

## *Review Paper*

Moein Razavi<sup>a,b,f</sup>, Samira Ziyadidegan<sup>a</sup>, Ahmadreza Mahmoudzadeh<sup>e,f</sup>, Saber Kazeminasab<sup>c</sup>,  
Elaheh Baharlouei<sup>d</sup>, Vahid Janfaza<sup>b</sup>, Reza Jahromi<sup>a,b</sup>, Farzan Sasangohar<sup>a,\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering, Texas A&M University

<sup>b</sup> Department of Computer Science and Engineering, Texas A&M University

<sup>c</sup> Harvard Medical School, Harvard University

<sup>d</sup> Department of Computer Science, University of Houston

<sup>e</sup> Engineering Academic and Student Affairs, College of Engineering, Texas A&M University

<sup>f</sup> Ford Motor Company, Global Data Insight & Analytics

Corresponding author. 3131 TAMU, College Station, TX, 77843, USA. E-mail address: sasangohar@tamu.edu

# **Machine Learning, Deep Learning and Data Preprocessing Techniques for Detection, Prediction, and Monitoring of Stress and Stress-related Mental Disorders: A Scoping Review**

## *Abstract*

**Background:** Mental stress and its consequent mental disorders (MDs) constitute a significant public health issue. With the advent of machine learning (ML), there's potential to harness computational techniques for better understanding and addressing mental stress and MDs. This comprehensive review seeks to elucidate the current ML methodologies employed in this domain to pave the way for enhanced detection, prediction, and analysis of mental stress and its subsequent mental disorders.

**Objective:** This review aims to investigate the scope of Machine Learning (ML) methodologies employed in the detection, prediction, and analysis of mental stress and its consequent mental disorders (MDs).

**Methods:** Utilizing a rigorous scoping review process with Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) guidelines, this investigation delves into the latest ML algorithms, preprocessing techniques, and data types employed in the context of stress and stress-related MDs.

**Results and Discussion:** Total of 98 peer-reviewed publication were examined for this review. The findings highlight that Support Vector Machine (SVM), Neural Network (NN), and Random Forest (RF) models consistently exhibit superior accuracy and robustness among all machine learning algorithms examined. Physiological parameters such as heart rate measurements and skin response are prevalently used as stress predictors due to their rich explanatory information concerning stress and stress-related MDs, as well as the relative ease of data acquisition. The application of dimensionality reduction techniques, including mappings, feature selection, filtering, and noise reduction, is frequently observed as a crucial step preceding the training of ML algorithms.

**Conclusion:** The synthesis of this review identifies significant research gaps and outlines future directions for the field. These encompass areas such as model interpretability, model personalization, the incorporation of naturalistic settings, and real-time processing capabilities for the detection and prediction of stress and stress-related MDs.

**Keywords:** Machine Learning; Deep Learning; Data Preprocessing; Stress Detection; Stress Prediction; Stress Monitoring; Mental Disorders

## *Introduction*

Mental health has become a public health concern. According to Institute of Health Metrics and Evaluation (IHME), in 2019, about 53 million people in the United States and about one in eight individuals worldwide (about 1 billion people) suffer from at least one mental health disorder (MD) [1]. MD is defined as an impairment in a person's cognition, emotional control, or behavior pattern, which has clinical significance and is often linked to distress or functional impairment [2]. MDs severely limit people's daily functioning and can be fatal [3], [4]. In 2019, mental health (MH) problems accounted for 6.6% of all disability-adjusted life years in the US, making it the fifth most significant cause of disability overall [5], [6].

Some of the more prevalent MDs are anxiety disorders, depression or mood disorders, bipolar disorders, psychotic disorders (including schizophrenia), eating disorders, social disorders and disruptive behavior and addictive behaviors [2]. In 2019, anxiety and depression have been the most prevalent forms of MDs (301 and 280 million people affected worldwide, respectively). Anxiety disorder encompasses emotions of concern, anxiety, excessive fear, or associated behavioral problems that are severe enough to affect everyday activities [2]. Symptoms include an unproportionate level of stress compared to the significance of the triggering event, difficulty in putting worries out of one's mind, and nervousness [7], [8]. Generalized anxiety disorder, panic attacks, social anxiety disorder, and post-traumatic stress disorder are all examples of different types of anxiety disorders [2], [9]. Depression is characterized by a long-lasting sadness and a lack of desire to be active. One of the main symptoms of depression is the inability to enjoy or find pleasure in most of one's daily activities as well as feeling sadness, anger, or emptiness [2], [10]. A depressive episode typically lasts for at least two weeks. Additionally, a loss of self-worth, feelings of hopelessness for the future and suicidal thoughts are indicators and symptoms of depression. People who are depressed are more prone to commit suicide [2], [10], [11].

Stress is categorized into distress, which typically has chronic negative effects on health, and eustress, which is short-term and positively influences motivation and development [12]. Throughout this paper, the term stress is specifically used to denote distress, rather than eustress. Mental stress has shown to significantly contribute to developing and worsening anxiety and depression disorders [13], [14], [15]. Mental stress is the body's natural response to various events in which a person feels that the demands of their external environment exceed their psychological and physiological resources for dealing with those demands [16]. Mental stress leads to an asynchrony between the sympathetic and parasympathetic nervous systems (SNS and PNS) which are the main divisions of the autonomic nervous system (ANS) [17] and serve an important role in regulating vital biological activities [18], [19]. The sympathetic nervous system is an integrative system that responds to potentially dangerous circumstances. Activation of the sympathetic

nervous system is part of the system responsible for controlling 'fight-or-flight' responses. The parasympathetic nervous system is responsible for the body's "rest and digest" processes.

Given the import role and impact of stress in MDs, previous research has investigated various qualitative and quantitative methods to measure and monitor stress to inform effective stress mitigation approaches. While majority of stress literature relies on self-reported measures, recent literature has used physiological variables such as heart rate, heart rate variability [20], [21], [22], [23], [24], and behavioral data (e.g., speech, movement, facial expressions) [25] to understand changes to SNS and PNS associated with stress. The recent advances in sensor and mobile health technologies has resulted in the emergence of "big data" related to mental health as well as advanced bioinformatics methods, tools, or techniques to use such data for modeling or inference. One such tool that has recently emerged as a robust, rapid, objective, reliable, and cost-efficient technique for studying chronic illnesses and MDs is Machine Learning (ML). ML uses advanced statistical and probabilistic techniques to construct systems that can automatically learn from data. Several characteristics of ML makes it suitable for applications in MH monitoring including significant pattern recognition and forecasting capabilities [26], capacity to extract crucial information from various data resources and opportunity to create personalized experiences [26], and ability to analyze large amounts of data in a short time [27]. As such, ML has gained popularity and has been applied to MH data to enable detection, monitoring, and treatment [28]. The objective of this research is to review the literature to summarize and synthesize the application of ML in the detection, monitoring, or prediction of stress and stress-related MDs, in particular anxiety and depression. This paper documents methods-specific findings such as data types, preprocessing methods, and different algorithms used as well as type and characteristics of studies that used ML. Traditional statistical methods, such as linear regression, logistic regression, t-tests, and ANOVA [29], have been widely employed in the past to detect and analyze stress and stress-related MDs. These methods have proven useful in specific contexts, such as comparing means of different groups, or modeling linear relationships between variables. As demonstrated by [22], [23], [24], [25] and [26], these methods have provided valuable insights in situations where the data is relatively simple and adheres to the underlying assumptions of the statistical techniques. However, when faced with complex, high-dimensional mental health data, which has become increasingly available thanks to advancements in technology and data collection techniques, these traditional statistical methods might not be sufficient. The limitations of these methods stem from their inherent simplicity and the assumptions they rely on, which might not hold true in the context of MH data. For example, linear and logistic regression assume linear relationships between variables, while t-tests and ANOVA require specific assumptions about the data distribution. These assumptions may not be applicable in the case of intricate and heterogeneous MH data, potentially leading to inaccurate or incomplete conclusions.

Advanced data analytics methods, such as machine learning (ML), offer a more powerful and flexible alternative to traditional statistical methods. ML algorithms, with their significant pattern recognition and forecasting capabilities [26], are capable of capturing complex, nonlinear relationships between variables and can adapt to various data distributions. These capabilities enable ML techniques to provide more accurate and insightful predictions, classifications, and associations in the context of MH data [34]. Additionally, ML algorithms can handle large-scale, high-dimensional data more efficiently than traditional methods, allowing researchers to analyze vast amounts of information from diverse sources, such as electronic health records, wearable

devices, and online platforms [27]. This capacity for handling big data is crucial for understanding the multifaceted nature of mental health disorders and developing tailored interventions. ML techniques also offer the advantage of automation and adaptability, allowing them to continuously learn and improve as new data becomes available [26]. This iterative learning process enables the development of more sophisticated and accurate models for detecting, monitoring, and predicting stress and stress-related MDs over time.

While traditional statistical methods have contributed significantly to our understanding of stress and stress related MDs in specific contexts, the growing complexity and volume of MH data necessitate the adoption of advanced data analytics methods like ML. By leveraging the power of ML, researchers can gain deeper insights into the underlying patterns and relationships between stress and MDs [34], ultimately leading to the development of more effective stress mitigation approaches and improved care for individuals suffering from anxiety, depression, and other MDs.

Acknowledging the substantial contributions of traditional statistical methods, it becomes evident that the escalating complexity and scale of mental health data demands the adoption of more sophisticated approaches such as ML. This advancement stands not as a replacement but as an essential evolution in the analytical toolbox available to researchers. As this paper delves into the myriad ways ML has been applied to mental health, particularly in the realms of stress, anxiety, and depression, it seeks to consolidate the current knowledge on the subject. By examining the types of data, preprocessing methods, and the algorithms used in existing studies, this review aspires to offer a detailed synthesis of the field. It aims to provide a clearer understanding of ML's effectiveness in the detection, monitoring, and prediction of mental health disorders, setting a foundation for future research and the enhancement of therapeutic strategies for those impacted by these conditions.

## ***Methods***

### **Protocol and Registration**

This scoping review adhered to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) guidelines [35]. No formal review protocol was registered due to the exploratory nature of this study, which aimed to map out existing research rather than address a prespecified hypothesis. This approach aligns with the methodological flexibility often required in emergent areas of research.

### **Eligibility Criteria**

We included studies published in English from 2017 to 2022 that utilized machine learning (ML) techniques to evaluate mental health disorders, specifically focusing on stress and stress-related conditions. Studies were excluded if they did not use ML as the primary analysis method or if they were published in languages other than English.

## Information Sources

The literature search involved databases such as EI Engineering Village, Web of Science, ACM Digital Library, and IEEE Xplore. Additional sources were identified through contact with experts and review of references in relevant articles.

## Search Strategy


A comprehensive search was conducted using a combination of keywords related to ML and mental health disorders (Table 1). The search strategy was designed to capture a broad spectrum of ML applications within this field. The full search list from all databases is available in the Multimedia Appendix.

**Table 1.** Keywords and search strategy for articles since 2017 (last 5 years)

First keyword		Second keyword		Third keyword
predict OR detect	AND	mental health OR mental disorder OR depression OR anxiety OR stress	AND	machine learning OR deep learning OR data mining OR pattern classification OR artificial intelligence OR neural networks

## Study Selection, Inclusion, and Exclusion Criteria

Articles that did not fully use ML for stress or stress related MDs evaluations were excluded from the research. Studies published in languages other than English were also excluded. The initial search yielded 1241 results. After duplicate articles were deleted and eligibility was confirmed using Rayyan QCRI [36], 1204 articles remained. After applying the exclusion criteria, 98 papers were selected for full review (Figure 1).



**Figure 1.** Preferred items for scoping literature review and meta-analysis flowchart [35]

### Data Charting Process

Data charting was conducted by two reviewers independently using a standardized form, which had been pretested on a subset of included studies. Discrepancies were resolved through discussion or consultation with a third reviewer. Study authors were contacted for clarification or additional data where necessary.

### Data Items

Data extracted included publication year, study design, population characteristics, ML techniques used, outcomes measured, and key findings. Other variables sought included data preprocessing methods and performance metrics of the ML models. Simplifying assumptions, such as considering different ML algorithms within the same family as a single technique, were made to facilitate synthesis.

### Synthesis of Results


Data were synthesized descriptively, grouping findings by ML techniques, data type and preprocessing techniques. Where possible, quantitative performance metrics were extracted or derived. Results were analyzed in the context of the overall study designs and populations to highlight trends and identify gaps in the current research landscape. No formal critical appraisal or quantitative meta-analysis was conducted due to the diversity of the included studies and the scoping nature of this review.

### Results and Discussion

In this section types of data, preprocessing techniques, and ML techniques used on the data in the literature have been reviewed, and compared with the existing literature.

## Types of Data

Various data types were used in the studies that used ML algorithms for stress and stress-related MDs. Studies used questionnaire (n=31), heart rate variability (HRV, n=25), skin response (e.g., skin temperature, skin conductance, etc., n=24), photoplethysmogram (PPG, n=21), electrocardiogram (ECG, n=19), heart rate (HR, n=17), electroencephalogram (EEG, n=9), acceleration/body movement (n=8), text data (n=7), respiratory signals (n=7), electromyogram (EMG, n=3), eye-tracking (n=3), speech signals (n=3) and others (n=4) including audio signals (n=2), blood pressure (BP, n=1), and hormones (n=1). Figure 2 shows the distribution of the type of data used for stress detection using ML techniques.



**Figure 2.** Number of articles by types of data


### *Heart Measures*

Heart metrics are primarily utilized for stress detection and are typically gathered through two main methods: ECG (Electrocardiography) and PPG (Photoplethysmography). ECG is a non-invasive diagnostic test that records the heart's electrical activity, while PPG is a non-invasive optical technique that detects changes in blood volume within the tissue's microvascular bed. By employing these methods, it is possible to measure various heart-related parameters, including heart rate (HR), as well as time and frequency domain features of heart rate variability (HRV), and blood pressure (BP).

- *Heart Rate Variability (HRV) (n=25)*: Heart Rate Variability (HRV) has been used to assess mental health issues, such as stress, anxiety, and depression, due to its rich time and


frequency domain features [37]. The Blood Volume Pulse (BVP) signal is another effective method for capturing HRV features, as it represents the heart's beat-to-beat volume changes. From the BVP signal, time domain measures like the Root Mean Square of Successive RR Interval Differences (RMSSD), Standard Deviation of NN intervals (SDNN), and Standard Deviation of RR intervals (SDRR) can be derived. Additionally, the frequency domain aspects of HRV, including Total Power (TP, frequencies below 0.4 Hz), Low Frequencies (LF, ranging from 0.04 Hz to 0.15 Hz), and High Frequencies (HF, between 0.15 Hz and 0.4 Hz), reflect the autonomic nervous system's dynamics during beat-to-beat measurements of the heart rate (Figure 3) [38], [39]. These HRV measures, both in the time and frequency domains, provide a nuanced view of the physiological underpinnings associated with various mental health conditions.

