

SOUL: An Energy-Efficient Unsupervised Online Learning Seizure Detection Classifier

Adelson Chua, *Student Member, IEEE*, Michael I. Jordan, *Fellow, IEEE*, and Rikky Muller, *Senior Member, IEEE*

Abstract—Implantable devices that record neural activity and detect seizures have been adopted to issue warnings or trigger neurostimulation to suppress epileptic seizures. Typical seizure detection systems rely on high-accuracy offline-trained machine learning classifiers that require manual retraining when seizure patterns change over long periods of time. For an implantable seizure detection system, a low power, at-the-edge, online learning algorithm can be employed to dynamically adapt to the neural signal drifts, thereby maintaining high accuracy without external intervention. This work proposes SOUL: Stochastic-gradient-descent-based Online Unsupervised Logistic regression classifier. After an initial offline training phase, continuous online unsupervised classifier updates are applied in situ, which improves sensitivity in patients with drifting seizure features. SOUL was tested on two human electroencephalography (EEG) datasets: the CHB-MIT scalp EEG dataset, and a long (>100 hours) NeuroVista intracranial EEG dataset. It was able to achieve an average sensitivity of 97.5% and 97.9% for the two datasets respectively, at >95% specificity. Sensitivity improved by at most 8.2% on long-term data when compared to a typical seizure detection classifier. SOUL was fabricated in TSMC’s 28 nm process occupying 0.1 mm² and achieves 1.5 nJ/classification energy efficiency, which is at least 24x more efficient than state-of-the-art.

Index Terms— classification, logistic regression, online learning, seizure detection, stochastic gradient descent

I. INTRODUCTION

EPILEPSY is a serious neurological disorder affecting around 50 million people worldwide [1] and is usually characterized by recurrent seizures. Seizure frequency varies greatly from person to person and can severely impact a person’s quality of life. Seizures are often seen as a series of high-amplitude, high-frequency electrical signals [2,3] that can be measured through electroencephalography (EEG).

As an aid to patients suffering from seizures, advisory systems have been developed that warn patients when a seizure is about to occur. The system first records EEG signals, either intracranially or on the scalp, and then performs classification to detect the onset or presence of a seizure. Closed-loop implantable neuromodulators have also been deployed for seizure treatment. These systems detect seizure events within an acceptable latency (typically <5 seconds [3,4]) and trigger neurostimulation to suppress the seizure. The NeuroPace

Responsive neurostimulation (RNS) [2-5] and the Medtronic Deep-brain stimulation (DBS) [6,7] are two medically approved devices of this kind. These devices utilize a small, battery-powered pulse generator surgically implanted in the skull with two electrode leads that are implanted intracranially and/or epicortically. This treatment method has demonstrated clinical efficacy in terms of reducing long-term seizure occurrence, reporting a reduction of 66% of seizures by Year 6 for the NeuroPace RNS [2] and 75% median reduction of seizures by Year 7 for the Medtronic DBS [7].

In some patients, EEG seizure patterns can change over time, which can be due to electrode displacement and impedance changes [8] or shifts to the patients’ circadian profiles [9]. Such changes would require regular retraining of the seizure detection algorithms to maintain high accuracy detection. Prior art in seizure prediction and detection utilized long-term datasets to capture such variations [10], resulting in seizure detection accuracy greater than 90%. However, the classifier algorithms in [10] were software-only implementations, where computational complexity and memory requirements were not a design consideration. For implantable closed-loop seizure detection systems, energy efficiency, area utilization, and long-term accuracy become important design constraints.

There were several application-specific integrated circuits (ASICs) for state-of-the-art seizure event classification published in the literature. These on-chip classifiers typically employ support vector machines (SVMs) [11-16] due to their high accuracy and relatively simple implementations. However, these classifiers can still have significant memory requirements to hold their support vectors. At least 64 kB [11-16] of memory is required leading to high on-chip area and power consumption. Moreover, while these ASIC seizure detectors usually incorporate on-chip feature calculations; training and its associated computational complexity is usually completely offloaded to software. The calculated SVM model parameters after offline training are loaded into the chip, which then performs online seizure classification. Consequently, for a seizure detection system to remain accurate over long periods of time on patients with changing seizure patterns, regular signal post-processing, labeling, and retraining by an expert physician would be required. Such external intervention can

Adelson Chua is with the Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Sciences, University of California at Berkeley, Berkeley, CA 94720 USA and with the Electrical and Electronics Engineering Institute, University of the Philippines, Diliman, Quezon City 1101 Philippines. (e-mail: adelson.chua@berkeley.edu).

Michael I. Jordan is with the Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Sciences and the Department of Statistics, University of California at Berkeley, Berkeley, CA 94720 USA. (e-mail: jordan@cs.berkeley.edu).

Rikky Muller is with the Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Sciences, University of California at Berkeley, Berkeley, CA 94720 USA, and with the Chan-Zuckerberg Biohub, San Francisco, CA 94158 USA. (email: rikky@berkeley.edu)

Color versions of one or more of the figures in this article are available online at <http://ieeexplore.ieee.org>

> REPLACE THIS LINE WITH YOUR MANUSCRIPT ID NUMBER (DOUBLE-CLICK HERE TO EDIT) <

also be costly and impractical.

