and term neonates [18,40–42,46]. We will use skin  
44 conductance using the BrainAmp system® (Brain Products GmbH, Gilching, Germany),  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 **3. Electrocardiography (ECG):** Heart rate (HR) changes are components of many pain  
4 assessment scales and recent studies have established correlations between HR variability (HRV)  
5 and pain [47,48]. A number of linear time-domain (HR mean, standard deviation) and frequency-  
6 domain (power spectral density) metrics and non-linear metrics (sample entropy, approximate  
7 entropy, etc.) can detect painful stimuli [47,48]. We will record the infant's ECG before, during,  
8 and after an acute pain event to extract the linear and nonlinear metrics (listed above) from the  
9 ECG signal for further analyses.  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

20 **4. Electroencephalography (EEG):** EEG studies to assess neonatal pain have met with variable  
21 results [49–51]. Opioid analgesia in adults leads to slowing of the EEG, whereas painful stimuli  
22 activate brain regions identified by neuroimaging studies [52] such as the primary sensory cortex  
23 (S1) [53]. EEG amplitudes and frequencies decreased when analgesics were given to newborns in  
24 pain [20,54–56]. Using the BrainAmp EEG system® (Brain Products GmbH, Gilching,  
25 Germany), we will apply 32 active EEG electrodes using the infant-sized ActiCap® (Brain  
26 Products GmbH, Gilching, Germany). Although Hartley et al. have selectively used the vertex  
27 (Cz) lead for neonatal pain studies [20,54], we believe that infant pain processing is widely  
28 distributed across many brain regions and the current evidence is not sufficiently strong enough  
29 to exclude information from other EEG leads. The BrainAmp is similar to other EEG monitors,  
30 however, it uses 32 active electrodes allowing for placement of the ActiCap on the infant's head  
31 with minimal preparation. Each active electrode amplifies the signal recorded from the skin and  
32 records also indicates the impedance of each electrode at the start of the recording to improve the  
33 quality of recorded signals. Over the past 10 years, this device has been used for research  
34 purposes in all age groups including infants and newborns. No side effects have been reported  
35 from its use in newborns and small infants.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 **5. Pulse Oximetry (SpO<sub>2</sub>):** Changes in SpO<sub>2</sub> occur frequently following acute pain and,  
4 therefore, have been included in the Premature Infant Pain Profile (PIPP) and other pain scales  
5 [57–59]. Newer generation monitors (Masimo, Irvine, CA) use multi-wavelength technology to  
6 provide more reliable SpO<sub>2</sub> and pulse rate signals, with parallel signal processing engines and  
7 adaptive filters to separate the arterial from venous signals, patient motion, or skin perfusion [60].  
8 Changes in skin blood flow were also used as physiological markers for neonatal pain or  
9 morphine analgesia [61,62]. We will test the utility of the SpO<sub>2</sub> and peripheral perfusion index  
10 provided by pulse oximetry monitors as possible signals for neonatal pain.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

## 23 **Statistical approach**

### 24 **A. Sensor Fusion**

25  
26  
27 We have previously investigated using machine learning to detect pain in neonates using facial  
28 expressions recorded by a camera [63]. We will develop a sensor fusion framework to detect pain  
29 in non-verbal infants based on machine learning to detect pain using multi-modal sensor data.  
30 Feasibility of this new framework will be assessed based on its sensitivity and specificity to  
31 detect pain events in infants and further refined into a prototype for validation in future studies.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

42 A “calibration” period will be used to establish a baseline for these multiple sensor modalities by  
43 monitoring neonates who are not in pain. The clinical staff at the bedside will identify the pain  
44 state of each neonate using validated pain scales and record the timing of pain-inducing  
45 clinically-indicated procedures such as a heel stick. Our sensor fusion framework will classify  
46 the neonatal/infant responses to infer pain intensity based on observed changes from baseline. A  
47 probabilistic relationship between pain intensity and sensor measurements can be established,  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 where the unknown parameters of the statistical relationships are identified by a training dataset.  
4  
5 The training dataset will also be used to measure the importance of each feature, which can then  
6  
7 be used to identify the optimal set of sensors [61].  
8  
9

10  
11 Pain intensity scores computed by our sensor fusion framework will be compared with pain  
12  
13 scores measured concurrently by skilled research staff. All sensors (facial EMG, EEG, ECG,  
14  
15 SpO<sub>2</sub>, and SC) will be time-locked with an event recorder to mark “pain” vs. “no-pain” states. To  
16  
17 make the best use of our data, the sensor fusion framework will use standard cross-validation  
18  
19 methods to establish the generalizability of this framework.  
20  
21  
22  
23

## 24 **B. Validation and Correlation with Pain Intensity**

25  
26  
27 We will compare clinical pain scores from nursing assessments with scores from the sensor  
28  
29 fusion framework. First, we will examine clinical pain scores to verify agreement with the pain  
30  
31 scores assessed by the research staff. Internal consistency will be evaluated by Cronbach’s  $\alpha$ ,  
32  
33 with values  $> 0.8$  to show good internal consistency. Second, we will conduct multivariable  
34  
35 linear regressions or generalized estimating equations (GEE) [64,65] to understand the agreement  
36  
37 between the device pain scores and the clinical pain scores, as well as the contribution of each  
38  
39 modality to the device pain scores. We will examine if these associations vary after adjustment  
40  
41 for covariates such as pain medications, age, sex, duration or invasiveness of the procedure. A co-  
42  
43 variance matrix will examine the degree of correlation between individual sensor inputs, types of  
44  
45 procedures, clinician pain scores, and analgesic therapies used during the procedure. Finally, due  
46  
47 to the limited understanding of factors contributing to pain in newborns, linear regression or GEE  
48  
49 models will examine the association of the sensor fusion pain scores reported by the device with  
50  
51 the demographic and clinical variables of neonates and infants.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Content validity depends on the sensors and sensor variables that we have chosen for the sensor  
4 fusion framework. Concurrent validity will depend on the pain scores of skilled research staff  
5 using validated pain scoring methods. Construct validity will rest on: *i*) the range of objective  
6 pain scores from procedures causing mild, moderate, or severe pain; *ii*) changes in pain scores  
7 with analgesic drugs or non-pharmacological therapies; and *iii*) variation in pain scores over time  
8 consistent with the expected, natural course of acute procedural pain.  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15

## 16 17 18 **ETHICS AND DISSEMINATION** 19

20  
21 The Institutional Review Board of the Stanford University approved the protocol. This  
22 observational study is registered at [www.ClinicalTrials.gov](http://www.ClinicalTrials.gov) (NCT03330496) and it does not  
23 involve any intervention other than those clinically required. Data collection includes  
24 physiological recordings and medical information. Other than the facial EMG, skin conductance  
25 leads (SC), and 32-channel BrainAmp Standard EEG monitor, all other sensors are used routinely  
26 as the standard of care. All sensors are considered non-invasive and safe. We will use standard  
27 electrodes which are routinely used for recording vital signs in the hospital (ECG, SpO2). All  
28 recordings will use sticky pads attached to the skin. Other than a potential for mild skin irritation  
29 from the adhesives used, there are no significant risks associated with these devices, or other  
30 study-related procedures.  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

45 Since the study subjects are aged less than 6 months, the parent's consent will be obtained for  
46 their child as a research subject. The primary risks to study subjects result from potential loss of  
47 confidentiality from the information collected and from the medical record and monitoring  
48 devices. As described in the consent form, the right to privacy during the consent process, data  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59

1  
2  
3 collection and study procedures, and protection of personal data will be given the utmost  
4 importance and strict safeguards will be maintained to protect data confidentiality.  
5  
6  
7

8  
9 Study findings will be published in peer-reviewed journals and presented at national and  
10 international scientific conferences. Practical use of this methodology will be taught at  
11 conference workshops, or via webinars, podcasts, video tutorials.  
12  
13  
14

15  
16  
17 Future studies will test the validity of this approach to pain assessments in larger populations of  
18 newborns, older infants and also extend these studies to smaller preterm neonates. Future  
19 applications may also include patient populations incapable of expressing pain (children with  
20 disability, adults with dementia, or mechanically ventilated patients).  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## REFERENCES

- 1 Tortora D, Severino M, Di Biase C, *et al.* Early Pain Exposure Influences Functional Brain Connectivity in Very Preterm Neonates. *Front Neurosci* 2019;**13**:899. doi:10.3389/fnins.2019.00899
- 2 Ranger M, Chau CMY, Garg A, *et al.* Neonatal Pain-Related Stress Predicts Cortical Thickness at Age 7 Years in Children Born Very Preterm. *PLoS One* 2013;**8**:e76702. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0076702
- 3 Vinall J, Grunau RE. Impact of repeated procedural pain-related stress in infants born very preterm. *Pediatr Res* 2014;**75**:584–7. doi:10.1038/pr.2014.16
- 4 Doesburg SM, Chau CM, Cheung TPL, *et al.* Neonatal pain-related stress, functional cortical activity and visual-perceptual abilities in school-age children born at extremely low gestational age. *Pain* 2013;**154**:1946–52. doi:10.1016/j.pain.2013.04.009
- 5 Valeri BO, Holsti L, Linhares MBM. Neonatal pain and developmental outcomes in children born preterm: a systematic review. *Clin J Pain* 2015;**31**:355–62. doi:10.1097/AJP.0000000000000114
- 6 de Graaf J, van Lingen RA, Simons SHP, *et al.* Long-term effects of routine morphine infusion in mechanically ventilated neonates on children’s functioning: five-year follow-up of a randomized controlled trial. *Pain* 2011;**152**:1391–7. doi:10.1016/j.pain.2011.02.017
- 7 Ferguson SA, Ward WL, Paule MG, *et al.* A pilot study of preemptive morphine analgesia in preterm neonates: effects on head circumference, social behavior, and response latencies in early childhood. *Neurotoxicol Teratol* 2012;**34**:47–55. doi:10.1016/j.ntt.2011.10.008
- 8 Bellù R, de Waal K, Zanini R. Opioids for neonates receiving mechanical ventilation: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Arch Dis Child Fetal Neonatal Ed* 2010;**95**:F241–251. doi:10.1136/adc.2008.150318
- 9 Cravero JP, Havidich JE. Pediatric sedation--evolution and revolution. *Paediatr Anaesth* 2011;**21**:800–9. doi:10.1111/j.1460-9592.2011.03617.x
- 10 Lim Y, Godambe S. Prevention and management of procedural pain in the neonate: an update, American Academy of Pediatrics, 2016. *Arch Dis Child Educ Pract Ed* 2017;**102**:254–6. doi:10.1136/archdischild-2016-311066
- 11 Boyle EM, Bradshaw J, Blake KI. Persistent pain in neonates: challenges in assessment without the aid of a clinical tool. *Acta Paediatr* 2018;**107**:63–7. doi:10.1111/apa.14081
- 12 Maxwell LG, Malavolta CP, Fraga MV. Assessment of pain in the neonate. *Clin Perinatol* 2013;**40**:457–69. doi:10.1016/j.clp.2013.05.001
- 13 Slater R, Cantarella A, Franck L, *et al.* How well do clinical pain assessment tools reflect pain in infants? *PLoS Med* 2008;**5**:e129. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.0050129
- 14 van Dijk M, Tibboel D. Update on pain assessment in sick neonates and infants. *Pediatr Clin North Am* 2012;**59**:1167–81. doi:10.1016/j.pcl.2012.07.012
- 15 Fitzgerald M. What do we really know about newborn infant pain? *Exp Physiol* 2015;**100**:1451–7. doi:10.1113/EP085134
- 16 Fitzgerald M, Walker SM. Infant pain management: a developmental neurobiological approach. *Nat Rev Neurol* 2009;**5**:35–50. doi:10.1038/ncpneuro0984
- 17 Storm H. Changes in skin conductance as a tool to monitor nociceptive stimulation and pain. *Curr Opin Anaesthesiol* 2008;**21**:796–804. doi:10.1097/ACO.0b013e3283183fe4
- 18 Gjerstad AC, Wagner K, Henrichsen T, *et al.* Skin Conductance Versus the Modified COMFORT Sedation Score as a Measure of Discomfort in Artificially Ventilated Children. *Pediatrics* 2008;**122**:e848–53. doi:10.1542/peds.2007-2545

- 19 Faye PM, De Jonckheere J, Logier R, *et al.* Newborn Infant Pain Assessment Using Heart Rate Variability Analysis: *The Clinical Journal of Pain* 2010;**26**:777–82. doi:10.1097/AJP.0b013e3181ed1058
- 20 Hartley C, Duff EP, Green G, *et al.* Nociceptive brain activity as a measure of analgesic efficacy in infants. *Sci Transl Med* 2017;**9**. doi:10.1126/scitranslmed.aah6122
- 21 Maxwell LG, Fraga MV, Malavolta CP. Assessment of Pain in the Newborn. *Clinics in Perinatology* 2019;**46**:693–707. doi:10.1016/j.clp.2019.08.005
- 22 Boyle EM, Freer Y, Wong CM, *et al.* Assessment of persistent pain or distress and adequacy of analgesia in preterm ventilated infants. *Pain* 2006;**124**:87–91. doi:10.1016/j.pain.2006.03.019
- 23 Serpa ABM, Guinsburg R, Balda R de CX, *et al.* Multidimensional pain assessment of preterm newborns at the 1st, 3rd and 7th days of life. *Sao Paulo Med J* 2007;**125**:29–33. doi:10.1590/s1516-31802007000100006
- 24 Pereira AL de ST, Guinsburg R, Almeida MFB de, *et al.* Validity of behavioral and physiologic parameters for acute pain assessment of term newborn infants. *Sao Paulo Med J* 1999;**117**:72–80. doi:10.1590/S1516-31801999000200005
- 25 Manworren RCB, Hynan LS. Clinical validation of FLACC: preverbal patient pain scale. *Pediatr Nurs* 2003;**29**:140–6.
- 26 Gibbins S, Stevens BJ, Yamada J, *et al.* Validation of the Premature Infant Pain Profile-Revised (PIPP-R). *Early Human Development* 2014;**90**:189–93. doi:10.1016/j.earlhumdev.2014.01.005
- 27 Grunau RE, Oberlander T, Holsti L, *et al.* Bedside application of the Neonatal Facial Coding System in pain assessment of premature neonates. *Pain* 1998;**76**:277–86. doi:10.1016/s0304-3959(98)00046-3
- 28 Hummel P, Puchalski M, Creech SD, *et al.* Clinical reliability and validity of the N-PASS: neonatal pain, agitation and sedation scale with prolonged pain. *J Perinatol* 2008;**28**:55–60. doi:10.1038/sj.jp.7211861
- 29 Hatfield LA, Ely EA. Measurement of acute pain in infants: a review of behavioral and physiological variables. *Biol Res Nurs* 2015;**17**:100–11. doi:10.1177/1099800414531448
- 30 Grunau RV, Craig KD. Pain expression in neonates: facial action and cry. *Pain* 1987;**28**:395–410. doi:10.1016/0304-3959(87)90073-x
- 31 Craig KD, Whitfield MF, Grunau RV, *et al.* Pain in the preterm neonate: behavioural and physiological indices. *Pain* 1993;**52**:287–99. doi:10.1016/0304-3959(93)90162-i
- 32 Willis MHW, Merkel SI, Voepel-Lewis T, *et al.* FLACC Behavioral Pain Assessment Scale: a comparison with the child's self-report. *Pediatr Nurs* 2003;**29**:195–8.
- 33 Cohn J, Ekman P. Measuring facial action by manual coding, facial EMG, and automatic facial image analysis. In: *Handbook of nonverbal behavior research methods in the affective sciences*. J. A. Harrigan RR, K. Scherer (editors). New York, NY: Oxford University Press USA; 2005:9Y64.
- 34 Balaban MT, Anthony BJ, Graham FK. Prestimulation effects on blink and cardiac reflexes of 15-month human infants. *Dev Psychobiol* 1989;**22**:115–27. doi:10.1002/dev.420220203
- 35 Schmidt LA, Fox NA. Fear-potentiated startle responses in temperamentally different human infants. *Dev Psychobiol* 1998;**32**:113–20.
- 36 Schmidt LA, Fox NA, Long JM. Acoustic startle electromyographic (EMG) Activity indexed from an electroculographic (EOG) Electrode placement: A methodological note. *International Journal of Neuroscience* 1998;**93**:185–8. doi:10.3109/00207459808986423

- 1  
2  
3 37 Storm H. The development of a software program for analyzing skin conductance changes  
4 in preterm infants. *Clin Neurophysiol* 2001;**112**:1562–8. doi:10.1016/s1388-2457(01)00573-9
- 5 38 van Dooren M, de Vries JJGG-J, Janssen JH. Emotional sweating across the body:  
6 comparing 16 different skin conductance measurement locations. *Physiol Behav* 2012;**106**:298–  
7 304. doi:10.1016/j.physbeh.2012.01.020
- 8 39 Hellerud BC, Storm H. Skin conductance and behaviour during sensory stimulation of  
9 preterm and term infants. *Early Hum Dev* 2002;**70**:35–46. doi:10.1016/s0378-3782(02)00070-1
- 10 40 Pereira-da-Silva L, Virella D, Monteiro I, *et al*. Skin conductance indices discriminate  
11 nociceptive responses to acute stimuli from different heel prick procedures in infants. *J Matern*  
12 *Fetal Neonatal Med* 2012;**25**:796–801. doi:10.3109/14767058.2011.587919
- 13 41 Harrison D, Boyce S, Loughnan P, *et al*. Skin conductance as a measure of pain and stress  
14 in hospitalised infants. *Early Hum Dev* 2006;**82**:603–8. doi:10.1016/j.earlhumdev.2005.12.008
- 15 42 Eriksson M, Storm H, Fremming A, *et al*. Skin conductance compared to a combined  
16 behavioural and physiological pain measure in newborn infants. *Acta Paediatr* 2008;**97**:27–30.  
17 doi:10.1111/j.1651-2227.2007.00586.x
- 18 43 Hoffman K, Bromster T, Hakansson S, *et al*. Monitoring of pain and stress in an infant  
19 with asphyxia during induced hypothermia: a case report. *Adv Neonatal Care* 2013;**13**:252–61.  
20 doi:10.1097/ANC.0b013e31829d8baf
- 21 44 Valkenburg AJ, Niehof SP, van Dijk M, *et al*. Skin conductance peaks could result from  
22 changes in vital parameters unrelated to pain. *Pediatr Res* 2012;**71**:375–9.  
23 doi:10.1038/pr.2011.72
- 24 45 Hullett B, Chambers N, Preuss J, *et al*. Monitoring electrical skin conductance: a tool for  
25 the assessment of postoperative pain in children? *Anesthesiology* 2009;**111**:513–7.  
26 doi:10.1097/ALN.0b013e3181b27c18
- 27 46 Munsters J, Wallström L, Ågren J, *et al*. Skin conductance measurements as pain  
28 assessment in newborn infants born at 22–27 weeks gestational age at different postnatal age.  
29 *Early Human Development* 2012;**88**:21–6. doi:10.1016/j.earlhumdev.2011.06.010
- 30 47 Toweil DL, Kovarik WD, Carr R, *et al*. Linear and nonlinear analysis of heart rate  
31 variability during propofol anesthesia for short-duration procedures in children. *Pediatr Crit Care*  
32 *Med* 2003;**4**:308–14. doi:10.1097/01.PCC.0000074260.93430.6A
- 33 48 Weissman A, Zimmer EZ, Aranovitch M, *et al*. Heart rate dynamics during acute pain in  
34 newborns. *Pflugers Arch* 2012;**464**:593–9. doi:10.1007/s00424-012-1168-x
- 35 49 Fabrizi L, Slater R, Worley A, *et al*. A shift in sensory processing that enables the  
36 developing human brain to discriminate touch from pain. *Curr Biol* 2011;**21**:1552–8.  
37 doi:10.1016/j.cub.2011.08.010
- 38 50 Fabrizi L, Worley A, Patten D, *et al*. Electrophysiological measurements and analysis of  
39 nociception in human infants. *J Vis Exp* Published Online First: 20 December 2011.  
40 doi:10.3791/3118
- 41 51 Norman E, Rosén I, Vanhatalo S, *et al*. Electroencephalographic response to procedural  
42 pain in healthy term newborn infants. *Pediatr Res* 2008;**64**:429–34.  
43 doi:10.1203/PDR.0b013e3181825487
- 44 52 Prichep LS, John ER, Howard B, *et al*. Evaluation of the pain matrix using EEG source  
45 localization: a feasibility study. *Pain Med* 2011;**12**:1241–8. doi:10.1111/j.1526-  
46 4637.2011.01191.x
- 47 53 Gross J, Schnitzler A, Timmermann L, *et al*. Gamma oscillations in human primary  
48 somatosensory cortex reflect pain perception. *PLoS Biol* 2007;**5**:e133.  
49 doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.0050133
- 50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 54 Hartley C, Goksan S, Poorun R, *et al.* The relationship between nociceptive brain activity,  
4 spinal reflex withdrawal and behaviour in newborn infants. *Sci Rep* 2015;**5**:12519.  
5 doi:10.1038/srep12519  
6  
7 55 Nguyen The Tich S, Vecchierini M-F, Debillon T, *et al.* Effects of sufentanil on  
8 electroencephalogram in very and extremely preterm neonates. *Pediatrics* 2003;**111**:123–8.  
9 doi:10.1542/peds.111.1.123  
10  
11 56 Bernet V, Latal B, Natalucci G, *et al.* Effect of sedation and analgesia on postoperative  
12 amplitude-integrated EEG in newborn cardiac patients. *Pediatr Res* 2010;**67**:650–5.  
13 doi:10.1203/PDR.0b013e3181da44ba  
14  
15 57 de Oliveira MVM, de Jesus J a. L, Tristao RM. Psychophysical parameters of a  
16 multidimensional pain scale in newborns. *Physiol Meas* 2012;**33**:39–49. doi:10.1088/0967-  
17 3334/33/1/39  
18  
19 58 Serpa ABM, Guinsburg R, Balda R de CX, *et al.* Multidimensional pain assessment of  
20 preterm newborns at the 1st, 3rd and 7th days of life. *Sao Paulo Med J* 2007;**125**:29–33.  
21 doi:10.1590/s1516-31802007000100006  
22  
23 59 Stevens B, Johnston C, Petryshen P, *et al.* Premature Infant Pain Profile: development and  
24 initial validation. *Clin J Pain* 1996;**12**:13–22. doi:10.1097/00002508-199603000-00004  
25  
26 60 Hay WW, Rodden DJ, Collins SM, *et al.* Reliability of conventional and new pulse  
27 oximetry in neonatal patients. *J Perinatol* 2002;**22**:360–6. doi:10.1038/sj.jp.7210740  
28  
29 61 Moustogiannis AN, Raju TN, Roohey T, *et al.* Intravenous morphine attenuates pain  
30 induced changes in skin blood flow in newborn infants. *Neurol Res* 1996;**18**:440–4.  
31 doi:10.1080/01616412.1996.11740448  
32  
33 62 McCulloch KM, Ji SA, Raju TN. Skin blood flow changes during routine nursery  
34 procedures. *Early Hum Dev* 1995;**41**:147–56. doi:10.1016/0378-3782(95)01617-c  
35  
36 63 Gholami B, Haddad WM, Tannenbaum AR. Relevance vector machine learning for  
37 neonate pain intensity assessment using digital imaging. *IEEE Trans Biomed Eng* 2010;**57**:1457–  
38 66. doi:10.1109/TBME.2009.2039214  
39  
40 64 Pepe MS, Heagerty P, Whitaker R. Prediction using partly conditional time-varying  
41 coefficients regression models. *Biometrics* 1999;**55**:944–50. doi:10.1111/j.0006-  
42 341x.1999.00944.x  
43  
44 65 Leung DHY, Wang Y-G, Zhu M. Efficient parameter estimation in longitudinal data  
45 analysis using a hybrid GEE method. *Biostatistics* 2009;**10**:436–45.  
46 doi:10.1093/biostatistics/kxp002  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 **Authors' contributions:** JMR, KJS and WMH, BG were responsible for manuscript writing.  
4  
5 JMR, KJS, IM, WMH and BG contributed to the concept, protocol development and study  
6  
7 design. KJS and BG secured funding for the project. JMR, IM and KJS are responsible for  
8  
9 recruitment of study patients. All authors critically revised and approved the manuscript before  
10  
11 submission and are accountable for all aspects of the work.  
12  
13  
14