- *Heart Rate (HR) (n=17)*: One of the most important indicators of stress is an abrupt increase in HR. Among the physiological signals, HR is among the top measures that explains stress in ML models and it has been used in different studies with almost all ML algorithms [40], [41], [42].
- *Blood Pressure (BP) (n=1)*: BP can be obtained by pulse transit time (PTT) or by pressure cuffs [43]. Stressful conditions create an influx of hormones that increase HR and constrict blood vessels leading to a temporary BP elevation [44]. In most cases, BP recovers to its pre-stress level after the stress response diminishes [45]. Schultebrucks et al. used systolic BP as one of the measures in predicting one's level of susceptibility to Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) [46].



(a)





(b)

**Figure 3.** (a) Depiction of heart's beat-to-beat measurements using Blood Volume Pulse (BVP) signal  
 (b) Power Spectral Density (PSD) of RR intervals (the signal is bandpass filtered with cut-off frequencies of 0.04 Hz and 0.4 Hz)

*Electroencephalogram (EEG) (n=9):* EEG detects brain electrical activity. Compared to other brain mapping techniques, for stress detection, it is more practical due to several factors including affordability, non-invasiveness, non-intrusiveness and most importantly its high temporal resolution [47]. The high temporal resolution of EEG makes it appropriate for real-time stress detection, as well as DL approaches which require large dataset for training [47], [48], [49], [50], [51].

The most commonly used EEG features for detection of stress are power of different frequency bands, Alpha (8-13 Hz), Beta (12.5-30 Hz), Theta (4-7.5 Hz), Gamma (30-40 Hz), average and standard deviation of a specific time window of EEG signal, and time-frequency features obtained by Discrete Wavelet Transform (DWT) algorithm [51], [52], [53]. It has also been shown that statistical features of EEG signal such as Kurtosis and Entropy are useful features in stress prediction using ML algorithms [50]. Moreover, Power Spectral Density (PSD), correlation (C), divisional asymmetry (DASM), rational asymmetry (RASM), and power spectrum (PS) are other EEG features that have been used in different studies for stress detection [54].

Since EEG signals are collected from the scalp, they include excessive noise and so they have high uncertainty. Therefore, signal processing and feature selection/extraction is a very important step while dealing with EEG data. Several well-developed methods are available for treating the EEG data. Among them, using latent space derived from auto-encoders and signal reconstruction techniques such as Artifact Subspace Reconstruction (ASR) are well-known methods that can be applied on EEG data to significantly reduce the artifacts [49]. These methods are also fast enough that can make online detection feasible.

Amygdala and hippocampus are the parts of the brain that have the major responsibility for human reactions to stress [55]. Brain activity caused by stress in those regions would affect the prefrontal cortex. Studies collecting data from prefrontal cortex have also verified that EEG data from this brain region can be used for stress detection [56]. EEG can be collected from the prefrontal cortex

using off-the-shelf EEG recording products such as MUSE and Neurosky Mindwave [50], [53], [54], [56].

*Eye Tracking (n=3)*: Eye-tracking features can be indicators of stress. For example, to diagnose the level of stress, the changes in the striations of muscle material in the iris as a response to stress can be used as features for ML algorithms. In other words, pupil diameter, which would be controlled by iris sphincter muscles can be used as a feature [57]. Other eye-tracking features that have been for stress detection are visual fixations, saccade movements, pupil size, micro saccades and number of eye-blinks in specific time window during a certain task [58], [59], [60].

*Skin Response (n=24)*: A skin response can be defined as a stimulus-regulated electrodermal response and is typically measured using electrodes placed on the fingertips or hands. Skin response is usually associated with increase in sympathetic activity upon inducing stress events [61]. The skin becomes a better conductor of electricity when it is stimulated either externally or internally by physiologically stimulating factors, including stressful conditions [62].

*Respiratory Signals (n=7)*: Mental stress can affect different respiratory cycle phases and breathing patterns [63], [64]. For example, It is discovered that stress had no impact on overall breath duration (respiration rate), but that exhalation periods were longer and pause periods were shorter in the stress experiment compared to the neutral condition [65].

Based on the findings of several studies, it can be concluded that respiratory signal is one of the top contributing factors in explanation of stress in ML models. The most common time domain respiratory signal features that are extracted for stress detection are: Root Mean Square (RMS), Interquartile range (IQR), Mean of squared Differences between Adjacent elements (MDA) of breathing rate and blood oxygenation levels. The most commonly used frequency domain features of the respiratory signal are the power of low frequencies (LF, under 2 Hz), the power of high frequencies (HF, above 2 Hz) and the ratio of power of low frequencies over the power of high frequencies (LF/HF) [42], [46], [47], [66], [67], [68].

*Electromyogram (EMG) (n=3)*: EMG detects the electrical activity of muscles at rest, during a modest contraction, and during a strong contraction [69]. Similar to acceleration data, several studies have shown that, using EMG data can help increasing the performance of ML models trained on ECG data. The action potential intrigued in the EMG during stress can reduce the variance for decision making of classification models that use ECG [42], [70], [71].

*Hormones (n=1)*: It has been shown that stress can alter the levels of glucocorticoids, catecholamines, growth hormones, and prolactin in the bloodstream. Therefore in ML models, level of hormones such as cortisol, dehydroepiandrosterone sulfate (DHEAS), thyroid-stimulating hormone (TSH), free triiodothyronine (FT3), and free thyroxine (FT4) can be used as predictors for detection of stress-related disorders [46].

*Acceleration/Body Movement (n=8)*: Mental Stress may cause a broad variety of behavioral/body movement symptoms such as shaking hands and feet which can be measured by the acceleration data [72]. Moreover, research has shown that people with a greater stress score had less variance in their activity level and body movements [73], [74], [75]. For example, In the elderly, stressful life events can be related to a reduced rate of regular physical exercise [76]. Time and frequency

features such as mean absolute deviation from mean (MAD), total power of acceleration, standard deviation, mean norm of acceleration, absolute integral, peak frequency of each axis are the features of hand/body acceleration used for stress detection [41], [77], [78]. One practical characteristic of motion/acceleration data would be the fact that it can be used to identify sources of noise in other signals. For example, motion data can help distinguishing stress from physical activity (e.g., exercise) when other physiological measures such as ECG have uncertainty in prediction [79], [80].

### *Audio and Speech Signals*

- *Speech Signals (n=3)*: Using speech signals, it is feasible to diagnose and assess neurological and MDs [81]. Moreover, studies have shown that, like body acceleration and EMG, features of speech signal can make stress predictions of heart measurements more robust. The best explanatory parameters of speech signal are frequency domain parameters (e.g., PSD, strongest frequency from FFT transform) and time-frequency features such as Mel-Frequency Cepstral Coefficient (MFCC) [40], [82], [83]. Since time-frequency measures are 2-dimensional measurements with high number of samples, they make this signal suitable for using in convolutional neural network models (CNNs) of stress and depression detection [84].
- *Audio Signals (n=2)*: For lab based studies, audio signals (e.g. beep sounds) can be used for stimulating stress events in participants [85], [86].

*Text data (n=7)*: Social media content is frequently subjected to reviews, opinions, and influence, as well as sentiment analysis. Natural language processing methods may be used to evaluate social networking posts and comments for mood and emotion to detect whether a user is stressed [87], [88], [89], [90], [91], [91], [92], [93].


*Questionnaire (n=31)*: There are different questionnaires that are used for diagnosis of stress and different MDs including anxiety and depression. The scores from different items on these questionnaires can be used as dependent/independent variables in ML studies. The questionnaires mentioned here were selected based on their prevalence in the literature as well as their relevance to the ML outcomes being predicted. For instance, some studies have successfully leveraged scores from multiple questionnaires, such as the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM), Depression Anxiety and Stress Scale (DASS), Edinburgh Perinatal/Postnatal Depression Scale (EPDS) Center for Epidemiological Studies-Depression (CES-D) survey, Mean Opinion Score (MOS), Hamilton Depression Rating Scale (HAM-D), State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI), Posttraumatic Stress Disorder Checklist for DSM (PCL), Beck Depression Inventory (BDI), Beck Anxiety Inventory (BAI), Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS), Goldberg's Depression Scale (GDS), self-reports and clinician reports, [94], [95], [96], [97], [98], [99], [100], [101], [102], [103], [104], [105], [106], [107], [108], [109], [110], [111].

### **Preprocessing Techniques**

In this section, important preprocessing techniques that have yielded significant findings and how they are used to help the detection of stress and its related MDs have been reviewed.

*Synthetic Minority Oversampling Technique (SMOTE) (n=3)*: In detection of stress and its related MDs, usually the number of samples for the stress or MD class is significantly lower than the non-stress or non-MD class. This imbalance in the number of samples for each class leads to a bias in prediction (towards the majority class). To correct for data bias, it is possible to oversample the underrepresented group. In stress detection studies using ML models, SMOTE is one of the most common approaches to boost the minority class using, which creates new samples by synthesizing those already available in the data (by combining their features) [77], [95], [112].

*Early Modality Fusion (n=1)*: In ML models used for prediction of stress with a multimodal approach, it has been shown that early fusion of multimodal data before feature extraction is more effective and archives a better performance. This is due to the fact that early modality fusion catches better the important characteristics that are in coherence with each other. For example a study showed that combining different measures including skin response, skin temperature and body acceleration before feature extraction outperforms the approach that extracts the features for each measure separately and combines them afterwards (Figure 4) [113].



**Figure 4.** (a) Early Modality Fusion (b) Late Modality Fusion

*Power Spectral Density (PSD) (n=13)*: In physiological signals for stress detection, usually power of the signal changes during the moments of stress. PSD explains the frequency-based power distribution of a time series and reveals the locations of strong and weak frequency variation. Welch's method is one of the most common approaches to calculate PSD [49]. PSD is often used in the studies that include frequency domain HRV features for stress detection such as total HF or LF power [66], [67], [68], [86], [114], [114], [115], [116], [117], [118], [119], [120], [121].

*ILIOU (n=1)*: In detection of MDs such as depression and anxiety using machine learning techniques, having the least error rate is significantly important so that the person can take further actions appropriately. In this matter, data preprocessing step has an important role to minimize the noise and bias towards the false prediction. Iliou et al. proposed ILIOU, a data mapping and transformation method, that identifies useful information for detection of MDs, especially for depression. This method outperforms common data preprocessing techniques such as Principal component analysis (PCA), Evolutionary Search Algorithm (ESA) and Isomap for detection of depression [99].

*Principal Component Analysis (PCA) (n=3)*: Principal component analysis (PCA) is a method for lowering the dimensionality of such datasets while maximizing interpretability and minimizing

loss of information. It does this by generating new variables that are uncorrelated and progressively optimize variance [42], [108], [122].

*Independent component analysis (ICA) ( $n=4$ ):* Independent component analysis (ICA) is a computational and statistical method for uncovering hidden elements underlying random variables, observations, or signals. This method is mostly used for removing artifacts from stationary signal noises of the multi-channel data. ICA optimizes higher-order statistics such as kurtosis, while PCA optimizes the covariance matrix of the data, which reflects second-order statistics. In stress detection using physiological signals that contain stationary noises (e.g. eyeblink noise in EEG) it is recommended to remove noises using ICA [47], [48], [49], [51].

*Artifact subspace reconstruction (ASR) ( $n=1$ ):* ASR is an adaptive approach for removing artifacts from signal recordings online or offline, mostly non-stationary signal noises. To identify artifacts based on their statistical qualities in the component subspace, it repeatedly computes a PCA on covariance matrices [123]. Since there are usually lots of non-stationary noises in the EEG data, in order to classify stress in multiple levels using EEG data, using ASR before classification is highly recommended [49].

*Latent Growth Mixture Modeling (LGMM) ( $n=1$ ):* Growth mixture modeling (GMM) is to discover numerous hidden subpopulations, describe longitudinal development within each hidden subpopulation, and investigate variation in hidden subpopulations' rates of change. Latent growth mixture models are gaining popularity as a statistical tool for estimating individual development over time and for probing the presence of latent trajectories, in which people belong to trajectories that are not directly observable [46], [124], [125].

*Dynamic Time Warping (DTW) ( $n=1$ ):* It is common practice to transform data from two time series into vectors and then compute the Euclidean distance between the resulting points in vector space to determine the degree of similarity or dissimilarity between the series, regardless of if they vary in time or velocity. DTW method can be applied to find such similarities that may exist between people in terms of their mood series. As an example, one may compare time-series to find whether they match for stress, depression, or anxiety. Moreover, it can be utilized to forecast the mental condition of persons with substantially comparable series patterns [115], [126]. The difference between DTW and Euclidean matching is that unlike Euclidean matching, DTW considers distance of each point in one sequence, to every point in the other sequence to determine the similarity between them (Figure 5).




**Figure 5.** Dynamic Time Warping Vs. Euclidean Matching [127]

*Kalman Filter ( $n=2$ ):* The Kalman filter is a technique for making predictions about unknown variables (e.g., missing data) based on observable data. Kalman filters include two iterative steps—predict and update—that are used to estimate states using linear dynamical systems in state space

format. Iterative cycles of predict and update are performed until convergence is achieved [128]. Kalman filter has been used to handle the missing data for stress detection in some studies [129], [130].


*Autoencoders (n=3)*: Autoencoders are a type of Neural Networks that learn a representation of the data in lower dimensions than the original data (encoding) by regenerating the input from the encodings (decoding). For data with very high dimensionality, usually clustering is not optimized because of the noise present in the original data. Hence, it is an appropriate practice to use the encoded representation of the data, obtained by autoencoders, to have lower and more optimized dimensions for clustering [49], [93], [131].

*Self-Organizing Map (SOM) (n=3)*: In ML, a self-organizing map (SOM) produces a low-dimensional – typically two-dimensional – representation of a high-dimensional dataset while preserving its topology by creating clusters. It is therefore possible to visualize and analyze high-dimensional data more easily (Figure 6) [92], [118], [132].



**Figure 6.** Representation of SOM before (left) and after mapping (right) [118].

*Wrapper Feature Selection Methods*: Wrapper methods try to use a subset of features while training a model. Changes will be made to the feature subset based on the performance about the prior model (Figure 7). Therefore, finding the best features using wrapper method is a search problem. These methods often have high computing costs [133]. Some most common wrapper methods are: Naïve search, Sequential Forward Feature Selection (SFFS), Sequential Backward Feature Selection (SBFS), and Generalized Sequential Search (GSS) [134]. Some studies used this approach as their feature selection technique [56], [59].



**Figure 7.** Steps of a wrapper feature selection method



*Filter Feature Selection Methods*: In general, filter methods are used as a preprocessing step without regard to any ML algorithms. Statistic tests are used instead to select features based on their correlation with dependent variables (Figure 8). The filter feature selection methods used in the literature are mentioned below.