This work demonstrates the use of unsupervised online learning to dynamically adapt to changes in neural signal patterns over time and maintain high detection accuracy without external intervention. This will be referred to as SOUL [17,18] (Stochastic-gradient-descent-based Online Unsupervised Logistic regression classifier), shown in Fig. 1. SOUL is initially trained offline and then feature weights are updated *in situ*. Moreover, due to the computationally simple algorithm and architectural optimizations used, SOUL is significantly more energy efficient than state-of-the-art on-chip seizure detectors.




Fig. 1. Proposed seizure detection system featuring a fully unsupervised online learning framework to maintain long-term high accuracy detection.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section II describes the proposed unsupervised online learning classifier for seizure detection. Section III evaluates the performance of the proposed classifier on two human EEG datasets: the CHB-MIT scalp EEG dataset [19] and the NeuroVista intracranial EEG dataset collected from a study conducted by the University of Melbourne [8]. Section IV describes the hardware architecture for the proposed algorithm and the energy efficiency measurements of the fabricated chip. Section V presents a discussion of the results and provides comparisons with prior work. Section VI concludes the paper.

II. ALGORITHM DESIGN

A. State-of-the-art online learning seizure detectors

Gradient descent is a commonly used optimization algorithm for training machine learning model parameters. The algorithm involves several matrix-based operations, which require mathematically complex calculations that lead to high energy per classification when implemented in hardware. For SVM-based classifiers, only [15] has demonstrated online learning through gradient descent on an ASIC. When the system was run on a 6-hour EEG recording, the sensitivity was maintained at

96.1% while the false alarm rate was reduced from 1.83% to 0.34%. However, the reported power consumption was on the order of milliwatts, with energy efficiency at 170 $\mu\text{J}/\text{classification}$.

A simpler approximation of SVM online learning, not using gradient descent, has also been demonstrated [16]. The implementation incorporates a post-processing block that selectively replaces the preloaded support vectors on-chip. It has reported a sensitivity improvement from 39.5% to 71.9% on a single patient. The energy efficiency of the classifier was reported to be at 0.34 $\mu\text{J}/\text{classification}$, which is 500x more efficient than the previous work utilizing gradient descent. An online learning neural network-based classifier has also been demonstrated [20] utilizing a post-processing block to modify the detection threshold for the classifier. A 4.2% improvement in accuracy attributed to the online learning scheme was reported on a 40-minute-long EEG dataset. Energy efficiency was measured to be 2.06 $\mu\text{J}/\text{classification}$, which is 6x greater than [16] due to the complexity of the classifier.

A common limitation of these implementations is that the online learning processes are entirely supervised. That is, these require external labels for the algorithms to work. Moreover, these were not tested on long-term continuous datasets (>100 hours per patient). Algorithms that work well on short EEG recordings, can fail to work on longer recordings. Gradient-descent-based online learning can work in the long term since it is an iterative optimization algorithm. However, its computational complexity leads to high power consumption for complex classifiers such as SVMs.

This work proposes the use of a binary classifier based on a generalized linear model, such as logistic regression, which can leverage gradient descent as an optimization algorithm without significant complexity. Moreover, by utilizing the classifier's output as the training label, unsupervised online learning can be achieved.

B. Logistic regression as a classifier

Logistic regression is a probabilistic model that utilizes the logistic function to map the weighted linear combination of input features to real values between 0 and 1, which can then be interpreted as probabilities. Thresholding the output to any value between 0 and 1 (typically 0.5), would result in binary classification. The standard logistic function is shown in (1):

$$p(w_t, x_t) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-w_t^T x_t}} \quad (1)$$

The w_t term refers to the vector of logistic regression feature weights corresponding to the vector of feature inputs x_t . The values for the weights in w_t are calculated through an iterative process to best fit the logistic function on the labeled set of feature inputs. That iterative process is how the logistic regression classifier is trained and is typically done in software as it uses the gradient descent algorithm for the optimization.

Since the output of logistic regression depends on the linear combination of weights and features, it performs very well on linearly separable data. As seizure and non-seizure events usually exhibit this property (especially using features that can detect the high amplitude and high frequency seizure signals,

> REPLACE THIS LINE WITH YOUR MANUSCRIPT ID NUMBER (DOUBLE-CLICK HERE TO EDIT) <

more on this later this section), logistic regression can be used as a seizure event classifier. Prior work has compared logistic regression against other classifiers [23–25] for this application and has shown comparable performance. However, when the feature values between seizures and non-seizures vary over time, linear separability between the two classes cannot be maintained, leading to accuracy degradation. SVMs, on the other hand, can utilize non-linear kernel functions to force class separability leading to better accuracy. This is the reason why state-of-the-art seizure classifiers typically use SVMs.

The limitation of logistic regression on the diminishing linear separability can be mitigated if logistic regression can track feature value changes over time. As the feature values x_t drift, the optimal feature weights w_t that were calculated during offline training might not hold true anymore. Thus, if a new set of weights can be calculated beyond the initial offline training period (i.e. online), the logistic function can shift dynamically, as shown in Fig. 2, to maintain optimality.




