EVALUATION OF DIFFERENT PEAK MODELS OF EYE BLINK EEG FOR SIGNAL PEAK DETECTION USING ARTIFICIAL NEURAL NETWORK
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Abstract: There is a growing interest of research being conducted on detecting eye blink to assist physically impaired people for verbal communication and controlling devices using electroencephalogram (EEG) signal. One particular eye blink can be determined from use of peak points. Therefore, the purpose of peak detection algorithm is to distinguish an actual peak location from a list of peak candidates. The need of a good peak model is important in ensuring a satisfy classification performance. In general, there are various peak models available in literature, which have been tested in several peak detection algorithms. In this study, performance evaluation of the existing peak models is conducted based on Artificial Neural Network (ANN) with particle swarm optimization (PSO) as learning algorithm. This study evaluates the performance of eye blink EEG signal peak detection algorithm for four different peak models which are Dumpala’s, Acir’s, Liu’s, and Dingle’s peak models. To generalize the performance evaluation, two case studies of eye blink EEG signal are considered, which are single and double eye blink signals. It has been observed that the best test performance, in average, is 91.94% and 87.47% for single and double eye blink signals, respectively. These results indicate that the Acir’s peak model offers high accuracy of peak detection for the two eye blink EEG signals as compared to other peak models. The result of statistical analysis also indicates that the Acir’s peak model is better than Dingle’s and Dumpala’s peak models.
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1. Introduction

There is a growing interest of research being conducted in biological signals on detecting eye blink to assist physically impaired people for verbal communication and controlling devices. Healthy people also use this signal for vehicle accident prevention. Biological signals are defined as an electrical signal that responds to any biological activities in a human body. The biological signals that can be used to measure eye blink are electrooculogram (EOG) and electroencephalogram (EEG) signals.

To record an EOG signal, a number of electrode sensors are placed around the eyes while, to record an EEG signal, a number of electrode sensors are placed on the surface of the brain. The electrode sensors that are placed on the surface of the brain are more relevant than the electrode sensors that are placed around the eyes [12]. Based on a literature study, a number of EOG eye blink signals have widely been proposed to control cursor movement [34], a robotic arm [35], and wheelchair [9]. However, study’s on the EEG eye blink signals are still limited. According to previous studies, the eye blink generated by EEG are considered as ocular artifacts [37]. Several algorithms have been developed for removing the artifacts (see [16] for review). However, the artifacts were found to be usable signals [43].

The observation of the eye blink of EEG signal indicates that the most observable signal pattern exists is peak points which signify the vertical eye movement response through the brain. A peak point is a point that holds the maximum value located on a specific time and location on an EEG signal. The known peak locations through the response of eye blink can be translated into an output, for example, wheelchair movement. Therefore, this study utilizes the peak detection algorithm to identify eye blinks on EEG signal.

A review of peak detection algorithms that is employed to the EEG signal is presented in [46]. To date, various approaches of peak detection algorithms have been proposed. These algorithms can be categorized into four main approaches based on time [2, 3, 5, 10, 13, 14, 28, 30, 31, 47], frequency [24], time-frequency [28, 38], and nonlinear [36] domains. In time domain approach, the peaks are analyzed as temporal information. In frequency domain approach, the peaks are analyzed as spectral information. Meanwhile, in time-frequency domain approach, the peaks are analyzed simultaneously as temporal and spectral information. In nonlinear domain approach, some statistical parameters of the peaks are analyzed.

The general peak detection algorithm usually involves several processes which are signal pre-processing, peak candidate detection, feature extraction, and classification. Various signal pre-processing methods have been employed such as data compression [11], wavelet transform [20], Kalman filter [33], and Hilbert transform [31]. Two methods for peak candidate detection have been used which are three point sliding window method [14] and k-point nonlinear energy operator (k-NEO) method [29]. Various feature extraction techniques have been proposed which are model-based [29], wavelet analysis [44], template matching [23], and power spectra analysis [15]. Several classifiers have been used, which are rule-based [14, 15], artificial neural network (ANN) [1, 3, 22, 28], support vector machine (SVM) [2, 17], and expert system [28].
Based on the literature, most of the researchers focus on the problem of an epileptic EEG signal when detecting peak. However, this study investigates the peak detection problem on eye blink EEG signal. Moreover, in time domain approach, 14 different peak features are derived from different peak models [2, 13, 14, 28]. The peak model is a set of peak features that represents a peak by its amplitude, width, and slope. Most algorithms [2, 3, 13, 14, 28-30, 47] in time domain approach consider different peak models and the different styles of algorithm. Note that although different peak models have been employed for various algorithms, there are not any peak detection algorithms that find the best peak model. The use of the best peak detection model will give a chance for the algorithm to achieve the best performance. On the other hand, the chosen peak model is not necessarily suitable for different types of biological signal. Moreover, the best peak model represents some meaningful information on the signal to be evaluated.