### Filter Method



**Figure 8.** Steps of a filter feature selection method

- *Chi-square test* ( $n=3$ ): This test checks for independence between categorical features and the target variable. Features with high Chi-square scores are selected, implying a strong association with the target variable, which may be valuable for the model [40], [120], [135].
- *Pearson Correlation* ( $n=2$ ): Pearson linear correlation coefficient is a way to quantify how closely two sets of data are correlated linearly. It indicates how different measures are related to each other by a number between -1 to 1. Therefore, among highly correlated variables some them can be removed as they don't add useful information to ML models [98], [136].
- *Minimum Redundancy Maximum Relevance (mRMR)* ( $n=2$ ): mRMR technique chooses characteristics having a high correlation to output (relevance) and a low correlation to one another (redundancy). F-statistic is used to determine the correlation between features and the output, whilst Pearson correlation coefficient (for non-time series features) and Dynamic Time Warping (DTW for time series features) may be used to calculate the correlation between features (Figure 9). The objective function, which is a function of relevance and redundancy, is then maximized by selecting features one at a time using a greedy search. Mutual Information Difference (MID) and Mutual Information Quotient (MIQ) criteria are both frequently employed objective functions that depict the difference or quotient between relevance and redundancy [137], [138]. Using this feature selection method, Giannakakis et al. have ranked ECG measurements in the order of importance as mean HR, LF, NN50, standard deviation of HR, pNN50, LF/HF, RMSSD, HF, and total power [115].




(b)

**Figure 9.** calculation of relevance and redundancy for (a) non-time series features (b) time-series features  
(DTW: Dynamic Time Warping)

### Machine Learning (ML) Techniques

The ML algorithms used for stress and MD detection have been reviewed in this section. The papers used DL approach or Neural Network (NN, n=39) Logistic Regression (LR, n=26) Naive Bayes (NB, n=22), Decision Tree (DT, n=23), Boosting (e.g., Adaptive Boosting (AdaBoost), extreme Gradient Boosting (XGBoost), etc., n=22), Random Forest (RF, n=36), Discriminant Analysis (e.g., Linear Discriminant Analysis (LDA), Quadratic Discriminant Analysis (QDA), n=6), Fuzzy *C-means* (n=2), K-nearest neighbors (KNN, n=22) and Support Vector Machines (SVM, n=48). Figure 10 shows the distribution of articles by ML model. Refer to table A1 to find which papers have used each ML technique.




**Figure 10.** Number of articles for each ML model

*Logistic Regression (LR) (n=26):* LR is a supervised parametric ML technique in which multiple independent variables will be utilized to detect the occurrence of stress or normal condition [56], [102]. Some studies utilized the numerical independent variables (e.g., HRV time-domain features: RMSSD, HR, pNN50) [79], [139] or categorical data (e.g., answer to multiple choice questions) obtained from questionnaires [92], [99], [100].

*Naïve Bayes (NB) (n=22):* Naïve Bayes algorithm is a supervised, generally parametric, classification method that uses the Bayes Theorem as its foundation and has the naïve assumption of predictor independence. In other words, Naïve Bayes classifier assumes that the existence of a given independent variable to predict the dependent variable is independent of the presence of any other independent variable that predicts the dependent variable.

*Decision Tree (DT) (n=23):* Decision Tree is a supervised non-parametric ML algorithm used in classification and regression applications. It comprises a root node, branches, internal nodes, and leaf nodes in a hierarchical, tree-like structure (Figure 11).






**Figure 11.** Structure of a Decision Tree

*Boosting (n=22):* Boosting is an ensemble learning for reducing training errors by combining a group of weak learners. When using Boosting algorithm, models are fitted on random samples of data, and then models are trained repeatedly in a sequence. When each model starts being trained in that sequence, it attempts to make up for the flaws of the one that came before it. The most commonly used Boosting algorithms are: Adaptive boosting (AdaBoost), Gradient boosting, and Extreme gradient boosting (XGBoost).

*Random Forest (RF) (n=36):* Random Forest is a supervised non-parametric ensemble learning algorithm that uses many Decision Trees built during the training process. Random Forest algorithm is used for both classification and regression problems. When it comes to classification, the Random Forest's output is the class that the majority of the Decision Trees choose. For regression purposes, an individual tree's predicted mean or average is returned as the output. Using Random Forests, we can overcome the tendency of decision trees to overfit to their training data.


*Discriminant Analysis (n=6):* Discriminant Analysis is a supervised parametric classification algorithm that works with data including a dependent variable and independent variables and mostly used to classify the observation into a certain group based on the independent variables in the data. Linear Discriminant Analysis (LDA) and Quadratic Discriminant Analysis (QDA) are the two forms of Discriminant Analysis.

*K-nearest neighbors (K-NN) (n=22):* K-nearest neighbors (K-NN) is a non-parametric supervised ML algorithm that is used for both classification and regression purposes. In classification, the algorithm determines the label of a new sample not available in the training data by assigning the label of the majority of k-nearest training data points to that new sample (Figure 12). In regression, the output for each sample, is the average of the values of k-nearest neighbors to that sample (not including the sample itself). In this literature K-NN has been only used for classification.



**Figure 12.** Example of K-NN classification with  $K = 7$ . In this example, the label of “Class C” is assigned to the new (black) datapoint since the majority of the 7-nearest datapoints to the new datapoint are from “Class C”.

*Support Vector Machines (SVM) (n=48):* Support Vector Machine is a parametric supervised ML algorithm used for both classification and regression problems. It can solve both linear and non-linear problems using non-linear kernels. For classification, the SVM algorithm finds a line (or a hyperplane for non-linear kernels) between each pair of classes of the training data in a way that the margin distance of that line or hyperplane to the closest point of each of those two classes is maximized (Figure 13). This is repeated for all pairs of classes in the dataset. Then the obtained lines are used as boundaries for classes. In regression, the SVM tries to find the line/hyperplane that within a very small margin of  $\epsilon$  (epsilon) has maximum number of datapoints. That line/hyperplane used for regression.




**Figure 13.** Visual representation of Support Vector Machine algorithm

*K-means clustering (n=4):* K-means clustering is an unsupervised ML algorithm that aims to arrange objects into groups based on their similarity. To find those similarities, it calculates the distance of data points into K random cluster centroids and assigns each data point to its closest centroid. Then location of each centroid is then updated by average value of all datapoints associated with that centroid. This process is repeated until there is no change in the location of the centroids. In ML models for stress detection, K-means clustering has been used in the literature for personalization of the ML models [42], [51], and for labeling the dataset [131], [140].


*Neural Network (NN) (n=39):* DL methods are a subset of ML methods that. NNs are the heart of the DL algorithms. The neural network is a method for implementing ML that utilizes interconnected nodes or neurons arranged in a layered structure resembling the human brain. There are different types of NNs have been explained below:

- *Artificial Neural Network (ANN):* It is possible to think of a single perceptron (or neuron) as an abstract Logistic Regression. In each layer of ANNs, a group of multiple perceptron or artificial neurons is used. Figure 14 shows an ANN with one layer and its working mechanism.



**Figure 14.** (a) Representation of an ANN with one hidden layer.  $W_{ij}^{(1)}$  and  $W_{ij}^{(2)}$  denote the weights of the links connecting the first layer (input layer) to the hidden layer and weights of the links connecting the second layer to the next layer (output layer), respectively. (b) Representation of how a single neuron works. First, all the outputs of the previous layer are multiplied by the weights associated with the links connecting them to the  $j^{th}$  neuron of the next layer and summed by a bias (summation and bias step). The result is then passed through an activation function (activation step).

- *Convolutional Neural Network (CNN):* CNNs are a form of neural network that are especially adept at handling data structures with a grid-like layout, such as images/objects. Classification and computer vision applications are common uses for convolutional neural networks (ConvNets or CNNs) (Figure 15).



**Figure 15.** Representation of CNN for physiological signal

- *Recurrent Neural Network (RNN):* An RNN is a subset of artificial neural networks designed specifically for use with time series data and other sequence-based data. Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM) networks are the most common type of RNNs. In RNNs, Attention mechanism is a method that simulates cognitive attention in neural networks. The purpose of the impact is to encourage the network to give greater attention to the small but significant portions of the input data by enhancing some and reducing others. Since stress may alter a small portion of physiological data (e.g. ECG), attention mechanism can be used to detect stress using RNNs when large datasets are available [141].

Cong et al. introduced X-A-BiLSTM, which is a DL model that includes XGBoost (to filter data and handle imbalanced data) and Attention Bi-LSTM (LSTM with forward and backward memory and Attention mechanism) Neural Network used for stress classification using text data [87].

*Other ML techniques (n=19):*

- *Voting ensemble classifier:* The classification is decided based on weighted voting, which is determined by using a voting ensemble approach. The voting classifier allows for voting in which the final class labels are determined either by the class chosen most frequently by the classification models, or by the average of the output probabilities from each classification model. In the literature, this method has been utilized for PTSD detection [112], stress and stress related MDs [68], [80], [103], [140], [142].
- *Fuzzy C-means (FCM) clustering:* Fuzzy C-means clustering (FCM) is a clustering approach that assigns every data point to all the clusters with a certain probability instead of assigning each point to only one cluster. A data point that is near to the cluster's center, for instance, will have a high degree of membership there, while a data point that is distant from the cluster's center would have a low degree of membership [143]. Since depression, anxiety are not discrete measures, some studies have used FCM as an alternative to other clustering techniques for detection of these MDs [99], [101].

In this article, the recent ML algorithms, preprocessing techniques, and data (e.g., physiological data, questionnaire data, etc.) used in detection, prediction and monitoring of stress and the most common MDs (i.e., depression, anxiety, other stress-related MDs) have been reviewed.

Based on this review, it is concluded that among classic ML algorithms (excluding DL approaches), supervised models of Support Vector Machines (SVMs) and Random Forest (RF), have been used more often and achieved better performance in terms of model accuracy and robustness (measured by parameters like Area Under the Receiver Operating Characteristic curve (AUROC)). The accuracy of ML models is a critical indicator of their utility in real-world applications. The review demonstrates that SVM consistently achieves high accuracy across various data types, including HR, HRV, and skin response. For instance, SVM achieved 93% accuracy with HR, PPG, and skin response data in study [34], and 96% with skin response data in study [140]. These results underscore SVM's robustness in handling complex, non-linear data. Random Forest also shows commendable performance, with an accuracy of 99.88% in study [144], reflecting its strength in ensemble learning to mitigate overfitting and noise.

Moreover, among the predicting measures for stress and stress-related MDs, HR, HRV and skin response have been used the most often (Figure 16). These measures were the major explaining factors in the ML algorithms to predict stress and stress-related MDs. It is noticeable that DL approaches are becoming more popular as these techniques provide unique specifications that classic ML algorithms cannot provide.

Since stress is a time dependent event, the relationship between different lags of time can be important for detection of stress. Recurrent Neural Networks (RNNs) and Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs) will take into account the relationship between datapoints in different time-series for their decision making and they have the potential to enhance the detections. Deep learning models, specifically CNNs and LSTMs, show promising results, with CNNs achieving

92.8% accuracy in HRV and ECG data in study [139], indicating their potential in feature-rich physiological data. However, it is worth noting that deep learning models require substantial data for training, which may limit their applicability in studies with smaller datasets. Attention mechanism in RNNs is a new technique that is becoming popular for finding anomalies in physiological signals. However, based on the review of literature, this mechanism has only been used on text data (not on physiological signals) to detect stress. Therefore, Attention mechanism is technology that can be further utilized for physiological signals to detect stress.


Unsupervised ML (and DL algorithms) such as clustering techniques have been used mostly for the preprocessing step to label the data (if labels are not available) and also for finding a representation of the data that achieves the best performance in detection algorithms.

For data preprocessing, feature selection (i.e., filter and wrapper methods) and extraction techniques have been commonly used. In feature extraction approaches, latent representations of data by transformations such as output of encoder in autoencoders have been useful to remove data noises and to make the data more compact, making further computations more efficient. PCA and ICA are other most common feature extraction approaches used in the literature.

Among the selected features, statistical indicators of heart measurements such as mean, standard deviation of HR, along with time and frequency representations of HRV such as RMSSD and total LF and HF power were most widely used. Heart measurements also have been more often than other measurements as they are unobtrusive, non-invasive, affordable and easier to measure and also describing a big portion of stress events. After those, skin response measure has been found as one of the most important factors in detection of stress and its related disorders. The time-frequency approaches to analyze time series data are getting more popular in this area as they are proper representations of data for DL approaches which can be more accurate and robust. As an example, for DL algorithms, RNNs with attention mechanisms can help to find portions of data related to stress and its related disorders with higher confidence.

Most of the studies models do not interpret the ML models and look at them as black box. This limits the contribution to the body of science. SHapley Additive exPlanations (SHAP) is a technique used by some studies to interpret the models such as evaluation of features to find the most important ones and also how in what direction each feature affects the predictions. SHAP correlation plot provides insight into the distribution of the features themselves, as well as the relationship between their influence on the model. In other words, it provides the importance of each feature on prediction of the dependent variable by taking into account both the main effect as and the interaction effect of that feature with other features in the data [46], [77], [105], [144], [145], [146].

Despite progress in stress detection methodologies, the exploration of personalized models has been limited. Most studies have not gone beyond basic normalization techniques, overlooking the fact that physiological measures are as distinct to individuals as biometric identifiers. A notable exception can be found in a select few studies [51], [113], [147], which have employed more sophisticated personalization techniques, integrating complex data transformations to account for individual variability.



**Figure 16.** Distribution of ML models used for each type of data. In this figure, **skin response** and **heart measures** (including HR, HRV and blood pressure) have been shown separately due to their high usage and importance in the literature. **Other psychophysiological measures** include EEG, EMG, Eye-tracking and respiratory signals. **Activity** includes body movement. **Sentiment** data includes speech and text data. Finally, perceived measures include questionnaire and self-report data.

## Strengths of the review

In undertaking this scoping review, we have embarked on a rich exploration of the applications of machine learning (ML) in the field of stress detection, articulating a narrative that is both comprehensive and detailed. The review lays out a landscape where diverse data types are not merely cataloged but deeply analyzed for their roles and interconnections within the broader context of methodological approaches. This provides a robust understanding of the field's current state and its complexities.

This review has documented a comprehensive assessment on various physiological measurement techniques, including heart rate variability (HRV), electroencephalograms (EEG), and electrocardiograms (ECG), etc. This assessment is not just a recounting of the types of data employed in the literature but a thoughtful consideration of how each contributes to a multifaceted understanding of stress indicators. It is an acknowledgment that the signals of stress are as complex as the condition itself, necessitating a rich palette of investigative tools.

The review also examines a range of advanced preprocessing techniques such as mRMR, SOM, SMOTE and PCA. This examination sheds light on how different studies leverage these methods to refine the quality of data fed into ML models, thereby potentially enhancing the models' accuracy and reliability in detecting stress. It is an illustration of how sophisticated data treatment can lead to more nuanced insights, even if our own methodology did not directly employ these techniques.