Fig. 2. Logistic function shift towards a new optimal curve due to updated feature weights after logistic regression retraining.

C. Stochastic gradient descent for logistic regression

The stochastic gradient descent (SGD) algorithm is an iterative method of optimizing the classifier feature weights by approximating the calculation of the gradient descent using a new set of feature inputs [26]. This algorithm avoids the complex computation of the gradient on the whole training data. While SGD is an approximation, it can be used to dynamically update the feature weights online through a defined optimization algorithm. Fig. 3 describes the procedure. A set of feature weights are initially trained offline, using any training algorithm available, to achieve the best possible accuracy from the training data. This process provides a good baseline for logistic regression classification. Then, upon classifier deployment, the classifier can utilize the new data to update the feature weights using SGD.

The logistic regression weight update is computationally simple as shown in (2):

$$w_{t+1} = w_t + \eta(y_t - p(w_t, x_t))x_t \quad (2)$$

The w_{t+1} term refers to the next set of feature weights after the update; η is the learning rate of the algorithm, which controls how much the feature weights will change based on new data; and y_t is the corresponding label for the current feature input. The SGD-based feature weight update can be done in a single iteration with minimal hardware. The logistic function calculation can also be implemented using a look-up table to further reduce the computational complexity. Architectural optimizations will be covered further in Section IV.




Fig. 3. Offline training phase generates the best possible set of starting feature weights for on-chip classification. Feature weights are dynamically updated on chip using SGD (highlighted in red).

D. Enabling unsupervised learning

Traditionally, SGD is meant for supervised learning, where an external label is provided for every data input [26]. However, for an implantable system operating *in situ*, externally provided labels are not readily available. Thus, this approach places SGD within an unsupervised learning paradigm during the online classification phase. This is implemented through bootstrapping, which uses the classifier’s predicted probability output to update its own feature weights. The classifier’s output probability $p(w_t, x_t)$ is rounded to either 0 or 1 and is then treated as a label y_t for SGD. This creates a positive feedback path between the classifier’s output and its input training label, highlighted in Fig. 4. Consequently, the cumulative accuracy over time is heavily dependent on the initial classifier accuracy after the offline training phase. It is critical that the initial logistic regression weights achieve a high classification accuracy during the training phase. The feature set used for this work, which will be described later in this section, adequately separates seizure and non-seizure events. Therefore, achieving high classification accuracy, at least during the training phase, is possible. The unsupervised online learning classifier (SOUL) will be tracking the long-term changes in these seizure and non-seizure patterns through feature weight updates *in situ*.




Fig. 4. Feedback loop when using the classifier’s own output probability (rounded off to 0 or 1) as the training label for SGD.

E. Making the unsupervised online learning robust

While high classification accuracy is required for offline

> REPLACE THIS LINE WITH YOUR MANUSCRIPT ID NUMBER (DOUBLE-CLICK HERE TO EDIT) <

training, the classifier can still make occasional errors. Generally, any misclassification can degrade the accuracy due to the positive feedback, as the classifier will retrain in the wrong direction. To avoid such an occurrence, the weights are only updated once a specified confidence threshold is reached by the logistic function output. Moreover, a windowing technique, shown in Fig. 5, is employed such that a series of high-confidence predictions are required to trigger the online feature weight update. Feature inputs corresponding to these high-confidence predictions would then be used as new data that the SGD algorithm will iterate over for the next weight update. This process ensures that short-term misclassifications and glitches will not negatively affect the update. The window size (WS) and confidence threshold (CT) become hyperparameters during the offline training phase (Fig. 3) and are tuned on a patient-specific basis.




Fig. 5. Windowing scheme and confidence thresholding implemented to only train the classifier once a series of high-confidence predictions are generated from the logistic regression output.

F. Classifier features

The feature extraction unit computes two main feature classes (Fig. 1): line length and spectral band powers for three frequency bands. These features are commonly used in seizure detection systems since they capture amplitude and frequency-dependent patterns usually attributed to seizure events. Other features were also considered, such as spectral entropy and time/frequency correlations, but were down-selected after running the initial training with L1-norm penalization, which zeroed out most of these features. After the feature selection, the classification accuracy values only decreased by <1%.

Line length [27] captures the high amplitude and high-frequency data characteristic of seizures, defined by the sum of the absolute value of differences between consecutive points, as shown in (3).

$$\sum_{t=1}^{N-1} |x_t - x_{t-1}| \quad (3)$$

Spectral band power captures frequency-dependent patterns, calculated by summing the spectral power over a specific frequency band. This feature has been shown to separate seizure and non-seizure events very well [13]. This can also be approximated by passing the signal through a bandpass filter on a specified frequency range and then performing a sum of squares, exploiting Parseval's theorem, as shown in (4). This

approximation eliminates the need for dedicated Fast Fourier

$$\sum_{t=0}^{N-1} x_t^2 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{f=0}^{N-1} |X_f|^2 \quad (4)$$

Transform (FFT) hardware in the system.

The spectral band power is calculated for three EEG frequency bands: α , 8-16 Hz; β , 16-32 Hz; γ , 32-96 Hz.