The main objective of this study is to evaluate the performance of eye blink EEG signal peak detection algorithm on four different peak models in time domain approach. This study also highlights the significance of the best peak model. In this study, the peak detection involves the following processes: peak candidate detection, feature extraction, and classification. The sliding three-point window is a method in peak candidate detection where it is based on local maximizes to find the peak candidates. For the feature extraction method, 14 different peak features of peak candidate are calculated. The identified peak candidates are classified between true peak point and true non-peak point using ANN classifier. The particle swarm optimization (PSO) algorithm is employed as training ANN algorithm. To evaluate the performance of the algorithm, four different sets of peak feature are considered and the best peak model is suggested.

The next section briefly describes the existing peak models in time domain analysis for peak detection algorithm. Section 3 explains in details the methodology of the proposed peak detection algorithm. The experiment setup and experiment protocols are introduced in Section 4. The experimental results and discussions are presented in Section 5. Section 6 are conclusions.

1.1 Peak model in time domain analysis

The earliest peak model was introduced by Dumpala et al. in 1982 [14]. The peak model comprises four features, which are (1) the amplitude between the magnitude of peak point and the magnitude of valley point at the first half wave, (2) the width between valley point of first half point and valley point at second half wave, (3) and (4) two slopes between a peak point and valley point in the first half wave and second half wave. A similar definition of the peak amplitude and slopes are also been used in [2, 3, 47].

An additional feature of peak amplitude and two features of peak width have been introduced by Acir et al. [2, 3]. The additional peak amplitude is the amplitude between the magnitude of peak point and the magnitude of valley point of the second half wave. The peak widths are the width between peak point and valley point of first half wave and second half wave. The total features that are introduced by Acir et al. are six features. Acir et al. did not use the width feature that was introduced by Dumpala et al. A similar definition of the peak amplitudes,
widths, and slopes are also been used in [29]. In [29], an additional peak feature is added with a set of feature that is introduced in [2, 3], which is the area of peak. However, the definition of area integration is not presented in the paper.

In addition, Liu et al. [28] have introduced 11 peak features. The peak model consists of four amplitudes: (1) the amplitude between the magnitude of peak point and the magnitude of valley point at the first half wave; (2) the amplitude between the magnitude of peak point and the magnitude of valley point of the second half wave; (3) the amplitude between the magnitude of peak and the magnitude of turning point at the first half wave, and (4) the amplitude between the magnitude of peak and the magnitude of turning point at the second half wave. The turning point is defined as the point where the slope decreases more than 50% as compared to the slope of the preceding point. The model also consists of three widths: (1) the width between valley point at first half point and valley point at second half wave, (2) the width between turning point at first half wave and turning point at second half wave, and (3) the width between half point at first half wave and half point at second half wave. Four slopes are also measured: (1) and (2) two slopes between a peak point and valley point in the first half wave and second half wave, (3) and (4) two slopes between peak point and turning point at first half wave and second half wave.

Another peak model consists of four features, which has been introduced by Dingle et al. [13]. The peak amplitude is the difference between the peak point and the floating mean. The floating mean is the average EEG which is centered at the peak point that is also called moving average curve (MAC) [30]. The width is calculated based on the difference between the valley point at the first half wave and the valley point at the second half wave. The two slopes are the slopes between a peak point and valley point in the first half wave and second half wave.

Generally, all the authors claimed that the selected peak features offer good classification performance on the proposed algorithm. However, the previous works did not provide the justification on the selected features.

1.2 Methodology

The EEG signals peak detection algorithm is shown in Fig. 1. In this algorithm, the peak detection involves training and testing phases. Filtered training and testing signals with known peak points is used in the training and testing phases. The first stage in peak detection is the detection of peak candidate. The next stage is extraction of the peak features based on the selected peak model. The numbers of peak features are depend on the selected peak model. Peak features of all peak candidates are extracted in this stage. Then, the peak features act as input to the ANN classifier. In the training phase, the classifier is trained to achieve the highest classification performance. During the training, the weights and threshold value in the network are varied in order to find the optimal value using the PSO algorithm approach. The optimal weights and decision threshold are then used during the testing phase. The final output of the training and testing phase is the predicted peak points and non-peak points of the identified peak candidates.
3.1 Peak candidate detection

The first step to detect peaks is to find candidate peaks. Consider a discrete-time signal, $x(I)$, of $L$ points. The $i$-th candidate peak point, $PP_i$, are identified using three-points sliding window method [14]. Those three-points are denoted as $x(I-1)$, $x(I)$, and $x(I+1)$ for $I=1, 2, \ldots, L$. A candidate peak point is identified when $x(PP_i-1) < x(PP_i) > x(PP_i+1)$ and two associated valley points, $VP_{1i}$ and $VP_{2i}$, are in between as shown in Fig. 2. Both valley points exist when $x(VP_{1i}-1) > x(VP_{1i}) < x(VP_{1i}+1)$ and $x(VP_{2i}-1) > x(VP_{2i}) < x(VP_{2i}+1)$.

Fig. 1 The eye blink EEG signal peak detection algorithm.