## **Limitations**

Our scoping review acknowledges its inherent constraints, including a possible selection bias due to potential omissions of pertinent studies. It serves as a contemporary cross-section of the rapidly evolving domains of machine learning and mental health, underscoring the imperative for periodic scholarly review to sustain its relevance and precision. While we survey a broad spectrum of machine learning techniques applied to stress detection, we do not extensively assess their efficacy, suggesting a fertile ground for future empirical investigations to assess these methods across diverse data cohorts and settings. Additionally, while we address the preprocessing techniques and their impact on model performance, our discussion does not delve into detailed technical analysis. Finally, the crucial issue of model interpretability is touched upon but not explored in depth, presenting an opportunity for further scholarly explorations.

## **Conclusions and Future Directions**

The pivotal insights from this review underscore the potential of ML to redefine the approach to mental health care, particularly in the diagnosis and management of stress-related conditions and MDs. As we have discerned, there is an expansive field ripe for further exploration, with research gaps suggesting a number of promising directions. Guided by these insights, we can now chart a course for future research that not only expands the boundaries of our scientific understanding but also translates into tangible improvements in clinical practice.

### *Real-time and Naturalistic ML Applications*

The scarcity of real-time studies in naturalistic settings has highlighted the importance of developing ML models that accurately reflect and respond to the complexities of real life. Future research must prioritize the creation of algorithms capable of operating amidst the unpredictability of daily life, providing immediate insights and adaptable interventions. These models hold the potential to transform practice by offering tools that can preemptively identify stress and MD symptoms, enabling clinicians to intervene before conditions worsen.

### *Temporal Data and Deep Learning*

Our review illuminates the untapped potential of time series data in capturing the evolution of stress and MDs. Deep learning techniques, specifically designed to interpret complex, sequential data, could lead to breakthroughs in how we understand and predict mental health trajectories. For practice, this means more sophisticated diagnostic tools that can provide a nuanced picture of a patient's mental health over time, enabling personalized treatment plans that are responsive to the patient's changing condition.

### *Personalization in ML Models*

The need for individualized care in mental health cannot be overstated. The heterogeneity of stress responses and MD symptoms calls for personalized ML models tailored to individual physiological and behavioral patterns. Future research should focus on leveraging multi-task learning to refine algorithms that adapt to individual baselines, enhancing the personalization of care. For clinicians, this means access to tools that can more accurately reflect and respond to the unique needs of each patient, reducing the risk of misdiagnosis and improving treatment efficacy.

Predictive analytics can be instrumental in identifying key factors that contribute to misdiagnosis and delayed help-seeking. Future studies should look to build on this knowledge to inform the creation of interventions that encourage timely and accurate diagnosis. In practice, this could lead to the development of targeted screening tools that assist clinicians in recognizing at-risk individuals more effectively. The integration of clinical expertise with ML innovation is crucial for the development of tools that are both advanced and clinically relevant. Collaboration between healthcare professionals, patients, and AI developers will be essential in creating user-centered tools that address real-world needs. This collaborative approach will likely result in the development of AI applications that are more intuitive and effective in clinical settings.

***Conflict of Interest***

There is no conflict of interest.



## References

- [1] IHME, “GBD Results,” Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation. Accessed: Mar. 31, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://vizhub.healthdata.org/gbd-results?params=gbd-api-2019-permalink/b9a68deae92b3b8772ae33689f5c7fce>
- [2] WHO, “Mental disorders.” Accessed: Aug. 09, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/mental-disorders>
- [3] U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, “Key Substance Use and Mental Health Indicators in the United States: Results from the 2019 National Survey on Drug Use and Health,” *Security Research Hub Reports*, Jan. 2020, [Online]. Available: <https://digitalcommons.fiu.edu/srhreports/health/health/32>
- [4] R. Mojtabai and M. Olfson, “National Trends in Mental Health Care for US Adolescents,” *JAMA Psychiatry*, vol. 77, no. 7, pp. 703–714, Jul. 2020, doi: 10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2020.0279.
- [5] Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation, “GBD Results,” Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation. Accessed: Aug. 30, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://vizhub.healthdata.org/gbd-results>
- [6] National Institute of Mental Health, “Mental Illness,” National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH). Accessed: Aug. 30, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://www.nimh.nih.gov/health/statistics/mental-illness>
- [7] Dan Brennan, “Anxiety Disorders: Types, Causes, Symptoms, Diagnosis, Treatment.” Accessed: Aug. 09, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://www.webmd.com/anxiety-panic/guide/anxiety-disorders>
- [8] Mayo Clinic, “Anxiety disorders - Symptoms and causes,” Mayo Clinic. Accessed: Aug. 09, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://www.mayoclinic.org/diseases-conditions/anxiety/symptoms-causes/syc-20350961>
- [9] National Institute of Mental Health, “Anxiety Disorders,” National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH). Accessed: Aug. 09, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://www.nimh.nih.gov/health/topics/anxiety-disorders>
- [10] National Institute of Mental Health, “Depression,” National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH). Accessed: Aug. 09, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://www.nimh.nih.gov/health/topics/depression>
- [11] Mayo Clinic, “Depression (major depressive disorder) - Symptoms and causes,” Mayo Clinic. Accessed: Aug. 09, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://www.mayoclinic.org/diseases-conditions/depression/symptoms-causes/syc-20356007>
- [12] J. Bienertova-Vasku, P. Lenart, and M. Scherlinger, “Eustress and Distress: Neither Good Nor Bad, but Rather the Same?,” *Bioessays*, vol. 42, no. 7, p. e1900238, Jul. 2020, doi: 10.1002/bies.201900238.
- [13] CAMH, “20131 Stress,” CAMH. Accessed: Jun. 18, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://www.camh.ca/en/health-info/mental-illness-and-addiction-index/stress>
- [14] J. Cooper, “The Link Between Stress and Depression,” WebMD. Accessed: Aug. 21, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://www.webmd.com/depression/features/stress-depression>
- [15] NIMH, “I’m So Stressed Out! Fact Sheet,” National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH). Accessed: Aug. 21, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://www.nimh.nih.gov/health/publications/so-stressed-out-fact-sheet>

- [16] S. Cohen, P. J. Gianaros, and S. B. Manuck, "A Stage Model of Stress and Disease," *Perspect Psychol Sci*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 456–463, Jul. 2016, doi: 10.1177/1745691616646305.
- [17] E. Won and Y.-K. Kim, "Stress, the Autonomic Nervous System, and the Immune-kynurenine Pathway in the Etiology of Depression," *Curr Neuropharmacol*, vol. 14, no. 7, pp. 665–673, Oct. 2016, doi: 10.2174/1570159X14666151208113006.
- [18] L. K. McCorry, "Physiology of the Autonomic Nervous System," *Am J Pharm Educ*, vol. 71, no. 4, p. 78, Aug. 2007.
- [19] G. Pongratz and R. H. Straub, "The sympathetic nervous response in inflammation," *Arthritis Research & Therapy*, vol. 16, no. 6, p. 504, Dec. 2014, doi: 10.1186/s13075-014-0504-2.
- [20] P. Schmidt, A. Reiss, R. Dürichen, and K. V. Laerhoven, "Wearable-Based Affect Recognition—A Review," *Sensors*, vol. 19, no. 19, Art. no. 19, Jan. 2019, doi: 10.3390/s19194079.
- [21] H.-G. Kim, E.-J. Cheon, D.-S. Bai, Y. H. Lee, and B.-H. Koo, "Stress and Heart Rate Variability: A Meta-Analysis and Review of the Literature," *Psychiatry Investig*, vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 235–245, Mar. 2018, doi: 10.30773/pi.2017.08.17.
- [22] A. V. Machado *et al.*, "Association between distinct coping styles and heart rate variability changes to an acute psychosocial stress task," *Sci Rep*, vol. 11, no. 1, Art. no. 1, Dec. 2021, doi: 10.1038/s41598-021-03386-6.
- [23] T. Adjei, W. von Rosenberg, T. Nakamura, T. Chanwimalueang, and D. P. Mandic, "The ClassA Framework: HRV Based Assessment of SNS and PNS Dynamics Without LF-HF Controversies," *Frontiers in Physiology*, vol. 10, 2019, Accessed: Feb. 23, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/physiology/articles/10.3389/fphys.2019.00505>
- [24] H. H. Yoo, S. J. Yune, S. J. Im, B. S. Kam, and S. Y. Lee, "Heart Rate Variability-Measured Stress and Academic Achievement in Medical Students," *Med Princ Pract*, vol. 30, no. 2, pp. 193–200, 2021, doi: 10.1159/000513781.
- [25] J. Chen, M. Abbod, and J.-S. Shieh, "Pain and Stress Detection Using Wearable Sensors and Devices—A Review," *Sensors*, vol. 21, no. 4, Art. no. 4, Jan. 2021, doi: 10.3390/s21041030.
- [26] M. I. Jordan and T. M. Mitchell, "Machine learning: Trends, perspectives, and prospects," *Science*, vol. 349, no. 6245, pp. 255–260, Jul. 2015, doi: 10.1126/science.aaa8415.
- [27] J. Luo, M. Wu, D. Gopukumar, and Y. Zhao, "Big Data Application in Biomedical Research and Health Care: A Literature Review," *Biomed Inform Insights*, vol. 8, pp. 1–10, Jan. 2016, doi: 10.4137/BII.S31559.
- [28] A. B. R. Shatte, D. M. Hutchinson, and S. J. Teague, "Machine learning in mental health: a scoping review of methods and applications," *Psychol. Med.*, vol. 49, no. 09, pp. 1426–1448, Jul. 2019, doi: 10.1017/S0033291719000151.
- [29] O. Kofman, N. Meiran, E. Greenberg, M. Balas, and H. Cohen, "Enhanced performance on executive functions associated with examination stress: Evidence from task-switching and Stroop paradigms," *Cognition and Emotion*, vol. 20, no. 5, pp. 577–595, Aug. 2006, doi: 10.1080/02699930500270913.
- [30] S. Mayya, V. Jilla, V. N. Tiwari, M. M. Nayak, and R. Narayanan, "Continuous monitoring of stress on smartphone using heart rate variability," in *2015 IEEE 15th International*

- Conference on Bioinformatics and Bioengineering (BIBE)*, Nov. 2015, pp. 1–5. doi: 10.1109/BIBE.2015.7367627.
- [31] D. A. Dimitriev, E. V. Saperova, and A. D. Dimitriev, “State Anxiety and Nonlinear Dynamics of Heart Rate Variability in Students,” *PLOS ONE*, vol. 11, no. 1, p. e0146131, Jan. 2016, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0146131.
- [32] M. R. Huerta-Franco, F. M. Vargas-Luna, and I. Delgadillo-Holtfort, “Effects of psychological stress test on the cardiac response of public safety workers: alternative parameters to autonomic balance,” *J. Phys.: Conf. Ser.*, vol. 582, p. 012040, Jan. 2015, doi: 10.1088/1742-6596/582/1/012040.
- [33] F. Wilhelm, P. Grossman, and W. Roth, “Assessment of heart rate variability during alterations in stress: Complex demodulation vs. spectral analysis,” *Biomedical sciences instrumentation*, vol. 41, pp. 346–51, Feb. 2005.
- [34] R. K. Nath, H. Thapliyal, A. Caban-Holt, and S. P. Mohanty, “Machine Learning Based Solutions for Real-Time Stress Monitoring,” *IEEE Consumer Electron. Mag.*, vol. 9, no. 5, pp. 34–41, Sep. 2020, doi: 10.1109/MCE.2020.2993427.
- [35] A. C. Tricco *et al.*, “PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and Explanation,” *Ann Intern Med*, vol. 169, no. 7, pp. 467–473, Oct. 2018, doi: 10.7326/M18-0850.
- [36] M. Ouzzani, H. Hammady, Z. Fedorowicz, and A. Elmagarmid, “Rayyan—a web and mobile app for systematic reviews,” *Systematic Reviews*, vol. 5, no. 1, p. 210, Dec. 2016, doi: 10.1186/s13643-016-0384-4.
- [37] Cleveland Clinic, “Heart Rate Variability (HRV): What It Is and How You Can Track It,” Cleveland Clinic. Accessed: Aug. 08, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://my.clevelandclinic.org/health/symptoms/21773-heart-rate-variability-hrv>
- [38] F. Shaffer and J. P. Ginsberg, “An Overview of Heart Rate Variability Metrics and Norms,” *Front Public Health*, vol. 5, p. 258, Sep. 2017, doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2017.00258.
- [39] Medicare, “HRV.” Accessed: Aug. 21, 2022. [Online]. Available: <http://www.medicore.co.kr/en/technology/hrv.html>
- [40] Y. Choi, Y.-M. Jeon, L. Wang, and K. Kim, “A Biological Signal-Based Stress Monitoring Framework for Children Using Wearable Devices,” *Sensors*, vol. 17, no. 9, Art. no. 9, Sep. 2017, doi: 10.3390/s17091936.
- [41] O. Sakri, C. Godin, G. Vila, E. Labyt, S. Charbonnier, and A. Campagne, “A Multi-User Multi-Task Model For Stress Monitoring From Wearable Sensors,” in *2018 21st International Conference on Information Fusion (FUSION)*, Jul. 2018, pp. 761–766. doi: 10.23919/ICIF.2018.8455378.
- [42] M. Elgendi and C. Menon, “Machine Learning Ranks ECG as an Optimal Wearable Biosignal for Assessing Driving Stress,” *IEEE Access*, vol. 8, pp. 34362–34374, 2020, doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2020.2974933.
- [43] R. Wang, W. Jia, Z.-H. Mao, R. J. Sclabassi, and M. Sun, “Cuff-Free Blood Pressure Estimation Using Pulse Transit Time and Heart Rate,” *Int Conf Signal Process Proc*, vol. 2014, pp. 115–118, Oct. 2014, doi: 10.1109/ICOSP.2014.7014980.
- [44] Mayo Clinic, “Stress and high blood pressure: What’s the connection?,” Mayo Clinic. Accessed: Aug. 09, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://www.mayoclinic.org/diseases-conditions/high-blood-pressure/in-depth/stress-and-high-blood-pressure/art-20044190>
- [45] AHA, “Managing Stress to Control High Blood Pressure,” [www.heart.org](http://www.heart.org). Accessed: Aug. 09, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://www.heart.org/en/health-topics/high-blood->

pressure/changes-you-can-make-to-manage-high-blood-pressure/managing-stress-to-control-high-blood-pressure

