SmartSleep Analyzer: Development of a clinically validated questionnaire and scoring algorithm designed to identify likely sleep problems amongst adults
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Background

Sleep is critical to maintaining health and quality of life; however, inadequate sleep duration and/or quality is common.(1) Further, clinical sleep disorders are increasingly prevalent,(2-5) and are often undiagnosed and therefore untreated.(6) It can be difficult to distinguish sleep issues that may be addressed through adjustments to lifestyle versus issues that may represent a more serious condition requiring medical intervention. There exists a clear need for a clinically validated tool that can be used in the community to direct individuals toward the care for a particular sleep concern from which they may benefit.

In response to this need, Philips – in conjunction with the Cooperative Research Center for Alertness, Safety, and Productivity (Victoria, Australia) – has developed a questionnaire and accompanying scoring algorithm known as SmartSleep Analyzer, designed for use by adults in the home environment. The questions cover domains including body habitus, medical history, sleep hygiene, sleep-related functional status and symptoms associated with common sleep disorders. The tool includes 113 questions in total; however, branching logic results in each respondent completing only a subset of questions most relevant to that individual.

When scored, SmartSleep Analyzer categorizes each respondent as follows:

- **Obstructive sleep apnea**: A sleep disorder characterized by repeated partial or complete collapse of the upper airway during sleep
- **Snoring**: Audible vibration of the soft tissue in the upper airway
- **Delayed sleep phase disorder**: Dysregulation of the circadian rhythm whereby the person falls asleep and wakes much later than the general population
- **Shift work disorder**: A disorder caused by a person’s work hours overlapping with their typical sleep period
- **Chronic sleep restriction**: Insufficient sleep resulting from restricted time in bed for any reason, such as work, lifestyle or a medical issue
- **Trouble falling asleep or staying asleep**: Prolonged patient dissatisfaction with falling or staying asleep
- **No sleep issue**
Upon completion of the questionnaire, respondents are shown which of these seven categories is likely to be their primary sleep issue, as well as the level of certainty regarding the categorization. Secondary and tertiary sleep issues are shown where applicable. Examples of the information provided to a respondent with a high likelihood of shift work disorder (primary) and a medium likelihood of snoring (secondary) are shown in Figure 1.

In a prior study completed in collaboration with the CRC, 2,316 adults completed the SmartSleep Analyzer questionnaire. A subset of 204 were recruited from sleep clinics and completed the questionnaire prior to their consultation with a physician.

Methods

This study was a retrospective analysis of existing data, performed with ethical approval from Allendale Institutional Review Board (10457; November 15, 2018).

Of the original 2,316 questionnaires completed by adults in our previous study (see above), 863 included completion of all branches of the survey. From these, 90 records were selected at random for the current analysis, ensuring that the selected sample matched the overall sample for age, BMI and self-reported sleep duration.

Three board-certified sleep physicians practicing in the United States were identified and trained on the protocol. The dataset consisting of 90 completed questionnaires was supplied to the physicians, who were instructed to identify a primary categorization of each respondent, as well as a secondary and/or tertiary if considered necessary. The category described above as ‘trouble falling asleep or staying asleep’ was labelled ‘insomnia’ by the physicians. Physicians were instructed to ensure that OSA did not co-exist with snoring, and insomnia did not co-exist with chronic sleep restriction, shift-work disorder or delayed sleep phase disorder within an individual respondent. Unlike the SmartSleep Analyzer scoring algorithm, physicians were given the option of selecting ‘other issue’ in addition to the seven categories listed above. This category allowed physicians to flag the potential for an additional non-sleep issue, such as excessive alcohol consumption, whereas the questionnaire was designed to return categorizations related directly to sleep. Each physician completed their assessments independently, based only on the completed questionnaire data provided to them.

The 90 questionnaire records were processed with the SmartSleep Analyzer scoring algorithm for comparison against physician assessments.

An a priori power calculation was completed. Assuming questionnaire versus physician assessment accuracy rates of 80% and a sample size of 90, the 95% confidence intervals were estimated to be approximately ± 10%.
Data analysis

In our primary analyses, rank choice methodology was used to determine the consensus assessment of each questionnaire across all three physicians. Each of the physician categorizations were assigned a point value of 3 (primary categorization), 2 (secondary categorization) or 1 (tertiary categorization) and points were summed for each individual respondent. The consensus primary, secondary and tertiary assessments were identified according to the three categorizations with the highest scores.

In the case of a tie, the categorization with the majority of physicians assigning it primary was selected. If a tie remained, the categorization assigned most often was selected. If a tie remained at this point, a category was randomly selected from the tied assessments. Whenever a tie was broken, the category not selected was assigned to the next subordinate level. The rank-choice derivation was iterated 20 times to account for the variance in some categories due to the random breaking of ties.

These comparisons were then repeated after combining OSA and snoring as a single category.

In addition to the consensus methodology described above, we compared the accuracy of SmartSleep Analyzer versus the physicians against the accuracy of the physicians versus each other. We first computed the mean accuracy of: SmartSleep Analyzer versus Dr. A, SmartSleep Analyzer versus Dr. B, SmartSleep Analyzer versus Dr. C. Next, we computed the mean accuracy of: Dr. A versus Dr. B, Dr. B versus Dr. C, Dr. A versus Dr. C. Comparing these two metrics allowed us to determine whether the accuracy of SmartSleep Analyzer against the physicians was more or less accurate than the physicians compared with each other. Finally, we investigated the level of agreement across the three physicians.
Interpretation of results

On average, the analytic sample (n=90) was 70% female (63/90), 42.2±14.5 years of age, had a BMI of 32.0±7.7 kg/m² and had a self-reported average sleep duration of 6.5±1.4 hours/night. The overall sample from which the analytic sample was drawn (n=2,316) had an average age of 41.7±13.9 years, BMI of 32.0±7.3 kg/m² and self-reported average sleep duration of 6.4±1.7 hours/night.