Both line length and spectral band power features require a specific sample window N . For this work, a 0.1-second window was used, which translates to a 100-sample sliding window for a 1 kHz input sampling rate. To minimize control circuitry, a new feature is calculated for every sample, leading to a 99% feature overlap. The significant feature overlap also helps mitigate the effects of input signal glitches through window averaging, which increases the robustness of SOUL.

III. CLASSIFIER PERFORMANCE

The performance of SOUL is tested using the NeuroVista intracranial EEG (iEEG) dataset [8] and the CHB-MIT scalp EEG dataset [19]. The former features >100-hour recordings on three patients to demonstrate how online learning performs over a long period of time. The latter is a collection of relatively short recordings on 24 patients for performance comparisons on a wider population. The CHB-MIT dataset also allows for state-of-the-art comparisons as it is a commonly used dataset to test seizure classifiers. Moreover, as the two datasets have different recording processes (iEEG versus scalp EEG, with the latter being inherently noisier than the former), using these also measures how SOUL performs on datasets with varying signal-to-noise ratios.

The iEEG dataset was divided into 15% training, 15% validation, and 70% testing sets. Contrary to random sampling during offline training, which is typically done in conventional machine learning approaches, time-series causality is maintained by considering only the first 30% (training + validation) of the data. Due to the limited seizure data for some patients in the CHB-MIT dataset, at least 2 seizure events were used for training and validation. However, if applicable, an approximate 15-15-70 split is still applied. For both datasets, the non-seizure samples were trimmed to balance the training data. Non-seizure samples closest to the start and end of the seizure events were retained to improve classification accuracy.

A. Tuning the online learning hyperparameters

As discussed in the previous section, the WS and CT hyperparameters are tuned on a patient-specific basis. The values of these hyperparameters depend on both the short-term and long-term variability of the EEG signals per patient. Noisy EEG signals require higher confidence thresholds. Long-term time-varying signals require shorter window sizes so that the classifier can track signal changes faster. Fig. 6 shows the achieved accuracies of the classifier during the hyperparameter tuning on three patients from the iEEG dataset [8]. WS, measured in terms of the number of samples (each sample is 1 ms), was swept from 1 to 15. CT, which thresholds the logistic function output, was swept from 0.6 to 0.9.

> REPLACE THIS LINE WITH YOUR MANUSCRIPT ID NUMBER (DOUBLE-CLICK HERE TO EDIT) <




Fig. 6. The classifier accuracies (z-axis) during the tuning phase of the two hyperparameters: window size and confidence threshold.

Figure 6 shows that for Patient 1, the optimal hyperparameter values are $CT = 0.8$ and $WS = 10$. The high CT value implies that the EEG signal is relatively noisy. Thus, the threshold needs to be high to avoid misclassifications negatively affecting the online training process. The optimal WS is also high to further mitigate the noise. Patient 3, on the other hand, has low hyperparameter values ($CT = 0.7$, $WS = 5$). These imply that the EEG signal is less noisy (lower CT) and that the signal varies over the long term (lower WS to stay on track). Fig. 6 also shows that without patient-specific tuning, a common value for the hyperparameters ($CT = 0.7$, $WS = 7$) can be used instead for these three patients, albeit with maximum sensitivities only reaching approximately 90%.

B. Performance on long-term iEEG data

The iEEG data from the NeuroVista Seizure Advisory System clinical trial is comprised of recordings from three human patients that had the lowest seizure prediction performances out of the ten patients in [8]. Fig. 7 shows the classification performance over time of three classifiers: SOUL, logistic regression, and a representative SVM. The latter two are only trained offline. Incorporating online learning results in an average sensitivity and specificity of 97.9% and 98.2% for the three patients. The average sensitivity improvement is 6.5% with $<1\%$ specificity degradation. While the performance of SOUL and the SVM is the same for Patients 1 and 2, a significant performance difference is observed for Patient 3. The decreasing sensitivities of the conventional offline-only-trained classifiers demonstrate that seizure patterns change over time, which leads to missed detections. As SOUL tunes the feature weights during classification, it effectively tracks the iEEG signal variability, allowing sensitivity to be maintained over time. Fig. 8 shows the summary of final sensitivity and specificity values across all three patients after running the test

dataset. In this work, <1.2 false alarms per day ($>95\%$ specificity) are maintained for all patients in all algorithms, equivalent to false alarm rates of commercial devices [4].

C. Performance on scalp EEG data

The CHB-MIT dataset consists of scalp EEG recordings from 24 pediatric subjects with intractable seizures [19]. Across all subjects, the mean recording time was 41 hours and the mean number of recorded seizure events per subject was 7.6. Compared to the iEEG dataset, this is significantly shorter in terms of recording time and the number of seizures. However, this dataset is used for comparison since most seizure detection systems refer to this dataset.

Fig. 9 shows the comparison to other works which presented their results on a per-patient basis across all 24 subjects [7,8]. For some select subjects (subjects 6, 8, 18), greater than 12% improvement in sensitivity was observed. For the rest of the subjects, there was a 1-3% improvement. The average specificity for all subjects was 98.2%.