- [46] K. Schultebrucks, M. Sijbrandij, I. Galatzer-Levy, J. Mouthaan, M. Olf, and M. van Zuiden, "Forecasting individual risk for long-term Posttraumatic Stress Disorder in emergency medical settings using biomedical data: A machine learning multicenter cohort study," *Neurobiology of Stress*, vol. 14, p. 100297, May 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.ynstr.2021.100297.
- [47] K. Masood and M. A. Alghamdi, "Modeling Mental Stress Using a Deep Learning Framework," *IEEE Access*, vol. 7, pp. 68446–68454, 2019, doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2019.2917718.
- [48] D. Shah, G. Y. Wang, M. Doborjeh, Z. Doborjeh, and N. Kasabov, "Deep Learning of EEG Data in the NeuCube Brain-Inspired Spiking Neural Network Architecture for a Better Understanding of Depression," in *Neural Information Processing*, vol. 11955, T. Gedeon, K. W. Wong, and M. Lee, Eds., in *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 11955, Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2019, pp. 195–206. doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-36718-3\_17.
- [49] A. Akella *et al.*, "Classifying Multi-Level Stress Responses From Brain Cortical EEG in Nurses and Non-Health Professionals Using Machine Learning Auto Encoder," *IEEE J. Transl. Eng. Health Med.*, vol. 9, pp. 1–9, 2021, doi: 10.1109/JTEHM.2021.3077760.
- [50] A. Arsalan, M. Majid, S. M. Anwar, and U. Bagci, "Classification of Perceived Human Stress using Physiological Signals," in *2019 41st Annual International Conference of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society (EMBC)*, Jul. 2019, pp. 1247–1250. doi: 10.1109/EMBC.2019.8856377.
- [51] L. Gonzalez-Carabarin, E. A. Castellanos-Alvarado, P. Castro-Garcia, and M. A. Garcia-Ramirez, "Machine Learning for personalised stress detection: Inter-individual variability of EEG-ECG markers for acute-stress response," *Computer Methods and Programs in Biomedicine*, vol. 209, p. 106314, Sep. 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.cmpb.2021.106314.
- [52] A. R. Subhani, W. Mumtaz, M. N. B. M. Saad, N. Kamel, and A. S. Malik, "Machine Learning Framework for the Detection of Mental Stress at Multiple Levels," *IEEE Access*, vol. 5, pp. 13545–13556, 2017, doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2017.2723622.
- [53] P. Nagar and D. Sethia, "Brain Mapping Based Stress Identification Using Portable EEG Based Device," in *2019 11th International Conference on Communication Systems & Networks (COMSNETS)*, Bengaluru, India: IEEE, Jan. 2019, pp. 601–606. doi: 10.1109/COMSNETS.2019.8711009.
- [54] A. Arsalan, M. Majid, A. R. Butt, and S. M. Anwar, "Classification of Perceived Mental Stress Using A Commercially Available EEG Headband," *IEEE Journal of Biomedical and Health Informatics*, vol. 23, no. 6, pp. 2257–2264, Nov. 2019, doi: 10.1109/JBHI.2019.2926407.
- [55] B. S. McEwen and P. J. Gianaros, "Central role of the brain in stress and adaptation: Links to socioeconomic status, health, and disease," *Ann N Y Acad Sci*, vol. 1186, pp. 190–222, Feb. 2010, doi: 10.1111/j.1749-6632.2009.05331.x.
- [56] A. Arsalan, M. Majid, and S. M. Anwar, "Electroencephalography Based Machine Learning Framework for Anxiety Classification," in *Intelligent Technologies and Applications*, vol. 1198, I. S. Bajwa, T. Sibalija, and D. N. A. Jawawi, Eds., in *Communications in Computer and Information Science*, vol. 1198, Singapore: Springer Singapore, 2020, pp. 187–197. doi: 10.1007/978-981-15-5232-8\_17.

- [57] A. Haider *et al.*, “An Iris based Smart System for Stress Identification,” in *2019 International Conference on Electrical, Communication, and Computer Engineering (ICECCE)*, Jul. 2019, pp. 1–5. doi: 10.1109/ICECCE47252.2019.8940707.
- [58] V. Skaramagkas *et al.*, “Review of eye tracking metrics involved in emotional and cognitive processes,” *IEEE Reviews in Biomedical Engineering*, pp. 1–1, 2021, doi: 10.1109/RBME.2021.3066072.
- [59] G. Giannakakis *et al.*, “Stress and anxiety detection using facial cues from videos,” *Biomedical Signal Processing and Control*, vol. 31, pp. 89–101, Jan. 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.bspc.2016.06.020.
- [60] A. I. Korda *et al.*, “Recognition of Blinks Activity Patterns during Stress Conditions Using CNN and Markovian Analysis,” *Signals*, vol. 2, no. 1, Art. no. 1, Mar. 2021, doi: 10.3390/signals2010006.
- [61] E. A. Bauer, K. A. Wilson, and A. MacNamara, “3.03 - Cognitive and Affective Psychophysiology,” in *Comprehensive Clinical Psychology (Second Edition)*, G. J. G. Asmundson, Ed., Oxford: Elsevier, 2022, pp. 49–61. doi: 10.1016/B978-0-12-818697-8.00013-3.
- [62] M. E. Dawson, A. M. Schell, and D. L. Filion, “The electrodermal system,” in *Handbook of psychophysiology, 4th ed.*, in Cambridge handbooks in psychology. , New York, NY, US: Cambridge University Press, 2017, pp. 217–243.
- [63] P. Philippot, G. Chappelle, and S. Blairy, “Respiratory feedback in the generation of emotion,” *Cognition & Emotion*, vol. 16, no. 5, pp. 605–627, Aug. 2002, doi: 10.1080/02699930143000392.
- [64] W. M. Suess, A. B. Alexander, D. D. Smith, H. W. Sweeney, and R. J. Marion, “The effects of psychological stress on respiration: a preliminary study of anxiety and hyperventilation,” *Psychophysiology*, vol. 17, no. 6, pp. 535–540, Nov. 1980, doi: 10.1111/j.1469-8986.1980.tb02293.x.
- [65] H. D. Cohen, D. R. Goodenough, H. A. Witkin, P. Oltman, H. Gould, and E. Shulman, “The Effects of Stress on Components of the Respiration Cycle,” *Psychophysiology*, vol. 12, no. 4, pp. 377–380, 1975, doi: 10.1111/j.1469-8986.1975.tb00005.x.
- [66] W. Seo, N. Kim, S. Kim, C. Lee, and S.-M. Park, “Deep ECG-Respiration Network (DeepER Net) for Recognizing Mental Stress,” *Sensors*, vol. 19, no. 13, p. 3021, Jul. 2019, doi: 10.3390/s19133021.
- [67] F. Kong, W. Wen, G. Liu, R. Xiong, and X. Yang, “Autonomic nervous pattern analysis of trait anxiety,” *Biomedical Signal Processing and Control*, vol. 71, p. 103129, Jan. 2022, doi: 10.1016/j.bspc.2021.103129.
- [68] P. Cipresso, D. Colombo, and G. Riva, “Computational Psychometrics Using Psychophysiological Measures for the Assessment of Acute Mental Stress,” *Sensors*, vol. 19, no. 4, Art. no. 4, Jan. 2019, doi: 10.3390/s19040781.
- [69] “Electromyography (EMG).” Accessed: Aug. 09, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://www.hopkinsmedicine.org/health/treatment-tests-and-therapies/electromyography-emg>
- [70] A. A. Al-Jumaily, N. Matin, and A. N. Hoshyar, “Machine Learning Based Biosignals Mental Stress Detection,” in *Soft Computing in Data Science*, A. Mohamed, B. W. Yap, J. M. Zain, and M. W. Berry, Eds., in Communications in Computer and Information Science. Singapore: Springer, 2021, pp. 28–41. doi: 10.1007/978-981-16-7334-4\_3.

- [71] S. DHAOUADI and M. M. BEN KHELIFA, “A multimodal Physiological-Based Stress Recognition: Deep Learning Models’ Evaluation in Gamers’ Monitoring Application,” in *2020 5th International Conference on Advanced Technologies for Signal and Image Processing (ATSIP)*, Sep. 2020, pp. 1–6. doi: 10.1109/ATSIP49331.2020.9231666.
- [72] W. C. Liang, J. Yuan, D. C. Sun, M. H. Lin, and S.-D. City, “Variation in Physiological Parameters Before and After an In- door Simulated Driving Task: Effect of Exercise Break,” p. 14, 2007.
- [73] A. Sano and R. W. Picard, “Stress Recognition Using Wearable Sensors and Mobile Phones,” in *2013 Humaine Association Conference on Affective Computing and Intelligent Interaction*, Geneva, Switzerland: IEEE, Sep. 2013, pp. 671–676. doi: 10.1109/ACII.2013.117.
- [74] A. Ghandeharioun *et al.*, “Objective Assessment of Depressive Symptoms with Machine Learning and Wearable Sensors Data,” p. 8, 2017.
- [75] Y. Tazawa *et al.*, “Evaluating depression with multimodal wristband-type wearable device: screening and assessing patient severity utilizing machine-learning,” *Heliyon*, vol. 6, no. 2, p. e03274, Feb. 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.heliyon.2020.e03274.
- [76] K. Yoshiuchi *et al.*, “Stressful life events and habitual physical activity in older adults: 1-year accelerometer data from the Nakanajo Study,” *Mental Health and Physical Activity*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 23–25, Jun. 2010, doi: 10.1016/j.mhpa.2010.02.001.
- [77] M. Sadeghi, A. D. McDonald, and F. Sasangohar, “Posttraumatic Stress Disorder Hyperarousal Event Detection Using Smartwatch Physiological and Activity Data,” *arXiv:2109.14743 [cs]*, Sep. 2021, Accessed: Apr. 25, 2022. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2109.14743>
- [78] P. Schmidt, A. Reiss, R. Duerichen, C. Marberger, and K. Van Laerhoven, “Introducing WESAD, a Multimodal Dataset for Wearable Stress and Affect Detection,” in *Proceedings of the 20th ACM International Conference on Multimodal Interaction*, in ICMI ’18. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, Oct. 2018, pp. 400–408. doi: 10.1145/3242969.3242985.
- [79] R. Dai, C. Lu, L. Yun, E. Lenze, M. Avidan, and T. Kannampallil, “Comparing stress prediction models using smartwatch physiological signals and participant self-reports,” *Computer Methods and Programs in Biomedicine*, vol. 208, p. 106207, Sep. 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.cmpb.2021.106207.
- [80] P. Siirtola and J. Rönig, “Comparison of Regression and Classification Models for User-Independent and Personal Stress Detection,” *Sensors*, vol. 20, no. 16, Art. no. 16, Jan. 2020, doi: 10.3390/s20164402.
- [81] Frontiers, “Speech signal analysis with applications in biomedicine and the life sciences | Frontiers Research Topic.” Accessed: Aug. 09, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://www.frontiersin.org/research-topics/3217/speech-signal-analysis-with-applications-in-biomedicine-and-the-life-sciences>
- [82] K. Nkurikiyeyezu, A. Yokokubo, and G. Lopez, “The Effect of Person-Specific Biometrics in Improving Generic Stress Predictive Models.” *arXiv*, Dec. 31, 2019. Accessed: Aug. 21, 2022. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1910.01770>
- [83] E. Garcia-Ceja *et al.*, “HTAD: A Home-Tasks Activities Dataset with Wrist-accelerometer and Audio Features,” p. 10.
- [84] S. Zhao, Q. Li, C. Li, Y. Li, and K. Lu, “A CNN-Based Method for Depression Detecting Form Audio,” in *Digital Health and Medical Analytics*, Y. Wang, W. Y. C. Wang, Z. Yan,

- and D. Zhang, Eds., in *Communications in Computer and Information Science*. Singapore: Springer, 2021, pp. 1–10. doi: 10.1007/978-981-16-3631-8\_1.
- [85] W. C. de Melo, E. Granger, and A. Hadid, “Depression Detection Based on Deep Distribution Learning,” in *2019 IEEE International Conference on Image Processing (ICIP)*, Taipei, Taiwan: IEEE, Sep. 2019, pp. 4544–4548. doi: 10.1109/ICIP.2019.8803467.
- [86] K. Awasthi, P. Nanda, and K. V. Suma, “Performance analysis of Machine Learning techniques for classification of stress levels using PPG signals,” in *2020 IEEE International Conference on Electronics, Computing and Communication Technologies (CONECCT)*, Jul. 2020, pp. 1–6. doi: 10.1109/CONECCT50063.2020.9198481.
- [87] Q. Cong, Z. Feng, F. Li, Y. Xiang, G. Rao, and C. Tao, “X-A-BiLSTM: a Deep Learning Approach for Depression Detection in Imbalanced Data,” in *2018 IEEE International Conference on Bioinformatics and Biomedicine (BIBM)*, Madrid, Spain: IEEE, Dec. 2018, pp. 1624–1627. doi: 10.1109/BIBM.2018.8621230.
- [88] Y. Ding, X. Chen, Q. Fu, and S. Zhong, “A Depression Recognition Method for College Students Using Deep Integrated Support Vector Algorithm,” *IEEE Access*, vol. 8, pp. 75616–75629, 2020, doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2020.2987523.
- [89] Md. R. Islam, M. A. Kabir, A. Ahmed, A. R. M. Kamal, H. Wang, and A. Ulhaq, “Depression detection from social network data using machine learning techniques,” *Health Inf Sci Syst*, vol. 6, no. 1, p. 8, Aug. 2018, doi: 10.1007/s13755-018-0046-0.
- [90] S. Liao, Q. zhang, and R. Gan, “Construction of real-time mental health early warning system based on machine learning,” *J. Phys.: Conf. Ser.*, vol. 1812, no. 1, p. 012032, Feb. 2021, doi: 10.1088/1742-6596/1812/1/012032.
- [91] M. Pandey, B. Jha, and R. Thakur, “An Exploratory Analysis Pertaining to Stress Detection in Adolescents,” in *Soft Computing: Theories and Applications*, M. Pant, T. Kumar Sharma, R. Arya, B. C. Sahana, and H. Zolfagharinia, Eds., in *Advances in Intelligent Systems and Computing*. Singapore: Springer, 2020, pp. 413–421. doi: 10.1007/978-981-15-4032-5\_38.
- [92] T. Simms, C. Ramstedt, M. Rich, M. Richards, T. Martinez, and C. Giraud-Carrier, “Detecting Cognitive Distortions Through Machine Learning Text Analytics,” in *2017 IEEE International Conference on Healthcare Informatics (ICHI)*, Park City, UT, USA: IEEE, Aug. 2017, pp. 508–512. doi: 10.1109/ICHI.2017.39.
- [93] X. Wang *et al.*, “Assessing depression risk in Chinese microblogs: a corpus and machine learning methods,” in *2019 IEEE International Conference on Healthcare Informatics (ICHI)*, Jun. 2019, pp. 1–5. doi: 10.1109/ICHI.2019.8904506.
- [94] “Psychiatry.org - DSM.” Accessed: Aug. 15, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://psychiatry.org:443/psychiatrists/practice/dsm>
- [95] M. U. Salma and K. A. A. Ann, “Active Learning from an Imbalanced Dataset: A Study Conducted on the Depression, Anxiety, and Stress Dataset,” in *Handbook of Machine Learning for Computational Optimization*, CRC Press, 2021.
- [96] M.-S. Mushtaq and A. Mellouk, “4 - QoE-based Power Efficient LTE Downlink Scheduler,” in *Quality of Experience Paradigm in Multimedia Services*, M.-S. Mushtaq and A. Mellouk, Eds., Elsevier, 2017, pp. 91–125. doi: 10.1016/B978-1-78548-109-3.50004-7.
- [97] V. Arun, P. V., M. Krishna, A. B.V., P. S.K., and S. V., “A Boosted Machine Learning Approach For Detection of Depression,” in *2018 IEEE Symposium Series on*