15  
16 **Funding statement:** This work was supported by the National Institutes of Health, National  
17  
18 Institute of Drug Abuse grant number 1 R41 DA046983-01.  
19  
20

21  
22 **Competing interests statement:** JMR reports an international mobility scholarship from Chiesi  
23  
24 Pharmaceuticals; WMH and BG are have equity ownership in Autonomous Healthcare, Inc.  
25  
26

27  
28 **Patient and Public Involvement:** This research was done without patient involvement. Patients  
29  
30 were not invited to comment on the study design and were not consulted to develop patient  
31  
32 relevant outcomes or interpret the results. Patients were not invited to contribute to the writing or  
33  
34 editing of this document for readability or accuracy.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



# BMJ Open

## Using sensor-fusion and machine-learning algorithms to assess acute pain in nonverbal infants: a study protocol

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2020-039292.R1
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	09-Oct-2020
Complete List of Authors:	Roué, Jean-Michel; CHRU de Brest, Neonatal & Pediatric Intensive Care Unit, Brest University Hospital; Université de Brest, Faculté de Médecine et des Sciences de la Santé, EA 4685 LIEN, University of Western Brittany, Brest Morag, Iris; Tel Aviv University Sackler Faculty of Medicine, Shamir Medical Center (Assaf Harofeh), Neonatal Intensive Care Unit Haddad, Wassim H.; Georgia Institute of Technology, School of Aerospace Engineering Gholami, Behnood; Autonomous Healthcare, Inc., Hoboken, NJ, USA Anand, Kanwaljeet J. S.; Stanford University School of Medicine
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b>:	Paediatrics
Secondary Subject Heading:	Intensive care
Keywords:	NEONATOLOGY, PAIN MANAGEMENT, PAEDIATRICS

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our [licence](#).

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which [Creative Commons](#) licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

1  
2  
3 **Title:** Using sensor-fusion and machine-learning algorithms to assess acute pain in nonverbal  
4 infants: a study protocol  
5

6  
7 Roué JM,<sup>1</sup> Morag I,<sup>2</sup> Haddad WM,<sup>3</sup> Gholami B,<sup>4</sup> Anand KJS<sup>5</sup>  
8  
9

10  
11 <sup>1</sup> Neonatal & Pediatric Intensive Care Unit, Brest University Hospital, University of Western  
12 Brittany, Brest, France  
13

14  
15 <sup>2</sup> Shamir Medical Center (Assaf Harofeh), Neonatal Intensive Care Unit, Sackler School of  
16 Medicine, Tel Aviv University, Israel  
17

18  
19 <sup>3</sup> School of Aerospace Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA  
20

21  
22 <sup>4</sup> Autonomous Healthcare, Inc., Hoboken, NJ, USA  
23

24  
25 <sup>5</sup> Professor of Pediatrics, Anesthesiology, Perioperative & Pain Medicine, Stanford University  
26 School of Medicine  
27

28  
29  
30  
31  
32 **Corresponding author:**  
33

34 Jean-Michel Roué,  
35

36 Neonatal & Pediatric Intensive Care Unit, Brest University Hospital, 2 Avenue Foch, 29200,  
37 Brest, France  
38

39 Email: jean-michel.roue@chu-brest.fr  
40

41 Phone: + 33 2 98 22 36 67, Fax: + 33 2 98 22 37 67  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 **Word count:** 3412 out of 4000  
4

5 **ABSTRACT** 288 words out of 300  
6

7 **Introduction:**  
8

9  
10 Objective pain assessment in non-verbal populations is clinically challenging due to their  
11 inability to express their pain via self-report. Repetitive exposures to acute or prolonged pain  
12 lead to clinical instability, with long-term behavioral and cognitive sequelae in newborn infants.  
13  
14 Strong analgesics are also associated with medical complications, potential neurotoxicity and  
15 altered brain development. Pain scores performed by bedside nurses provide subjective, observer-  
16 dependent assessments rather than objective data for infant pain management; the required  
17 observations are labour-intensive, difficult to perform by a nurse who is concurrently performing  
18 the procedure, and increase the nursing workload. Multimodal pain assessment, using sensor  
19 fusion and machine learning algorithms, can provide a patient-centered, context-dependent,  
20 observer-independent, and objective pain measure.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33 **Methods and analysis:**  
34

35 In newborns undergoing painful procedures, we use facial electromyography (EMG) to record  
36 facial muscle activity related infant pain, electrocardiography (ECG) to examine heart rate (HR)  
37 changes and HR variability (HRV), electrodermal activity (skin conductance) to measure  
38 catecholamine-induced palmar sweating, changes in oxygen saturations and skin perfusion, and  
39 electroencephalography (EEG) using active electrodes to assess brain activity in real-time. This  
40 multimodal approach has the potential to improve the accuracy of pain assessment in non-verbal  
41 infants and may even allow continuous pain monitoring at the bedside. The feasibility of this  
42 approach will be evaluated in an observational prospective study of clinically required painful  
43 procedures in 60 preterm and term newborns, and infants aged 6 months or less.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54

55 **Ethics and dissemination:**  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 The Institutional Review Board of the Stanford University approved the protocol. Study findings  
4 will be published in peer-reviewed journals, presented at scientific meetings, taught via webinars,  
5  
6 podcasts, video tutorials, and listed on academic/scientific websites. Future studies will validate  
7  
8 and refine this approach using the minimum number of sensors required to assess neonatal/infant  
9  
10  
11  
12 pain.  
13

14  
15  
16  
17 **Registration number:** ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT03330496  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51 **An Article Summary:**

52  
53  
54 **‘Strengths and limitations of this study’**  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- An innovative and objective approach for continuous pain monitoring in infants including term and preterm neonates is described.
- To discriminate between noxious and non-noxious events, we use sensor fusion and machine-learning algorithms.
- Multimodal assessments may be more sensitive and specific for identifying pain and quantifying its intensity than the subjective assessments currently used in pain scales.
- Accurate, objective pain assessments may help reduce infant pain and suffering, enhance recovery, avoid untreated pain vs. analgesic overuse, and allow evaluation of newer analgesics or other therapies in randomized clinical trials.
- Multiple sensors are used for the first step of this study, but recording artifacts may require data corrections and sensor variability may generate a need for recruiting more patients.

## INTRODUCTION

Being non-verbal, hospitalized infants are particularly vulnerable to inadequate pain management. Repetitive pain in newborns leads to short- and long-term neurodevelopmental consequences including behavioral and cognitive sequelae [1][2–5]. Conversely, the safety and efficacy of some analgesics in neonates and their negative consequences on the neonatal brain have raised concerns [6][7][8][9]. Objectively assessing the pain responses in infants is thus necessary to assess the efficacy of analgesics in infants in order to avoid over treatment but also undertreatment and the consequences of repetitive pain exposure.

Composite pain scales including behavioral and physiological measures are the most widely used surrogate measures of infant pain and are currently recommended for the clinical practice [10]. However, they provide a one-time measurement and their use can be challenging for the bedside staff leading to low interrater reliability, with over- or underestimation of infant pain [11][12]. Depending on the context, behaviors or physiological responses may mirror non-noxious stimuli, leading to misinterpretation and a lack of specificity in subjective pain scales [13][14][15].

Pain from clinically required invasive procedures leads to well-described neurophysiological responses in term and preterm infants [15]. These responses imply that the central, peripheral, and autonomic nervous systems can be monitored using various behavioral and physiologic modalities [16][17,18][19]. Since pain is a complex process, multimodal measurement may improve the accuracy of pain assessment, also suggested by studies reporting the presence of pain-evoked potentials in some neonates showing no facial expressions of pain or others pointing out different profiles of pain responses [13][20].

Thus, developing new methods to assess the responses to pain in infants deserves a high priority. Multimodal measurements that provide an objective estimate of real-time and continuous pain

1  
2  
3 monitoring at the bedside will avoid the subjective bias and limitations associated with clinical  
4 pain scales, especially when behavioral assessment is limited by the medical conditions [21].  
5

6  
7 Our study protocol was designed to develop a multimodal pain assessment system, using sensor  
8 fusion and novel machine learning algorithms to provide an objective estimate of acute pain  
9 intensity in infants that is patient-centered, context-dependent, and observer-independent.  
10  
11  
12  
13

## 14 15 16 **METHODS AND ANALYSIS**

### 17 18 **Study design**

19  
20 We designed a prospective observational study enrolling subjects from Lucile Packard Children's  
21 Hospital at Stanford. The study started on October 30<sup>th</sup>, 2017 and will be completed on  
22 November 30<sup>th</sup>, 2025 ([www.ClinicalTrials.gov](http://www.ClinicalTrials.gov), NCT03330496).  
23  
24  
25  
26

### 27 28 **Study population**

29  
30 We will collect data from 15 study subjects in each of the following age groups: 1) Preterm  
31 infants (34-37 weeks of corrected gestational age, postnatal age 3-30 days); 2) Term newborns  
32 (37-42 weeks of corrected gestational age, less than 1 month of age); 3) Infants from 1-3 months  
33 age; 4) Older infants from 3-6 months age.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

### 41 42 **Eligibility criteria**

43 After obtaining parental consent, we will include all infants less than 6 months of corrected  
44 chronological age requiring an acute painful procedure for routine clinical care in Lucile Packard  
45 Children's Hospital.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51  
52 We will exclude newborns with birth trauma, intrapartum asphyxia (5-minute Apgar Score <4 or  
53 cord pH < 7.01), fetal growth restriction (birth weight < 5<sup>th</sup> percentile for gestation), congenital  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 anomalies or metabolic disorders, or any kind of brain injury; if their mothers had a history of  
4 heavy smoking or drug abuse (alcohol, cocaine, ketamine, and heroin/other opiates) or  
5 psychiatric drugs used during this pregnancy; infants requiring positive pressure ventilation using  
6 a face mask (BiPAP) or endotracheal tube; those receiving continuous infusions of opioid drugs  
7 (morphine, fentanyl, and others) and nerve blocks or neuraxial analgesia affecting the site of the  
8 invasive procedure in the 24 hours prior to study entry; infants with facial anomalies (cleft lip),  
9 injuries or other pathologies affecting the facial area; and infants breastfed to alleviate pain  
10 during the painful procedure.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

## 24 **Objectives/Outcomes**

### 25 *Primary Objective:*

26  
27  
28 Our primary objective is to identify the specific signals and patterns from each sensor that  
29 correlate with the pain stimulus. This pilot study is designed to exclusively assess acute pain  
30 responses during routine, clinically-required skin-breaking procedures – it measures the intensity  
31 of acute pain from the physiological responses of each subject.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

### 37 *Primary Outcome:*

38  
39 We will extract pain-related information using non-invasive multimodal sensors. Specific  
40 features of the physiological/behavioral indicators of infant pain will require unique processing  
41 algorithms. We will record pain signals using facial electromyography (EMG),  
42 electrocardiography (ECG), electrodermal activity (skin conductance), oxygen saturation (SpO<sub>2</sub>),  
43 and electroencephalography (EEG) in real-time. Dedicated algorithms for each sensor will extract  
44 pain-related information such as facial grimacing or heart rate variability. The reliability and  
45 validity of these algorithms will be tested prospectively on data from preterm and term neonates,  
46 and 1-6 month-old infants experiencing acute pain during invasive procedures.  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 ***Secondary Objectives:***  
6

7 We aim to identify if multiple sensors will provide overlapping information, which a sensor  
8 fusion framework can integrate to identify “pain” and “no pain” related features. These features  
9 will be used to train machine learning algorithms that will finally provide reliable, objective  
10 assessments of pain intensity in real-time.  
11  
12

13 We will also study if the pain intensity measured by the sensor fusion framework will show  
14 clinical validity, inter-rater reliability, as well as responsiveness to pain relief using analgesic  
15 drugs or non- pharmacological therapies. However, no interventions are planned in this study.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

24 ***Secondary outcomes:***  
25

26 We will develop a sensor fusion framework designed to integrate data from different sensor  
27 modalities. No single sensor is capable of measuring neonatal pain. Rather, skilled clinicians  
28 draw upon multiple sources of information to estimate pain. A machine learning algorithm will  
29 be developed to test if the sensor fusion framework (i) can “calibrate” itself to the unique  
30 physiology of each newborn, (ii) handle missing (e.g. sensor failure) or unreliable data (e.g.  
31 movement artifact), and (iii) determine specific features from each modality to reach asymptotic  
32 levels of sensitivity and specificity. We hypothesize that this automated sensor fusion approach  
33 will be able to estimate neonatal pain intensity with greater specificity and sensitivity than the  
34 pain scales clinically used at the bedside.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50 To assess the reliability and validity of the pain intensity measured by the sensor fusion  
51 framework, we will compare the objective pain measure with the pain scores assessed by skilled  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 research staff. Variations in the objective pain scores before and after the clinical use of analgesic  
4  
5 therapies will also be assessed to explore whether this device can also identify pain relief [22].  
6  
7  
8  
9

### 10 11 **Sample size calculations**

12  
13 We assume an  $\alpha$ -error =0.05,  $1-\beta$  error =0.8, and a mean:SD ratio of 2:1 for clinical and sensor-  
14  
15 based pain scores (based on prior studies of clinical assessments of procedural pain in infants)  
16  
17 [23,24]. Based on these assumptions, to detect a slope that corresponds to a 0.5-unit change in  
18  
19 the outcome (e.g., sensor pain score) per 1-unit change in the predictor (e.g., clinical pain score)  
20  
21 we will require a minimum of 40 infants in the *training dataset*. For a binary predictor with 25%  
22  
23 or 50% prevalence (e.g., mild vs. moderate pain, or male vs. female neonate), with this sample  
24  
25 size, we will be able to detect a 0.7 or 0.8-unit change in the outcome, respectively. Given the  
26  
27 number of sensors used for the first step of this study, some artifacts may occur requiring data  
28  
29 corrections or greater variability, with a need for recruiting more patients. We plan to recruit 60  
30  
31 patients in this study.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

### 39 **Interventions/Experimental design**

40  
41  
42 After applying inclusion/exclusion criteria and parental consent, infants' medical data will be  
43  
44 recorded including: date of birth, perinatal/medical history, birth weight, gestational age, Apgar  
45  
46 scores, congenital anomalies, metabolic defects, other diagnoses, previous surgeries, recent labs,  
47  
48 prior imaging, major physical findings, number and types of painful procedures, and all  
49  
50 medications used in the 24 hours immediately preceding the study. We will document the type of  
51  
52 procedure, time of day, its location and duration, number of attempts and behavioral state of the  
53  
54 infant before and after the procedure.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59

1  
2  
3 Prior to a clinically-indicated procedure such as a heel stick, subcutaneous or intramuscular  
4 injections (vaccine, drug shot), we will attach skin conductance (SC) leads to measure galvanic  
5 skin responses either on a hand palm or foot sole, and electromyography (EMG) to record facial  
6 muscle activity from cheek and forehead, and directly obtain recordings from clinical monitors  
7 (electrocardiography (ECG) and oxygen saturation (SpO2)). In addition, the infant will wear a  
8 cap with Electroencephalography (EEG) leads. For study procedures, research staff will clinically  
9 assess pain using the Neonatal Pain & Sedation Scale (N-PASS) before and after the procedure,  
10 the Premature Infant Pain Profile-Revised (PIPP-R) and the Neonatal Facial Coding System  
11 (NFCS) during the procedure. For older patients, the FLACC (Face, Legs, Activity, Cry,  
12 Consolability) scale or Visual Analogue Scale (VAS) will be scored to assess pain during the  
13 procedure [25,26][27][28]. Physiological and audio recordings will start 10-30 minutes before a  
14 planned procedure and continue for up to 20-30 minutes after the procedure.

15  
16 All sensors will be monitored and displayed on the same laptop. We will use the Brain Vision  
17 software to display and record EEG, EMG and skin conductance responses and the  
18 MediCollector software for ECG and SpO2. The recording time of the 2 softwares will be  
19 synchronised based on the laptop digital clock. The event marker will be triggered by the  
20 researcher using a dedicated function of the Brain Vision software to time-lock and record times  
21 of noxious and non-noxious events for all sensors (Brain Vision and MediCollector).

22  
23 At the completion of recording, all the above sensors will be disconnected from each patient and  
24 study procedures will be terminated. The entire study will last approximately 30-60 minutes;  
25 however the study may be stopped earlier if any infant shows signs of distress or if a bedside  
26 nurse or parent has any concerns.