The classification performance of SOUL on the two datasets shows that the proposed unsupervised online learning scheme works for both iEEG and scalp EEG. This demonstrates the flexibility of the algorithm on different EEG recording methods (and the corresponding differences in signal-to-noise ratios), as well as on different recording lengths. Compared to the other classifiers, SOUL maintains equal or higher sensitivities over the entire classification period. As classification goes on for longer, the sensitivity improvement from SOUL increases, as seen in Fig. 7 specifically for Patient 3.




Fig. 7. Comparison of cumulative sensitivity over time for different classifiers versus SOUL for all three iEEG recordings. For Patients 1 and 2, SOUL and SVM sensitivity performance is equivalent.

> REPLACE THIS LINE WITH YOUR MANUSCRIPT ID NUMBER (DOUBLE-CLICK HERE TO EDIT) <




Fig. 8. Final sensitivity and specificity values at the end of the iEEG testing period; error bars indicate max and min values within the last 24 hours. All classifiers are trained so that specificity remains >95%.




Fig. 9. Sensitivity comparison against state of the art on the CHB-MIT dataset on select patients where significant improvement was observed. For the remainder of the patients, an average of 1-3% improvement was observed.

IV. SYSTEM ARCHITECTURE

Fig. 10 shows the overall system architecture. The classifier receives 16-bit digitized neural data in 8 channels clocked at 1 kS/s. The implemented system supports 8 channels, but the algorithm is scalable to any number of channels.




Fig. 10. System architecture (feature extraction unit + SOUL).

Channel multiplexing and serialization are employed to minimize the duplication of hardware. The feature extraction unit is reused for each channel, which forces the system to run at 8x the sampling frequency (8 kHz). Feature values from all 8 channels are passed to the classifier hardware, which will be discussed later in the section. Classifications are performed for every new sample, leading to a classification rate of 1 kHz.

A. Feature extraction hardware

The feature extraction hardware unit is shown in Fig. 10 (upper half). Both line length and approximate spectral band power (using the sum of squares approximation) have a similar 100-sample register-based delay line, corresponding to the feature window, each connected to an accumulator to represent the summation of these 100 samples per feature. Each feature has a channel FIFO, controlled by the Channel ID signal that also controls the channel multiplexing state machine. Each channel FIFO is an 8-address register file that contains the current set of 100 samples for the corresponding active channel. The FIFO separates the feature data for each channel during the multiplexing phase.

The spectral band power block uses IIR filters instead of the conventional FIR filter. During the feature extraction process, filters with at least 20 dB stopband were required for the spectral band power to work as a feature. If the filters do not meet those specifications, the approximated spectral band power using the sum of squares gets removed by the feature selection process leading to accuracy degradation of >10%. Designing FIR filters in MATLAB for a narrow passband, as an example, between 16-32 Hz, would require a minimum of 141 stages: each stage containing a register, an adder, and a multiplier. However, if elliptic IIR filters are used instead to achieve the same specification, it would only require three second-order sections: each section containing four registers, adders, and multipliers. Across all three spectral band power calculations, this filter choice translates to a 10x decrease in filter hardware requirements. When utilizing the elliptic filter architecture, the effects of frequency-dependent group delay on the classifier performance were ignored. It is assumed that this delay would be factored in during the offline training phase with minimal impact on detection latency.

The feature extraction unit computes in a 16-bit fixed-point format to avoid dedicated hardware for floating-point conversions. The Direct Form I IIR filter topology was used to avoid internal filter overflow. Given the 16-bit input to the system, 6 bits were set to be the integer part and the latter 10 were set to be the fractional part. This partitioning minimizes the round-off errors within the filter's internal states, which can cause instability.

B. Classification and online learning hardware

The SOUL hardware, shown in Fig. 10 (lower half), merges the two modes of operation of the classifier: classification mode and retraining mode. The dot product for the logistic function is calculated during the classification mode, as shown in Fig. 11. Since the four features from each channel are transferred one cycle at a time for every channel, the cumulative dot product is temporarily saved. Once all 4x8 features are collected, then classification will proceed.

The logistic function is approximated using a look-up table

> REPLACE THIS LINE WITH YOUR MANUSCRIPT ID NUMBER (DOUBLE-CLICK HERE TO EDIT) <

(LUT) to minimize computation hardware. While the classifier output is rounded-off to determine whether a seizure is detected or not, the accuracy for the LUT will matter since the value of the logistic function is part of the SGD feature weight update formula, as shown in Fig. 4. For this system, a 10-entry LUT was found to be enough, shown in Fig. 12, as it impacts the classifier accuracy by <1% compared to a classifier with full precision logistic function calculation.




Fig. 11. SOUL classification mode where the dot product for the logistic function is calculated. Logistic function is approximated with an LUT.




Fig. 12. Logistic LUT approximation impact on classifier accuracy

The output of the LUT provides the input to two sets of comparators, which correspond to the high confidence thresholds as described previously in Section II. The hardware for the confidence thresholding and the windowing scheme is shown in Fig. 13. Two separate confidence thresholds correspond to seizure and non-seizure. The seizure confidence threshold equals the value of CT, while the non-seizure confidence threshold equals $1 - CT$. The output of these comparators then goes to their corresponding series of shift registers representing the window size. The WS value for non-seizures is set to 10x longer than the WS value for seizures to minimize the retraining frequency during the long non-seizure periods. This scaling balances the number of training points on the seizure and non-seizure events for an unbiased logistic model during the retraining period. Only when there is a series of high-confidence probability outputs will the classifier go into retraining mode. The retraining process can happen during either the seizure or non-seizure interval. The WS and CT parameters are programmable in hardware.