- Computational Intelligence (SSCI)*, Nov. 2018, pp. 41–47. doi: 10.1109/SSCI.2018.8628945.
- [98] S. Casaccia *et al.*, “Measurement of Users’ Well-Being Through Domestic Sensors and Machine Learning Algorithms,” *IEEE Sensors J.*, vol. 20, no. 14, pp. 8029–8038, Jul. 2020, doi: 10.1109/JSEN.2020.2981209.
- [99] T. Iliou *et al.*, “ILIOU machine learning preprocessing method for depression type prediction,” *Evolving Systems*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 29–39, Mar. 2019, doi: 10.1007/s12530-017-9205-9.
- [100] R. Joseph, S. Udupa, S. Jangale, K. Kotkar, and P. Pawar, “Employee Attrition Using Machine Learning And Depression Analysis,” in *2021 5th International Conference on Intelligent Computing and Control Systems (ICICCS)*, Madurai, India: IEEE, May 2021, pp. 1000–1005. doi: 10.1109/ICICCS51141.2021.9432259.
- [101] R. M. Khalil and A. Al-Jumaily, “Machine learning based prediction of depression among type 2 diabetic patients,” in *2017 12th International Conference on Intelligent Systems and Knowledge Engineering (ISKE)*, Nanjing: IEEE, Nov. 2017, pp. 1–5. doi: 10.1109/ISKE.2017.8258766.
- [102] A. Kumar, “Machine learning for psychological disorder prediction in Indians during COVID-19 nationwide lockdown,” *IDT*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 161–172, Mar. 2021, doi: 10.3233/IDT-200061.
- [103] P. Kumar, R. Chauhan, T. Stephan, A. Shankar, and S. Thakur, “A Machine Learning Implementation for Mental Health Care. Application: Smart Watch for Depression Detection,” in *2021 11th International Conference on Cloud Computing, Data Science & Engineering (Confluence)*, Jan. 2021, pp. 568–574. doi: 10.1109/Confluence51648.2021.9377199.
- [104] S. T. A. Mary and L. Jabasheela, “ANT COLONY OPTIMIZATION BASED FEATURE SELECTION AND DATA CLASSIFICATION FOR DEPRESSION ANXIETY AND STRESS,” *COMPUTER SCIENCE*, vol. 9, p. 8, 2018.
- [105] M. D. Nemesure, M. V. Heinz, R. Huang, and N. C. Jacobson, “Predictive modeling of depression and anxiety using electronic health records and a novel machine learning approach with artificial intelligence,” *Sci Rep*, vol. 11, no. 1, p. 1980, Dec. 2021, doi: 10.1038/s41598-021-81368-4.
- [106] J. S. Obeid *et al.*, “Automated detection of altered mental status in emergency department clinical notes: a deep learning approach,” *BMC Med Inform Decis Mak*, vol. 19, no. 1, p. 164, Aug. 2019, doi: 10.1186/s12911-019-0894-9.
- [107] U. S. Reddy, A. V. Thota, and A. Dharun, “Machine Learning Techniques for Stress Prediction in Working Employees,” in *2018 IEEE International Conference on Computational Intelligence and Computing Research (ICCIC)*, Madurai, India: IEEE, Dec. 2018, pp. 1–4. doi: 10.1109/ICCIC.2018.8782395.
- [108] A. Sau and I. Bhakta, “Predicting anxiety and depression in elderly patients using machine learning technology,” *Healthc. technol. lett.*, vol. 4, no. 6, pp. 238–243, Dec. 2017, doi: 10.1049/htl.2016.0096.
- [109] A. Sharma and W. J. M. I. Verbeke, “Improving Diagnosis of Depression With XGBOOST Machine Learning Model and a Large Biomarkers Dutch Dataset (n = 11,081),” *Front. Big Data*, vol. 3, p. 15, Apr. 2020, doi: 10.3389/fdata.2020.00015.
- [110] H. Yang and P. A. Bath, “Automatic Prediction of Depression in Older Age,” in *Proceedings of the third International Conference on Medical and Health Informatics*



- 2019, in ICMHI 2019. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, May 2019, pp. 36–44. doi: 10.1145/3340037.3340042.
- [111] W. Zhang, H. Liu, V. M. B. Silenzio, P. Qiu, and W. Gong, “Machine Learning Models for the Prediction of Postpartum Depression: Application and Comparison Based on a Cohort Study,” *JMIR Med Inform*, vol. 8, no. 4, p. e15516, Apr. 2020, doi: 10.2196/15516.
- [112] P. Annappareddy *et al.*, “Predicting PTSD Severity in Veterans from Self-reports for Early Intervention: A Machine Learning Approach,” in *2020 IEEE 21st International Conference on Information Reuse and Integration for Data Science (IRI)*, Las Vegas, NV, USA: IEEE, Aug. 2020, pp. 201–208. doi: 10.1109/IRI49571.2020.00036.
- [113] B. Li and A. Sano, “Early versus Late Modality Fusion of Deep Wearable Sensor Features for Personalized Prediction of Tomorrow’s Mood, Health, and Stress,” in *2020 42nd Annual International Conference of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine & Biology Society (EMBC)*, Montreal, QC, Canada: IEEE, Jul. 2020, pp. 5896–5899. doi: 10.1109/EMBC44109.2020.9175463.
- [114] N. P. Novani, L. Arief, R. Anjasmara, and A. S. Prihatmanto, “Heart Rate Variability Frequency Domain for Detection of Mental Stress Using Support Vector Machine,” in *2018 International Conference on Information Technology Systems and Innovation (ICITSI)*, Oct. 2018, pp. 520–525. doi: 10.1109/ICITSI.2018.8695938.
- [115] G. Giannakakis, K. Marias, and M. Tsiknakis, “A stress recognition system using HRV parameters and machine learning techniques,” in *2019 8th International Conference on Affective Computing and Intelligent Interaction Workshops and Demos (ACIIW)*, Sep. 2019, pp. 269–272. doi: 10.1109/ACIIW.2019.8925142.
- [116] Y. S. Can, N. Chalabianloo, D. Ekiz, and C. Ersoy, “Continuous Stress Detection Using Wearable Sensors in Real Life: Algorithmic Programming Contest Case Study,” *Sensors*, vol. 19, no. 8, p. 1849, Apr. 2019, doi: 10.3390/s19081849.
- [117] L. V. Coutts, D. Plans, A. W. Brown, and J. Collomosse, “Deep learning with wearable based heart rate variability for prediction of mental and general health,” *Journal of Biomedical Informatics*, vol. 112, p. 103610, Dec. 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.jbi.2020.103610.
- [118] D. Cho *et al.*, “Detection of Stress Levels from Biosignals Measured in Virtual Reality Environments Using a Kernel-Based Extreme Learning Machine,” *Sensors*, vol. 17, no. 10, Art. no. 10, Oct. 2017, doi: 10.3390/s17102435.
- [119] U. Pluntke, S. Gerke, A. Sridhar, J. Weiss, and B. Michel, “Evaluation and Classification of Physical and Psychological Stress in Firefighters using Heart Rate Variability,” *Annu Int Conf IEEE Eng Med Biol Soc*, vol. 2019, pp. 2207–2212, Jul. 2019, doi: 10.1109/EMBC.2019.8856596.
- [120] R. Lima, D. Osório, and H. Gamboa, “Heart Rate Variability and Electrodermal Activity Biosignal Processing: Predicting the Autonomous Nervous System Response in Mental Stress,” in *Biomedical Engineering Systems and Technologies*, A. Roque, A. Tomczyk, E. De Maria, F. Putze, R. Moucek, A. Fred, and H. Gamboa, Eds., in Communications in Computer and Information Science. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2020, pp. 328–351. doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-46970-2\_16.
- [121] V. Montesinos, F. Dell’Agnola, A. Arza, A. Aminifar, and D. Atienza, “Multi-Modal Acute Stress Recognition Using Off-the-Shelf Wearable Devices,” in *2019 41st Annual International Conference of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society (EMBC)*, Berlin, Germany: IEEE, Jul. 2019, pp. 2196–2201. doi: 10.1109/EMBC.2019.8857130.

- [122] A. Ghandeharioun *et al.*, “Objective assessment of depressive symptoms with machine learning and wearable sensors data,” in *2017 Seventh International Conference on Affective Computing and Intelligent Interaction (ACII)*, Oct. 2017, pp. 325–332. doi: 10.1109/ACII.2017.8273620.
- [123] S. Blum, N. S. J. Jacobsen, M. G. Bleichner, and S. Debener, “A Riemannian Modification of Artifact Subspace Reconstruction for EEG Artifact Handling,” *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, vol. 13, 2019, Accessed: Aug. 22, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fnhum.2019.00141>
- [124] R. Van de Schoot, “Latent Growth Mixture Models to estimate PTSD trajectories,” *European Journal of Psychotraumatology*, vol. 6, no. 1, p. 27503, Dec. 2015, doi: 10.3402/ejpt.v6.27503.
- [125] N. Ram and K. J. Grimm, “Methods and Measures: Growth mixture modeling: A method for identifying differences in longitudinal change among unobserved groups,” *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, vol. 33, no. 6, pp. 565–576, Nov. 2009, doi: 10.1177/0165025409343765.
- [126] W. van Breda, J. Pastor, M. Hoogendoorn, J. Ruwaard, J. Asselbergs, and H. Ripper, “Exploring and Comparing Machine Learning Approaches for Predicting Mood Over Time,” in *Innovation in Medicine and Healthcare 2016*, vol. 60, Y.-W. Chen, S. Tanaka, R. J. Howlett, and L. C. Jain, Eds., in *Smart Innovation, Systems and Technologies*, vol. 60. , Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2016, pp. 37–47. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-39687-3\_4.
- [127] “Understanding Dynamic Time Warping - The Databricks Blog,” Databricks. Accessed: Aug. 22, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://www.databricks.com/blog/2019/04/30/understanding-dynamic-time-warping.html>
- [128] Q. Gui, Z. Jin, and W. Xu, “Exploring missing data prediction in medical monitoring: A performance analysis approach,” in *2014 IEEE Signal Processing in Medicine and Biology Symposium (SPMB)*, Dec. 2014, pp. 1–6. doi: 10.1109/SPMB.2014.7002968.
- [129] A. D. McDonald, F. Sasangohar, A. Jatav, and A. H. Rao, “Continuous monitoring and detection of post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) triggers among veterans: A supervised machine learning approach,” *IISE Transactions on Healthcare Systems Engineering*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 201–211, Jul. 2019, doi: 10.1080/24725579.2019.1583703.
- [130] M. A. Adheena, N. Sindhu, and S. Jerritta, “Physiological Detection of Anxiety,” in *2018 International Conference on Circuits and Systems in Digital Enterprise Technology (ICCSDET)*, Kottayam, India: IEEE, Dec. 2018, pp. 1–5. doi: 10.1109/ICCSDET.2018.8821162.
- [131] W. Gerych, E. Agu, and E. Rundensteiner, “Classifying Depression in Imbalanced Datasets Using an Autoencoder- Based Anomaly Detection Approach,” in *2019 IEEE 13th International Conference on Semantic Computing (ICSC)*, Newport Beach, CA, USA: IEEE, Jan. 2019, pp. 124–127. doi: 10.1109/ICOSC.2019.8665535.
- [132] D. Huysmans *et al.*, “Unsupervised Learning for Mental Stress Detection - Exploration of Self-Organizing Maps,” in *Proc. of Biosignals 2018*, Scitepress, Jan. 2018, pp. 26–35. doi: 10.5220/0006541100260035.
- [133] R. Jain and W. Xu, “Artificial Intelligence based wrapper for high dimensional feature selection,” *BMC Bioinformatics*, vol. 24, no. 1, p. 392, Oct. 2023, doi: 10.1186/s12859-023-05502-x.

- [134] U. Braga-Neto, *Fundamentals of Pattern Recognition and Machine Learning*. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2020. doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-27656-0.
- [135] Y. Zhang, S. Wang, A. Hermann, R. Joly, and J. Pathak, "Development and validation of a machine learning algorithm for predicting the risk of postpartum depression among pregnant women," *Journal of Affective Disorders*, vol. 279, pp. 1–8, Jan. 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.jad.2020.09.113.
- [136] D. Deka and B. Deka, "Characterization of heart rate variability signal for distinction of meditative and pre-meditative states," *Biomedical Signal Processing and Control*, vol. 66, p. 102414, Apr. 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.bspc.2021.102414.
- [137] M. Radovic, M. Ghalwash, N. Filipovic, and Z. Obradovic, "Minimum redundancy maximum relevance feature selection approach for temporal gene expression data," *BMC Bioinformatics*, vol. 18, no. 1, p. 9, Jan. 2017, doi: 10.1186/s12859-016-1423-9.
- [138] L. Xia, A. S. Malik, and A. R. Subhani, "A physiological signal-based method for early mental-stress detection," *Biomedical Signal Processing and Control*, vol. 46, pp. 18–32, Sep. 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.bspc.2018.06.004.
- [139] L. Quintero, P. Papapetrou, J. E. Munoz, and U. Fors, "Implementation of Mobile-Based Real-Time Heart Rate Variability Detection for Personalized Healthcare," in *2019 International Conference on Data Mining Workshops (ICDMW)*, Beijing, China: IEEE, Nov. 2019, pp. 838–846. doi: 10.1109/ICDMW.2019.00123.
- [140] M. Srividya, S. Mohanavalli, and N. Bhalaji, "Behavioral Modeling for Mental Health using Machine Learning Algorithms," *J Med Syst*, vol. 42, no. 5, p. 88, Apr. 2018, doi: 10.1007/s10916-018-0934-5.
- [141] P. Zhang *et al.*, "Psychological Stress Detection According to ECG Using a Deep Learning Model with Attention Mechanism," *Applied Sciences*, vol. 11, no. 6, Art. no. 6, Jan. 2021, doi: 10.3390/app11062848.
- [142] Y. E. Alharahsheh and M. A. Abdullah, "Predicting Individuals Mental Health Status in Kenya using Machine Learning Methods," in *2021 12th International Conference on Information and Communication Systems (ICICS)*, Valencia, Spain: IEEE, May 2021, pp. 94–98. doi: 10.1109/ICICS52457.2021.9464608.
- [143] "Fuzzy C-Means Clustering - MATLAB & Simulink." Accessed: Aug. 14, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://www.mathworks.com/help/fuzzy/fuzzy-c-means-clustering.html>
- [144] V. Trevisan, "Using SHAP Values to Explain How Your Machine Learning Model Works," Medium. Accessed: Aug. 22, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://towardsdatascience.com/using-shap-values-to-explain-how-your-machine-learning-model-works-732b3f40e137>
- [145] E. U. P. Vieira, "You are underutilizing shap values — feature groups and correlations," Medium. Accessed: Aug. 22, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://towardsdatascience.com/you-are-underutilizing-shap-values-feature-groups-and-correlations-8df1b136e2c2>
- [146] C. O'Sullivan, "Analysing Interactions with SHAP," Medium. Accessed: Aug. 22, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://towardsdatascience.com/analysing-interactions-with-shap-8c4a2bc11c2a>
- [147] A. Saeed, T. Ozcebebi, J. Lukkien, J. B. F. van Erp, and S. Trajanovski, "Model Adaptation and Personalization for Physiological Stress Detection," in *2018 IEEE 5th International Conference on Data Science and Advanced Analytics (DSAA)*, Oct. 2018, pp. 209–216. doi: 10.1109/DSAA.2018.00031.