1.3 Peak candidate detection

The first step to detect peaks is to find candidate peaks. Consider a discrete-time signal, $x(I)$, of $L$ points. The $i$-th candidate peak point, $PP_i$, are identified using three-points sliding window method [14]. Those three-points are denoted as $x(I-1)$, $x(I)$, and $x(I+1)$ for $I=1, 2, \ldots, L$. A candidate peak point is identified when $x(PP_i-1) < x(PP_i) > x(PP_i+1)$ and two associated valley points, $VP_{1i}$ and $VP_{2i}$, are in between as shown in Fig. 2. Both valley points exist when $x(VP_{1i}-1) > x(VP_{1i}) < x(VP_{1i}+1)$ and $x(VP_{2i}-1) > x(VP_{2i}) < x(VP_{2i}+1)$.

Fig. 2 Peak model parameters.
1.4 Feature extraction

Based on the existing peak models, the total peak features are 14. The peak features of a peak candidate are calculated based on the eight parameters as shown in Fig. 2. The parameters consist of the \( i \)-th candidate peak point (PP\(_i\)), the two associated valley points (VP\(_1\)_\(i\)) and (VP\(_2\)_\(i\)), the half point at first half wave (HP\(_1\)_\(i\)), the half point at second half wave (HP\(_2\)_\(i\)), the turning point at first half wave (TP\(_1\)_\(i\)), the turning point at second half wave (TP\(_2\)_\(i\)), and the moving average curve (MAC(PP\(_i\))). The peak features can be categorized into three following groups: amplitude, width, and slope. There are five different amplitudes, five different widths, and four different slopes that can be calculated based on the parameters. All equations and description of peak features are tabulated in Tab. I. The list of different peak models and their sets of feature are tabulated in Tab. II.

1.5 Artificial neural network classifier

The architecture of a single layer feedforward ANN is shown in Fig. 3. In the network architecture, the input weights \( w_{ij} \) are located on the connection between the input layer and the hidden layer, while the output weights, \( w_{jk} \) are located on the link between the hidden layer and the output layer. The total number of weights is dependent on the number of inputs, \( n \), number of outputs, \( m \), and number of neurons, \( l \), which can be calculated using the following equation:

\[
\text{total weights} = (n \times l) + (l \times m). \tag{1}
\]

As shown in Fig. 3, hyperbolic tangent (tanh) function is chosen for all neurons at hidden and linear function for neuron in the output layer. The output of each neuron at hidden layer is denoted as \( y_j \) and the output of neuron at output layer is denoted as \( y_k \). The output, \( y \) is a classifier output. The outputs, \( y_j, y_k \), and \( y \) can be defined as follows:

\[
y = \begin{cases} 
0 & \text{if } y_k \leq \theta, \\
1 & \text{if } y_k > \theta, 
\end{cases} \tag{2}
\]

where

\[
y_k = \tanh (\text{net}_k), \tag{3}
\]

\[
y_j = \tanh (\text{net}_j), \tag{4}
\]

\[
\tanh(\text{net}) = \frac{e^{\text{net}} - e^{-\text{net}}}{e^{\text{net}} + e^{-\text{net}}}, \tag{5}
\]

\[
\text{net}_k = \sum_{j=1}^{l} y_j w_{jk}. \tag{6}
\]

Based on Eq. (2), the classifier can classify the output into two classes (output): class 0 and class 1. The classifier produces 1 if \( y_k \) is greater than the decision threshold, \( \theta \). Otherwise, the classifier produces 0.
### Peak Feature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peak Feature</th>
<th>Equation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peak-to-peak amplitude at the first half wave</td>
<td>$f_1 =</td>
<td>x(PP_1) - x(VP_{1i})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak-to-peak amplitude at the second half wave</td>
<td>$f_2 =</td>
<td>x(PP_2) - x(VP_{2i})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turning point amplitude at the first half wave</td>
<td>$f_3 =</td>
<td>x(PP_1) - x(TP_{1i})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turning point amplitude at the second half wave</td>
<td>$f_4 =</td>
<td>x(PP_2) - x(TP_{2i})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving average amplitude</td>
<td>$f_5 =</td>
<td>x(PP_i) - MAC(PP_i)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Widths

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Equation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peak width</td>
<td>$f_6 =</td>
<td>VP_{1i} - VP_{2i}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First half wave width</td>
<td>$f_7 =</td>
<td>PP_{1i} - VP_{1i}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second half wave width</td>
<td>$f_8 =</td>
<td>PP_{1i} - VP_{2i}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turning point width</td>
<td>$f_9 =</td>
<td>TP_{1i} - TP_{2i}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half point width</td>
<td>$f_{10} =</td>
<td>HP_{1i} - HP_{2i}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Slopes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slope</th>
<th>Equation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peak slope at the first half wave</td>
<td>$f_{11} = \frac{</td>
<td>x(PP_{1i}) - x(VP_{1i})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak slope at the second half wave</td>
<td>$f_{12} = \frac{</td>
<td>x(PP_{2i}) - x(VP_{2i})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turning point slope at the first half wave</td>
<td>$f_{13} = \frac{</td>
<td>x(PP_{1i}) - x(TP_{1i})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turning point slope at the second half wave</td>
<td>$f_{14} = \frac{</td>
<td>x(PP_{2i}) - x(TP_{2i})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tab. I Equations and descriptions of peak features.