## 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 **Data analysis**

## A. Signal-Filtering and Information Extraction from Sensors

For each sensing modality, we will develop a software algorithm to process signals recorded by sensors and extract the clinically relevant information related to pain. Proof-of-concept algorithms will be tested using the collected dataset. The feasibility of each sensing modality will be based on: *i*) sensitivity and specificity of detecting clinically relevant pain-related changes, and *ii*) robustness of sensor readings in the presence of non-pain related disturbances (e.g., movement artifact).

In order to address artifacts due to movement or suboptimal electrode-skin contact, we will initially use filtering techniques (e.g., to remove power line interference). In addition, we will identify channels exhibiting artifacts by considering the range of signal values, where signals showing extreme deviation from average values or channels showing virtually zero activity will be excluded. Specifically for EEG analysis, we will identify and remove EMG-related artifacts using well-established techniques such as filtering and independent component analysis.

**1. Pain Behaviors:** Newborn behaviors (e.g., facial expressions, body movements) are accepted as the most sensitive and valid indicators of pain [29][13]. Facial expressions like brow bulge, eye squeeze, nasolabial furrow, and horizontal mouth stretch were verified as the most valid and discriminative components of neonatal pain scales [30,31][32]. Using facial EMG in real-time, we will detect the presence of muscle activity in neonatal pain-associated facial movements [33]. Given the multiple overlapping layers of facial muscles, facial EMGs record signals from a facial region as opposed to any specific muscle [33]. Previous studies of startle and blinking in infants used miniature silver (Ag/AgCl) periorbital surface electrodes for recording EMGs [34–36]. We

1  
2  
3 will focus on infant forehead and cheek areas to detect EMG activity associated with brow bulge,  
4 eye squeeze and nasolabial furrow [33]. We will iteratively refine our algorithms by using multi-  
5 modality sensing and developing robust feature extraction and classification frameworks that  
6 address the challenges specific to neonatal/infant pain detection. We will exclude mechanically  
7 ventilated infants due to the challenges associated with identifying facial features (occluded by  
8 securing tape, ventilator tubing or devices) and their need for ongoing sedation/analgesia.  
9

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18 **2. Skin Conductance:** Acute pain stimulates the sympathetic post-ganglionic cholinergic neurons  
19 [37], leading to diaphoresis, palmar sweating and increased skin conductance [38]. Eliminating  
20 painful stimuli results in sweat reabsorption and decreased conductivity. The amplitude of  
21 changes in palmar skin conductance reflect increased sympathetic nervous system activity, which  
22 tracks with pain intensity [39–42]. Skin conductance can change with body temperature [43,44],  
23 but not with the ambient temperatures [44]. Specifically, the number of fluctuations of skin  
24 conductance per second (NFSC) was correlated with pain intensity in children [45], and was  
25 more sensitive than pain scores in preterm and term neonates [18,40–42,46]. We will use skin  
26 conductance using the BrainAmp system® (Brain Products GmbH, Gilching, Germany),  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 **3. Electrocardiography (ECG):** Heart rate (HR) changes are components of many pain  
41 assessment scales and recent studies have established correlations between HR variability (HRV)  
42 and pain [47,48]. A number of linear time-domain (HR mean, standard deviation) and frequency-  
43 domain (power spectral density) metrics and non-linear metrics (sample entropy, approximate  
44 entropy, etc.) can detect painful stimuli [47,48]. We will record the infant's ECG before, during,  
45 and after an acute pain event to extract the linear and nonlinear metrics (listed above) from the  
46 ECG signal for further analyses.  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 **4. Electroencephalography (EEG):** EEG studies to assess neonatal pain have met with variable  
4  
5 results [49–51]. Opioid analgesia in adults leads to slowing of the EEG, whereas painful stimuli  
6  
7 activate brain regions identified by neuroimaging studies [52] such as the primary sensory cortex  
8  
9 (S1) [53]. EEG amplitudes and frequencies decreased when analgesics were given to newborns in  
10  
11 pain [20,54–56]. Using the BrainAmp EEG system® (Brain Products GmbH, Gilching,  
12  
13 Germany), we will apply 32 active EEG electrodes using the infant-sized ActiCap® (Brain  
14  
15 Products GmbH, Gilching, Germany). Although Hartley et al. have selectively used the vertex  
16  
17 (Cz) lead for neonatal pain studies [20,54], we believe that infant pain processing is widely  
18  
19 distributed across many brain regions and the current evidence is not sufficiently strong enough  
20  
21 to exclude information from other EEG leads. The BrainAmp is similar to other EEG monitors,  
22  
23 however, it uses 32 active electrodes allowing for placement of the ActiCap on the infant's head  
24  
25 with minimal preparation. Each active electrode amplifies the signal recorded from the skin and  
26  
27 records also indicates the impedance of each electrode at the start of the recording to improve the  
28  
29 quality of recorded signals. Over the past 10 years, this device has been used for research  
30  
31 purposes in all age groups including infants and newborns. No side effects were reported from its  
32  
33 use in newborns and small infants.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

41 **5. Pulse Oximetry (SpO<sub>2</sub>):** Changes in SpO<sub>2</sub> occur frequently following acute pain and,  
42  
43 therefore, have been included in the Premature Infant Pain Profile (PIPP) and other pain scales  
44  
45 [57–59]. Newer generation monitors (Masimo, Irvine, CA) use multi-wavelength technology to  
46  
47 provide more reliable SpO<sub>2</sub> and pulse rate signals, with parallel signal processing engines and  
48  
49 adaptive filters to separate the arterial from venous signals, patient motion, or skin perfusion [60].  
50  
51 Changes in skin blood flow were also used as physiological markers for neonatal pain or  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 morphine analgesia [61,62]. We will test the utility of the SpO<sub>2</sub> and peripheral perfusion index  
4  
5 provided by pulse oximetry monitors as possible signals for neonatal pain.  
6  
7

## 8 9 **Statistical approach**

### 10 11 12 **A. Sensor Fusion**

13  
14  
15 We have previously investigated using machine learning to detect pain in neonates using facial  
16 expressions recorded by a camera [63]. We will develop a sensor fusion framework to detect pain  
17 in non-verbal infants based on machine learning to detect pain using multi-modal sensor data.  
18 Feasibility of this new framework will be assessed based on its sensitivity and specificity to  
19 detect pain events in infants and further refined into a prototype for validation in future studies.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

27  
28 A “calibration” period will be used to establish a baseline for these multiple sensor modalities by  
29 monitoring neonates who are not in pain. The clinical staff at the bedside will identify the pain  
30 state of each neonate/infant using validated pain scales (N-PASS, NFCS and PIPP-R; FLACC,  
31 VAS) and record the timing of pain-inducing clinically-indicated procedures. Our sensor fusion  
32 framework will classify the neonatal/infant responses to infer pain intensity based on observed  
33 changes from baseline. A probabilistic relationship between pain intensity and sensor  
34 measurements can be established, where the unknown parameters of the statistical relationships  
35 are identified by a training dataset. The training dataset will also be used to estimate the  
36 importance of each feature, which can then be used to identify the optimal set of sensors [61].  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50 Pain intensity scores computed by our sensor fusion framework will be compared with pain  
51 scores measured concurrently by skilled research staff. All sensors (facial EMG, EEG, ECG,  
52 SpO<sub>2</sub>, and SC) will be connected with an event recorder to mark “pain” vs. “no-pain” states. To  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59



1  
2  
3 make the best use of our data, the sensor fusion framework will use standard cross-validation  
4 methods to establish the generalizability of this framework.  
5  
6

7  
8  
9 Data from patients will be divided to a training set and a test set. The training set is used for  
10 model training and optimization of model parameters. A leave-one-patient-out cross validation  
11 technique will be used, where the machine learning classifier is trained on data from all but one  
12 patient and the performance of the classifier is assessed on the remaining patient. Once the  
13 appropriate machine learning classifier and its associated parameters are selected using the  
14 training set and the associated cross validation procedure, the performance of the machine  
15 learning classifier will be assessed on the test set.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

## 26 **B. Validation and Correlation with Pain Intensity**

27

28  
29 We will compare clinical pain scores from nursing assessments with scores from the sensor  
30 fusion framework. First, we will examine clinical pain scores to verify agreement with the pain  
31 scores assessed by the research staff. Internal consistency will be evaluated by Cronbach's  $\alpha$ ,  
32 with values  $> 0.8$  to show good internal consistency. Second, we will conduct multivariable  
33 linear regressions or generalized estimating equations (GEE) [64,65] to understand the agreement  
34 between the device pain scores and the clinical pain scores, as well as the contribution of each  
35 modality to the device pain scores. We will examine if these associations vary after adjustment  
36 for covariates such as pain medications, age, sex, duration or invasiveness of the procedure. A co-  
37 variance matrix will examine the degree of correlation between individual sensor inputs, types of  
38 procedures, clinician pain scores, and analgesic therapies used during the procedure. Finally, due  
39 to the limited understanding of factors contributing to pain in newborns, linear regression or GEE  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 models will examine the association of the sensor fusion pain scores reported by the device with  
4  
5 the demographic and clinical variables of neonates and infants.  
6  
7

8  
9 Content validity depends on the sensors and sensor variables that we have chosen for the sensor  
10  
11 fusion framework. Concurrent validity will depend on the pain scores of skilled research staff  
12  
13 using validated pain scoring methods. Construct validity will rest on: *i*) the range of objective  
14  
15 pain scores from procedures causing mild, moderate, or severe pain; *ii*) changes in pain scores  
16  
17 with analgesic drugs or non-pharmacological therapies; and *iii*) variation in pain scores over time  
18  
19 consistent with the expected, natural course of acute procedural pain.  
20  
21  
22

## 23 **ETHICS AND DISSEMINATION**

24  
25  
26  
27 The Institutional Review Board of the Stanford University approved the protocol. This  
28  
29 observational study is registered at [www.ClinicalTrials.gov](http://www.ClinicalTrials.gov) (NCT03330496) and it does not  
30  
31 involve any intervention other than those clinically required. Data collection includes  
32  
33 physiological recordings and medical information. Other than the facial EMG, skin conductance  
34  
35 leads (SC), and 32-channel BrainAmp EEG data acquisition system, all other sensors are used  
36  
37 routinely as the standard of care. All sensors are non-invasive and safe. We will use standard  
38  
39 electrodes which are routinely used for recording vital signs in the hospital (ECG, SpO2). All  
40  
41 recordings will use sticky pads attached to the skin. Other than a potential for mild skin irritation  
42  
43 from the adhesives used, there are no significant risks associated with these devices, or other  
44  
45 study-related procedures.  
46  
47  
48  
49

50  
51 Since all study subjects are aged less than 6 months, the parent's consent will be obtained for their  
52  
53 child as a research subject. The primary risks to study subjects result from potential loss of  
54  
55 confidentiality from the information collected and from the medical record and monitoring  
56  
57  
58  
59

1  
2  
3 devices. As described in the consent form, the right to privacy during the consent process, data  
4 collection and study procedures, and protection of personal data will be given the utmost  
5 importance and strict safeguards will be maintained to protect data confidentiality. All  
6 physiological data will be deidentified by the team at Stanford prior to transfer for further  
7 analysis by the team at Autonomous Healthcare.  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14

15  
16 Study findings will be published in peer-reviewed journals and presented at national and  
17 international scientific conferences. Practical use of this methodology will be taught at  
18 conference workshops, or via webinars, podcasts, video tutorials.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

24 Future studies will test the validity of this approach to pain assessments in larger populations of  
25 newborns, older infants and also extend these studies to smaller preterm neonates. Future  
26 applications may also include patient populations incapable of expressing pain (children with  
27 disability, adults with dementia, or mechanically ventilated patients).  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**REFERENCES**

- 1 Tortora D, Severino M, Di Biase C, *et al.* Early Pain Exposure Influences Functional Brain Connectivity in Very Preterm Neonates. *Front Neurosci* 2019;**13**:899.  
doi:10.3389/fnins.2019.00899
- 2 Ranger M, Chau CMY, Garg A, *et al.* Neonatal Pain-Related Stress Predicts Cortical Thickness at Age 7 Years in Children Born Very Preterm. *PLoS One* 2013;**8**:e76702.  
doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0076702
- 3 Vinall J, Grunau RE. Impact of repeated procedural pain-related stress in infants born very preterm. *Pediatr Res* 2014;**75**:584–7. doi:10.1038/pr.2014.16
- 4 Doesburg SM, Chau CM, Cheung TPL, *et al.* Neonatal pain-related stress, functional cortical activity and visual-perceptual abilities in school-age children born at extremely low gestational age. *Pain* 2013;**154**:1946–52. doi:10.1016/j.pain.2013.04.009
- 5 Valeri BO, Holsti L, Linhares MBM. Neonatal pain and developmental outcomes in children born preterm: a systematic review. *Clin J Pain* 2015;**31**:355–62.  
doi:10.1097/AJP.0000000000000114
- 6 de Graaf J, van Lingen RA, Simons SHP, *et al.* Long-term effects of routine morphine infusion in mechanically ventilated neonates on children's functioning: five-year follow-up of a randomized controlled trial. *Pain* 2011;**152**:1391–7. doi:10.1016/j.pain.2011.02.017
- 7 Ferguson SA, Ward WL, Paule MG, *et al.* A pilot study of preemptive morphine analgesia in preterm neonates: effects on head circumference, social behavior, and response latencies in early childhood. *Neurotoxicol Teratol* 2012;**34**:47–55. doi:10.1016/j.ntt.2011.10.008
- 8 Bellù R, de Waal K, Zanini R. Opioids for neonates receiving mechanical ventilation: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Arch Dis Child Fetal Neonatal Ed* 2010;**95**:F241-251.  
doi:10.1136/adc.2008.150318

- 1  
2  
3 9 Cravero JP, Havidich JE. Pediatric sedation--evolution and revolution. *Paediatr Anaesth*  
4  
5 2011;**21**:800–9. doi:10.1111/j.1460-9592.2011.03617.x  
6  
7  
8 10 Lim Y, Godambe S. Prevention and management of procedural pain in the neonate: an  
9  
10 update, American Academy of Pediatrics, 2016. *Arch Dis Child Educ Pract Ed* 2017;**102**:254–6.  
11  
12 doi:10.1136/archdischild-2016-311066  
13  
14 11 Boyle EM, Bradshaw J, Blake KI. Persistent pain in neonates: challenges in assessment  
15  
16 without the aid of a clinical tool. *Acta Paediatr* 2018;**107**:63–7. doi:10.1111/apa.14081  
17  
18  
19 12 Maxwell LG, Malavolta CP, Fraga MV. Assessment of pain in the neonate. *Clin Perinatol*  
20  
21 2013;**40**:457–69. doi:10.1016/j.clp.2013.05.001  
22  
23  
24 13 Slater R, Cantarella A, Franck L, *et al*. How well do clinical pain assessment tools reflect  
25  
26 pain in infants? *PLoS Med* 2008;**5**:e129. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.0050129  
27  
28  
29 14 van Dijk M, Tibboel D. Update on pain assessment in sick neonates and infants. *Pediatr*  
30  
31 *Clin North Am* 2012;**59**:1167–81. doi:10.1016/j.pcl.2012.07.012  
32  
33 15 Fitzgerald M. What do we really know about newborn infant pain? *Exp Physiol*  
34  
35 2015;**100**:1451–7. doi:10.1113/EP085134  
36  
37  
38 16 Fitzgerald M, Walker SM. Infant pain management: a developmental neurobiological  
39  
40 approach. *Nat Rev Neurol* 2009;**5**:35–50. doi:10.1038/ncpneuro0984  
41  
42  
43 17 Storm H. Changes in skin conductance as a tool to monitor nociceptive stimulation and  
44  
45 pain. *Curr Opin Anaesthesiol* 2008;**21**:796–804. doi:10.1097/ACO.0b013e3283183fe4  
46  
47  
48 18 Gjerstad AC, Wagner K, Henrichsen T, *et al*. Skin Conductance Versus the Modified  
49  
50 COMFORT Sedation Score as a Measure of Discomfort in Artificially Ventilated Children.  
51  
52 *Pediatrics* 2008;**122**:e848–53. doi:10.1542/peds.2007-2545  
53  
54 19 Faye PM, De Jonckheere J, Logier R, *et al*. Newborn Infant Pain Assessment Using Heart  
55  
56 Rate Variability Analysis: *The Clinical Journal of Pain* 2010;**26**:777–82.  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 doi:10.1097/AJP.0b013e3181ed1058  
4

5 20 Hartley C, Duff EP, Green G, *et al.* Nociceptive brain activity as a measure of analgesic  
6 efficacy in infants. *Sci Transl Med* 2017;**9**. doi:10.1126/scitranslmed.aah6122  
7

8  
9  
10 21 Maxwell LG, Fraga MV, Malavolta CP. Assessment of Pain in the Newborn. *Clinics in*  
11 *Perinatology* 2019;**46**:693–707. doi:10.1016/j.clp.2019.08.005  
12  
13

14 22 Boyle EM, Freer Y, Wong CM, *et al.* Assessment of persistent pain or distress and  
15 adequacy of analgesia in preterm ventilated infants. *Pain* 2006;**124**:87–91.  
16  
17

18  
19 doi:10.1016/j.pain.2006.03.019  
20

21 23 Serpa ABM, Guinsburg R, Balda R de CX, *et al.* Multidimensional pain assessment of  
22 preterm newborns at the 1st, 3rd and 7th days of life. *Sao Paulo Med J* 2007;**125**:29–33.  
23  
24

25  
26 doi:10.1590/s1516-31802007000100006  
27

28 24 Pereira AL de ST, Guinsburg R, Almeida MFB de, *et al.* Validity of behavioral and  
29 physiologic parameters for acute pain assessment of term newborn infants. *Sao Paulo Med J*  
30  
31  
32 1999;**117**:72–80. doi:10.1590/S1516-31801999000200005  
33  
34

35 25 Manworren RCB, Hynan LS. Clinical validation of FLACC: preverbal patient pain scale.  
36  
37 *Pediatr Nurs* 2003;**29**:140–6.  
38

39 26 Gibbins S, Stevens BJ, Yamada J, *et al.* Validation of the Premature Infant Pain Profile-  
40 Revised (PIPP-R). *Early Human Development* 2014;**90**:189–93.  
41  
42

43  
44  
45 doi:10.1016/j.earlhumdev.2014.01.005  
46

47 27 Grunau RE, Oberlander T, Holsti L, *et al.* Bedside application of the Neonatal Facial  
48 Coding System in pain assessment of premature neonates. *Pain* 1998;**76**:277–86.  
49

50  
51  
52 doi:10.1016/s0304-3959(98)00046-3  
53

54 28 Hummel P, Puchalski M, Creech SD, *et al.* Clinical reliability and validity of the N-  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60 PASS: neonatal pain, agitation and sedation scale with prolonged pain. *J Perinatol* 2008;**28**:55–

1  
2  
3 60. doi:10.1038/sj.jp.7211861  
4

5 29 Hatfield LA, Ely EA. Measurement of acute pain in infants: a review of behavioral and  
6 physiological variables. *Biol Res Nurs* 2015;**17**:100–11. doi:10.1177/1099800414531448  
7

8 30 Grunau RV, Craig KD. Pain expression in neonates: facial action and cry. *Pain*  
9 1987;**28**:395–410. doi:10.1016/0304-3959(87)90073-x  
10  
11

12 31 Craig KD, Whitfield MF, Grunau RV, *et al.* Pain in the preterm neonate: behavioural and  
13 physiological indices. *Pain* 1993;**52**:287–99. doi:10.1016/0304-3959(93)90162-i  
14  
15

16 32 Willis MHW, Merkel SI, Voepel-Lewis T, *et al.* FLACC Behavioral Pain Assessment  
17 Scale: a comparison with the child's self-report. *Pediatr Nurs* 2003;**29**:195–8.  
18  
19

20 33 Cohn J, Ekman P. Measuring facial action by manual coding, facial EMG, and automatic  
21 facial image analysis. In: *Handbook of nonverbal behavior research methods in the affective*  
22 *sciences*. J. A. Harrigan RR, K. Scherer (editors). New York, NY: Oxford University Press USA;  
23 2005:9Y64.  
24  
25

26 34 Balaban MT, Anthony BJ, Graham FK. Prestimulation effects on blink and cardiac  
27 reflexes of 15-month human infants. *Dev Psychobiol* 1989;**22**:115–27.  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
doi:10.1002/dev.420220203

60 35 Schmidt LA, Fox NA. Fear-potentiated startle responses in temperamentally different  
human infants. *Dev Psychobiol* 1998;**32**:113–20.