- [148] A. Mallol-Ragolta, S. Dhamija, and T. E. Boulton, "A Multimodal Approach for Predicting Changes in PTSD Symptom Severity," in *Proceedings of the 20th ACM International Conference on Multimodal Interaction*, Boulder CO USA: ACM, Oct. 2018, pp. 324–333. doi: 10.1145/3242969.3242981.
- [149] J. Huang, X. Luo, and X. Peng, "A Novel Classification Method for a Driver's Cognitive Stress Level by Transferring Interbeat Intervals of the ECG Signal to Pictures," *Sensors*, vol. 20, no. 5, Art. no. 5, Jan. 2020, doi: 10.3390/s20051340.
- [150] C. M. Durán Acevedo, J. K. Carrillo Gómez, and C. A. Albarracín Rojas, "Academic stress detection on university students during COVID-19 outbreak by using an electronic nose and the galvanic skin response," *Biomedical Signal Processing and Control*, vol. 68, p. 102756, Jul. 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.bspc.2021.102756.
- [151] J. C. Y. Wong, J. Wang, E. Y. Fu, H. V. Leong, and G. Ngai, "Activity Recognition and Stress Detection via Wristband," in *Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Advances in Mobile Computing & Multimedia*, in MoMM2019. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, Dec. 2019, pp. 102–106. doi: 10.1145/3365921.3365950.
- [152] J. Šalkevičius, R. Damaševičius, R. Maskeliūnas, and I. Laukienė, "Anxiety Level Recognition for Virtual Reality Therapy System Using Physiological Signals," *Electronics*, vol. 8, no. 9, Art. no. 9, Sep. 2019, doi: 10.3390/electronics8091039.
- [153] A. Wongkoblaph, M. A. Vellido, and V. Curcin, "Classifying Depressed Users With Multiple Instance Learning from Social Network Data," in *2018 IEEE International Conference on Healthcare Informatics (ICHI)*, New York, NY: IEEE, Jun. 2018, pp. 436–436. doi: 10.1109/ICHI.2018.00088.
- [154] V. Chandra, A. Priyadarshi, and D. Sethia, "Comparative Study of Physiological Signals from Empatica E4 Wristband for Stress Classification," in *Advances in Computing and Data Sciences*, M. Singh, V. Tyagi, P. K. Gupta, J. Flusser, T. Ören, and V. R. Sonawane, Eds., in Communications in Computer and Information Science. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2021, pp. 218–229. doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-88244-0\_21.
- [155] J.-W. Baek and K. Chung, "Context Deep Neural Network Model for Predicting Depression Risk Using Multiple Regression," *IEEE Access*, vol. 8, pp. 18171–18181, 2020, doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2020.2968393.
- [156] I. Bichindaritz, C. Breen, E. Cole, N. Keshan, and P. Parimi, "Feature Selection and Machine Learning Based Multilevel Stress Detection from ECG Signals," in *Innovation in Medicine and Healthcare 2017*, Y.-W. Chen, S. Tanaka, R. J. Howlett, and L. C. Jain, Eds., in Smart Innovation, Systems and Technologies. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2018, pp. 202–213. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-59397-5\_22.
- [157] M. Maritsch *et al.*, "Improving heart rate variability measurements from consumer smartwatches with machine learning," in *Adjunct Proceedings of the 2019 ACM International Joint Conference on Pervasive and Ubiquitous Computing and Proceedings of the 2019 ACM International Symposium on Wearable Computers*, London United Kingdom: ACM, Sep. 2019, pp. 934–938. doi: 10.1145/3341162.3346276.
- [158] N. E. J. Asha, Ehtesum-Ul-Islam, and R. Khan, "Low-Cost Heart Rate Sensor and Mental Stress Detection Using Machine Learning," in *2021 5th International Conference on Trends in Electronics and Informatics (ICOEI)*, Tirunelveli, India: IEEE, Jun. 2021, pp. 1369–1374. doi: 10.1109/ICOEI51242.2021.9452873.

- [159] A. Ghandeharioun *et al.*, “Objective assessment of depressive symptoms with machine learning and wearable sensors data,” in *2017 Seventh International Conference on Affective Computing and Intelligent Interaction (ACII)*, Oct. 2017, pp. 325–332. doi: 10.1109/ACII.2017.8273620.
- [160] R. Katarya and S. Maan, “Predicting Mental health disorders using Machine Learning for employees in technical and non-technical companies,” in *2020 IEEE International Conference on Advances and Developments in Electrical and Electronics Engineering (ICADEE)*, Coimbatore, India: IEEE, Dec. 2020, pp. 1–5. doi: 10.1109/ICADEE51157.2020.9368923.
- [161] A. E. Tate, R. C. McCabe, H. Larsson, S. Lundström, P. Lichtenstein, and R. Kuja-Halkola, “Predicting mental health problems in adolescence using machine learning techniques,” *PLoS ONE*, vol. 15, no. 4, p. e0230389, Apr. 2020, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0230389.
- [162] S. Wshah, C. Skalka, and M. Price, “Predicting Posttraumatic Stress Disorder Risk: A Machine Learning Approach,” *JMIR Ment Health*, vol. 6, no. 7, p. e13946, Jul. 2019, doi: 10.2196/13946.
- [163] W. A. van Eeden *et al.*, “Predicting the 9-year course of mood and anxiety disorders with automated machine learning: A comparison between auto-sklearn, naïve Bayes classifier, and traditional logistic regression,” *Psychiatry Research*, vol. 299, p. 113823, May 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.psychres.2021.113823.
- [164] H. Alharthi, “Predicting the level of generalized anxiety disorder of the coronavirus pandemic among college age students using artificial intelligence technology,” in *2020 19th International Symposium on Distributed Computing and Applications for Business Engineering and Science (DCABES)*, Xuzhou, China: IEEE, Oct. 2020, pp. 218–221. doi: 10.1109/DCABES50732.2020.00064.
- [165] J. He, K. Li, X. Liao, P. Zhang, and N. Jiang, “Real-Time Detection of Acute Cognitive Stress Using a Convolutional Neural Network From Electrocardiographic Signal,” *IEEE Access*, vol. 7, pp. 42710–42717, 2019, doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2019.2907076.
- [166] R. K. Sah and H. Ghasemzadeh, “Stress Classification and Personalization: Getting the most out of the least.” arXiv, Jul. 12, 2021. Accessed: Sep. 04, 2022. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2107.05666>
- [167] Z. Zainudin, S. Hasan, S. M. Shamsuddin, and S. Argawal, “Stress Detection using Machine Learning and Deep Learning,” *J. Phys.: Conf. Ser.*, vol. 1997, no. 1, p. 012019, Aug. 2021, doi: 10.1088/1742-6596/1997/1/012019.
- [168] M. Sadeghi, A. D. McDonald, and F. Sasangohar, “Posttraumatic stress disorder hyperarousal event detection using smartwatch physiological and activity data,” *PLoS ONE*, vol. 17, no. 5, p. e0267749, May 2022, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0267749.

## Appendix

**Table A1.** Summary of all articles included in the synthesis

Article	Year	Data Type	Population Type	Population Demographic Data	Personalization Method	Real-Time?	ML Model	Data Collection Tool	Study Type	ML Type	Ground-Truth	Performance (Best Model)
---------	------	-----------	-----------------	-----------------------------	------------------------	------------	----------	----------------------	------------	---------	--------------	--------------------------

[40]	2017	HR, PPG, Audio Signals	Children			Yes	NB, DT, SVM	Wearable Sensor, Microphone	Naturalistic	Classification		Accuracy: 83% (DT)
[97]	2018	Questionnaire	Patients	N=270		No	Boosting, XGBoost	Questionnaire	Pre-collected data without experiment	Classification	DSM scores for depression	Accuracy: 97.8% (XGBoost)
[88]	2020	Text	College Students	N=693 (108 Depressed, 585 Normal)		No	NN, Boosting, Adaboost, SVM	Weibo Sina Application	Naturalistic	Regression	frequency of positive and negative words	Precision: 0.88 (Adaboost)
[104]	2018	Questionnaire	Indian College Students	N=938		No	Ant Colony Optimization	DASS-21 Questionnaire	Lab	Classification	DASS-21 scores	Accuracy: 93.57% (ACO)
[84]	2021	Audio Signals	Depressed Patients and Healthy People	N=142 (42 Patient, 100 Healthy)		No	NN		Naturalistic	Classification	Depression Diagnosis (RSDD) dataset	Accuracy: 84% (CNN)
[103]	2021	Questionnaire	Unemployed people	N=334 (86 Depressed, 248 Normal)		No	LR, NB, DT, KNN, SVM		Naturalistic	Classification	Questionnaire scores for depression	Accuracy: 89.6% (Ensemble)
[41]	2018	HR, PPG, Acceleration/Body Movement, Skin Response		N=6		No	NB, DT, SVM	Empatica E4	Lab	Classification	Stress-inducing task	Accuracy: 93% (SVM)
[148]	2018	Skin Response, Questionnaire		N=110		No	SVM	PCL-5 Questionnaire	Lab	Regression	PCL-5 questionnaire for PTSD	MSE: 138 (SVR)
[71]	2020	EMG, Skin Response	Young Gamers	N=15		Yes	NN	Wearable Sensor	Lab	Classification	Questionnaire scores	Accuracy: 95% (LSTM)
[149]	2020	HRV, ECG				No	NN	BIOPAC MP150-BioNomadix	Lab	Classification	Three phases of driving task in driving simulator	Accuracy: 92.8% (CNN)
[115]	2019	HRV, ECG		N=24	Baseline Removal, Pairwise Transformation	No	NB, RF, LDA/QDA, KNN, SVM, Other	Ag/AgCl Electrodes	Lab	Classification	Stress-inducing task	Accuracy: 84.4% (SVM)
[150]	2021	Skin Response	Students	N=25	Standard Scale on E-nose data.	No	KNN, SVM, LDA	Gas sensor	Lab	Classification	Stress-inducing task	Accuracy: 96% (SVM)
[151]	2021	HR, PPG, Skin Response	College Students	N=1 (22 years old)		No	SVM	Empatica E4	Lab	Classification	Stress-inducing task	Accuracy: 80% (SVM)
[91]	2020	Text		~11k Tweets		No	LR, NB, RF, SVM	Twitter	Naturalistic	Classification	Labeling by sentiment analysis	Accuracy: 90% (SVM)
[57]	2019	Eye Tracking		N=100 (50 Healthy, 50 Non-healthy)		No	NN	Nvidia GPU	Lab	Classification	Number of rings in eye Iris	Accuracy: 98% (NN)
[152]	2019	Skin Response, PPG, HR, HRV	Patients during virtual speaking	N=30	Min-max normalization, Zero means normalization	No	SVM	Empatica E4	Lab	Classification	Stress-inducing task	Accuracy: 86.3% (SVM)
[93]	2019	Text		~14k posts from Weibo Sina		No	NN, SVM, BERT	Weibo Sina Application	Naturalistic	Classification	Hamilton Depression Rating Scale for depression	F1 score: 0.538 (BERT)
[106]	2019	Questionnaire	Adult patients		Normalization by Term Frequency-Inverse Document Frequency (TF-IDF)	No	NN, Other		Naturalistic	Classification	Labels by clinician	Accuracy: 94.5%, AUROC: 98.5% (NN)
[110]	2019	Questionnaire	Adults above 50			No	NN, LR, Boosting, XGBoost, RF	Questionnaire	Pre-collected data without experiment	Classification	CES-D scores	Log-loss: 0.241, AUROC: 0.886 (XGBoost)
[67]	2022	Respiratory, ECG, Questionnaire, HRV	Students	N=99	Resting state ECG removed from data as baseline	No	NB, DT, LDA/QDA, KNN, SVM	E-prime software	Lab	Classification	STAI scores	Accuracy: 73.68% (DT)
[140]	2018	Questionnaire	Students and Working professionals	N=656		No	LR, NB, DT, K-means, KNN, SVM	Questionnaire	Naturalistic	Classification	Clustering labels	Accuracy: 90% (RF)
[53]	2019	EEG	Students	N=63		No	KNN, SVM	PSS-14 Questionnaire, Neurosky Mindwave EEG	Lab	Classification	PSS-14 scores	Accuracy: 74.43% (KNN)
[136]	2021	HRV, ECG	Yoga and Chi practitioners	N=12		No	KNN	Precollected dataset (from PhysioNet)	Pre-collected data without experiment	Classification	Stress-inducing task	Accuracy: 95.31% (SVM)
[50]	2019	EEG, Skin Response, PPG, HRV	College Students and Instructors	N=28		No	NN, NB, SVM	MUSE EEG, Shimmer GSR+	Lab	Classification	PSS scores	Accuracy: 75% (NN)
[54]	2019	EEG	College Students and Instructors	N=28		No	NN, NB, SVM	MUSE EEG	Lab	Classification	PSS scores	Accuracy: 92.85% (NN)
[153]	2018	Questionnaire, Text	Facebook users	N=431 (319 Depressed, 162 Normal)		No	NN, Other	Facebook, CES-D Questionnaire	Naturalistic	Classification	CES-D scores	Accuracy: 72% (CNN)
[131]	2019	Questionnaire	College Students	N=48		No	NN, Boosting, XGBoost, RF, K-means, SVM		Naturalistic	Classification	PHQ-9 scores	AUROC: 0.92 (SVM)