1.6 **Particle swarm optimization**

PSO is a stochastic population-based optimization algorithm introduced by James Kennedy and Russell Eberhart [25] in 1995. This algorithm is based on the movement and information sharing of particles in a multi-dimensional search space. The PSO algorithm has been numerously enhanced fundamentally [26, 32] and applied in many fields [4, 8, 19]. A pseudo code of the PSO algorithm is described in Algorithm 1.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peak model</th>
<th>Set of feature</th>
<th>No. of features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dumpala et al. [14]</td>
<td>(f_1, f_6, f_{11}, f_{12})</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acir et al. [1-3]</td>
<td>(f_1, f_2, f_7, f_{11}, f_{12})</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liu et al. [28]</td>
<td>(f_1, f_2, f_3, f_4, f_6, f_9, f_{10}, f_{11}, f_{12}, f_{13}, f_{14})</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dingle et al. [13]</td>
<td>(f_5, f_6, f_{11}, f_{12})</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tab. II List of different peak models and sets of feature.

Fig. 3 Architecture of a single layer feedforward ANN.

In the preliminary stage of the PSO algorithm, some parameters are initialized: (1) PSO parameters, (2) position of particles, and (3) velocity of particles. PSO parameters include the maximum number of particles, the inertia weight, \(\omega\), the cognitive component, \(c_1\), the social component, \(c_2\), the random values \(r_1\) and \(r_2\), and the maximum number of iterations, \(k\). The position of particles is randomly located in the search space, and the velocity of particles is set to zero.

Algorithm 1 The PSO algorithm.

1: Initialization
2: while not stopping criteria do
3: for each \(i\)-th particle in a population do
4: calculate fitness evaluation function
5: update \(P_{\text{best}}\) and \(G_{\text{best}}\)
6: end for
7: for each particle in a population do
8: update the \(i\)-th particle’s velocity and
9: update the \(i\)-th particle’s position
10: end for
11: end while

After the initialization stage is done, the fitness evaluation function is calculated. The fitness evaluation function is problem dependent. Then, the algorithm follows by updating the personal best (\(P_{\text{best}}\)) and the global best (\(G_{\text{best}}\)).
The peak detection algorithm is schematically illustrated in Fig. 4. The ANN with the PSO algorithm for classification performance. A process flow of ANN with the PSO algorithm for the input and output weights and the decision threshold for producing the best process. The primary concern is to find, during the training process, the value of maximum iterations, then the algorithm is stopped. Termination based on a stopping criterion. For example, if the algorithm reaches a value between \( \omega \) and \( \omega \)-th dimension of output weights, the \( s_{i,d} \) best of particle \( i \) at \( k \)-th iteration \( k \), \( r_1 \) and \( r_2 \) are random numbers \([0, 1] \), and \( c_1 \) and \( c_2 \) denote the cognitive and social coefficients, respectively. The particle’s new velocity is then used to update the particle’s position using following equation:

\[
v_{i}^{k+1} = \omega v_{i}^{k} + c_1 r_1 (p_{\text{best}}^{k} - s_{i}^{k}) + c_2 r_2 (G_{\text{best}}^{k} - s_{i}^{k}),
\]

where \( v_{i}^{k} \) is the velocity particle \( i \) at \( k \)-th iteration \( k \), \( r_1 \) and \( r_2 \) are random numbers \([0, 1] \), and \( c_1 \) and \( c_2 \) denote the cognitive and social coefficients, respectively.

The maximum inertia weight \([40, 41]\) is used and calculated as follows:

\[
\omega = \omega_{\text{max}} - \frac{\omega_{\text{max}} - \omega_{\text{min}}}{k_{\text{max}}} \times k, \tag{9}
\]

where \( \omega_{\text{max}} \) and \( \omega_{\text{min}} \) denote the maximum and minimum values of inertia weight, respectively, and \( k_{\text{max}} \) is the maximum iteration. The linear dynamic inertia weight takes a value between \( \omega_{\text{max}} = 0.9 \) and \( \omega_{\text{min}} = 0.4 \). Then, the PSO algorithm is terminated based on a stopping criterion. For example, if the algorithm reaches maximum iterations, then the algorithm is stopped.

The PSO algorithm adapts the neural network parameters during a training process. The primary concern is to find, during the training process, the value of the input and output weights and the decision threshold for producing the best classification performance. A process flow of ANN with the PSO algorithm for peak detection algorithm is schematically illustrated in Fig. 4.