36 Schmidt LA, Fox NA, Long JM. Acoustic startle electromyographic (EMG) Activity  
37 indexed from an electroculographic (EOG) Electrode placement: A methodological note.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
*International Journal of Neuroscience* 1998;**93**:185–8. doi:10.3109/00207459808986423

37 Storm H. The development of a software program for analyzing skin conductance changes  
in preterm infants. *Clin Neurophysiol* 2001;**112**:1562–8. doi:10.1016/s1388-2457(01)00573-9

38 van Dooren M, de Vries JJGG-J, Janssen JH. Emotional sweating across the body:

1  
2  
3 comparing 16 different skin conductance measurement locations. *Physiol Behav* 2012;**106**:298–  
4 304. doi:10.1016/j.physbeh.2012.01.020

7 39 Hellerud BC, Storm H. Skin conductance and behaviour during sensory stimulation of  
8 preterm and term infants. *Early Hum Dev* 2002;**70**:35–46. doi:10.1016/s0378-3782(02)00070-1  
9

12 40 Pereira-da-Silva L, Virella D, Monteiro I, *et al.* Skin conductance indices discriminate  
13 nociceptive responses to acute stimuli from different heel prick procedures in infants. *J Matern*  
14 *Fetal Neonatal Med* 2012;**25**:796–801. doi:10.3109/14767058.2011.587919  
15  
16

19 41 Harrison D, Boyce S, Loughnan P, *et al.* Skin conductance as a measure of pain and stress  
20 in hospitalised infants. *Early Hum Dev* 2006;**82**:603–8. doi:10.1016/j.earlhumdev.2005.12.008  
21  
22

24 42 Eriksson M, Storm H, Fremming A, *et al.* Skin conductance compared to a combined  
25 behavioural and physiological pain measure in newborn infants. *Acta Paediatr* 2008;**97**:27–30.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

43 Hoffman K, Bromster T, Hakansson S, *et al.* Monitoring of pain and stress in an infant  
with asphyxia during induced hypothermia: a case report. *Adv Neonatal Care* 2013;**13**:252–61.  
doi:10.1097/ANC.0b013e31829d8baf

44 Valkenburg AJ, Niehof SP, van Dijk M, *et al.* Skin conductance peaks could result from  
45 changes in vital parameters unrelated to pain. *Pediatr Res* 2012;**71**:375–9.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

45 Hullett B, Chambers N, Preuss J, *et al.* Monitoring electrical skin conductance: a tool for  
46 the assessment of postoperative pain in children? *Anesthesiology* 2009;**111**:513–7.  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

46 Munsters J, Wallström L, Ågren J, *et al.* Skin conductance measurements as pain  
53 assessment in newborn infants born at 22–27weeks gestational age at different postnatal age.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



- 1  
2  
3 47 Toweill DL, Kovarik WD, Carr R, *et al.* Linear and nonlinear analysis of heart rate  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11 48 Weissman A, Zimmer EZ, Aranovitch M, *et al.* Heart rate dynamics during acute pain in  
12  
13  
14  
15 49 Fabrizi L, Slater R, Worley A, *et al.* A shift in sensory processing that enables the  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22 50 Fabrizi L, Worley A, Patten D, *et al.* Electrophysiological measurements and analysis of  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29 51 Norman E, Rosén I, Vanhatalo S, *et al.* Electroencephalographic response to procedural  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36 52 Prichep LS, John ER, Howard B, *et al.* Evaluation of the pain matrix using EEG source  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43 53 Gross J, Schnitzler A, Timmermann L, *et al.* Gamma oscillations in human primary  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49 54 Hartley C, Goksan S, Poorun R, *et al.* The relationship between nociceptive brain activity,  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56 55 Nguyen The Tich S, Vecchierini M-F, Debillon T, *et al.* Effects of sufentanil on  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 electroencephalogram in very and extremely preterm neonates. *Pediatrics* 2003;**111**:123–8.

4  
5 doi:10.1542/peds.111.1.123

6  
7 56 Bernet V, Latal B, Natalucci G, *et al.* Effect of sedation and analgesia on postoperative  
8 amplitude-integrated EEG in newborn cardiac patients. *Pediatr Res* 2010;**67**:650–5.

9  
10  
11 doi:10.1203/PDR.0b013e3181da44ba

12  
13 57 de Oliveira MVM, de Jesus J a. L, Tristao RM. Psychophysical parameters of a  
14 multidimensional pain scale in newborns. *Physiol Meas* 2012;**33**:39–49. doi:10.1088/0967-  
15 3334/33/1/39

16  
17 58 Serpa ABM, Guinsburg R, Balda R de CX, *et al.* Multidimensional pain assessment of  
18 preterm newborns at the 1st, 3rd and 7th days of life. *Sao Paulo Med J* 2007;**125**:29–33.

19  
20  
21 doi:10.1590/s1516-31802007000100006

22  
23 59 Stevens B, Johnston C, Petryshen P, *et al.* Premature Infant Pain Profile: development and  
24 initial validation. *Clin J Pain* 1996;**12**:13–22. doi:10.1097/00002508-199603000-00004

25  
26  
27 60 Hay WW, Rodden DJ, Collins SM, *et al.* Reliability of conventional and new pulse  
28 oximetry in neonatal patients. *J Perinatol* 2002;**22**:360–6. doi:10.1038/sj.jp.7210740

29  
30  
31 61 Moustogiannis AN, Raju TN, Roohey T, *et al.* Intravenous morphine attenuates pain  
32 induced changes in skin blood flow in newborn infants. *Neurol Res* 1996;**18**:440–4.

33  
34  
35 doi:10.1080/01616412.1996.11740448

36  
37  
38 62 McCulloch KM, Ji SA, Raju TN. Skin blood flow changes during routine nursery  
39 procedures. *Early Hum Dev* 1995;**41**:147–56. doi:10.1016/0378-3782(95)01617-c

40  
41  
42 63 Gholami B, Haddad WM, Tannenbaum AR. Relevance vector machine learning for  
43 neonate pain intensity assessment using digital imaging. *IEEE Trans Biomed Eng* 2010;**57**:1457–

44  
45  
46 66. doi:10.1109/TBME.2009.2039214

47  
48  
49 64 Pepe MS, Heagerty P, Whitaker R. Prediction using partly conditional time-varying

1  
2  
3 coefficients regression models. *Biometrics* 1999;**55**:944–50. doi:10.1111/j.0006-  
4 341x.1999.00944.x  
5

6  
7 65 Leung DHY, Wang Y-G, Zhu M. Efficient parameter estimation in longitudinal data  
8 analysis using a hybrid GEE method. *Biostatistics* 2009;**10**:436–45.  
9  
10  
11  
12 doi:10.1093/biostatistics/kxp002  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 **Authors' contributions:** JMR, KJS and WMH, BG were responsible for manuscript writing.

4  
5 JMR, KJS, IM, WMH and BG contributed to the concept, protocol development and study  
6  
7 design. KJS and BG secured funding for the project. JMR, IM and KJS are responsible for  
8  
9 recruitment of study patients. All authors critically revised and approved the manuscript before  
10  
11 submission and are accountable for all aspects of the work.  
12  
13

14  
15 **Funding statement:** This work was supported by the National Institutes of Health, National  
16  
17 Institute of Drug Abuse grant number 1 R41 DA046983-01.  
18  
19

20  
21 **Competing interests statement:** JMR reports an international mobility scholarship from Chiesi  
22  
23 Pharmaceuticals; WMH and BG have equity ownership in Autonomous Healthcare, Inc.; WMH,  
24  
25 BG and KJSA have proprietary interests in the potential devices that may be developed from  
26  
27 these studies; Some equipments used in this study were provided by Autonomous Healthcare,  
28  
29 Inc.  
30  
31

32  
33 **Patient and Public Involvement:** This research was done without patient involvement. Patients  
34  
35 were not invited to comment on the study design and were not consulted to develop patient  
36  
37 relevant outcomes or interpret the results. Patients were not invited to contribute to the writing or  
38  
39 editing of this document for readability or accuracy.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

# BMJ Open

## Using sensor-fusion and machine-learning algorithms to assess acute pain in nonverbal infants: a study protocol

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2020-039292.R2
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	10-Dec-2020
Complete List of Authors:	Roué, Jean-Michel; CHRU de Brest, Neonatal & Pediatric Intensive Care Unit, Brest University Hospital; Université de Brest, Faculté de Médecine et des Sciences de la Santé, EA 4685 LIEN, University of Western Brittany, Brest Morag, Iris; Tel Aviv University Sackler Faculty of Medicine, Shamir Medical Center (Assaf Harofeh), Neonatal Intensive Care Unit Haddad, Wassim H.; Georgia Institute of Technology, School of Aerospace Engineering Gholami, Behnood; Autonomous Healthcare, Inc., Hoboken, NJ, USA Anand, Kanwaljeet J. S.; Stanford University School of Medicine
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b>:	Paediatrics
Secondary Subject Heading:	Intensive care
Keywords:	NEONATOLOGY, PAIN MANAGEMENT, PAEDIATRICS

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our [licence](#).

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which [Creative Commons](#) licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

1  
2  
3 **Title:** Using sensor-fusion and machine-learning algorithms to assess acute pain in nonverbal  
4 infants: a study protocol  
5

6  
7 Roué JM,<sup>1</sup> Morag I,<sup>2</sup> Haddad WM,<sup>3</sup> Gholami B,<sup>4</sup> Anand KJS<sup>5</sup>  
8  
9

10  
11 <sup>1</sup> Neonatal & Pediatric Intensive Care Unit, Brest University Hospital, University of Western  
12 Brittany, Brest, France  
13

14  
15 <sup>2</sup> Shamir Medical Center (Assaf Harofeh), Neonatal Intensive Care Unit, Sackler School of  
16 Medicine, Tel Aviv University, Israel  
17

18  
19 <sup>3</sup> School of Aerospace Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA  
20

21  
22 <sup>4</sup> Autonomous Healthcare, Inc., Hoboken, NJ, USA  
23

24  
25 <sup>5</sup> Professor of Pediatrics, Anesthesiology, Perioperative & Pain Medicine, Stanford University  
26 School of Medicine  
27

28  
29  
30  
31  
32 **Corresponding author:**  
33

34 Jean-Michel Roué,  
35

36 Neonatal & Pediatric Intensive Care Unit, Brest University Hospital, 2 Avenue Foch, 29200,  
37 Brest, France  
38

39  
40  
41 Email: jean-michel.roue@chu-brest.fr  
42

43  
44 Phone: + 33 2 98 22 36 67, Fax: + 33 2 98 22 37 67  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 **Word count:** 3805 out of 4000

4  
5 **ABSTRACT** 288 words out of 300

6  
7  
8 **Introduction:**

9  
10 Objective pain assessment in non-verbal populations is clinically challenging due to their  
11 inability to express their pain via self-report. Repetitive exposures to acute or prolonged pain  
12 lead to clinical instability, with long-term behavioral and cognitive sequelae in newborn infants.  
13  
14 Strong analgesics are also associated with medical complications, potential neurotoxicity and  
15 altered brain development. Pain scores performed by bedside nurses provide subjective, observer-  
16 dependent assessments rather than objective data for infant pain management; the required  
17 observations are labour-intensive, difficult to perform by a nurse who is concurrently performing  
18 the procedure, and increase the nursing workload. Multimodal pain assessment, using sensor  
19 fusion and machine learning algorithms, can provide a patient-centered, context-dependent,  
20 observer-independent, and objective pain measure.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33 **Methods and analysis:**

34  
35 In newborns undergoing painful procedures, we use facial electromyography (EMG) to record  
36 facial muscle activity related infant pain, electrocardiography (ECG) to examine heart rate (HR)  
37 changes and HR variability (HRV), electrodermal activity (skin conductance) to measure  
38 catecholamine-induced palmar sweating, changes in oxygen saturations and skin perfusion, and  
39 electroencephalography (EEG) using active electrodes to assess brain activity in real-time. This  
40 multimodal approach has the potential to improve the accuracy of pain assessment in non-verbal  
41 infants and may even allow continuous pain monitoring at the bedside. The feasibility of this  
42 approach will be evaluated in an observational prospective study of clinically required painful  
43 procedures in 60 preterm and term newborns, and infants aged 6 months or less.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54

55  
56 **Ethics and dissemination:**



1  
2  
3 The Institutional Review Board of the Stanford University approved the protocol. Study findings  
4 will be published in peer-reviewed journals, presented at scientific meetings, taught via webinars,  
5  
6 podcasts, video tutorials, and listed on academic/scientific websites. Future studies will validate  
7  
8 and refine this approach using the minimum number of sensors required to assess neonatal/infant  
9  
10  
11  
12 pain.  
13

14  
15  
16  
17 **Registration number:** ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT03330496  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## **An Article Summary:**

### **‘Strengths and limitations of this study’**

- An innovative and objective approach for continuous pain monitoring in infants including term and preterm neonates is described.
- To discriminate between noxious and non-noxious events, we use sensor fusion and machine-learning algorithms.
- Multimodal assessments may be more sensitive and specific for identifying pain and quantifying its intensity than the subjective assessments currently used in pain scales.
- Accurate, objective pain assessments may help reduce infant pain and suffering, enhance recovery, avoid untreated pain vs. analgesic overuse, and allow evaluation of newer analgesics or other therapies in randomized clinical trials.
- Multiple sensors are used for the first step of this study, but recording artifacts may require data corrections and sensor variability may generate a need for recruiting more patients.

## INTRODUCTION

Being non-verbal, hospitalized infants are particularly vulnerable to inadequate pain management. Repetitive pain in newborns leads to short- and long-term neurodevelopmental consequences including behavioral and cognitive sequelae [1][2–5]. Conversely, the safety and efficacy of some analgesics in neonates and their negative consequences on the neonatal brain have raised concerns [6][7][8][9]. Objectively assessing the pain responses in infants is thus necessary to assess the efficacy of analgesics in infants in order to avoid over treatment but also undertreatment and the consequences of repetitive pain exposure.

Composite pain scales including behavioral and physiological measures are the most widely used surrogate measures of infant pain and are currently recommended for the clinical practice [10]. However, they provide a one-time measurement and their use can be challenging for the bedside staff leading to low interrater reliability, with over- or underestimation of infant pain [11][12]. Depending on the context, behaviors or physiological responses may mirror non-noxious stimuli, leading to misinterpretation and a lack of specificity in subjective pain scales [13][14][15].

Pain from clinically required invasive procedures leads to well-described neurophysiological responses in term and preterm infants [15]. These responses imply that the central, peripheral, and autonomic nervous systems can be monitored using various behavioral and physiologic modalities [16][17,18][19]. Since pain is a complex process, multimodal measurement may improve the accuracy of pain assessment, also suggested by studies reporting the presence of pain-evoked potentials in some neonates showing no facial expressions of pain or others pointing out different profiles of pain responses [13][20].

Thus, developing new methods to assess the responses to pain in infants deserves a high priority. Multimodal measurements that provide an objective estimate of real-time and continuous pain

1  
2  
3 monitoring at the bedside will avoid the subjective bias and limitations associated with clinical  
4 pain scales, especially when behavioral assessment is limited by the medical conditions [21].  
5

6  
7 Our study protocol was designed to develop a multimodal pain assessment system, using sensor  
8 fusion and novel machine learning algorithms to provide an objective estimate of acute pain  
9 intensity in infants that is patient-centered, context-dependent, and observer-independent.  
10  
11  
12  
13

## 14 15 **METHODS AND ANALYSIS**

### 16 17 **Study design**

18  
19 We designed a prospective observational study enrolling subjects from Lucile Packard Children's  
20 Hospital at Stanford. The study started on October 30<sup>th</sup>, 2017 and will be completed on  
21 November 30<sup>th</sup>, 2025 (www.ClinicalTrials.gov, NCT03330496).  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

### 27 28 **Study population**

29  
30 We will collect data from 15 study subjects in each of the following age groups: 1) Preterm  
31 infants (34-37 weeks of corrected gestational age, postnatal age 3-30 days); 2) Term newborns  
32 (37-42 weeks of corrected gestational age, less than 1 month of age); 3) Infants from 1-3 months  
33 age; 4) Older infants from 3-6 months age.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

### 41 42 **Eligibility criteria**

43  
44 After obtaining parental consent, we will include all infants less than 6 months of corrected  
45 chronological age requiring an acute painful procedure for routine clinical care in Lucile Packard  
46 Children's Hospital.  
47  
48  
49  
50

51  
52 We will exclude newborns with birth trauma, intrapartum asphyxia (5-minute Apgar Score <4 or  
53 cord pH < 7.01), fetal growth restriction (birth weight < 5<sup>th</sup> percentile for gestation), congenital  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 anomalies or metabolic disorders, or any kind of brain injury; if their mothers had a history of  
4 heavy smoking or drug abuse (alcohol, cocaine, ketamine, and heroin/other opiates) or  
5 psychiatric drugs used during this pregnancy; infants requiring positive pressure ventilation using  
6 a face mask (BiPAP) or endotracheal tube; those receiving continuous infusions of opioid drugs  
7 (morphine, fentanyl, and others) and nerve blocks or neuraxial analgesia affecting the site of the  
8 invasive procedure in the 24 hours prior to study entry; infants with facial anomalies (cleft lip),  
9 injuries or other pathologies affecting the facial area; and infants breastfed to alleviate pain  
10 during the painful procedure.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

## 24 **Objectives/Outcomes**

### 25 *Primary Objective:*

26  
27  
28 Our primary objective is to identify the specific signals and patterns from each sensor that  
29 correlate with the pain stimulus. This pilot study is designed to exclusively assess acute pain  
30 responses during routine, clinically-required skin-breaking procedures – it measures the intensity  
31 of acute pain from the physiological responses of each subject.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

### 37 *Primary Outcome:*

38  
39 We will extract pain-related information using non-invasive multimodal sensors. Specific  
40 features of the physiological/behavioral indicators of infant pain will require unique processing  
41 algorithms. We will record pain signals using facial electromyography (EMG),  
42 electrocardiography (ECG), electrodermal activity (skin conductance), oxygen saturation (SpO<sub>2</sub>),  
43 and electroencephalography (EEG) in real-time. Dedicated algorithms for each sensor will extract  
44 pain-related information such as facial grimacing or heart rate variability. The reliability and  
45 validity of these algorithms will be tested prospectively on data from preterm and term neonates,  
46 and 1-6 month-old infants experiencing acute pain during invasive procedures.  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 ***Secondary Objectives:***  
4

5 We aim to identify if multiple sensors will provide overlapping information, which a sensor  
6 fusion framework can integrate to identify “pain” and “no pain” related features. These features  
7 will be used to train machine learning algorithms that will finally provide reliable, objective  
8 assessments of pain intensity in real-time.  
9

10 We will also study if the pain intensity measured by the sensor fusion framework will show  
11 clinical validity, inter-rater reliability, as well as responsiveness to pain relief using analgesic  
12 drugs or non- pharmacological therapies. However, no interventions are planned in this study.  
13  
14

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22 ***Secondary outcomes:***  
23

24 We will develop a sensor fusion framework designed to integrate data from different sensor  
25 modalities. No single sensor is capable of measuring neonatal pain. Rather, skilled clinicians  
26 draw upon multiple sources of information to estimate pain. A machine learning algorithm will  
27 be developed to test if the sensor fusion framework (i) can “calibrate” itself to the unique  
28 physiology of each newborn, (ii) handle missing (e.g. sensor failure) or unreliable data (e.g.  
29 movement artifact), and (iii) determine specific features from each modality to reach asymptotic  
30 levels of sensitivity and specificity. We hypothesize that this automated sensor fusion approach  
31 will be able to estimate neonatal pain intensity with greater specificity and sensitivity than the  
32 pain scales clinically used at the bedside.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46  
47 To assess the reliability and validity of the pain intensity measured by the sensor fusion  
48 framework, we will compare the objective pain measure with the pain scores assessed by skilled  
49 research staff. Variations in the objective pain scores before and after the clinical use of analgesic  
50 therapies will also be assessed to explore whether this device can also identify pain relief [22].  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### Sample size calculations

We assume an  $\alpha$ -error =0.05,  $1-\beta$  error =0.8, and a mean:SD ratio of 2:1 for clinical and sensor-based pain scores (based on prior studies of clinical assessments of procedural pain in infants) [23,24]. Based on these assumptions, to detect a slope that corresponds to a 0.5-unit change in the outcome (e.g., sensor pain score) per 1-unit change in the predictor (e.g., clinical pain score) we will require a minimum of 40 infants in the *training dataset*. For a binary predictor with 25% or 50% prevalence (e.g., mild vs. moderate pain, or male vs. female neonate), with this sample size, we will be able to detect a 0.7 or 0.8-unit change in the outcome, respectively. Given the number of sensors used for the first step of this study, some artifacts may occur requiring data corrections or greater variability, with a need for recruiting more patients. We plan to recruit 60 patients in this study.