Fig. 13. Hardware implementation of the confidence thresholding and windowing scheme for robust online learning.

Fig. 14 shows the retraining mode calculations following the SGD formula for logistic regression. The learning rate for the retraining was set to be approximately 0.015 (1/64) and is calculated with simple right shifts. The bootstrap register computes the difference between the generated label (thresholded against 0.5 for unsupervised learning) and the actual LUT-based logistic function approximation. The retraining mode finishes in 8 cycles, as the multiplier array is reused from the previous classification mode. During the update process, the old feature weight vectors are overwritten four at a time. Consequently, since the retraining mode consumes the same number of cycles as the classification, one input sample is ignored during the process. Once the retraining process is complete, the windowing scheme (at Fig. 13) resets, and the classification mode begins for the next input sample.




Fig. 14. SGD calculation during SOUL retraining. Probability output from the previous classification cycle (coming from the grayed out blocks, refer back to Fig. 11) will be used during the retraining.

V. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The classifier was fabricated in TSMC's 28 nm HPM process occupying 0.1 mm² in area, shown in Fig. 15. The power consumption was measured to be 1.5 μ W, which corresponds to an energy efficiency of 1.5 nJ/classification at 1 kHz classification rate. Since the power consumption is leakage-dominated in this regime, the described hardware reduction and reuse techniques significantly impact the total power. Further power reduction could be achieved by implementing the classifier in a low power (LP) process, instead of the high-performance mobile (HPM) variant that was used in this implementation. Digital logic and memory requirements were significantly reduced due to the relative computational

TABLE I
COMPARISON TABLE VS. RECENT STATE-OF-THE-ART ON-CHIP SEIZURE EVENT CLASSIFIERS

	JETCAS 2018 ^[21]	ISSCC 2018 ^[13]	ISSCC 2020 ^[22]	ISSCC 2020 ^[14]	JSSC 2020 ^[15]	ISSCC 2021 ^[20]	VLSI 2021 ^[16]	This Work	
Dataset (# of patients)	ieeg.org (20)	EPILEPSIAE (4)	EPILEPSIAE (-) ^(c)	CHB-MIT (23)	CHB-MIT + Local (24 + 2)	Bonn University (5)	CHB-MIT + Local (24 + 1)	NeuroVista (3)	CHB-MIT (24)
Channels	32	32	8	8	16	- ^(c)	16	8	
Classifier	Decision trees	EDM-SVM	EDM-Brain Forest	Coarse/Fine LS-SVM	Non-linear SVM	Reconfigurable Neural network	GTCA-SVM	Logistic regression + SGD (SOUL)	
Online Training Algorithm (Labeling method)	X	X	X	X	ADMM (Supervised)	ALE (Supervised)	GTCA (Supervised)	SGD (Unsupervised)	
Sensitivity (%)	83.7	100	96.7	97.8	96.6	99.84	97.8	97.9	97.5
Specificity (%)	88.1	- ^(a)	- ^(a)	99.7	99.5	- ^(c)	99.5	98.2	98.2
Latency (s)	1.79	<0.1	- ^(c)	<0.3	0.71	- ^(c)	<1	2.6	1.6
Technology (nm)	65	130	65	180	40	65	40	28	
Supply voltage (V)	0.8	1.2	1.2	1.5	0.58	0.75	0.7	0.5	
Energy Efficiency (nJ/cls)	41.2	104,000	36	14,200	170,000	2,060	430 - 680	1.5	
Classifier Area (mm²)	1	5 ^(b)	1 ^(b)	3.51	4.5	1.74	2.25 ^(b)	0.1	

a: Reported 0.80 false alarms per hour b: Estimated from chip photo c: Not reported

simplicity of logistic regression coupled with architectural optimizations implemented to support online learning. These lead to at least 10x lower area and 24x better energy efficiency compared to other on-chip state-of-the-art classifiers. A comparison of this work with the state-of-the-art is shown in Table I.




Fig. 15. Chip micrograph of SOUL in TSMC's 28 nm process.

The classifier performance in terms of accuracy has already been reported in Section III. It has been shown that SOUL performed well on both short-term (CHB-MIT) and long-term (iEEG) datasets with differing recording qualities. Table I also shows the accuracy results together with the most recent on-chip state-of-the-art seizure detection systems. Some cited works used different datasets that introduced partiality since the EEG signal recording quality can be different. Moreover, the classifier performance on long-term data (recording times ranging from several days to weeks) was not explicitly addressed in the other works. Many algorithms that work well on short EEG recordings (i.e. within a day) may fail to work on longer recordings. As SOUL has demonstrated that maintaining high accuracies over long periods of time is possible through SGD-based online learning, it would be interesting to see how the different online learning techniques from other implementations [15,16,20] would compare on the same long-term data.