Tab. III illustrates the representation of particle position, particle velocity, \( p_{\text{best}} \), and \( G_{\text{best}} \). The position of particle \( i \) at iteration \( k \) is denoted as

\[
s_{i}^{k} = \{w_{i,1}^{k}, w_{i,2}^{k}, w_{i,3}^{k}, \ldots, w_{i,d}^{k}, w_{i,1}^{k}, w_{i,2}^{k}, w_{i,3}^{k}, \ldots, w_{i,D}^{k}, \theta_{i,e}^{k}\},
\]

while the velocity of particle \( i \) at iteration \( k \) is denoted as

\[
v_{i}^{k} = \{v_{i,1}^{k}, v_{i,2}^{k}, v_{i,3}^{k}, \ldots, v_{i,d}^{k}, v_{i,1}^{k}, v_{i,2}^{k}, v_{i,3}^{k}, \ldots, v_{i,D}^{k}, v_{i,1}^{k}, v_{i,2}^{k}, v_{i,3}^{k}, \ldots, v_{i,D}^{k}, v_{i,1}^{k}, v_{i,2}^{k}, v_{i,3}^{k}, \ldots, v_{i,D}^{k}\}.
\]

The \( p_{\text{best}} \) of particle \( i \) is represented as

\[
pb_{i}^{k} = \{pb_{i,1}^{k}, pb_{i,2}^{k}, pb_{i,3}^{k}, \ldots, pb_{i,d}^{k}, pb_{i,1}^{k}, pb_{i,2}^{k}, pb_{i,3}^{k}, \ldots, pb_{i,D}^{k}, v_{i,1}^{k}, v_{i,2}^{k}, v_{i,3}^{k}, \ldots, v_{i,D}^{k}\},
\]

and the \( G_{\text{best}} \) is denoted as

\[
gb_{k} = \{gb_{k,1}, gb_{k,2}, gb_{k,3}, \ldots, gb_{k,d}, gb_{k,1}, gb_{k,2}, gb_{k,3}, \ldots, gb_{k,D}, gb_{k,e}\}.
\]

The \( d = 1, 2, 3, \ldots, nl \) is a \( d \)-th dimension of input weights, the \( D = nl + 1, nl + 2, nl + 3, \ldots, nl + bn \) is a \( D \)-th dimension of output weights, and the \( nl + bn + 1 \) is an \( e \)-th dimension of decision threshold. \( nl \) is the total number of input weights.
Tab. III Representation of Particle Position, Particle Velocity, $p_{\text{best}}$, and $G_{\text{best}}$. 

$bn$ is the total number of output weights. The total number of weight is denoted as $nl + bm$. The total number of particle dimension is denoted as $nl + lm + 1$.

The PSO fitness evaluation function is based on $G_{\text{mean}}$ [18]. The $G_{\text{mean}}$ is calculated as follows:

$$TNR = \frac{TN}{TN + FP},$$  \hfill (11)  

$$G_{\text{mean}} = \sqrt{TPR \times TNR},$$  \hfill (12)  

where true peak (TP) is correctly detected peak point of peak candidate, true non-peak (TN) is correctly detected non-peak point of peak candidate, false peak (FP) is wrongly detected the non-peak point of peak candidate, false non-peak (FN) is wrongly detected the peak point of peak candidate, TPR is a sensitivity or true peak rate, and TNR is a specificity or a true non-peak rate.

### 2. Experimental setup

The experiment is conducted in 10 independent runs. The first 50% of the filtered EEG signal is divided for training data, and the remaining 50% is for testing data. For the ANN classifier, as shown in Tab. IV, the numbers of neurons are selected using a trial and error method which is set to 10. The hyperbolic tangent $[-1, 1]$ is used as an activation function in the hidden layer for normalization, while a linear function is located inside the neuron in the output layer. Other settings for the ANN classifier, such as the number of neurons in the input layer and the total number of weights, are dependent on the dataset as calculated using Eq. (1). The PSO algorithm is employed as the learning algorithm which is to produce the optimal weights and decision threshold value. The PSO parameter values are based on the suggested values by Shi and Eberhart [42]. The parameters setting of PSO are tabulated in Tab. V. For each run, 10 particles are used, and the maximum iteration was set to 150.
2.1 Experimental protocols

This study uses two different set of eye blink EEG signals to evaluate the algorithm. The observation of the eye blink EEG signal indicates that the most observable signal pattern is the peak point which signifies the brain response on eye blink. The experimental protocol to acquire this EEG signal was reviewed and approved by the Medical Ethic Committee (MEC) in the University of Malaya Medical Centre (UMMC). The subject gave a written consent prior to the data collection.
session. This EEG signal was acquired in the Applied Control and Robotic (ACR) Laboratory, Department of Electrical Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, University of Malaya, Malaysia. 30 healthy subjects were involved voluntarily in these data collection sessions who were undergraduate and postgraduate students in the Faculty of Engineering.

The filtered EEG signal recording was conducted using the g.USBamp biological signal acquisition system. The EEG sensors are a number of electrodes which are placed using the 10–20 international electrode placement system. The EEG signal was recorded from F9 channel. The reference electrode was located on the ear. The ground electrode was located on channel AFz. The sampling frequency was set to 256 Hz.