### Interventions/Experimental design

After applying inclusion/exclusion criteria and parental consent, infants' medical data will be recorded including: date of birth, perinatal/medical history, birth weight, gestational age, Apgar scores, congenital anomalies, metabolic defects, other diagnoses, previous surgeries, recent labs, prior imaging, major physical findings, number and types of painful procedures, and all medications used in the 24 hours immediately preceding the study. We will document the type of procedure, time of day, its location and duration, number of attempts and behavioral state of the infant before and after the procedure.

Prior to a clinically-indicated procedure such as a heel stick, subcutaneous or intramuscular injections (vaccine, drug shot), we will attach skin conductance (SC) leads to measure galvanic skin responses either on a hand palm or foot sole, and electromyography (EMG) to record facial

1  
2  
3 muscle activity from cheek and forehead, and directly obtain recordings from clinical monitors  
4  
5 (electrocardiography (ECG) and oxygen saturation (SpO<sub>2</sub>)). In addition, the infant will wear a  
6  
7 cap with Electroencephalography (EEG) leads. For study procedures, research staff will clinically  
8  
9 assess pain using the Neonatal Pain & Sedation Scale (N-PASS) before and after the procedure,  
10  
11 the Premature Infant Pain Profile-Revised (PIPP-R) and the Neonatal Facial Coding System  
12  
13 (NFCS) during the procedure. For older patients, the FLACC (Face, Legs, Activity, Cry,  
14  
15 Consolability) scale or Visual Analogue Scale (VAS) will be scored to assess pain during the  
16  
17 procedure [25,26][27][28]. Physiological and audio recordings will start 10-30 minutes before a  
18  
19 planned procedure and continue for up to 20-30 minutes after the procedure.  
20  
21

22  
23 All sensors will be monitored and displayed on the same laptop. We will use the Brain Vision  
24  
25 software to display and record EEG, EMG and skin conductance responses and the  
26  
27 MediCollector software for ECG and SpO<sub>2</sub>. The recording time of the 2 softwares will be  
28  
29 synchronised based on the laptop digital clock. The event marker will be triggered by the  
30  
31 researcher using a dedicated function of the Brain Vision software to time-lock and record times  
32  
33 of noxious and non-noxious events for all sensors (Brain Vision and MediCollector).  
34  
35  
36  
37

38  
39 At the completion of recording, all the above sensors will be disconnected from each patient and  
40  
41 study procedures will be terminated. The entire study will last approximately 30-60 minutes;  
42  
43 however the study may be stopped earlier if any infant shows signs of distress or if a bedside  
44  
45 nurse or parent has any concerns.  
46  
47  
48

## 49 **Data analysis**

### 50 51 52 **A. Signal-Filtering and Information Extraction from Sensors**

53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 For each sensing modality, we will develop a software algorithm to process signals recorded by  
4 sensors and extract the clinically relevant information related to pain. Proof-of-concept  
5 algorithms will be tested using the collected dataset. The feasibility of each sensing modality will  
6 be based on: *i*) sensitivity and specificity of detecting clinically relevant pain-related changes,  
7 and *ii*) robustness of sensor readings in the presence of non-pain related disturbances (e.g.,  
8 movement artifact).  
9

10  
11 In order to address artifacts due to movement or suboptimal electrode-skin contact, we will  
12 initially use filtering techniques (e.g., to remove power line interference). In addition, we will  
13 identify channels exhibiting artifacts by considering the range of signal values, where signals  
14 showing extreme deviation from average values or channels showing virtually zero activity will  
15 be excluded. Specifically for EEG analysis, we will identify and remove EMG-related artifacts  
16 using well-established techniques such as filtering and independent component analysis.  
17

18  
19 Windows of different lengths will be used for the analysis. Specifically, for ECG, SpO<sub>2</sub>, EMG,  
20 and skin conductance signals an analysis window of 1-5 minutes will be used to extract  
21 appropriate features. The window lengths ranging from 400ms to 5 seconds will be used for EEG  
22 signals.  
23  
24

25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42 **1. Pain Behaviors:** Newborn behaviors (e.g., facial expressions, body movements) are accepted  
43 as the most sensitive and valid indicators of pain [29][13]. Facial expressions like brow bulge,  
44 eye squeeze, nasolabial furrow, and horizontal mouth stretch were verified as the most valid and  
45 discriminative components of neonatal pain scales [30,31][32]. Using facial EMG in real-time,  
46 we will detect the presence of muscle activity in neonatal pain-associated facial movements [33].  
47 Given the multiple overlapping layers of facial muscles, facial EMGs record signals from a facial  
48 region as opposed to any specific muscle [33]. Previous studies of startle and blinking in infants  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 used miniature silver (Ag/AgCl) periorbital surface electrodes for recording EMGs [34–36]. We  
4  
5 will focus on infant forehead and cheek areas to detect EMG activity associated with brow bulge,  
6  
7 eye squeeze and nasolabial furrow [33]. We will iteratively refine our algorithms by using multi-  
8  
9 modality sensing and developing robust feature extraction and classification frameworks that  
10  
11 address the challenges specific to neonatal/infant pain detection. We will exclude mechanically  
12  
13 ventilated infants due to the challenges associated with identifying facial features (occluded by  
14  
15 securing tape, ventilator tubing or devices) and their need for ongoing sedation/analgesia.  
16  
17

18  
19  
20 **2. Skin Conductance:** Acute pain stimulates the sympathetic post-ganglionic cholinergic neurons  
21  
22 [37], leading to diaphoresis, palmar sweating and increased skin conductance [38]. Eliminating  
23  
24 painful stimuli results in sweat reabsorption and decreased conductivity. The amplitude of  
25  
26 changes in palmar skin conductance reflect increased sympathetic nervous system activity, which  
27  
28 tracks with pain intensity [39–42]. Skin conductance can change with body temperature [43,44],  
29  
30 but not with the ambient temperatures [44]. Specifically, the number of fluctuations of skin  
31  
32 conductance per second (NFSC) was correlated with pain intensity in children [45], and was  
33  
34 more sensitive than pain scores in preterm and term neonates [18,40–42,46]. We will use skin  
35  
36 conductance using the BrainAmp system® (Brain Products GmbH, Gilching, Germany),  
37  
38  
39

40  
41  
42 **3. Electrocardiography (ECG):** Heart rate (HR) changes are components of many pain  
43  
44 assessment scales and recent studies have established correlations between HR variability (HRV)  
45  
46 and pain [47,48]. A number of linear time-domain (HR mean, standard deviation) and frequency-  
47  
48 domain (power spectral density) metrics and non-linear metrics (sample entropy, approximate  
49  
50 entropy, etc.) can detect painful stimuli [47,48]. We will record the infant's ECG before, during,  
51  
52 and after an acute pain event to extract the linear and nonlinear metrics (listed above) from the  
53  
54 ECG signal for further analyses.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59

1  
2  
3 **4. Electroencephalography (EEG):** EEG studies to assess neonatal pain have met with variable  
4  
5 results [49–51]. Opioid analgesia in adults leads to slowing of the EEG, whereas painful stimuli  
6  
7 activate brain regions identified by neuroimaging studies [52] such as the primary sensory cortex  
8  
9 (S1) [53]. EEG amplitudes and frequencies decreased when analgesics were given to newborns in  
10  
11 pain [20,54–56]. Using the BrainAmp EEG system® (Brain Products GmbH, Gilching,  
12  
13 Germany), we will apply 32 active EEG electrodes using the infant-sized ActiCap® (Brain  
14  
15 Products GmbH, Gilching, Germany). Although Hartley et al. have selectively used the vertex  
16  
17 (Cz) lead for neonatal pain studies [20,54], we believe that infant pain processing is widely  
18  
19 distributed across many brain regions and the current evidence is not sufficiently strong enough  
20  
21 to exclude information from other EEG leads. The BrainAmp is similar to other EEG monitors,  
22  
23 however, it uses 32 active electrodes allowing for placement of the ActiCap on the infant's head  
24  
25 with minimal preparation. Each active electrode amplifies the signal recorded from the skin and  
26  
27 records also indicates the impedance of each electrode at the start of the recording to improve the  
28  
29 quality of recorded signals. Over the past 10 years, this device has been used for research  
30  
31 purposes in all age groups including infants and newborns. No side effects were reported from its  
32  
33 use in newborns and small infants.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

41 In order to analyze EEG signals and extract appropriate features, we will first remove noise and  
42  
43 artifacts using standard techniques such as independent component analysis (ICA) and wavelet  
44  
45 denoising [57]. After artifacts are removed, we will investigate the correlation between features  
46  
47 extracted from EEG data and pain. Specifically, we will use spectral decomposition and extract  
48  
49 features such as mean power in different frequency bands (delta, theta, alpha, and beta) as well as  
50  
51 asymmetry measures for each homologous pair and functional connectivity measures for further  
52  
53 investigation.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 **5. Pulse Oximetry (SpO<sub>2</sub>):** Changes in SpO<sub>2</sub> occur frequently following acute pain and,  
4 therefore, have been included in the Premature Infant Pain Profile (PIPP) and other pain scales  
5 [58–60]. Newer generation monitors (Masimo, Irvine, CA) use multi-wavelength technology to  
6 provide more reliable SpO<sub>2</sub> and pulse rate signals, with parallel signal processing engines and  
7 adaptive filters to separate the arterial from venous signals, patient motion, or skin perfusion [61].  
8 Changes in skin blood flow were also used as physiological markers for neonatal pain or  
9 morphine analgesia [62,63]. We will test the utility of the SpO<sub>2</sub> and peripheral perfusion index  
10 provided by pulse oximetry monitors as possible signals for neonatal pain.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

## 23 **Statistical approach**

### 24 **A. Sensor Fusion**

25  
26  
27 We have previously investigated using machine learning to detect pain in neonates using facial  
28 expressions recorded by a camera [64]. We will develop a sensor fusion framework to detect pain  
29 in non-verbal infants based on machine learning to detect pain using multi-modal sensor data.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38 Feasibility of this new framework will be assessed based on its sensitivity and specificity to  
39 detect pain events in infants and further refined into a prototype for validation in future studies.  
40  
41  
42  
43

44 A “calibration” period will be used to establish a baseline for these multiple sensor modalities by  
45 monitoring neonates who are not in pain. The clinical staff at the bedside will identify the pain  
46 state of each neonate/infant using validated pain scales (N-PASS, NFCS and PIPP-R; FLACC,  
47 VAS) and record the timing of pain-inducing clinically-indicated procedures. Our sensor fusion  
48 framework will classify the neonatal/infant responses to infer pain intensity based on observed  
49 changes from baseline. A probabilistic relationship between pain intensity and sensor  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 measurements can be established, where the unknown parameters of the statistical relationships  
4 are identified by a training dataset. The training dataset will also be used to estimate the  
5 importance of each feature, which can then be used to identify the optimal set of sensors [62].  
6  
7  
8  
9

10  
11 Gestational age, postnatal age, and days of life and in hospital will be taken into account in the  
12 statistical analyses. We will initially focus on recruiting term neonates who are studied within 1  
13 week after birth and have minimal exposures to prior painful events. This will increase the  
14 homogeneity of our sample and minimize the variability in physiological responses due to  
15 gestational age, postnatal age, days in the hospital, and long-lasting effects of previous painful  
16 experiences.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

24  
25  
26 Interventions to manage pain will be allowed including non pharmacological and  
27 pharmacological treatments apart from continuous infusions of opioid drugs. This will be  
28 considered in the statistical analysis.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34  
35 Pain intensity scores computed by our sensor fusion framework will be compared with pain  
36 scores measured concurrently by skilled research staff. All sensors (facial EMG, EEG, ECG,  
37 SpO<sub>2</sub>, and SC) will be connected with an event recorder to mark “pain” vs. “no-pain” states. To  
38 make the best use of our data, the sensor fusion framework will use standard cross-validation  
39 methods to establish the generalizability of this framework.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46  
47 The extracted features from each modality will be used to train a machine learning algorithm.  
48 Specifically, we will train a binary classifier to assign “pain” and “no pain” class labels based on  
49 the extracted features. We will specifically investigate using the random forests classifier given  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 their robustness to outliers and its classification performance when a large number of features are  
4 used for classification.  
5  
6

7  
8  
9 Data from patients will be divided to a training set and a test set. The training set is used for  
10 model training and optimization of model parameters. A leave-one-patient-out cross validation  
11 technique will be used, where the machine learning classifier is trained on data from all but one  
12 patient and the performance of the classifier is assessed on the remaining patient. Once the  
13 appropriate machine learning classifier and its associated parameters are selected using the  
14 training set and the associated cross validation procedure, the performance of the machine  
15 learning classifier will be assessed on the test set.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

## 26 **B. Validation and Correlation with Pain Intensity**

27

28  
29 We will compare clinical pain scores from nursing assessments with scores from the sensor  
30 fusion framework. First, we will examine clinical pain scores to verify agreement with the pain  
31 scores assessed by the research staff. Internal consistency will be evaluated by Cronbach's  $\alpha$ ,  
32 with values  $> 0.8$  to show good internal consistency. Second, we will conduct multivariable  
33 linear regressions or generalized estimating equations (GEE) [65,66] to understand the agreement  
34 between the device pain scores and the clinical pain scores, as well as the contribution of each  
35 modality to the device pain scores. We will examine if these associations vary after adjustment  
36 for covariates such as pain medications, age, sex, duration or invasiveness of the procedure. A co-  
37 variance matrix will examine the degree of correlation between individual sensor inputs, types of  
38 procedures, clinician pain scores, and analgesic therapies used during the procedure. Finally, due  
39 to the limited understanding of factors contributing to pain in newborns, linear regression or GEE  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 models will examine the association of the sensor fusion pain scores reported by the device with  
4  
5 the demographic and clinical variables of neonates and infants.  
6  
7

8  
9 Content validity depends on the sensors and sensor variables that we have chosen for the sensor  
10  
11 fusion framework. Concurrent validity will depend on the pain scores of skilled research staff  
12  
13 using validated pain scoring methods. Construct validity will rest on: *i*) the range of objective  
14  
15 pain scores from procedures causing mild, moderate, or severe pain; *ii*) changes in pain scores  
16  
17 with analgesic drugs or non-pharmacological therapies; and *iii*) variation in pain scores over time  
18  
19 consistent with the expected, natural course of acute procedural pain.  
20  
21

22  
23 We will also develop a machine learning algorithm to predict subjective pain. As part of the  
24  
25 validation, we will evaluate the machine learning pain assessment algorithm which has been  
26  
27 trained on clinical classification of pain based on validated pain scales and compare the results  
28  
29 with the results provided by the machine learning pain assessment algorithm which has been  
30  
31 trained on data involving objective pain events (e.g., heel stick).  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

### 37 **ETHICS AND DISSEMINATION**

38  
39  
40  
41 The Institutional Review Board of the Stanford University approved the protocol. This  
42  
43 observational study is registered at [www.ClinicalTrials.gov](http://www.ClinicalTrials.gov) (NCT03330496) and it does not  
44  
45 involve any intervention other than those clinically required. Data collection includes  
46  
47 physiological recordings and medical information. Other than the facial EMG, skin conductance  
48  
49 leads (SC), and 32-channel BrainAmp EEG data acquisition system, all other sensors are used  
50  
51 routinely as the standard of care. All sensors are non-invasive and safe. We will use standard  
52  
53 electrodes which are routinely used for recording vital signs in the hospital (ECG, SpO<sub>2</sub>). All  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59

1  
2  
3 recordings will use sticky pads attached to the skin. Other than a potential for mild skin irritation  
4  
5 from the adhesives used, there are no significant risks associated with these devices, or other  
6  
7 study-related procedures.  
8  
9

10  
11 Since all study subjects are aged less than 6 months, the parent's consent will be obtained for their  
12  
13 child as a research subject. The primary risks to study subjects result from potential loss of  
14  
15 confidentiality from the information collected and from the medical record and monitoring  
16  
17 devices. As described in the consent form, the right to privacy during the consent process, data  
18  
19 collection and study procedures, and protection of personal data will be given the utmost  
20  
21 importance and strict safeguards will be maintained to protect data confidentiality. All  
22  
23 physiological data will be deidentified by the team at Stanford prior to transfer for further  
24  
25 analysis by the team at Autonomous Healthcare.  
26  
27  
28  
29

30  
31 Study findings will be published in peer-reviewed journals and presented at national and  
32  
33 international scientific conferences. Practical use of this methodology will be taught at  
34  
35 conference workshops, or via webinars, podcasts, video tutorials.  
36  
37

38  
39 The sample size calculated for the first step of the study may represent a challenge for machine  
40  
41 learning by limiting samples sizes for the training and testing datasets. Therefore, the results  
42  
43 provided by our analyses will be confirmed in larger sample sizes within the next steps of the  
44  
45 study.  
46  
47

48  
49 Future studies will test the validity of this approach to pain assessments in larger populations of  
50  
51 newborns, older infants and also extend these studies to smaller preterm neonates. Future  
52  
53 applications may also include patient populations incapable of expressing pain (children with  
54  
55 disability, adults with dementia, or mechanically ventilated patients).  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 **Authors' contributions:** JMR, KJS and WMH, BG were responsible for manuscript writing.  
4  
5 JMR, KJS, IM, WMH and BG contributed to the concept, protocol development and study  
6  
7 design. KJS and BG secured funding for the project. JMR, IM and KJS are responsible for  
8  
9 recruitment of study patients. All authors critically revised and approved the manuscript before  
10  
11 submission and are accountable for all aspects of the work.  
12  
13  
14

15  
16 **Competing interests statement:** JMR reports an international mobility scholarship from Chiesi  
17  
18 Pharmaceuticals; WMH and BG have equity ownership in Autonomous Healthcare, Inc.; WMH,  
19  
20 BG and KJSA have proprietary interests in the potential devices that may be developed from  
21  
22 these studies; Some equipments used in this study were provided by Autonomous Healthcare,  
23  
24 Inc.  
25  
26

27  
28 **Funding statement:** This work was supported by the National Institutes of Health, National  
29  
30 Institute of Drug Abuse grant number 1 R41 DA046983-01.  
31  
32  
33

34 **Patient and Public Involvement:** This research was done without patient involvement. Patients  
35  
36 were not invited to comment on the study design and were not consulted to develop patient  
37  
38 relevant outcomes or interpret the results. Patients were not invited to contribute to the writing or  
39  
40 editing of this document for readability or accuracy.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## REFERENCES