The main advantage of SOUL over the other online learning classifiers in the literature is its unsupervised online learning feature. Providing external labels to constantly tune the classifier model parameters can be costly and impractical, especially when the system is already deployed. On the other

hand, an unsupervised online learning scheme can enable a seizure detection system that would not require any external intervention to maintain high accuracies over time.

The reported seizure detection latency for SOUL was 1.6-2.6 seconds which is relatively high when compared to the state-of-the-art. This can be attributed to the frequency-dependent group delay introduced by IIR filters on the feature extraction unit, which varies the spectral power feature values when it arrives at the classifier. This group delay can be compensated by cascading a corresponding phase equalizer after every IIR filter, which increases the filter hardware requirements by approximately 2x. The relatively high detection latency might also be a consequence of the limited feature set that was used since the feature selection process only selected features based on accuracy and not latency. Nevertheless, it has been shown [3] that latencies less than 5 seconds have demonstrated clinical efficacy in detection-triggered stimulation devices.

This work has demonstrated an unsupervised, online learning classifier that can outperform conventional classifiers in terms of seizure detection accuracy, especially in the long term, while still being significantly more energy efficient. The achieved low energy consumption was a direct consequence of both the algorithm choice and the architectural optimizations. Selecting logistic regression as the base classifier for SOUL enabled significantly low memory overhead compared to the conventional SVM-based classifier. While logistic regression, on its own, may not perform well on datasets that are not linearly separable, incorporating SGD (also a relatively simple calculation for logistic regression) enabled dynamic feature weight updates. This technique allowed SOUL to maintain high accuracies even as seizure patterns change, avoiding the need for a relatively complex, high memory overhead classifier to capture such changes. Architectural optimizations also reduced the hardware requirements, leading to a significantly less overall area and leakage power. Indeed, reducing the digital backend power consumption might not offer a significant benefit in terms of overall system power when the analog front ends are included. However, given that the current implementation is significantly more energy-efficient than the

> REPLACE THIS LINE WITH YOUR MANUSCRIPT ID NUMBER (DOUBLE-CLICK HERE TO EDIT) <

state-of-the-art, this gives more room for more complex feature extraction units to be incorporated with the classification hardware. This can further improve the long-term performance of the unsupervised online learning scheme.

VI. SUMMARY

To the authors' knowledge, this work is the first to demonstrate an on-chip, unsupervised, online learning classifier for seizure detection. The classifier can continuously update, without external intervention, from an initial offline-trained model using a combination of stochastic gradient descent and bootstrapping. This allows high seizure detection accuracies to be maintained over longer periods of time when compared to static offline-only-trained classifiers. The classifier performance has been evaluated on two datasets, for a total of 27 human subjects. For the long-term iEEG dataset, incorporating online learning results in an average sensitivity and specificity of 97.9% and 98.2% respectively, improving sensitivity by 6.5% on average with <1% specificity degradation over three patients. For the scalp EEG dataset, the classifier achieves 97.5% and 98.2% average sensitivity and specificity over 24 subjects. The sensitivity for the subjects either stayed the same (6/24) or improved (15/24) by 1-3%. Moreover, an improvement of >12% was observed on three subjects when compared against other state-of-the-art presenting a per-subject sensitivity breakdown.

A significant benefit of this online learning approach is that the reported high accuracies were achieved on energy-efficient hardware. The combination of the proposed algorithmic approach and circuit-level optimizations resulted in an energy efficiency of 1.5 nJ/classification, which is at least 24x better than the state-of-the-art. The unsupervised classifier continuously improves its model over time and can dynamically adapt to neural pattern changes in real-time, mitigating the need for in implantable or wearable seizure detection systems.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors thank NSF CAREER, the Wagner Foundation, and the Weill Neurohub, the Army Research Office under contract/grant number W911NF-16-1-0368, the DOST-SEI, and the University of the Philippines, Diliman. Thanks to the sponsors of the Berkeley Wireless Research Center, as well as the Savio computational cluster resource provided by the Berkeley Research Computing program. Finally, thanks to Dr. Mark Cook and Dr. Dean Freestone for providing the iEEG patient dataset.

