

# Beat-to-Beat Fetal Heart Rate Analysis Using Portable Medical Device and Wavelet Transformation Technique

Maria Farahi,<sup>1,2</sup> Daniel Lechuga Morente,<sup>1,3</sup> Omid Sarrafzadeh,<sup>1</sup> Yasaman Zamani,<sup>1</sup>  
Hooran Ahmadi,<sup>1</sup> Alícia Casals Gelpí,<sup>2</sup> Naeimeh Behbood,<sup>1</sup> and Hessam Habibian<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Sana Meditech S.L., Barcelona, Spain*

<sup>2</sup>*Center of Research in Biomedical Engineering. Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya, BarcelonaTech, Barcelona, Spain*

<sup>3</sup>*Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona, Spain*

(Dated: November 5, 2021)

A beat-to-beat Tele-fetal Monitoring and comparison with clinical data are studied with multi wavelet transformation approach. Tele-fetal monitoring is a big progress toward wearable medical device for a pregnant woman capable of obtaining prenatal care at home. We propose an algorithm for fetal cardiac monitoring using a portable fetal Doppler medical device. Choosing an appropriate mother wavelet, 85 different mother wavelets are investigated. The efficiency of the proposed method is evaluated using two data sets. From a publicly available data on PhysioBank, and simultaneous clinical measurement we prove that our beat-to-beat fetal heart rate (FHR) comparison between obtained fetal heart rate by algorithm and the baselines yields a promising accuracy beyond 94%. The proposed algorithm would be robust technique for any similar Tele-fetal monitoring approach.

## I. INTRODUCTION

A gestation can end with a live birth, a spontaneous miscarriage, an induced abortion, or a stillbirth [1, 2]. Prenatal care by the mother and constant monitoring of the gestational period are key elements in improving birth outcomes [3]. Clinically, various medical devices have been introduced to monitor the Fetal Heart Rate (FHR) during pregnancy. Approaches like cardiotocography (CTG) [4], fetal magnetocardiography (fMCG) [5], fetal electrocardiography (fECG) [6], and fetal scalp electrocardiography (fsECG) [7] are examples of clinical techniques that can be applied for fHR monitoring.

First of all, fetal scalp electrocardiography in which electrodes are applied on fetal scalp. It captures signals with a high Signal to Noise Ratio (SNR). However, it is invasive and increases the risk of infections. In addition, it can be used only during the delivery. And, it needs a skilled specialist for installation [7].

Secondly, among non-invasive devices, fMCG is a method which is well known for its high SNR in data capturing. It uses SQUID (for Superconducting QUantum Interference Device) sensors to record the magnetic field of the fetal heart from maternal abdomen. But it is expensive and needs a shielded room with an expert specialist to apply it on the mother's abdomen [5].

Next non-invasive technique, known as fECG, is a cheap technology which enables user to perform continuous monitoring. This method not only suffers from low SNR, but also its electrodes should be placed on mother's abdomen by a skilled specialists [6].

Finally, CTG is a standard non-invasive clinical method. It is a well-known technique which uses Doppler ultrasound sensors to monitor both fHR and uterus contractions. It is highly accurate, and requires less skills to operate [8, 9], but it is highly sensitive to the fetal movements [10].

Tele-Fetal Monitoring (TFM) is an approach which makes a pregnant woman capable of obtaining prenatal care. It can decrease the risk of pregnancies with hypertensive disorders [11]. Moreover, it has illustrated profits in other high-risk

pregnancies like those with gestational diabetes. Also, it can be beneficial in having access to rural pregnant women whom are far from modern hospitals [12].

In the past decade, many efforts have been dedicated to find a suitable way for distant fHR extraction. As an example, fHS analysis is considered as a non-invasive method. It is simple to apply and it has a low-cost. However, fHS signals are profoundly corrupted by noise since they are recorded at the maternal abdominal surface. There are various sources of noise in fHS signals including fetal movements, contractions of mother's uterus, maternal digestive sounds, sensor movements, ambient sounds, maternal respiratory and maternal heart sound [13].

The basic principle behind the fHS processing is that the heart's mechanical activity is accompanied by the generation of a various characteristic sounds. These sounds are associated with changes in the speed of blood flow, as well as with the opening and closing of heart valves [14]. Dia et al. estimated adult heart rate from phonocardiograph (PCG) signals [15]. They applied non-negative matrix factorization approach on the spectrogram of the taken signals. They evaluated their work by considering synchronous ECG and PCG signals. Samieinasab et al. [16], used a single-channel denoising framework to reduce the noise of fetal PCGs. Then, similar to [15], they utilized non-negative matrix factorization method to decompose fPCGs in time-frequency domain. In addition, Khandoker et al. proposed a four-channel fPCG system and evaluate it using fECG data [17]. They used 10-minutes clinical data for evaluation. Reported results were  $P < 0.01$  in cross correlation analysis and  $< 5\%$  agreement in Bland-Altman plot.