- 1 Tortora D, Severino M, Di Biase C, *et al.* Early Pain Exposure Influences Functional Brain Connectivity in Very Preterm Neonates. *Front Neurosci* 2019;**13**:899. doi:10.3389/fnins.2019.00899
- 2 Ranger M, Chau CMY, Garg A, *et al.* Neonatal Pain-Related Stress Predicts Cortical Thickness at Age 7 Years in Children Born Very Preterm. *PLoS One* 2013;**8**:e76702. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0076702
- 3 Vinall J, Grunau RE. Impact of repeated procedural pain-related stress in infants born very preterm. *Pediatr Res* 2014;**75**:584–7. doi:10.1038/pr.2014.16
- 4 Doesburg SM, Chau CM, Cheung TPL, *et al.* Neonatal pain-related stress, functional cortical activity and visual-perceptual abilities in school-age children born at extremely low gestational age. *Pain* 2013;**154**:1946–52. doi:10.1016/j.pain.2013.04.009
- 5 Valeri BO, Holsti L, Linhares MBM. Neonatal pain and developmental outcomes in children born preterm: a systematic review. *Clin J Pain* 2015;**31**:355–62. doi:10.1097/AJP.0000000000000114
- 6 de Graaf J, van Lingen RA, Simons SHP, *et al.* Long-term effects of routine morphine infusion in mechanically ventilated neonates on children’s functioning: five-year follow-up of a randomized controlled trial. *Pain* 2011;**152**:1391–7. doi:10.1016/j.pain.2011.02.017
- 7 Ferguson SA, Ward WL, Paule MG, *et al.* A pilot study of preemptive morphine analgesia in preterm neonates: effects on head circumference, social behavior, and response latencies in early childhood. *Neurotoxicol Teratol* 2012;**34**:47–55. doi:10.1016/j.ntt.2011.10.008
- 8 Bellù R, de Waal K, Zanini R. Opioids for neonates receiving mechanical ventilation: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Arch Dis Child Fetal Neonatal Ed* 2010;**95**:F241-251. doi:10.1136/adc.2008.150318
- 9 Cravero JP, Havidich JE. Pediatric sedation--evolution and revolution. *Paediatr Anaesth* 2011;**21**:800–9. doi:10.1111/j.1460-9592.2011.03617.x
- 10 Lim Y, Godambe S. Prevention and management of procedural pain in the neonate: an update, American Academy of Pediatrics, 2016. *Arch Dis Child Educ Pract Ed* 2017;**102**:254–6. doi:10.1136/archdischild-2016-311066
- 11 Boyle EM, Bradshaw J, Blake KI. Persistent pain in neonates: challenges in assessment without the aid of a clinical tool. *Acta Paediatr* 2018;**107**:63–7. doi:10.1111/apa.14081
- 12 Maxwell LG, Malavolta CP, Fraga MV. Assessment of pain in the neonate. *Clin Perinatol* 2013;**40**:457–69. doi:10.1016/j.clp.2013.05.001
- 13 Slater R, Cantarella A, Franck L, *et al.* How well do clinical pain assessment tools reflect pain in infants? *PLoS Med* 2008;**5**:e129. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.0050129
- 14 van Dijk M, Tibboel D. Update on pain assessment in sick neonates and infants. *Pediatr Clin North Am* 2012;**59**:1167–81. doi:10.1016/j.pcl.2012.07.012
- 15 Fitzgerald M. What do we really know about newborn infant pain? *Exp Physiol* 2015;**100**:1451–7. doi:10.1113/EP085134
- 16 Fitzgerald M, Walker SM. Infant pain management: a developmental neurobiological approach. *Nat Rev Neurol* 2009;**5**:35–50. doi:10.1038/ncpneuro0984
- 17 Storm H. Changes in skin conductance as a tool to monitor nociceptive stimulation and pain. *Curr Opin Anaesthesiol* 2008;**21**:796–804. doi:10.1097/ACO.0b013e3283183fe4
- 18 Gjerstad AC, Wagner K, Henrichsen T, *et al.* Skin Conductance Versus the Modified COMFORT Sedation Score as a Measure of Discomfort in Artificially Ventilated Children. *Pediatrics* 2008;**122**:e848–53. doi:10.1542/peds.2007-2545

- 19 Faye PM, De Jonckheere J, Logier R, *et al.* Newborn Infant Pain Assessment Using Heart Rate Variability Analysis: *The Clinical Journal of Pain* 2010;**26**:777–82. doi:10.1097/AJP.0b013e3181ed1058
- 20 Hartley C, Duff EP, Green G, *et al.* Nociceptive brain activity as a measure of analgesic efficacy in infants. *Sci Transl Med* 2017;**9**. doi:10.1126/scitranslmed.aah6122
- 21 Maxwell LG, Fraga MV, Malavolta CP. Assessment of Pain in the Newborn. *Clinics in Perinatology* 2019;**46**:693–707. doi:10.1016/j.clp.2019.08.005
- 22 Boyle EM, Freer Y, Wong CM, *et al.* Assessment of persistent pain or distress and adequacy of analgesia in preterm ventilated infants. *Pain* 2006;**124**:87–91. doi:10.1016/j.pain.2006.03.019
- 23 Serpa ABM, Guinsburg R, Balda R de CX, *et al.* Multidimensional pain assessment of preterm newborns at the 1st, 3rd and 7th days of life. *Sao Paulo Med J* 2007;**125**:29–33. doi:10.1590/s1516-31802007000100006
- 24 Pereira AL de ST, Guinsburg R, Almeida MFB de, *et al.* Validity of behavioral and physiologic parameters for acute pain assessment of term newborn infants. *Sao Paulo Med J* 1999;**117**:72–80. doi:10.1590/S1516-31801999000200005
- 25 Manworren RCB, Hynan LS. Clinical validation of FLACC: preverbal patient pain scale. *Pediatr Nurs* 2003;**29**:140–6.
- 26 Gibbins S, Stevens BJ, Yamada J, *et al.* Validation of the Premature Infant Pain Profile-Revised (PIPP-R). *Early Human Development* 2014;**90**:189–93. doi:10.1016/j.earlhumdev.2014.01.005
- 27 Grunau RE, Oberlander T, Holsti L, *et al.* Bedside application of the Neonatal Facial Coding System in pain assessment of premature neonates. *Pain* 1998;**76**:277–86. doi:10.1016/s0304-3959(98)00046-3
- 28 Hummel P, Puchalski M, Creech SD, *et al.* Clinical reliability and validity of the N-PASS: neonatal pain, agitation and sedation scale with prolonged pain. *J Perinatol* 2008;**28**:55–60. doi:10.1038/sj.jp.7211861
- 29 Hatfield LA, Ely EA. Measurement of acute pain in infants: a review of behavioral and physiological variables. *Biol Res Nurs* 2015;**17**:100–11. doi:10.1177/1099800414531448
- 30 Grunau RV, Craig KD. Pain expression in neonates: facial action and cry. *Pain* 1987;**28**:395–410. doi:10.1016/0304-3959(87)90073-x
- 31 Craig KD, Whitfield MF, Grunau RV, *et al.* Pain in the preterm neonate: behavioural and physiological indices. *Pain* 1993;**52**:287–99. doi:10.1016/0304-3959(93)90162-i
- 32 Willis MHW, Merkel SI, Voepel-Lewis T, *et al.* FLACC Behavioral Pain Assessment Scale: a comparison with the child's self-report. *Pediatr Nurs* 2003;**29**:195–8.
- 33 Cohn J, Ekman P. Measuring facial action by manual coding, facial EMG, and automatic facial image analysis. In: *Handbook of nonverbal behavior research methods in the affective sciences*. J. A. Harrigan RR, K. Scherer (editors). New York, NY: Oxford University Press USA; 2005:9Y64.
- 34 Balaban MT, Anthony BJ, Graham FK. Prestimulation effects on blink and cardiac reflexes of 15-month human infants. *Dev Psychobiol* 1989;**22**:115–27. doi:10.1002/dev.420220203
- 35 Schmidt LA, Fox NA. Fear-potentiated startle responses in temperamentally different human infants. *Dev Psychobiol* 1998;**32**:113–20.
- 36 Schmidt LA, Fox NA, Long JM. Acoustic startle electromyographic (EMG) Activity indexed from an electroculographic (EOG) Electrode placement: A methodological note. *International Journal of Neuroscience* 1998;**93**:185–8. doi:10.3109/00207459808986423

- 1  
2  
3 37 Storm H. The development of a software program for analyzing skin conductance changes  
4 in preterm infants. *Clin Neurophysiol* 2001;**112**:1562–8. doi:10.1016/s1388-2457(01)00573-9  
5  
6 38 van Dooren M, de Vries JJGG-J, Janssen JH. Emotional sweating across the body:  
7 comparing 16 different skin conductance measurement locations. *Physiol Behav* 2012;**106**:298–  
8 304. doi:10.1016/j.physbeh.2012.01.020  
9  
10 39 Hellerud BC, Storm H. Skin conductance and behaviour during sensory stimulation of  
11 preterm and term infants. *Early Hum Dev* 2002;**70**:35–46. doi:10.1016/s0378-3782(02)00070-1  
12  
13 40 Pereira-da-Silva L, Virella D, Monteiro I, *et al*. Skin conductance indices discriminate  
14 nociceptive responses to acute stimuli from different heel prick procedures in infants. *J Matern*  
15 *Fetal Neonatal Med* 2012;**25**:796–801. doi:10.3109/14767058.2011.587919  
16  
17 41 Harrison D, Boyce S, Loughnan P, *et al*. Skin conductance as a measure of pain and stress  
18 in hospitalised infants. *Early Hum Dev* 2006;**82**:603–8. doi:10.1016/j.earlhumdev.2005.12.008  
19  
20 42 Eriksson M, Storm H, Fremming A, *et al*. Skin conductance compared to a combined  
21 behavioural and physiological pain measure in newborn infants. *Acta Paediatr* 2008;**97**:27–30.  
22 doi:10.1111/j.1651-2227.2007.00586.x  
23  
24 43 Hoffman K, Bromster T, Hakansson S, *et al*. Monitoring of pain and stress in an infant  
25 with asphyxia during induced hypothermia: a case report. *Adv Neonatal Care* 2013;**13**:252–61.  
26 doi:10.1097/ANC.0b013e31829d8baf  
27  
28 44 Valkenburg AJ, Niehof SP, van Dijk M, *et al*. Skin conductance peaks could result from  
29 changes in vital parameters unrelated to pain. *Pediatr Res* 2012;**71**:375–9.  
30 doi:10.1038/pr.2011.72  
31  
32 45 Hullett B, Chambers N, Preuss J, *et al*. Monitoring electrical skin conductance: a tool for  
33 the assessment of postoperative pain in children? *Anesthesiology* 2009;**111**:513–7.  
34 doi:10.1097/ALN.0b013e3181b27c18  
35  
36 46 Munsters J, Wallström L, Ågren J, *et al*. Skin conductance measurements as pain  
37 assessment in newborn infants born at 22–27 weeks gestational age at different postnatal age.  
38 *Early Human Development* 2012;**88**:21–6. doi:10.1016/j.earlhumdev.2011.06.010  
39  
40 47 Toweil DL, Kovarik WD, Carr R, *et al*. Linear and nonlinear analysis of heart rate  
41 variability during propofol anesthesia for short-duration procedures in children. *Pediatr Crit Care*  
42 *Med* 2003;**4**:308–14. doi:10.1097/01.PCC.0000074260.93430.6A  
43  
44 48 Weissman A, Zimmer EZ, Aranovitch M, *et al*. Heart rate dynamics during acute pain in  
45 newborns. *Pflugers Arch* 2012;**464**:593–9. doi:10.1007/s00424-012-1168-x  
46  
47 49 Fabrizi L, Slater R, Worley A, *et al*. A shift in sensory processing that enables the  
48 developing human brain to discriminate touch from pain. *Curr Biol* 2011;**21**:1552–8.  
49 doi:10.1016/j.cub.2011.08.010  
50  
51 50 Fabrizi L, Worley A, Patten D, *et al*. Electrophysiological measurements and analysis of  
52 nociception in human infants. *J Vis Exp* Published Online First: 20 December 2011.  
53 doi:10.3791/3118  
54  
55 51 Norman E, Rosén I, Vanhatalo S, *et al*. Electroencephalographic response to procedural  
56 pain in healthy term newborn infants. *Pediatr Res* 2008;**64**:429–34.  
57 doi:10.1203/PDR.0b013e3181825487  
58  
59 52 Prichep LS, John ER, Howard B, *et al*. Evaluation of the pain matrix using EEG source  
60 localization: a feasibility study. *Pain Med* 2011;**12**:1241–8. doi:10.1111/j.1526-  
4637.2011.01191.x  
61  
62 53 Gross J, Schnitzler A, Timmermann L, *et al*. Gamma oscillations in human primary  
63 somatosensory cortex reflect pain perception. *PLoS Biol* 2007;**5**:e133.  
64 doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.0050133

- 1  
2  
3 54 Hartley C, Goksan S, Poorun R, *et al.* The relationship between nociceptive brain activity,  
4 spinal reflex withdrawal and behaviour in newborn infants. *Sci Rep* 2015;**5**:12519.  
5 doi:10.1038/srep12519  
6  
7 55 Nguyen The Tich S, Vecchierini M-F, Debillon T, *et al.* Effects of sufentanil on  
8 electroencephalogram in very and extremely preterm neonates. *Pediatrics* 2003;**111**:123–8.  
9 doi:10.1542/peds.111.1.123  
10  
11 56 Bernet V, Latal B, Natalucci G, *et al.* Effect of sedation and analgesia on postoperative  
12 amplitude-integrated EEG in newborn cardiac patients. *Pediatr Res* 2010;**67**:650–5.  
13 doi:10.1203/PDR.0b013e3181da44ba  
14  
15 57 Jiang X, Bian G-B, Tian Z. Removal of Artifacts from EEG Signals: A Review. *Sensors*  
16 2019;**19**:987. doi:10.3390/s19050987  
17  
18 58 de Oliveira MVM, de Jesus J a. L, Tristao RM. Psychophysical parameters of a  
19 multidimensional pain scale in newborns. *Physiol Meas* 2012;**33**:39–49. doi:10.1088/0967-  
20 3334/33/1/39  
21  
22 59 Serpa ABM, Guinsburg R, Balda R de CX, *et al.* Multidimensional pain assessment of  
23 preterm newborns at the 1st, 3rd and 7th days of life. *Sao Paulo Med J* 2007;**125**:29–33.  
24 doi:10.1590/s1516-31802007000100006  
25  
26 60 Stevens B, Johnston C, Petryshen P, *et al.* Premature Infant Pain Profile: development and  
27 initial validation. *Clin J Pain* 1996;**12**:13–22. doi:10.1097/00002508-199603000-00004  
28  
29 61 Hay WW, Rodden DJ, Collins SM, *et al.* Reliability of conventional and new pulse  
30 oximetry in neonatal patients. *J Perinatol* 2002;**22**:360–6. doi:10.1038/sj.jp.7210740  
31  
32 62 Moustogiannis AN, Raju TN, Roohey T, *et al.* Intravenous morphine attenuates pain  
33 induced changes in skin blood flow in newborn infants. *Neurol Res* 1996;**18**:440–4.  
34 doi:10.1080/01616412.1996.11740448  
35  
36 63 McCulloch KM, Ji SA, Raju TN. Skin blood flow changes during routine nursery  
37 procedures. *Early Hum Dev* 1995;**41**:147–56. doi:10.1016/0378-3782(95)01617-c  
38  
39 64 Gholami B, Haddad WM, Tannenbaum AR. Relevance vector machine learning for  
40 neonate pain intensity assessment using digital imaging. *IEEE Trans Biomed Eng* 2010;**57**:1457–  
41 66. doi:10.1109/TBME.2009.2039214  
42  
43 65 Pepe MS, Heagerty P, Whitaker R. Prediction using partly conditional time-varying  
44 coefficients regression models. *Biometrics* 1999;**55**:944–50. doi:10.1111/j.0006-  
45 341x.1999.00944.x  
46  
47 66 Leung DHY, Wang Y-G, Zhu M. Efficient parameter estimation in longitudinal data  
48 analysis using a hybrid GEE method. *Biostatistics* 2009;**10**:436–45.  
49 doi:10.1093/biostatistics/kxp002  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

# BMJ Open

## Using sensor-fusion and machine-learning algorithms to assess acute pain in nonverbal infants: a study protocol

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2020-039292.R3
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	17-Dec-2020
Complete List of Authors:	Roué, Jean-Michel; CHRU de Brest, Neonatal & Pediatric Intensive Care Unit, Brest University Hospital; Université de Brest, Faculté de Médecine et des Sciences de la Santé, EA 4685 LIEN, University of Western Brittany, Brest Morag, Iris; Tel Aviv University Sackler Faculty of Medicine, Shamir Medical Center (Assaf Harofeh), Neonatal Intensive Care Unit Haddad, Wassim H.; Georgia Institute of Technology, School of Aerospace Engineering Gholami, Behnood; Autonomous Healthcare, Inc., Hoboken, NJ, USA Anand, Kanwaljeet J. S.; Stanford University School of Medicine
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b>:	Paediatrics
Secondary Subject Heading:	Intensive care
Keywords:	NEONATOLOGY, PAIN MANAGEMENT, PAEDIATRICS

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our [licence](#).

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which [Creative Commons](#) licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

1  
2  
3 **Title:** Using sensor-fusion and machine-learning algorithms to assess acute pain in nonverbal  
4 infants: a study protocol  
5

6  
7 Roué JM,<sup>1</sup> Morag I,<sup>2</sup> Haddad WM,<sup>3</sup> Gholami B,<sup>4</sup> Anand KJS<sup>5</sup>  
8  
9

10  
11 <sup>1</sup> Neonatal & Pediatric Intensive Care Unit, Brest University Hospital, University of Western  
12 Brittany, Brest, France  
13

14  
15 <sup>2</sup> Shamir Medical Center (Assaf Harofeh), Neonatal Intensive Care Unit, Sackler School of  
16 Medicine, Tel Aviv University, Israel  
17

18  
19 <sup>3</sup> School of Aerospace Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA  
20

21  
22 <sup>4</sup> Autonomous Healthcare, Inc., Hoboken, NJ, USA  
23

24  
25 <sup>5</sup> Professor of Pediatrics, Anesthesiology, Perioperative & Pain Medicine, Stanford University  
26 School of Medicine  
27

28  
29  
30  
31  
32 **Corresponding author:**  
33

34 Jean-Michel Roué,  
35

36 Neonatal & Pediatric Intensive Care Unit, Brest University Hospital, 2 Avenue Foch, 29200,  
37 Brest, France  
38

39  
40  
41 Email: jean-michel.roue@chu-brest.fr  
42

43  
44 Phone: + 33 2 98 22 36 67, Fax: + 33 2 98 22 37 67  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 **Word count:** 3733 out of 4000  
4

5 **ABSTRACT** 288 words out of 300  
6

7 **Introduction:**  
8

9  
10 Objective pain assessment in non-verbal populations is clinically challenging due to their  
11 inability to express their pain via self-report. Repetitive exposures to acute or prolonged pain  
12 lead to clinical instability, with long-term behavioral and cognitive sequelae in newborn infants.  
13  
14 Strong analgesics are also associated with medical complications, potential neurotoxicity and  
15 altered brain development. Pain scores performed by bedside nurses provide subjective, observer-  
16 dependent assessments rather than objective data for infant pain management; the required  
17 observations are labour-intensive, difficult to perform by a nurse who is concurrently performing  
18 the procedure, and increase the nursing workload. Multimodal pain assessment, using sensor  
19 fusion and machine learning algorithms, can provide a patient-centered, context-dependent,  
20 observer-independent, and objective pain measure.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33 **Methods and analysis:**  
34

35 In newborns undergoing painful procedures, we use facial electromyography (EMG) to record  
36 facial muscle activity related infant pain, electrocardiography (ECG) to examine heart rate (HR)  
37 changes and HR variability (HRV), electrodermal activity (skin conductance) to measure  
38 catecholamine-induced palmar sweating, changes in oxygen saturations and skin perfusion, and  
39 electroencephalography (EEG) using active electrodes to assess brain activity in real-time. This  
40 multimodal approach has the potential to improve the accuracy of pain assessment in non-verbal  
41 infants and may even allow continuous pain monitoring at the bedside. The feasibility of this  
42 approach will be evaluated in an observational prospective study of clinically required painful  
43 procedures in 60 preterm and term newborns, and infants aged 6 months or less.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54

55 **Ethics and dissemination:**  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 The Institutional Review Board of the Stanford University approved the protocol. Study findings  
4 will be published in peer-reviewed journals, presented at scientific meetings, taught via webinars,  
5  
6 podcasts, video tutorials, and listed on academic/scientific websites. Future studies will validate  
7  
8 and refine this approach using the minimum number of sensors required to assess neonatal/infant  
9  
10  
11  
12 pain.  
13  
14  
15  
16

17 **Registration number:** ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT03330496  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## **An Article Summary:**

### **‘Strengths and limitations of this study’**

- An innovative and objective approach for continuous pain monitoring in infants including term and preterm neonates is described.
- To discriminate between noxious and non-noxious events, we use sensor fusion and machine-learning algorithms.
- Multimodal assessments may be more sensitive and specific for identifying pain and quantifying its intensity than the subjective assessments currently used in pain scales.
- Accurate, objective pain assessments may help reduce infant pain and suffering, enhance recovery, avoid untreated pain vs. analgesic overuse, and allow evaluation of newer analgesics or other therapies in randomized clinical trials.
- Multiple sensors are used for the first step of this study, but recording artifacts may require data corrections and sensor variability may generate a need for recruiting more patients.