Five protocol deviations were noted in the physician assessments. Specifically, one respondent was categorized by one physician with co-existing insomnia and chronic sleep restriction; two respondents were categorized by one physician with co-existing insomnia and shift-work disorder, two respondents were categorized by one physician with insomnia as both the primary and secondary categorization. There were no instances of an individual respondent being categorized with both OSA and snoring, or with both insomnia and delayed sleep phase disorder. These errors were retained in the dataset, rather than removing or modifying physician responses.

![Figure 2: Mean and 95% confidence intervals of the agreement between the SmartSleep Analyzer scoring algorithm and consensus physician assessments.](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>95% CI – Lower-bound</th>
<th>95% CI – Upper-bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;SmartSleep Analyzer 1°/2°/3° vs. Physicians 1° All Categories Separate&quot;</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>95.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;SmartSleep Analyzer 1°/2°/3° vs. Physicians 1° OSA/Snoring Combined&quot;</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;SmartSleep Analyzer 1° vs. Physicians 1°/2°/3° All Categories Separate&quot;</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>96.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;SmartSleep Analyzer 1° vs. Physicians 1° OSA/Snoring Combined&quot;</td>
<td>96.4</td>
<td>90.3</td>
<td>99.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;SmartSleep Analyzer 1° vs. Physicians 1° All Categories Separate&quot;</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>74.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;SmartSleep Analyzer 1° vs. Physicians 1° OSA/Snoring Combined&quot;</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>80.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2 shows the levels of agreement between the SmartSleep Analyzer algorithm and the consensus physician categorization of all 90 records. When comparing the SmartSleep Analyzer response/s (primary, secondary or tertiary) against the primary response of the physicians, average agreement was 91%. Recognizing that it can be difficult for a physician to predict whether a patient they see during a consultation is suffering from OSA or snoring, we performed an analysis in which the OSA and snoring categories were combined. In this scenario, average agreement was 99%. The lower-bound of the 95% confidence interval was 94%, meaning that if this comparison were to be made 100 times, the agreement rate between SmartSleep Analyzer and the physicians would be at least 94% in 95 cases.

We also performed this analysis in reverse; that is, we compared the primary categorization of SmartSleep Analyzer against the consensus categorization (primary, secondary or tertiary) of the physicians. The average agreement was 91%.
when the seven categories were separated, and 96% when OSA and snoring were combined. Comparing the primary categorization of SmartSleep Analyzer with the primary categorization of the physicians, average agreement was 64%, and 72% when OSA and snoring were combined.

We noted substantial disagreement across physicians regarding the categorization of respondents (see Table 2), reflecting the complexities associated with reviewing sleep routines and symptoms and attempting to predict the underlying cause/s. Of the 90 records, there were 27 instances (30%) for which all three physicians were in agreement as to the primary categorization, and all three physicians disagreed in 10% of cases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All categories separate</th>
<th>OSA and snoring combined into a single category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All agree</td>
<td>27 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All disagree</td>
<td>9 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. A and Dr. B agree</td>
<td>22 (24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. A and Dr. C agree</td>
<td>16 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. B and Dr. C agree</td>
<td>16 (18%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Frequency and percentage of agreement of the primary categorization across the three physicians

**Concluding remarks**

The results of this validation study demonstrate that the Philips SmartSleep Analyzer scoring algorithm performs well for the purpose of identifying the sleep issue/s that may impact each respondent, using physician-review as the comparison standard. Interpreting these results in the setting where SmartSleep Analyzer will be used, our data suggest that if an adult were to complete the questionnaire and then see a sleep physician, there would be a 91% chance on average that the physician’s opinion of his or her primary sleep issue would be in the list of potential issues identified by SmartSleep Analyzer.

The average of the SmartSleep Analyzer primary/secondary/tertiary categorization versus the primary categorization of Dr. A, Dr. B and Dr. C was 82%, compared with an average of 70% when comparing each physician’s primary against the other physicians’ primary/secondary/tertiary categorizations. In the converse analysis, the average of the SmartSleep Analyzer primary categorization versus the primary/secondary/tertiary categorization of Dr. A, Dr. B and Dr. C was 73%, compared with the aforementioned average of 70% when comparing each physician’s primary against the other physicians’ primary/secondary/tertiary categorizations. Finally, the average of the SmartSleep Analyzer primary categorization versus the primary categorization of Dr. A, Dr. B and Dr. C was 56%, compared with an average of 50% when comparing each physician’s primary against the other physicians’ primary categorizations.

In all analyses undertaken, the accuracy of SmartSleep Analyzer against physicians exceeded the accuracy of the physicians when compared to each other. Thus, we have developed a clinically-validated tool to guide adults in the community towards appropriate care for the sleep issues that may be affecting their lives. Ultimately, we hope that SmartSleep Analyzer will improve the quality of life of many adults who may benefit from addressing their sleep concerns through sleep hygiene and lifestyle adjustments, and potentially reduce the reported diagnostic barriers and delays for those suffering from more serious sleep disorders.
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