Motivated by this fact that the most challenging step in fHR extraction from fetal heart sound signals is denoising, this paper presents a denoising algorithm based on wavelet transform. Also, the other aim of current paper is to introduce an algorithm capable of performing fHR extraction from fetal heart sound in order to facilitate tele-fetal monitoring for pregnant women.

In this paper, a pocket size fetal Doppler monitor is used

arXiv:2103.01014v3 [q-bio.QM] 4 Nov 2021




FIG. 1: Clinical data acquisition setup

for data capturing. It is connected through a cable to a mobile to save fetal heart sounds and be able to further analyze them and do the comparison with a clinical device.

In the following, in section 2, the procedure of data acquisition is explained. Then, the applied method for fHR extraction is illustrated in section 3. In section 4, obtained results are shown. Finally, the current work is discussed and concluded in section 5.

## II. DATA ACQUISITION

In order to collect clinical data, a portable Baby Sound A pocket fetal Doppler device manufactured by Contec Medical Co. [18] is used. It is certified under medical CE and FDA approval. The device is utilized by Sana Meditech company [19] with a brand of Baby Heart Beat [20]. Obtaining data for algorithm development, simultaneous measurement of Baby Heart Beat together with a clinical device Bionet model FC-1400 [21] is performed. The data acquisition mechanism is shown pictorially in figure 1. Total length of 130 minutes signal has been acquired from seven pregnant women (average age 32). The average of the records duration is almost 3 minutes with a sampling frequency of 8KHz. Simultaneously, pregnant women are monitored with a clinical device (Bionet FC-1400) which allows us to validate our proposed approach.

Clinical data is recorded for rigorous analysis of the algorithm and continuous improvement during the development process. Table I illustrates the eligible criteria of our study population.

TABLE I: Study population's eligible criteria.

Age (year)	from 18 to 50
Type of pregnancy	singleton
Gestation (week)	greater than 32
Body Mass Index	from 15 to 45
Anomaly	allowed

In addition, our proposed algorithm is applied on a simulated fetal heart sound data set provided by Cesarelli [22]. It is publicly available in physionet [23], and contains 37 signals. Each signal has a duration of 8 minutes, and sampling frequency is 1KHz. In this data set, in order to simulate envi-

ronment noise, signals are corrupted with different SNR values from -26.7dB to -4.4dB. For more information about this data set, reader can refer to [23].

## III. MATERIALS AND METHODS

In order to have a successful tele-fetal monitoring, the device should have some capabilities. First of all, it should be user-friendly, without any need to a specialist for its implementation. Next, it must provide continuous monitoring, and finally, it should achieve high accuracy results in order to omit false positive reports.




FIG. 2: A comprehensive representation of the dynamics of a single heart cycle and its related sounds. Note the temporal synchronisation between the different signals. Taken from [24]

Recently, the use of a pocket Doppler device is becoming common which allows pregnant women to listen to their fetal heart sound (fHS) at home. A portable fetal Doppler device used for this study, has an AUX port which provides a possibility to export fHS data. The exported fHS signal can be recorded by a dedicated mobile App, and subsequently can be used for the extraction of fetal heart rate. Therefore, in this paper, we propose a new method consists of adaptive band pass filtering and wavelet transform in order to extract fHR from recorded fHS signals. Fetal heart sound signals which




FIG. 3: Proposed scheme for fHR extraction.

are recorded from mother abdomen would have a shape like figure 2. In this figure, S shows the position of systole while D

is representative of Diastole. In order to extract fHR, the distance between two systole should be calculated. In this paper, the overall proposed signal processing steps for fHR extraction from fHS signals is shown in figure 3. As depicted, the algorithm starts with a pre-processing stage. In two further steps, those peaks which are related to systole are detected. Afterwards, fHR is extracted. Finally, a smoothing step is performed to avoid outliers in the final reported of fHR. Following sections describe the major stages of the shown flowchart in detail.

### A. Pre-Processing

Fetal heart sound signals are heavily corrupted by noise since they are recorded at the maternal abdominal surface. Fetal movements, contractions of mother's uterus, mother's abdominal sounds, sensor movements, ambient sounds, maternal respiratory and heart sound are the various sources of noise [13]. In this study, noise reduction is performed based on the use of wavelet transform.