## INTRODUCTION

Being non-verbal, hospitalized infants are particularly vulnerable to inadequate pain management. Repetitive pain in newborns leads to short- and long-term neurodevelopmental consequences including behavioral and cognitive sequelae [1][2–5]. Conversely, the safety and efficacy of some analgesics in neonates and their negative consequences on the neonatal brain have raised concerns [6][7][8][9]. Objectively assessing the pain responses in infants is thus necessary to assess the efficacy of analgesics in infants in order to avoid over treatment but also undertreatment and the consequences of repetitive pain exposure.

Composite pain scales including behavioral and physiological measures are the most widely used surrogate measures of infant pain and are currently recommended for the clinical practice [10]. However, they provide a one-time measurement and their use can be challenging for the bedside staff leading to low interrater reliability, with over- or underestimation of infant pain [11][12]. Depending on the context, behaviors or physiological responses may mirror non-noxious stimuli, leading to misinterpretation and a lack of specificity in subjective pain scales [13][14][15].

Pain from clinically required invasive procedures leads to well-described neurophysiological responses in term and preterm infants [15]. These responses imply that the central, peripheral, and autonomic nervous systems can be monitored using various behavioral and physiologic modalities [16][17,18][19]. Since pain is a complex process, multimodal measurement may improve the accuracy of pain assessment, also suggested by studies reporting the presence of pain-evoked potentials in some neonates showing no facial expressions of pain or others pointing out different profiles of pain responses [13][20].

Thus, developing new methods to assess the responses to pain in infants deserves a high priority. Multimodal measurements that provide an objective estimate of real-time and continuous pain

1  
2  
3 monitoring at the bedside will avoid the subjective bias and limitations associated with clinical  
4 pain scales, especially when behavioral assessment is limited by the medical conditions [21].  
5

6  
7 Our study protocol was designed to develop a multimodal pain assessment system, using sensor  
8 fusion and novel machine learning algorithms to provide an objective estimate of acute pain  
9 intensity in infants that is patient-centered, context-dependent, and observer-independent.  
10  
11  
12  
13

## 14 15 16 **METHODS AND ANALYSIS**

### 17 18 **Study design**

19  
20 We designed a prospective observational study enrolling subjects from Lucile Packard Children's  
21 Hospital at Stanford. The study is registered at [www.ClinicalTrials.gov](http://www.ClinicalTrials.gov) (NCT03330496) and it  
22 does not involve any intervention other than those clinically required. The study started on  
23 October 30<sup>th</sup>, 2017 and will be completed on November 30<sup>th</sup>, 2025.  
24  
25  
26  
27

### 28 29 **Study population**

30 We will collect data from 15 study subjects in each of the following age groups: 1) Preterm  
31 infants (34-37 weeks of corrected gestational age, postnatal age 3-30 days); 2) Term newborns  
32 (37-42 weeks of corrected gestational age, less than 1 month of age); 3) Infants from 1-3 months  
33 age; 4) Older infants from 3-6 months age.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

### 41 42 **Eligibility criteria**

43 After obtaining parental consent, we will include all infants less than 6 months of corrected  
44 chronological age requiring an acute painful procedure for routine clinical care in Lucile Packard  
45 Children's Hospital.  
46  
47  
48  
49

50  
51  
52 We will exclude newborns with birth trauma, intrapartum asphyxia (5-minute Apgar Score <4 or  
53 cord pH < 7.01), fetal growth restriction (birth weight < 5<sup>th</sup> percentile for gestation), congenital  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59

1  
2  
3 anomalies or metabolic disorders, or any kind of brain injury; if their mothers had a history of  
4 heavy smoking or drug abuse (alcohol, cocaine, ketamine, and heroin/other opiates) or  
5 psychiatric drugs used during this pregnancy; infants requiring positive pressure ventilation using  
6 a face mask (BiPAP) or endotracheal tube; those receiving continuous infusions of opioid drugs  
7 (morphine, fentanyl, and others) and nerve blocks or neuraxial analgesia affecting the site of the  
8 invasive procedure in the 24 hours prior to study entry; infants with facial anomalies (cleft lip),  
9 injuries or other pathologies affecting the facial area; and infants breastfed to alleviate pain  
10 during the painful procedure.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

## 24 **Objectives/Outcomes**

### 25 *Primary Objective:*

26  
27  
28 Our primary objective is to identify the specific signals and patterns from each sensor that  
29 correlate with the pain stimulus. This pilot study is designed to exclusively assess acute pain  
30 responses during routine, clinically-required skin-breaking procedures – it measures the intensity  
31 of acute pain from the physiological responses of each subject.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

### 37 *Primary Outcome:*

38  
39 We will extract pain-related information using non-invasive multimodal sensors. Specific  
40 features of the physiological/behavioral indicators of infant pain will require unique processing  
41 algorithms. We will record pain signals using facial electromyography (EMG),  
42 electrocardiography (ECG), electrodermal activity (skin conductance), oxygen saturation (SpO<sub>2</sub>),  
43 and electroencephalography (EEG) in real-time. Dedicated algorithms for each sensor will extract  
44 pain-related information such as facial grimacing or heart rate variability. The reliability and  
45 validity of these algorithms will be tested prospectively on data from preterm and term neonates,  
46 and 1-6 month-old infants experiencing acute pain during invasive procedures.  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 ***Secondary Objectives:***  
4

5 We aim to identify if multiple sensors will provide overlapping information, which a sensor  
6 fusion framework can integrate to identify “pain” and “no pain” related features. These features  
7 will be used to train machine learning algorithms that will finally provide reliable, objective  
8 assessments of pain intensity in real-time.  
9

10 We will also study if the pain intensity measured by the sensor fusion framework will show  
11 clinical validity, inter-rater reliability, as well as responsiveness to pain relief using analgesic  
12 drugs or non- pharmacological therapies. However, no interventions are planned in this study.  
13  
14

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22 ***Secondary outcomes:***  
23

24 We will develop a sensor fusion framework designed to integrate data from different sensor  
25 modalities. No single sensor is capable of measuring neonatal pain. Rather, skilled clinicians  
26 draw upon multiple sources of information to estimate pain. A machine learning algorithm will  
27 be developed to test if the sensor fusion framework (i) can “calibrate” itself to the unique  
28 physiology of each newborn, (ii) handle missing (e.g. sensor failure) or unreliable data (e.g.  
29 movement artifact), and (iii) determine specific features from each modality to reach asymptotic  
30 levels of sensitivity and specificity. We hypothesize that this automated sensor fusion approach  
31 will be able to estimate neonatal pain intensity with greater specificity and sensitivity than the  
32 pain scales clinically used at the bedside.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46  
47 To assess the reliability and validity of the pain intensity measured by the sensor fusion  
48 framework, we will compare the objective pain measure with the pain scores assessed by skilled  
49 research staff. Variations in the objective pain scores before and after the clinical use of analgesic  
50 therapies will also be assessed to explore whether this device can also identify pain relief [22].  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### Sample size calculations

We assume an  $\alpha$ -error =0.05,  $1-\beta$  error =0.8, and a mean:SD ratio of 2:1 for clinical and sensor-based pain scores (based on prior studies of clinical assessments of procedural pain in infants) [23,24]. Based on these assumptions, to detect a slope that corresponds to a 0.5-unit change in the outcome (e.g., sensor pain score) per 1-unit change in the predictor (e.g., clinical pain score) we will require a minimum of 40 infants in the *training dataset*. For a binary predictor with 25% or 50% prevalence (e.g., mild vs. moderate pain, or male vs. female neonate), with this sample size, we will be able to detect a 0.7 or 0.8-unit change in the outcome, respectively. Given the number of sensors used for the first step of this study, some artifacts may occur requiring data corrections or greater variability, with a need for recruiting more patients. We plan to recruit 60 patients in this study.

The sample size calculated for the first step of the study may represent a challenge for machine learning by limiting samples sizes for the training and testing datasets. Therefore, the results provided by our analyses will be confirmed in larger sample sizes within the next steps of the study.

### Interventions/Experimental design

After applying inclusion/exclusion criteria and parental consent, infants' medical data will be recorded including: date of birth, perinatal/medical history, birth weight, gestational age, Apgar scores, congenital anomalies, metabolic defects, other diagnoses, previous surgeries, recent labs, prior imaging, major physical findings, number and types of painful procedures, and all medications used in the 24 hours immediately preceding the study. We will document the type of



1  
2  
3 procedure, time of day, its location and duration, number of attempts and behavioral state of the  
4  
5 infant before and after the procedure.  
6  
7

8  
9 Prior to a clinically-indicated procedure such as a heel stick, subcutaneous or intramuscular  
10  
11 injections (vaccine, drug shot), we will attach skin conductance (SC) leads to measure galvanic  
12  
13 skin responses either on a hand palm or foot sole, and electromyography (EMG) to record facial  
14  
15 muscle activity from cheek and forehead, and directly obtain recordings from clinical monitors  
16  
17 (electrocardiography (ECG) and oxygen saturation (SpO<sub>2</sub>)). In addition, the infant will wear a  
18  
19 cap with Electroencephalography (EEG) leads. For study procedures, research staff will clinically  
20  
21 assess pain using the Neonatal Pain & Sedation Scale (N-PASS) before and after the procedure,  
22  
23 the Premature Infant Pain Profile-Revised (PIPP-R) and the Neonatal Facial Coding System  
24  
25 (NFCS) during the procedure. For older patients, the FLACC (Face, Legs, Activity, Cry,  
26  
27 Consolability) scale or Visual Analogue Scale (VAS) will be scored to assess pain during the  
28  
29 procedure [25,26][27][28]. Physiological and audio recordings will start 10-30 minutes before a  
30  
31 planned procedure and continue for up to 20-30 minutes after the procedure.  
32  
33  
34  
35

36  
37 All sensors will be monitored and displayed on the same laptop. We will use the Brain Vision  
38  
39 software to display and record EEG, EMG and skin conductance responses and the  
40  
41 MediCollector software for ECG and SpO<sub>2</sub>. The recording time of the 2 softwares will be  
42  
43 synchronised based on the laptop digital clock. The event marker will be triggered by the  
44  
45 researcher using a dedicated function of the Brain Vision software to time-lock and record times  
46  
47 of noxious and non-noxious events for all sensors (Brain Vision and MediCollector).  
48  
49  
50

51  
52 At the completion of recording, all the above sensors will be disconnected from each patient and  
53  
54 study procedures will be terminated. The entire study will last approximately 30-60 minutes;  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59

1  
2  
3 however the study may be stopped earlier if any infant shows signs of distress or if a bedside  
4 nurse or parent has any concerns.  
5  
6

7  
8  
9 Data collection includes physiological recordings and medical information. Other than the facial  
10 EMG, skin conductance leads (SC), and 32-channel BrainAmp EEG data acquisition system, all  
11 other sensors are used routinely as the standard of care. All sensors are non-invasive and safe. We  
12 will use standard electrodes which are routinely used for recording vital signs in the hospital  
13 (ECG, SpO<sub>2</sub>). All recordings will use sticky pads attached to the skin. Other than a potential for  
14 mild skin irritation from the adhesives used, there are no significant risks associated with these  
15 devices, or other study-related procedures.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

## 24 25 26 **Data analysis**

### 27 28 29 **A. Signal-Filtering and Information Extraction from Sensors**

30  
31  
32  
33 For each sensing modality, we will develop a software algorithm to process signals recorded by  
34 sensors and extract the clinically relevant information related to pain. Proof-of-concept  
35 algorithms will be tested using the collected dataset. The feasibility of each sensing modality will  
36 be based on: *i*) sensitivity and specificity of detecting clinically relevant pain-related changes,  
37 and *ii*) robustness of sensor readings in the presence of non-pain related disturbances (e.g.,  
38 movement artifact).  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46  
47  
48 In order to address artifacts due to movement or suboptimal electrode-skin contact, we will  
49 initially use filtering techniques (e.g., to remove power line interference). In addition, we will  
50 identify channels exhibiting artifacts by considering the range of signal values, where signals  
51 showing extreme deviation from average values or channels showing virtually zero activity will  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 be excluded. Specifically for EEG analysis, we will identify and remove EMG-related artifacts  
4 using well-established techniques such as filtering and independent component analysis.  
5

6  
7 Windows of different lengths will be used for the analysis. Specifically, for ECG, SpO<sub>2</sub>, EMG,  
8 and skin conductance signals an analysis window of 1-5 minutes will be used to extract  
9 appropriate features. The window lengths ranging from 400ms to 5 seconds will be used for EEG  
10 signals.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15

16  
17  
18 **1. Pain Behaviors:** Newborn behaviors (e.g., facial expressions, body movements) are accepted  
19 as the most sensitive and valid indicators of pain [29][13]. Facial expressions like brow bulge,  
20 eye squeeze, nasolabial furrow, and horizontal mouth stretch were verified as the most valid and  
21 discriminative components of neonatal pain scales [30,31][32]. Using facial EMG in real-time,  
22 we will detect the presence of muscle activity in neonatal pain-associated facial movements [33].  
23 Given the multiple overlapping layers of facial muscles, facial EMGs record signals from a facial  
24 region as opposed to any specific muscle [33]. Previous studies of startle and blinking in infants  
25 used miniature silver (Ag/AgCl) periorbital surface electrodes for recording EMGs [34–36]. We  
26 will focus on infant forehead and cheek areas to detect EMG activity associated with brow bulge,  
27 eye squeeze and nasolabial furrow [33]. We will iteratively refine our algorithms by using multi-  
28 modality sensing and developing robust feature extraction and classification frameworks that  
29 address the challenges specific to neonatal/infant pain detection. We will exclude mechanically  
30 ventilated infants due to the challenges associated with identifying facial features (occluded by  
31 securing tape, ventilator tubing or devices) and their need for ongoing sedation/analgesia.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50  
51 **2. Skin Conductance:** Acute pain stimulates the sympathetic post-ganglionic cholinergic neurons  
52 [37], leading to diaphoresis, palmar sweating and increased skin conductance [38]. Eliminating  
53 painful stimuli results in sweat reabsorption and decreased conductivity. The amplitude of  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59

1  
2  
3 changes in palmar skin conductance reflect increased sympathetic nervous system activity, which  
4 tracks with pain intensity [39–42]. Skin conductance can change with body temperature [43,44],  
5 but not with the ambient temperatures [44]. Specifically, the number of fluctuations of skin  
6 conductance per second (NFSC) was correlated with pain intensity in children [45], and was  
7 more sensitive than pain scores in preterm and term neonates [18,40–42,46]. We will use skin  
8 conductance using the BrainAmp system® (Brain Products GmbH, Gilching, Germany),  
9

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18 **3. Electrocardiography (ECG):** Heart rate (HR) changes are components of many pain  
19 assessment scales and recent studies have established correlations between HR variability (HRV)  
20 and pain [47,48]. A number of linear time-domain (HR mean, standard deviation) and frequency-  
21 domain (power spectral density) metrics and non-linear metrics (sample entropy, approximate  
22 entropy, etc.) can detect painful stimuli [47,48]. We will record the infant's ECG before, during,  
23 and after an acute pain event to extract the linear and nonlinear metrics (listed above) from the  
24 ECG signal for further analyses.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34  
35 **4. Electroencephalography (EEG):** EEG studies to assess neonatal pain have met with variable  
36 results [49–51]. Opioid analgesia in adults leads to slowing of the EEG, whereas painful stimuli  
37 activate brain regions identified by neuroimaging studies [52] such as the primary sensory cortex  
38 (S1) [53]. EEG amplitudes and frequencies decreased when analgesics were given to newborns in  
39 pain [20,54–56]. Using the BrainAmp EEG system® (Brain Products GmbH, Gilching,  
40 Germany), we will apply 32 active EEG electrodes using the infant-sized ActiCap® (Brain  
41 Products GmbH, Gilching, Germany). Although Hartley et al. have selectively used the vertex  
42 (Cz) lead for neonatal pain studies [20,54], we believe that infant pain processing is widely  
43 distributed across many brain regions and the current evidence is not sufficiently strong enough  
44 to exclude information from other EEG leads. The BrainAmp is similar to other EEG monitors,  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 however, it uses 32 active electrodes allowing for placement of the ActiCap on the infant's head  
4  
5 with minimal preparation. Each active electrode amplifies the signal recorded from the skin and  
6  
7 records also indicates the impedance of each electrode at the start of the recording to improve the  
8  
9 quality of recorded signals. Over the past 10 years, this device has been used for research  
10  
11 purposes in all age groups including infants and newborns. No side effects were reported from its  
12  
13 use in newborns and small infants.  
14  
15

16  
17  
18 In order to analyze EEG signals and extract appropriate features, we will first remove noise and  
19  
20 artifacts using standard techniques such as independent component analysis (ICA) and wavelet  
21  
22 denoising [57]. After artifacts are removed, we will investigate the correlation between features  
23  
24 extracted from EEG data and pain. Specifically, we will use spectral decomposition and extract  
25  
26 features such as mean power in different frequency bands (delta, theta, alpha, and beta) as well as  
27  
28 asymmetry measures for each homologous pair and functional connectivity measures for further  
29  
30 investigation.  
31  
32  
33  
34

35 **5. Pulse Oximetry (SpO<sub>2</sub>):** Changes in SpO<sub>2</sub> occur frequently following acute pain and,  
36  
37 therefore, have been included in the Premature Infant Pain Profile (PIPP) and other pain scales  
38  
39 [58–60]. Newer generation monitors (Masimo, Irvine, CA) use multi-wavelength technology to  
40  
41 provide more reliable SpO<sub>2</sub> and pulse rate signals, with parallel signal processing engines and  
42  
43 adaptive filters to separate the arterial from venous signals, patient motion, or skin perfusion [61].  
44  
45 Changes in skin blood flow were also used as physiological markers for neonatal pain or  
46  
47 morphine analgesia [62,63]. We will test the utility of the SpO<sub>2</sub> and peripheral perfusion index  
48  
49 provided by pulse oximetry monitors as possible signals for neonatal pain.  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54

## 55 **Statistical approach**

56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### A. Sensor Fusion

We have previously investigated using machine learning to detect pain in neonates using facial expressions recorded by a camera [64]. We will develop a sensor fusion framework to detect pain in non-verbal infants based on machine learning to detect pain using multi-modal sensor data.

Feasibility of this new framework will be assessed based on its sensitivity and specificity to detect pain events in infants and further refined into a prototype for validation in future studies.

A “calibration” period will be used to establish a baseline for these multiple sensor modalities by monitoring neonates who are not in pain. The clinical staff at the bedside will identify the pain state of each neonate/infant using validated pain scales (N-PASS, NFCS and PIPP-R; FLACC, VAS) and record the timing of pain-inducing clinically-indicated procedures. Our sensor fusion framework will classify the neonatal/infant responses to infer pain intensity based on observed changes from baseline. A probabilistic relationship between pain intensity and sensor measurements can be established, where the unknown parameters of the statistical relationships are identified by a training dataset. The training dataset will also be used to estimate the importance of each feature, which can then be used to identify the optimal set of sensors [62].

Gestational age, postnatal age, and days of life and in hospital will be taken into account in the statistical analyses. We will initially focus on recruiting term neonates who are studied within 1 week after birth and have minimal exposures to prior painful events. This will increase the homogeneity of our sample and minimize the variability in physiological responses due to gestational age, postnatal age, days in the hospital, and long-lasting effects of previous painful experiences.