[49]	2021	EEG	Nurses and non-health professionals	N=80 (30 Nurses, 50 non-health professionals)		No	AdaBoost, RF, KNN, SVM, LDA, Ridge, Deep Belief Network	NeuroScan EEG, SynAmps 2 amplifier	Lab	Classification	Self-report	Accuracy: 91% (SVM)
[154]	2021	HR, Skin Response, PPG	Engineering College Students	N=21		No	Boosting, AdaBoost, XGBoost, RF, KNN	Empatica E4	Lab	Classification	Stress-inducing task	Accuracy: 99.88% (RF)
[79]	2021	Acceleration/Body Movement, PPG, Questionnaire	Students and Staff	N=32	PSS scores were used to change the threshold for stress detection	Yes	LR, Boosting, AdaBoost, XGBoost, RF, SVM	Fossil Gen4 Explorer	Both lab and naturalistic	Classification	Stress-inducing task, Self-report	Accuracy: 82.6%, AUROC: 0.790, F-1 score: 0.623 (SVM)
[80]	2020	Acceleration/Body Movement, Skin Response, PPG, HR, HRV	Drivers	N=9	One model was trained for each subject (with different thresholds for each subject)	No	RF	Empatica E4	Pre-collected data without experiment	Regression	Baseline and driving condition	RMSE: 0.03 (Regression)
[68]	2019	Skin Response, Respiratory, ECG, HRV	Students	N=60		No	LR, NB, DT, RF, SVM, Other	thoracic respiration belt, skin conductance adhesive patches, BVP sensor	Lab			Accuracy: 74% (LR)
[90]	2021	Text				Yes	NB, RF, KNN, SVM, Other	web page crawler	Naturalistic	Classification	Self-report	
[155]	2020	Questionnaire	Korean people	N=39,225		Yes	Context-DNN		Pre-collected data without experiment	Classification	Precollected Depression Scores	Accuracy: 94.57% (Context-DNN)
[129]	2019	HR, PPG	Veterans	N=100		Yes	NN, NB, RF, SVM, Other	iPhone	Naturalistic	Classification	Self-reported PTSD triggers	AUROC: 0.67 (SVM)
[116]	2019	HRV, PPG, Acceleration/Body Movement, Skin Response	Students	N=21	One model was trained for each subject	Yes	RF, KNN, LR, NN	Samsung Gear S, Empatica E4	Naturalistic	Classification	PSS, NASA-TLX, STAI and other questionnaire scores	Accuracy: 97.92% (RF)
[66]	2019	HRV, Respiratory, ECG	Students	N=18	Resting state removed from ECG and RESP data as baseline	No	NN	Zephyr BioHarness 3.0	Lab	Classification	Stress-inducing task	Accuracy: 83.9% (DeepER)
[48]	2019	EEG	Healthy and Mild-depressed	N=22		No	Spiking Neural Network (SNN)	SynAmps amplifier, 61-channel EEG	Lab	Classification	BDI scores for depression	Accuracy: 72.13% (SNN)
[117]	2020	HRV, PPG, Questionnaire	Participants taking exams	N=632		No	NN	BioBeats Biobeam band	Naturalistic	Classification	PSS, STAI and DASS scores	Accuracy: 83% (LSTM)
[85]	2019	Video		N=82		No	NN, Other	AVEC2013 and AVEC2014 datasets	Pre-collected data without experiment	Regression	BDI scores for depression	RMSE: 8.5 (CNN)
[92]	2017	Text		459 posts (207 distorted, 252 undistorted)		No	NN, LR, NB, DT, KNN, SOM		Pre-collected data without experiment	Classification	Hand-labeled data	Accuracy: 73% (LR)
[118]	2017	Skin Response, PPG, HRV	Healthy subjects	N=12		No	CNN, SOM	Samsung Gear VR	Lab	Classification	Stress-inducing task	Accuracy: 95% (K-ELM)
[135]	2020	Other	Women	N=69,169		No	NN, LR, DT, XGBoost, RF		Pre-collected data without experiment	Classification	Depression from electronic health records (EHRs)	AUROC: 0.937 (LR)
[113]	2020	Acceleration/Body Movement, Skin Response	College Students	N=239	Multi-task learning with participants as tasks in NN	No	NN	SNAP-SHOT dataset	Pre-collected data without experiment	Classification	Self-report	
[56]	2020	EEG	Healthy subjects	N=28		No	LR, RF, NN	MUSE EEG	Lab	Classification	STAI Scores	Accuracy: 78.5% (RF)
[100]	2021	Questionnaire				No	LR, NB, DT, RF, KNN, SVM	Goldberg's Depression Questionnaire	Pre-collected data without experiment	Classification	Goldberg questionnaire scores	Accuracy: 86% (RF)
[75]	2019	HR, PPG, Acceleration/Body Movement, Skin Response, Other	Depressed and Healthy Japanese people	N=86 (45 Depressed, 41 Healthy)		No	XGBoost	Silmeee W20 Wristband	Naturalistic	Classification	healthy/patient participants	Accuracy: 76%, Sensitivity: 73%, Specificity: 79% (XGBoost)
[119]	2019	HRV, ECG	Firefighters	N=26		Yes	DT, SVM	Polar H7 chest strap ECG	Lab	Classification	Stress-inducing task	Accuracy: 88% (DT)
[126]	2016	Other		N=270	Normalizing the variables	No	RF, SVM	eMate EMA application, iYouVU application	Naturalistic	Regression	Mood self-report	MSE: 0.410 (SVM)
[156]	2018	ECG, HRV	Drivers	N=17		No	NN, DT, RF	Wearable Sensors	Pre-collected data without experiment	Classification	Stress-inducing task	Accuracy: Up to 100%, AUC: 1 (RF)

[46]	2021	HR, Hormones, BP, Respiratory	Patients	N=417	Normalizing the variables	No	XGBoost		Naturalistic	Classification	Self-report	AUC: 0.89 (XGBoost)
[120]	2020	HRV, PPG, Skin Response		N=15		No	LR, RF, SVM, Other	PLUX BITalino Wearable Sensor	Lab	Classification	Stress-inducing task	Accuracy: 80% (RF)
[114]	2018	HRV, PPG				No	SVM	Polar H7 HRM	Lab	Classification	Self-report	Accuracy: 81% (SVM)
[99]	2017	Questionnaire	Stressed Students	N=249		No	NN, RF, Fuzzy, SVM, Other		Pre-collected data without experiment	Classification	BDI scores	Accuracy: 100% (NN)
[109]	2020	Questionnaire	Depressed and Healthy Dutch citizens	N=11,081 (570 self-reported depression)		No	XGBoost		Pre-collected data without experiment	Classification	Self-report	Accuracy: 97.65%, Precision: 95.48%, Recall: 99.87%, F1 score: 0.98 (XGBoost)
[157]	2019	HRV, PPG				No	NN	Firstbeat Bodyguard 2, Smartwatch	Lab	Regression	Heart Rate Monitor (HRM) measurements	RMSE: 28.5 (Regression)
[158]	2021	HR, PPG				No	SVM	PPG Sensor, Arduino UNO	Lab	Classification	Stress-inducing task	Accuracy: 62% (SVM)
[70]	2021	EMG, ECG, HRV	Healthy Drivers	N=16		No	SVM	ECG, EMG, Volvo S70	Lab	Classification	Stress-inducing task	Accuracy: 93.7% (SVM)
[101]	2017	Questionnaire				No	NN, Fuzzy, K-means, SVM		Pre-collected data without experiment	Classification	Pre-collected dataset for depression	Accuracy: 97% (SVM)
[51]	2021	EEG, ECG, HR	Students	N=24	Using K-means on EEG energy	No	NN, DT, RF, K-means, KNN, SVM	19-channel EEG, 12-channel ECG	Lab	Classification	Stress-inducing task	Accuracy: 82% (ANN)
[102]	2021	Questionnaire	Indian people with mental disorder	N=395		No	LR, NB, RF, KNN, SVM	Google Forms	Naturalistic	Classification	Self-report	Accuracy: 92.15%
[52]	2017	EEG	Healthy subjects	N=42		No	LR, NB, SVM	EEG 128 channels, Electrical Geodesic Net Amps 300 amplifier	Lab	Classification	Stress-inducing task	Accuracy: 94.6% (NB)
[111]	2020	Questionnaire	Pregnant Women	N=508		No	RF, SVM	Questionnaire	Naturalistic	Classification	EPDS scores	Accuracy: 80% (SVM)
[42]	2020	HR, EMG, Skin Response, Respiratory, ECG	Drivers	N=17		No	LR, DT, LDA/QDA, KNN, SVM		Lab	Classification	Stress markers in driving task	Accuracy: 75.02%
[107]	2018	Questionnaire	Employees	N=750		No	LR, DT, Boosting, RF, KNN	Survey	Naturalistic	Classification		Accuracy: 75.13% (Boosting)
[98]	2020	Questionnaire		N=8		No	DT, RF	Thermostat, and Passive InfraRed Sensors	Naturalistic	Regression	MOS (SF36) Questionnaire	MSE: 0.17 (RF)
[147]	2018	ECG, HR, Skin Response			Multi-task learning with participants as tasks in NN	No	NN, LR, SVM		Pre-collected data without experiment	Classification	Stress-inducing task	AUROC: 0.91 (NN)
[47]	2019	HRV, EEG, Skin Response, Respiratory	Healthy subjects	N=24		No	NN	Polar Wearlink HRM, E243 electrodes	Lab	Classification	Stress-inducing task	Accuracy: 90% (NN)
[121]	2019	ECG, PPG, HRV, Skin Response, Respiratory	Healthy subjects	N=30		No	RF, DT, KNN	Shimmer 3 ECG, Empatica E4	Lab	Classification	Stress-inducing task	Accuracy: 84.13 (RF)
[159]	2017	Acceleration/Body Movement, Skin Response, Other	Patients with MDD	N=12		No	LR, Adaboost, RF, Other	Empatica E4, Android Smartphones	Naturalistic	Regression	Clinical score, self-report	RMSE: 2.8 (Ridge)
[86]	2020	HR, HRV, PPG, Questionnaire	Healthy subjects			No	LR, DT, RF, SVM	Self-made PPG sensor	Lab	Classification	Audio-visual stress inducing stimulus	Accuracy: 91% (RF), AUROC: 0.96 (RF)
[130]	2018	HR, ECG		N=15		No	SVM, Kalman Filter		Lab	Classification	Anxiety stimuli	Accuracy: 71% (SVM)
[108]	2017	Questionnaire	Geriatric patients	N=520		No	NB, RF, Other		Lab	Classification	HADS scale	Accuracy: 90%, AUROC: 94.3% (RF)
[142]	2021	Questionnaire	Kenya people	N=800		No	LR, NB, DT, Boosting, Adaboost, XGBoost, RF, SVM		Pre-collected data without experiment	Classification	Survey	Accuracy: 85%, F1 score= 0.78 (SVM, RF, Ada Boosting, Voting Ensemble)
[160]	2020	Questionnaire	People from tech and non-tech companies			No	LR, DT, RF, KNN, SVM	Survey	Pre-collected data without experiment	Classification	Survey	Accuracy: 84%, F1 score: 0.87 (LR, DT)
[161]	2020	Questionnaire	Child and Adolescent Twins in Sweden	N=7,638		No	NN, LR, XGBoost, RF, SVM	Survey, Reports	Pre-collected data without experiment	Classification	Survey	AUROC: 0.739 (RF)



[162]	2019	Questionnaire	PTSD patients	N=90		No	LR, NB, RF, SVM, Ensemble Methods, Hard Voting	Metricwire Mobile app	Naturalistic	Classification	DSM-5 scores	AUROC: 0.85 (Ensemble)
[112]	2020	Questionnaire	Veterans with PTSD	N=305		No	LR, Boosting		Naturalistic	Classification	Self report	F1 score: 0.69 (Voting Classifier)
[163]	2021	Questionnaire	NESDA cohort participants			No	LR, NB, AUTO-SKLEARN		Pre-collected data without experiment	Classification	Self report	Accuracy: 79% (auto-sklearn)
[164]	2020	Questionnaire	Students	N=917		No	NN, Boosting, Adaboost, KNN, DT, SVM, RF	WhatsApp	Pre-collected data without experiment	Classification	GAD-7 score	Accuracy: 75.4% (NN)
[105]	2021	Questionnaire	Students	N=4184		No	NN, LR, Boosting, XGBoost, RF, KNN, SVM		Pre-collected data without experiment	Classification	MDD/GAD patients and normal people	AUC: 0.73 GAD, 0.67 MDD (XGBoost)
[141]	2021	ECG	Chinese Academy of Sciences	N=34		No	NN	Sticker-Type ECG	Lab	Classification	Stress-inducing task, self-report	Accuracy: 86.8%, Specificity: 0.93 (LSTM)
[165]	2019	HRV, ECG				No	LDA/QDA, SVM		Lab	Classification	Stress-inducing task	Accuracy: 82.7% (CNN)
[166]	2021	Skin Response	WESAD dataset	N=15	Only showed the importance of personalization	No	NN	WESAD Dataset	Pre-collected data without experiment	Classification	Stress-inducing task	Accuracy: 92.85% (CNN)
[167]	2021	HRV, ECG, Skin Response				No	DT		Lab	Classification	Self-report	Accuracy: 79% (SVM)
[82]	2020	Audio Signals, HRV, Skin Response, ECG	WESAD and SWELL datasets	N=50	One model was trained for each subject (from ground-up and transfer learning)	No	DT	SWELL and WESAD Datasets	Naturalistic	Classification	Questionnaire scores, self-report	Accuracy: 95.2% (RF)
[132]	2018	Skin Response, ECG, PPG, HRV	Employees with reported stress	N=12		No	SOM	MindMedia NeXus-10 MKII, imec Health Patch	Lab	Classification	SOMs were used to generates	Accuracy: 79%, Sensitivity: 75.6%
[87]	2018	Text	Depressed people	N~9000		No	NN, Boosting, XGBoost		Pre-collected data without experiment	Classification	Reddit Self-reported Depression Diagnosis (RSDD) dataset	Precision: 16.9%, Recall: 17.8%, F1 score: 17.6% (increased compared to CNN)
[95]	2021	Questionnaire		N=39,975		No	SVM, RF, XGBoost, DT, NB	DASS Questionnaire	Pre-collected data without experiment	Classification	DASS scores	AUROC: 0.98 (SVM)
[168]	2021	HR	PTSD patients	N=99		No	XGBoost, RF, GLM, SVM	Apple Watch, MOTO 360	Naturalistic	Classification	Self-report	Accuracy: 83%, AUROC: 0.7 (XGBoost)
[59]	2017	Eye Tracking, Acceleration/Body Movement, HR, PPG	Adults	N=23		No	Adaboost, KNN, SVM, NB	Camera	Lab	Classification	Stress-inducing task	Accuracy: 88.32% (KNN)
[60]	2021	Eye Tracking	Adults	N=23		No	NN (CNN, LSTM)	Camera	Lab	Classification	Stress-inducing task	Accuracy: 86.1% (LSTM)