Fig. 5 shows two different filtered EEG signals that are named as single eye blink signal, and double eye blink signal. The dotted-red vertical lines show the actual peak point. The actual peak points have been identified by EEG expert. The descriptions of both signals are tabulated in Tab. 6.

The single eye blink signal has 30 signals, 10-second length per signal, 2560 sampling points per signal, and each signal containing two known peak points and some additional signal patterns. The additional signal patterns are the edge transitions which represent the eye movements. The known peak pattern in this signal represents a single eye blink. The peak pattern of a single eye blink is useful as an additional feature for controlling an electric wheelchair [27]. The total training and testing sampling points are 38400 and 38400, respectively. From the total sampling points, 3238 sampling point locations are identified as the locations of peak candidates, 60 sampling point locations are identified as the locations of true peaks, and 3178 sampling point locations are identified as the locations of false peaks.

The double eye blink signal has 5 signals, 80-second length per signal, 20480 sampling points per signal, and each signal containing 8 known peak points and some additional signal patterns. The additional signal patterns are the edge transitions which represent the eye movements. Sometimes the signals containing a peak of the single eye blink. The peak pattern of the double eye blink is also useful as an additional feature for controlling a wheelchair [6]. The total training and testing sampling points are 51200 and 51200, respectively. From the total sampling points, 4662 sampling point locations are identified as the locations of peak candidates, 40 sampling point locations are identified as the locations of true peaks, and 4622 sampling point locations are identified as the locations of false peaks.

In general, the peak amplitude of EEG signal is different from one subject to another where it can vary between 600 and 1100 $\mu$V [21]. Another research work by Sovierzoski, M.A., et al. [45], have analyzed the electrical behavior of EEG eye blink events. The research work has recorded the minimum, maximum, and the average of peak amplitude. The minimum value of amplitude was 55 $\mu$V. The maximum value of amplitude was 533 $\mu$V. The average of peak amplitude was 170 $\mu$V. These findings showed that the peak amplitude can vary from 55 up to 533 $\mu$V and it is depend on subjects. Sometimes, the amplitude is higher than usual due to various noises.

In this study, the single and double eye blink signals that are shown in Figs. 5(a) and 5(b) were recorded from different subjects. It is also shown that both figures
consist of different baseline. Based on this reason, the peak amplitude of double blink is much lower than the single eye blink. However, for one particular subject, the same value of peak amplitude between double and single eye blinks can be observed as shown in Fig. 5(b). Moreover, the peak amplitude can be measured for both figures, where the values are approximately around 300 to 500 µV.

![Graphs showing filtered EEG signal](image)

**Fig. 5** The filtered EEG signal: (a) single eye blink (2 peak points per signal) and (b) double eye blink (8 peak points per signal).

### 3. Experimental results and discussions

Tab. 7 shows the performance of each peak model for a single eye blink signal. For the single eye blink signal experiments, the best average test performance is 91.94%, which was obtained by Acir’s peak model. On the other hand, the worst test performance is 73.86%, which was obtained by Dingle’s peak model. Based on Acir’s peak model test performance, the maximum test performance reached 97.08%, the minimum test performance dropped to 85.26%, and the standard deviation value is 4.12%. The best and worst test performance is also highlighted in the table. The sensitivity and specificity of Acir’s peak model are 94.91% and 89.38%, respectively. The whole sensitivity and specificity of test performance are shown in Tab. 8.

Tab. 9 shows the performance of each peak model for the double eye blink signal. Based on the end results in the Tab. 8, the best average test performance is 87.47%, which was obtained by Acir’s peak model. The worst test performance is 75.79%, which was obtained by Dingle’s peak model. Based on Acir’s peak model test performance, the maximum test performance reached 92.10%, the minimum test performance dropped to 82.72%, and the standard deviation value is 3.17%. The best and worst test performance is also highlighted in the table. The sensitivity and
Initial PSO parameters | Value
---|---
Decrease inertia weight, $\omega$ | $0.9 \sim 0.4$
Cognitive component, $c_1$ | 2
Social component, $c_2$ | 2
Random value, $r_1$ and $r_2$ | Random number $[0, 1]$
Initial velocity vector for each particle | 0
Initial $p^{\text{best}}$ score for each particle | 0
Initial $G^{\text{best}}$ score | 0

Tab. V Parameters setting of PSO.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of signal</th>
<th>No. of signal</th>
<th>No. of sampling point per signal</th>
<th>Length per signal (second)</th>
<th>No. of peak per signal</th>
<th>Class distribution (peak point/non-peak point)</th>
<th>Total number of (candidate peak/true peak/false peak)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single eye blink</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2560</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2/2558</td>
<td>3238/60/3178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double eye blink</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20480</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8/20472</td>
<td>4662/40/4622</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tab. VI Description of the signals.
specificity of Acir’s peak model are 88.74% and 86.33%, respectively. The whole sensitivity and specificity of test performance for double eye blinking problem are shown in Tab. X.