1  
2  
3 Interventions to manage pain will be allowed including non pharmacological and  
4 pharmacological treatments apart from continuous infusions of opioid drugs. This will be  
5 considered in the statistical analysis.  
6  
7  
8  
9

10  
11 Pain intensity scores computed by our sensor fusion framework will be compared with pain  
12 scores measured concurrently by skilled research staff. All sensors (facial EMG, EEG, ECG,  
13 SpO<sub>2</sub>, and SC) will be connected with an event recorder to mark “pain” vs. “no-pain” states. To  
14 make the best use of our data, the sensor fusion framework will use standard cross-validation  
15 methods to establish the generalizability of this framework.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

24 The extracted features from each modality will be used to train a machine learning algorithm.  
25 Specifically, we will train a binary classifier to assign “pain” and “no pain” class labels based on  
26 the extracted features. We will specifically investigate using the random forests classifier given  
27 their robustness to outliers and its classification performance when a large number of features are  
28 used for classification.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

37 Data from patients will be divided to a training set and a test set. The training set is used for  
38 model training and optimization of model parameters. A leave-one-patient-out cross validation  
39 technique will be used, where the machine learning classifier is trained on data from all but one  
40 patient and the performance of the classifier is assessed on the remaining patient. Once the  
41 appropriate machine learning classifier and its associated parameters are selected using the  
42 training set and the associated cross validation procedure, the performance of the machine  
43 learning classifier will be assessed on the test set.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

## 54 **B. Validation and Correlation with Pain Intensity**

55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 We will compare clinical pain scores from nursing assessments with scores from the sensor  
4 fusion framework. First, we will examine clinical pain scores to verify agreement with the pain  
5 scores assessed by the research staff. Internal consistency will be evaluated by Cronbach's  $\alpha$ ,  
6 with values  $> 0.8$  to show good internal consistency. Second, we will conduct multivariable  
7 linear regressions or generalized estimating equations (GEE) [65,66] to understand the agreement  
8 between the device pain scores and the clinical pain scores, as well as the contribution of each  
9 modality to the device pain scores. We will examine if these associations vary after adjustment  
10 for covariates such as pain medications, age, sex, duration or invasiveness of the procedure. A co-  
11 variance matrix will examine the degree of correlation between individual sensor inputs, types of  
12 procedures, clinician pain scores, and analgesic therapies used during the procedure. Finally, due  
13 to the limited understanding of factors contributing to pain in newborns, linear regression or GEE  
14 models will examine the association of the sensor fusion pain scores reported by the device with  
15 the demographic and clinical variables of neonates and infants.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 Content validity depends on the sensors and sensor variables that we have chosen for the sensor  
35 fusion framework. Concurrent validity will depend on the pain scores of skilled research staff  
36 using validated pain scoring methods. Construct validity will rest on: *i*) the range of objective  
37 pain scores from procedures causing mild, moderate, or severe pain; *ii*) changes in pain scores  
38 with analgesic drugs or non-pharmacological therapies; and *iii*) variation in pain scores over time  
39 consistent with the expected, natural course of acute procedural pain.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

49 We will also develop a machine learning algorithm to predict subjective pain. As part of the  
50 validation, we will evaluate the machine learning pain assessment algorithm which has been  
51 trained on clinical classification of pain based on validated pain scales and compare the results  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 with the results provided by the machine learning pain assessment algorithm which has been  
4  
5 trained on data involving objective pain events (e.g., heel stick).  
6  
7  
8  
9

10 Future studies will test the validity of this approach to pain assessments in larger populations of  
11 newborns, older infants and also extend these studies to smaller preterm neonates. Future  
12 applications may also include patient populations incapable of expressing pain (children with  
13 disability, adults with dementia, or mechanically ventilated patients).  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

## 21 **ETHICS AND DISSEMINATION**

22  
23  
24  
25 The Institutional Review Board of the Stanford University approved the protocol (Protocol  
26 #39076). The ethics approval includes anonymity and written consent will be provided by the  
27  
28 parents.  
29  
30  
31  
32

33 Study findings will be published in peer-reviewed journals and presented at national and  
34 international scientific conferences. Practical use of this methodology will be taught at  
35  
36 conference workshops, or via webinars, podcasts, video tutorials.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 **Authors' contributions:** JMR, KJS and WMH, BG were responsible for manuscript writing.  
4  
5 JMR, KJS, IM, WMH and BG contributed to the concept, protocol development and study  
6  
7 design. KJS and BG secured funding for the project. JMR, IM and KJS are responsible for  
8  
9 recruitment of study patients. All authors critically revised and approved the manuscript before  
10  
11 submission and are accountable for all aspects of the work.  
12  
13  
14

15  
16 **Competing interests statement:** JMR reports an international mobility scholarship from Chiesi  
17  
18 Pharmaceuticals; WMH and BG have equity ownership in Autonomous Healthcare, Inc.; WMH,  
19  
20 BG and KJSA have proprietary interests in the potential devices that may be developed from  
21  
22 these studies; Some equipments used in this study were provided by Autonomous Healthcare,  
23  
24 Inc.  
25  
26  
27

28 **Funding statement:** This work was supported by the National Institutes of Health, National  
29  
30 Institute of Drug Abuse grant number 1 R41 DA046983-01.  
31  
32  
33

34 **Patient and Public Involvement:** This research was done without patient involvement. Patients  
35  
36 were not invited to comment on the study design and were not consulted to develop patient  
37  
38 relevant outcomes or interpret the results. Patients were not invited to contribute to the writing or  
39  
40 editing of this document for readability or accuracy.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## REFERENCES

- 1 Tortora D, Severino M, Di Biase C, *et al.* Early Pain Exposure Influences Functional Brain Connectivity in Very Preterm Neonates. *Front Neurosci* 2019;**13**:899. doi:10.3389/fnins.2019.00899
- 2 Ranger M, Chau CMY, Garg A, *et al.* Neonatal Pain-Related Stress Predicts Cortical Thickness at Age 7 Years in Children Born Very Preterm. *PLoS One* 2013;**8**:e76702. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0076702
- 3 Vinall J, Grunau RE. Impact of repeated procedural pain-related stress in infants born very preterm. *Pediatr Res* 2014;**75**:584–7. doi:10.1038/pr.2014.16
- 4 Doesburg SM, Chau CM, Cheung TPL, *et al.* Neonatal pain-related stress, functional cortical activity and visual-perceptual abilities in school-age children born at extremely low gestational age. *Pain* 2013;**154**:1946–52. doi:10.1016/j.pain.2013.04.009
- 5 Valeri BO, Holsti L, Linhares MBM. Neonatal pain and developmental outcomes in children born preterm: a systematic review. *Clin J Pain* 2015;**31**:355–62. doi:10.1097/AJP.0000000000000114
- 6 de Graaf J, van Lingen RA, Simons SHP, *et al.* Long-term effects of routine morphine infusion in mechanically ventilated neonates on children’s functioning: five-year follow-up of a randomized controlled trial. *Pain* 2011;**152**:1391–7. doi:10.1016/j.pain.2011.02.017
- 7 Ferguson SA, Ward WL, Paule MG, *et al.* A pilot study of preemptive morphine analgesia in preterm neonates: effects on head circumference, social behavior, and response latencies in early childhood. *Neurotoxicol Teratol* 2012;**34**:47–55. doi:10.1016/j.ntt.2011.10.008
- 8 Bellù R, de Waal K, Zanini R. Opioids for neonates receiving mechanical ventilation: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Arch Dis Child Fetal Neonatal Ed* 2010;**95**:F241-251. doi:10.1136/adc.2008.150318
- 9 Cravero JP, Havidich JE. Pediatric sedation--evolution and revolution. *Paediatr Anaesth* 2011;**21**:800–9. doi:10.1111/j.1460-9592.2011.03617.x
- 10 Lim Y, Godambe S. Prevention and management of procedural pain in the neonate: an update, American Academy of Pediatrics, 2016. *Arch Dis Child Educ Pract Ed* 2017;**102**:254–6. doi:10.1136/archdischild-2016-311066
- 11 Boyle EM, Bradshaw J, Blake KI. Persistent pain in neonates: challenges in assessment without the aid of a clinical tool. *Acta Paediatr* 2018;**107**:63–7. doi:10.1111/apa.14081
- 12 Maxwell LG, Malavolta CP, Fraga MV. Assessment of pain in the neonate. *Clin Perinatol* 2013;**40**:457–69. doi:10.1016/j.clp.2013.05.001
- 13 Slater R, Cantarella A, Franck L, *et al.* How well do clinical pain assessment tools reflect pain in infants? *PLoS Med* 2008;**5**:e129. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.0050129
- 14 van Dijk M, Tibboel D. Update on pain assessment in sick neonates and infants. *Pediatr Clin North Am* 2012;**59**:1167–81. doi:10.1016/j.pcl.2012.07.012
- 15 Fitzgerald M. What do we really know about newborn infant pain? *Exp Physiol* 2015;**100**:1451–7. doi:10.1113/EP085134
- 16 Fitzgerald M, Walker SM. Infant pain management: a developmental neurobiological approach. *Nat Rev Neurol* 2009;**5**:35–50. doi:10.1038/ncpneuro0984
- 17 Storm H. Changes in skin conductance as a tool to monitor nociceptive stimulation and pain. *Curr Opin Anaesthesiol* 2008;**21**:796–804. doi:10.1097/ACO.0b013e3283183fe4
- 18 Gjerstad AC, Wagner K, Henrichsen T, *et al.* Skin Conductance Versus the Modified COMFORT Sedation Score as a Measure of Discomfort in Artificially Ventilated Children. *Pediatrics* 2008;**122**:e848–53. doi:10.1542/peds.2007-2545

- 19 Faye PM, De Jonckheere J, Logier R, *et al.* Newborn Infant Pain Assessment Using Heart Rate Variability Analysis: *The Clinical Journal of Pain* 2010;**26**:777–82. doi:10.1097/AJP.0b013e3181ed1058
- 20 Hartley C, Duff EP, Green G, *et al.* Nociceptive brain activity as a measure of analgesic efficacy in infants. *Sci Transl Med* 2017;**9**. doi:10.1126/scitranslmed.aah6122
- 21 Maxwell LG, Fraga MV, Malavolta CP. Assessment of Pain in the Newborn. *Clinics in Perinatology* 2019;**46**:693–707. doi:10.1016/j.clp.2019.08.005
- 22 Boyle EM, Freer Y, Wong CM, *et al.* Assessment of persistent pain or distress and adequacy of analgesia in preterm ventilated infants. *Pain* 2006;**124**:87–91. doi:10.1016/j.pain.2006.03.019
- 23 Serpa ABM, Guinsburg R, Balda R de CX, *et al.* Multidimensional pain assessment of preterm newborns at the 1st, 3rd and 7th days of life. *Sao Paulo Med J* 2007;**125**:29–33. doi:10.1590/s1516-31802007000100006
- 24 Pereira AL de ST, Guinsburg R, Almeida MFB de, *et al.* Validity of behavioral and physiologic parameters for acute pain assessment of term newborn infants. *Sao Paulo Med J* 1999;**117**:72–80. doi:10.1590/S1516-31801999000200005
- 25 Manworren RCB, Hynan LS. Clinical validation of FLACC: preverbal patient pain scale. *Pediatr Nurs* 2003;**29**:140–6.
- 26 Gibbins S, Stevens BJ, Yamada J, *et al.* Validation of the Premature Infant Pain Profile-Revised (PIPP-R). *Early Human Development* 2014;**90**:189–93. doi:10.1016/j.earlhumdev.2014.01.005
- 27 Grunau RE, Oberlander T, Holsti L, *et al.* Bedside application of the Neonatal Facial Coding System in pain assessment of premature neonates. *Pain* 1998;**76**:277–86. doi:10.1016/s0304-3959(98)00046-3
- 28 Hummel P, Puchalski M, Creech SD, *et al.* Clinical reliability and validity of the N-PASS: neonatal pain, agitation and sedation scale with prolonged pain. *J Perinatol* 2008;**28**:55–60. doi:10.1038/sj.jp.7211861
- 29 Hatfield LA, Ely EA. Measurement of acute pain in infants: a review of behavioral and physiological variables. *Biol Res Nurs* 2015;**17**:100–11. doi:10.1177/1099800414531448
- 30 Grunau RV, Craig KD. Pain expression in neonates: facial action and cry. *Pain* 1987;**28**:395–410. doi:10.1016/0304-3959(87)90073-x
- 31 Craig KD, Whitfield MF, Grunau RV, *et al.* Pain in the preterm neonate: behavioural and physiological indices. *Pain* 1993;**52**:287–99. doi:10.1016/0304-3959(93)90162-i
- 32 Willis MHW, Merkel SI, Voepel-Lewis T, *et al.* FLACC Behavioral Pain Assessment Scale: a comparison with the child's self-report. *Pediatr Nurs* 2003;**29**:195–8.
- 33 Cohn J, Ekman P. Measuring facial action by manual coding, facial EMG, and automatic facial image analysis. In: *Handbook of nonverbal behavior research methods in the affective sciences*. J. A. Harrigan RR, K. Scherer (editors). New York, NY: Oxford University Press USA; 2005:9Y64.
- 34 Balaban MT, Anthony BJ, Graham FK. Prestimulation effects on blink and cardiac reflexes of 15-month human infants. *Dev Psychobiol* 1989;**22**:115–27. doi:10.1002/dev.420220203
- 35 Schmidt LA, Fox NA. Fear-potentiated startle responses in temperamentally different human infants. *Dev Psychobiol* 1998;**32**:113–20.
- 36 Schmidt LA, Fox NA, Long JM. Acoustic startle electromyographic (EMG) Activity indexed from an electrocuclographic (EOG) Electrode placement: A methodological note. *International Journal of Neuroscience* 1998;**93**:185–8. doi:10.3109/00207459808986423

- 1  
2  
3 37 Storm H. The development of a software program for analyzing skin conductance changes  
4 in preterm infants. *Clin Neurophysiol* 2001;**112**:1562–8. doi:10.1016/s1388-2457(01)00573-9
- 5 38 van Dooren M, de Vries JJGG-J, Janssen JH. Emotional sweating across the body:  
6 comparing 16 different skin conductance measurement locations. *Physiol Behav* 2012;**106**:298–  
7 304. doi:10.1016/j.physbeh.2012.01.020
- 8 39 Hellerud BC, Storm H. Skin conductance and behaviour during sensory stimulation of  
9 preterm and term infants. *Early Hum Dev* 2002;**70**:35–46. doi:10.1016/s0378-3782(02)00070-1
- 10 40 Pereira-da-Silva L, Virella D, Monteiro I, *et al*. Skin conductance indices discriminate  
11 nociceptive responses to acute stimuli from different heel prick procedures in infants. *J Matern*  
12 *Fetal Neonatal Med* 2012;**25**:796–801. doi:10.3109/14767058.2011.587919
- 13 41 Harrison D, Boyce S, Loughnan P, *et al*. Skin conductance as a measure of pain and stress  
14 in hospitalised infants. *Early Hum Dev* 2006;**82**:603–8. doi:10.1016/j.earlhumdev.2005.12.008
- 15 42 Eriksson M, Storm H, Fremming A, *et al*. Skin conductance compared to a combined  
16 behavioural and physiological pain measure in newborn infants. *Acta Paediatr* 2008;**97**:27–30.  
17 doi:10.1111/j.1651-2227.2007.00586.x
- 18 43 Hoffman K, Bromster T, Hakansson S, *et al*. Monitoring of pain and stress in an infant  
19 with asphyxia during induced hypothermia: a case report. *Adv Neonatal Care* 2013;**13**:252–61.  
20 doi:10.1097/ANC.0b013e31829d8baf
- 21 44 Valkenburg AJ, Niehof SP, van Dijk M, *et al*. Skin conductance peaks could result from  
22 changes in vital parameters unrelated to pain. *Pediatr Res* 2012;**71**:375–9.  
23 doi:10.1038/pr.2011.72
- 24 45 Hullett B, Chambers N, Preuss J, *et al*. Monitoring electrical skin conductance: a tool for  
25 the assessment of postoperative pain in children? *Anesthesiology* 2009;**111**:513–7.  
26 doi:10.1097/ALN.0b013e3181b27c18
- 27 46 Munsters J, Wallström L, Ågren J, *et al*. Skin conductance measurements as pain  
28 assessment in newborn infants born at 22–27 weeks gestational age at different postnatal age.  
29 *Early Human Development* 2012;**88**:21–6. doi:10.1016/j.earlhumdev.2011.06.010
- 30 47 Toweil DL, Kovarik WD, Carr R, *et al*. Linear and nonlinear analysis of heart rate  
31 variability during propofol anesthesia for short-duration procedures in children. *Pediatr Crit Care*  
32 *Med* 2003;**4**:308–14. doi:10.1097/01.PCC.0000074260.93430.6A
- 33 48 Weissman A, Zimmer EZ, Aranovitch M, *et al*. Heart rate dynamics during acute pain in  
34 newborns. *Pflugers Arch* 2012;**464**:593–9. doi:10.1007/s00424-012-1168-x
- 35 49 Fabrizi L, Slater R, Worley A, *et al*. A shift in sensory processing that enables the  
36 developing human brain to discriminate touch from pain. *Curr Biol* 2011;**21**:1552–8.  
37 doi:10.1016/j.cub.2011.08.010
- 38 50 Fabrizi L, Worley A, Patten D, *et al*. Electrophysiological measurements and analysis of  
39 nociception in human infants. *J Vis Exp* Published Online First: 20 December 2011.  
40 doi:10.3791/3118
- 41 51 Norman E, Rosén I, Vanhatalo S, *et al*. Electroencephalographic response to procedural  
42 pain in healthy term newborn infants. *Pediatr Res* 2008;**64**:429–34.  
43 doi:10.1203/PDR.0b013e3181825487
- 44 52 Prichep LS, John ER, Howard B, *et al*. Evaluation of the pain matrix using EEG source  
45 localization: a feasibility study. *Pain Med* 2011;**12**:1241–8. doi:10.1111/j.1526-  
46 4637.2011.01191.x
- 47 53 Gross J, Schnitzler A, Timmermann L, *et al*. Gamma oscillations in human primary  
48 somatosensory cortex reflect pain perception. *PLoS Biol* 2007;**5**:e133.  
49 doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.0050133
- 50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 54 Hartley C, Goksan S, Poorun R, *et al.* The relationship between nociceptive brain activity,  
4 spinal reflex withdrawal and behaviour in newborn infants. *Sci Rep* 2015;**5**:12519.  
5 doi:10.1038/srep12519  
6  
7 55 Nguyen The Tich S, Vecchierini M-F, Debillon T, *et al.* Effects of sufentanil on  
8 electroencephalogram in very and extremely preterm neonates. *Pediatrics* 2003;**111**:123–8.  
9 doi:10.1542/peds.111.1.123  
10  
11 56 Bernet V, Latal B, Natalucci G, *et al.* Effect of sedation and analgesia on postoperative  
12 amplitude-integrated EEG in newborn cardiac patients. *Pediatr Res* 2010;**67**:650–5.  
13 doi:10.1203/PDR.0b013e3181da44ba  
14  
15 57 Jiang X, Bian G-B, Tian Z. Removal of Artifacts from EEG Signals: A Review. *Sensors*  
16 2019;**19**:987. doi:10.3390/s19050987  
17  
18 58 de Oliveira MVM, de Jesus J a. L, Tristao RM. Psychophysical parameters of a  
19 multidimensional pain scale in newborns. *Physiol Meas* 2012;**33**:39–49. doi:10.1088/0967-  
20 3334/33/1/39  
21  
22 59 Serpa ABM, Guinsburg R, Balda R de CX, *et al.* Multidimensional pain assessment of  
23 preterm newborns at the 1st, 3rd and 7th days of life. *Sao Paulo Med J* 2007;**125**:29–33.  
24 doi:10.1590/s1516-31802007000100006  
25  
26 60 Stevens B, Johnston C, Petryshen P, *et al.* Premature Infant Pain Profile: development and  
27 initial validation. *Clin J Pain* 1996;**12**:13–22. doi:10.1097/00002508-199603000-00004  
28  
29 61 Hay WW, Rodden DJ, Collins SM, *et al.* Reliability of conventional and new pulse  
30 oximetry in neonatal patients. *J Perinatol* 2002;**22**:360–6. doi:10.1038/sj.jp.7210740  
31  
32 62 Moustogiannis AN, Raju TN, Roohey T, *et al.* Intravenous morphine attenuates pain  
33 induced changes in skin blood flow in newborn infants. *Neurol Res* 1996;**18**:440–4.  
34 doi:10.1080/01616412.1996.11740448  
35  
36 63 McCulloch KM, Ji SA, Raju TN. Skin blood flow changes during routine nursery  
37 procedures. *Early Hum Dev* 1995;**41**:147–56. doi:10.1016/0378-3782(95)01617-c  
38  
39 64 Gholami B, Haddad WM, Tannenbaum AR. Relevance vector machine learning for  
40 neonate pain intensity assessment using digital imaging. *IEEE Trans Biomed Eng* 2010;**57**:1457–  
41 66. doi:10.1109/TBME.2009.2039214  
42  
43 65 Pepe MS, Heagerty P, Whitaker R. Prediction using partly conditional time-varying  
44 coefficients regression models. *Biometrics* 1999;**55**:944–50. doi:10.1111/j.0006-  
45 341x.1999.00944.x  
46  
47 66 Leung DHY, Wang Y-G, Zhu M. Efficient parameter estimation in longitudinal data  
48 analysis using a hybrid GEE method. *Biostatistics* 2009;**10**:436–45.  
49 doi:10.1093/biostatistics/kxp002  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60