#### A. Wavelet Filtering

Wavelet Transformation (WT) is a time-frequency processing method and its definition for an input signal  $x(t)$  is as Eq. 1:

$$WT_{x(a,b)} = \int x(t)\Psi_{a,b}^*(t)dt \quad ; a \neq 0 \quad (1)$$

where the basic function,  $\Psi_{a,b}(t)$ , is featured by scale and time-shift parameters ( $a$  and  $b$ , respectively) as Eq.2:

$$\Psi_{a,b}(t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{a}}\psi\left(\frac{t-b}{a}\right) \quad (2)$$

$\Psi_{a,b}(t)$  can be also used for signal decomposition. The main challenge in using WT for denoising is to choose the optimum mother wavelet for the given tasks. In order to conclude which mother wavelet is suitable for a specific purpose, main properties such as vanishing moments [31], size of support [32], regularity [25], orthogonality [33], bio-orthogonality [33], energy [34], symmetry, and the ability of implementing on discrete signals should be investigated. Table II presents 14 different families of mother wavelets that we have investigated in this paper. They include HAAR, Daubechies, Symlets, Coiflets, Biorthogonal, Fejer-Krovokin, Meyers, Gaussian, Mexican hat, Morlet, Complex Gaussian, Shannon, Freq. B-Spline, and Complex Morlet. Next section describes the procedure of choosing the best mother wavelet related to our goal (fHS denoising).

### B. Mother wavelet Selection

In this paper, the selection of most suitable mother wavelet is performed by looking at each mother wavelet's properties (see table II). It means that we firstly considered our needs to discard some mother wavelets which are far from our goals. For instance, we need a mother wavelet that preserves the energy of the signal after decomposition (like orthogonal and bio-orthogonal). As a result, we crossed out non-orthogonal

mother wavelets including Gaussian, Mexican hat, Morlet, Complex Gaussian, Shannon, Freq B-Spline and Complex Morlet.

Similarly, the chosen wavelet family must be able to offer the possibility of performing the discrete wavelet transform. Since Meyer family can not do fast WT for discrete data, we crossed it out from further investigation.

Finally, relatively complex mother wavelets, with a minimum number of vanishing moments are needed. This will allow to represent more complex functions with fewer wavelet coefficients [35]. Considering mentioned specifications, mother wavelets of Daubechies, Symlets, Coiflets and Biorthogonal are chosen. In this paper, all mother wavelets of  $db1, db2, \dots, db45, sym1, sym2 \dots, sym20, coif1, coif2, \dots, coif5$ , and  $bior1.1, bior1.2, \dots, bior6.8$  are investigated.

In order to find the most proper mother wavelet among others, two factors are important to be taken into account: **energy** and **entropy**. Energy clarifies how much a signal and a mother wavelet are similar to each other. The energy of a detail signal at each resolution level,  $j$  is:

$$E_j = \sum_{k=1}^J |C_j(k)|^2 \quad (3)$$

where  $C_j(k)$  is wavelet coefficients in level  $j$ . In consequence, the total energy can be obtained by:

$$E_{tot} = \sum_j \sum_k |C_j(k)|^2 = \sum_{j=1} E_j \quad (4)$$

Relative wavelet energy will assist to choose an effective mother wavelet [36]. It can detect the degree of similarities between different segments of a signal [37] and is defined as Eq.5.

$$p_j = \frac{E_j}{E_{tot}} \quad (5)$$

Entropy shows the effect of mother wavelet on the accuracy of reconstruction. It illustrates how much of data will be missed by a chosen mother wavelet. The definition of entropy is presented in equation 6.

$$H(j) = - \sum_{j=1}^J p_j^2 \log(p_j^2) \quad (6)$$

where  $p_j$  is the energy probability distribution of the wavelet coefficients defined in Eq5.

Dividing relative wavelet energy by entropy (see Eq. 7), what we get is a ratio that clearly indicates which mother wavelet mostly resembles the original signal. The mother wavelet we are most interested in, will be the one that obtains a higher value of this ratio, meaning that the similarities between the wavelet and the original signal are greater than the non-conserved information between them.