Overall, Acir’s peak model offers the highest classification performance rate on the single eye blink and double eye blink signals. In general, it may due to the small variation of peak width of Acir’s peak model. Therefore, the small variation of peak width relaxes the learning process of the classifier in the algorithm.

Moreover, the main concern in developing any techniques resorts to the ability of generalizing the model. The main index to measure the generalization capability is best to indicate by minimum $G_{\text{mean}}$. Referring in Tab. VII and Tab. IX, Acir’s peak model obtained the highest classification rate for minimum testing result on the single eye blink (85.26%) and double eye blink (82.72%) as compared to the Dumpala’s, Liu’s, and Dingle’s peak models. Therefore, based on these experimental results, Acir’s peak model provided a good generalized model on the single eye blink and double eye blink signals.

Also, the comparison of the average test accuracy between the four peak models is proved using Friedman’s test as statistical analysis. The analysis indicates that there is a difference in test accuracies between the peak models with $p$-value is lower than 0.01 for the two signals. The average ranking of Friedman’s test for the two signals is tabulated in Tab. XI. The first ranked is Acir’s peak model, then it is followed by Liu’s, Dumpala’s, and Dingle’s peak models. The post-hoc analysis for Friedman’s test is then evaluated to find the relationship through the comparison of the four peak models. The post-hoc analysis is based on Holm-Bonferroni method using two difference confidence intervals, $\alpha = 0.05$ and $\alpha = 0.10$. Both Friedman’s test and Holm-Bonferroni post-hoc analysis are carried out by using KEEL software tool [7]. The results in Tab. XII show similar patterns for $\alpha = 0.05$ and $\alpha = 0.10$ for the two signals where Acir’s peak model offers significantly better test accuracies than Dingle’s and Dumpala’s peak models. In addition, there is no significant difference in test accuracies for Acir’s and Liu’s peak models, Dumpala’s and Dingle’s peak models, and Dumpala’s and Liu’s peak models. In other words, the Acir’s peak model is proved through statistical analysis to offer the highest accuracy as compared to previous results tabulated in Tabs. VII, VIII, IX, and X.

In this study, the ratio between true peak and false peak is 60:3178 for single eye blink signal and 40:4622 for double eye blink signal, respectively. That means both signals have extremely imbalanced dataset ratio. In this case, the conventional ANN learning algorithm such as levenberg marquart and gradient descent may fail to offer high accuracy of performance for imbalanced dataset problem. Hence, metaheuristic algorithms are more suitable to handle the training [48]. There are several metaheuristic algorithms can be employed such as PSO, genetic algorithm (GA), simulated annealing (SA), and Tabu search (TS) to train ANN for this type of problem. The PSO algorithm is used in this study because it has proved to be effective to train ANN for imbalanced dataset problem [39].

In utilizing PSO to train ANN for imbalanced dataset, the existing fitness evaluation function for balanced dataset need to be reformulated using $G_{\text{mean}}$. Therefore, the key factor in solving the problem of extremely imbalanced dataset in this study relies on the capability of $G_{\text{mean}}$ as fitness evaluation function. In order to maximize the $G_{\text{mean}}$, PSO provides the most appropriate ANN parameters and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peak model</th>
<th>Training results</th>
<th>Testing results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average [%]</td>
<td>Max [%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumpala et al.</td>
<td>91.23</td>
<td>92.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acir et al. [3]</td>
<td>97.61</td>
<td>99.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liu et al.</td>
<td>93.10</td>
<td>95.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dingle et al.</td>
<td>84.21</td>
<td>87.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tab. VII** Performance of peak detection models for single eye blink signal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peak model</th>
<th>Sensitivity [%] = $\frac{TP}{TP + FN} \times 100$</th>
<th>Specificity [%] = $\frac{TN}{TN + FP} \times 100$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dumpala et al.</td>
<td>94.11</td>
<td>70.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acir et al. [3]</td>
<td>94.91</td>
<td>89.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liu et al.</td>
<td>90.02</td>
<td>86.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dingle et al.</td>
<td>76.16</td>
<td>72.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tab. VIII** Sensitivity and specificity test results for single eye blink signal.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peak model</th>
<th>Training results</th>
<th>Testing results</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average [%]</td>
<td>Max [%]</td>
<td>Min [%]</td>
<td>STDEV [%]</td>
<td>Average [%]</td>
<td>Max [%]</td>
<td>Min [%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumpala et al.</td>
<td>85.42</td>
<td>87.46</td>
<td>82.64</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>80.14</td>
<td>83.28</td>
<td>76.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acir et al. [3]</td>
<td>89.05</td>
<td>91.04</td>
<td>87.20</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>87.47^{best}</td>
<td>92.10</td>
<td>82.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liu et al.</td>
<td>89.75</td>
<td>91.25</td>
<td>86.24</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>86.10</td>
<td>89.65</td>
<td>81.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dingle et al.</td>
<td>83.79</td>
<td>87.65</td>
<td>80.56</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>75.79^{worst}</td>
<td>83.22</td>
<td>64.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tab. IX** *Performance of peak detection models for double eye blink signal.*