REFERENCES

- [1] "Epilepsy," World Health Organization, Sep. 13, 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/epilepsy>
- [2] "NeuroPace RNS System Clinical Summary", NeuroPace, June 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://www.neuropace.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/neuropace-rns-system-clinical-summary.pdf>
- [3] Echaz, J. et al., "Long-term validation of detection algorithms suitable for an implantable device", *Epilepsia*, pp. 35-36, Jan 2001.
- [4] "Summary of safety and effectiveness data: NeuroPace RNS System." U.S. Food & Drug Administration, Nov. 14, 2013. [Online]. Available: https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf10/p100026b.pdf.
- [5] "Pre-market Approval (PMA): NeuroPace RNS System", U.S. Food & Drug Administration, Sep. 13, 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cdrh/cfdocs/cfPMA/pma.cfm?id=P100026>
- [6] "Pre-market Approval (PMA): Medtronic DBS Therapy for Epilepsy", U.S. Food & Drug Administration, Sep. 13, 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cdrh/cfdocs/cfpma/pma.cfm?id=P960009S219>
- [7] "Clinical Outcomes: Epilepsy Deep Brain Stimulation", Medtronic, 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://www.medtronic.com/us-en/healthcare-professionals/therapies-procedures/neurological/deep-brain-stimulation/indications/epilepsy/clinical-outcomes.html>
- [8] M. Cook, "Prediction of seizure likelihood with a long-term, implanted seizure advisory system in patients with drug-resistant epilepsy: a first in-man study.", *Lancet Neurology*, vol. 12, pp. 563–71, June 2013.
- [9] P. J. Karoly, et al., "The circadian profile of epilepsy improves seizure forecasting", *Brain*, Vol. 140,8, Aug 2017, pp. 2169–2182
- [10] L. Kuhlmann et al., "Epilepsyecosystem.org: crowd-sourcing reproducible seizure prediction with long-term human intracranial EEG," *Brain*, vol. 141, pp. 2619–2630, August 2018.
- [11] J. Yoo, et al., "An 8-Channel Scalable EEG Acquisition SoC With Patient-Specific Seizure Classification and Recording Processor," in *IEEE Journal of Solid-State Circuits*, vol. 48, pp. 214-228, Jan. 2013.
- [12] C. Zhang, et al., "Design and Implementation of an On-Chip Patient-Specific Closed-Loop Seizure Onset and Termination Detection System," in *IEEE Journal of Biomedical and Health Informatics*, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 996-1007, July 2016.
- [13] G. O'Leary et al., "A recursive-memory brain-state classifier with 32-channel track-and-zoom $\Delta\Sigma$ ADCs and Charge-Balanced Programmable Waveform Neurostimulators," 2018 IEEE International Solid - State Circuits Conference - (ISSCC), 2018, pp. 296-298.
- [14] Y. Wang, et al., "A Closed-Loop Neuromodulation Chipset with 2-Level Classification Achieving 1.5Vpp CM Interference Tolerance, 35dB Stimulation Artifact Rejection in 0.5ms and 97.8% Sensitivity Seizure Detection," 2020 IEEE International Solid- State Circuits Conference - (ISSCC), 2020, pp. 406-408.
- [15] S. Huang, et al., "A 1.9-mW SVM Processor With On-Chip Active Learning for Epileptic Seizure Control," in *IEEE Journal of Solid-State Circuits*, vol. 55, no. 2, pp. 452-464, Feb. 2020.
- [16] M. Zhang et al., "A One-Shot Learning, Online-Tuning, Closed-Loop Epilepsy Management SoC with 0.97 μ J/Classification and 97.8% Vector-Based Sensitivity," 2021 Symposium on VLSI Circuits, pp. 1-2.
- [17] A. Chua, et al., "Unsupervised Online Learning for Long-Term High Sensitivity Seizure Detection," 2020 42nd Annual International Conference of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine & Biology Society (EMBC), 2020, pp. 528-531.
- [18] A. Chua, et al., "A 1.5nJ/cls Unsupervised Online Learning Classifier for Seizure Detection," 2021 Symposium on VLSI Circuits, 2021, pp. 1-2,
- [19] Goldberger, A., et al., "PhysioBank, PhysioToolkit, and PhysioNet: Components of a new research resource for complex physiologic signals.," *Circulation* [Online], pp. e215–e220.
- [20] J. Liu et al., "4.5 BioAIP: A Reconfigurable Biomedical AI Processor with Adaptive Learning for Versatile Intelligent Health Monitoring," 2021 IEEE International Solid- State Circuits Conference (ISSCC), 2021, pp. 62-64.
- [21] M. Shoaran, et al., "Energy-Efficient Classification for Resource-Constrained Biomedical Applications," in *IEEE Journal on Emerging and Selected Topics in Circuits and Systems*, pp. 693-707, Dec. 2018.
- [22] G. O'Leary et al., "A Neuromorphic Multiplier-Less Bit-Serial Weight-Memory-Optimized 1024-Tree Brain-State Classifier and Neuromodulation SoC with an 8-Channel Noise-Shaping SAR ADC Array," 2020 IEEE International Solid- State Circuits Conference - (ISSCC), 2020, pp. 402-404.
- [23] A. Page, et al., "A Flexible Multichannel EEG Feature Extractor and Classifier for Seizure Detection," in *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems II: Express Briefs*, vol. 62, no. 2, pp. 109-113, Feb. 2015.
- [24] S. Chen, et al., "Automatic Diagnosis of Epileptic Seizure in Electroencephalography Signals Using Nonlinear Dynamics Features," in *IEEE Access*, vol. 7, pp. 61046-61056, 2019.
- [25] Y. Li, et al., "Epileptic Seizure Classification of EEGs Using Time-Frequency Analysis Based Multiscale Radial Basis Functions," in *IEEE Journal of Biomedical and Health Informatics*, pp. 386-397, March 2018.
- [26] Kiefer, J., and J. Wolfowitz. "Stochastic Estimation of the Maximum of a Regression Function." *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, vol. 23, no. 3, 1952, pp. 462–466.
- [27] L. Logesparan, et al., "Optimal features for online seizure detection," *Medical & Biological Engineering & Computing*, pp. 659–669, Jul 2012.