\[
\text{Sensitivity [%]} = \frac{TP}{TP + FN} \times 100
\]

\[
\text{Specificity [%]} = \frac{TN}{TN + FP} \times 100
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peak model</th>
<th>Sensitivity [%]</th>
<th>Specificity [%]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dumpala et al.</td>
<td>86.57</td>
<td>74.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acir et al. [3]</td>
<td>88.74</td>
<td>86.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liu et al.</td>
<td>89.08</td>
<td>83.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dingle et al.</td>
<td>75.20</td>
<td>77.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tab. X** *Sensitivity and specificity test results for double eye blink signal.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peak model</th>
<th>Average ranking</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single eye blink signal</td>
<td>Double eye blink signal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumpala et al.</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acir et al. [3]</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liu et al.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dingle et al.</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tab. XI** *Average ranking of Friedman's test with $p < 0.01$.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>i</th>
<th>Peak model</th>
<th>$\alpha = 0.05$</th>
<th>$\alpha = 0.10$</th>
<th>$\alpha = 0.05$</th>
<th>$\alpha = 0.10$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Acir’s vs. Dingle’s</td>
<td>0.00002</td>
<td>0.00833</td>
<td>0.01667</td>
<td>0.00002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Liu’s vs. Dingle’s</td>
<td>0.00182</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00182</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dumpala’s vs. Acir’s</td>
<td>0.00558</td>
<td>0.0125</td>
<td>0.00558</td>
<td>0.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Dumpala’s vs. Liu’s</td>
<td>0.11903</td>
<td>0.01667</td>
<td>0.11903</td>
<td>0.03333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dumpala’s vs. Dingle’s</td>
<td>0.11903</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.11903</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Acir’s vs. Liu’s</td>
<td>0.22535</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.22535</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tab. XII** *Pos-hoc analysis for Friedman’s test.*
consequently balancing the detection rate between false peak and true peak rates of the dataset.

Furthermore, three peak models, which are Acir’s, Liu’s, and Dingle’s, have been successfully employed in EEG epilepsy application while Dumpala’s peak model has successfully been used for Electric Control Activity (ECA) application [3, 13, 14, 28]. The utilization of a particular peak model is to detect true peaks in a particular application. For example in epilepsy detection application, when a number of true peaks are detected within certain times, an epilepsy event may occur. Similar approach is also used in eye blink detection application. When one true peak or two true peaks are detected, a subject may has blinked his eyes once or twice, respectively. This method has proved to achieve good detection performance especially for epilepsy application. As pointed out by Dumpala et al. [14], Acir et al. [3], Liu et al. [28], and Dingle et al. [13], their detection system with the selected peak model and subsequent processes contributed to the good detection performance. Although good detection performance has been achieved in [3, 13, 14, 28], yet there used various type of peak detection algorithms on different peak models. Therefore, the need for further research on the evaluation of detection performance using combination of different types of peak models in a common platform such as ANN for fair evaluation.

Without precisely determines the peak model from the collection of features, the best detection performance only depends on the design of subsequent processes, for example, classification process. Therefore, in this study, with precisely determination of peak model, the peak detection algorithm with Acir’s peak model and the subsequent processes (ANN with the PSO learning algorithm) offers good detection performance on EEG eye blink detection. Additionally, the peak model that gives the lowest detection performance can be determined as well.

This study may provide significant contribution in many applications. For example, in medical diagnostic, human machine interface (HMI), brain computer interface (BCI), and harmonic detection in digital and audio signal processing as these applications share a common peak detection problem. In devising a common platform for detecting the peak with various peak features, this study may offer more generalized solution and avoid problem dependent solution.

4. Conclusions

In this study, ANN with the PSO learning algorithm has been employed as a classifier for peak detection in eye blink EEG signals in order to evaluate the performance of four different peak models. The eye blink EEG signals that were collected from 30 healthy subjects were used in the investigation. From this, two case studies of eye blink signal involving single and double eye blink signals were considered for performance evaluation of all peak models. The finding of the both performance evaluations indicates that the Acir’s peak model is the best peak model for eye blink EEG signals peak detection. The results indicate the highest average test performance of peak detection algorithm is 91.94% and 87.47% for single and double eye blink signals, respectively. This is due to the small variation of peak width of Acir’s model that relaxes the learning process of the classifier in the algorithm. Furthermore, the results also indicate that the Acir’s peak model is
capable to provide a good generalized model by measuring the highest classification rate of minimum testing result. In statistical analysis by Friedman’s test, there is a significant difference in test accuracies between the peak models for the two signals. Also, the pos-hoc analysis indicates that the Acir’s peak model is better than Dingle’s and Dumpala’s peak models. In general, from the experimental results, it can be observed that the relevant peak model and the chosen $G_{\text{mean}}$ function are the main factors in achieving higher classification rate. The utilization of the PSO learning algorithm with ANN for peak detection algorithm is to balance the ratio between false peak and true peak detection rates. As there are various combinations of peak features in the existing peak models, the use of feature selection will be investigated in future to further increase the classification rate.
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