TABLE II: A summary of different mother wavelets' properties

Mother Wavelet	Compact Support	Vanishing Moment	Regularity	Orthogonal	Bio-Orthogonal	Symmetric	Energy	Discrete Wavelet	Continues Wavelet	References
HAAR	✓	1	×	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	[25]
Daubechies	✓	N	0.2N	✓	✓	×	✓	✓	✓	[25]
Symlets	✓	N	-	✓	✓	near	✓	✓	✓	[25]
Coiflets	✓	2N	-	✓	✓	near	✓	✓	✓	[25]
Biorthogonal	✓	Nr	Nr-1	×	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	[25]
Fejer-Korovkin	✓	N	-	✓	×	×	✓	✓	✓	[26, 27]
Meyers	×	N	inf	✓	✓	✓	✓	*	✓	[25]
Gaussian	×	-	-	×	×	**	×	×	✓	[28]
Mexican hat	×	2	-	×	×	✓	×	×	✓	[25, 29]
Morlet	×	-	-	×	×	✓	×	×	✓	[25]
Complex Gaussian	×	-	-	×	×	**	×	×	✓	[28]
Shannon	×	N	-	×	×	✓	×	×	✓	[30]
Freq. B-Spline	×	-	-	×	×	✓	×	×	✓	[30]
Complex Morlet	×	-	-	×	×	✓	×	×	✓	[30]

\* It is possible but without fast WT.

\*\* They are symmetric if their order is even.

## B. Systole Extraction

$$RWEER(j) = \frac{E(j)}{H(j)} \quad (7)$$

where RWEER is a representative of Relative Wavelet Energy to Entropy Ratio.

In this study, RWEER is calculated until level  $j = 12$  on 215 abdominal fetal heart sound sections. 85 mother wavelets are investigated to select the most proper one. These mother wavelets are  $db1, db2, \dots, db45, sym1, sym2, \dots, sym20, coif1, \dots, coif5$ , and  $bior1.1, \dots, bior6.8$ . Maximum RWEER for each level is obtained. First row of figure 4 shows that the highest RWEER happens in level 4. Therefore, level  $j = 4$  is chosen. In the next step, RWEER is calculated for  $level = 4$  to find the best mother wavelet. In figure 4 bottom, the shown boxplot depicts the RWEER distribution for each mother wavelet applied on 215 fHS sections. Also, red-dashed graph illustrates the execution time for each mother wavelet, and black-dash line displays the ratio of mean to standard deviation for RWEER of all 215 sections. Based on this figure, mother wavelet number 74,  $bior2.2$ , is chosen to denoise fHS signals. It has the highest mean/std ratio and it also is more repeatable than others while its time execution is low.

To sum up, in this work, decomposition, denoising and reconstruction of fHS signals were performed by the use of  $Bior2.2$  with 4 levels of decomposition. An example of a noisy fHS versus denoised fHS is shown in figure 5 top. In this figure, top graph shows 1-second of original fHS signal and bottom graph depicts denoised fHS signal using proposed denoising approach.

Figure 2 shows that the detection of systole is essential for fHR extraction. In fHS signals, the distance between systole (S) and diastole (D) is much shorter than that in adult's heart sound. Considering the fact that diastolic duration is longer than systolic duration, D falls at least 100ms after preceding S and at most 200ms before successive S [38]. As a result, a reasonable approach for S extraction, is to firstly find all the candidates (including S and D) and secondly select S among them.

In the first stage, two steps including enveloping and finding local maxima are applied to extract all peaks (S and D). Considering figure 5, local maxima can be taken into account as potential candidates for S peaks. The procedure of S selection is based on this fact that the normal duration of a fetal beating heart cycle is 430ms while the minimum is 375ms and the maximum is 545ms [38]. Therefore, in this study, a thresholding method is chosen to extract S peaks. Selected S-peaks are passed through the next step, which is fHR calculation. An example of the results of S-selection is shown in the last row of figure 5. In this figure, red graph shows obtained envelope. All candidates are illustrated in red bullets while selected S-peaks are depicted in green bullets.

## C. fHR calculation

Knowing that the time elapsed between two successive S in a fHS signal, is a combination of systolic time and diastolic time[39], fHR can be calculated using Eq.8.




FIG. 4: Distribution plot of RWEER for different 85 mother wavelets including *db* 1, *db* 2, ..., *db* 45, *sym* 1, *sym* 2, ..., *sym* 20, *coif* 1, *coif* 2, ..., *coif* 5, *bior* 1.1, *bior* 1.3, ..., and *bior* 6.8. First row: The effect of wavelet decomposition in different levels on the abundance of maximum RWEER. It shows that level  $j = 4$  works better than others. Second row: The investigation of RWEER for 215 sections with different mother wavelets on level  $j = 4$ , red dash-dot graph interprets the proposed algorithm's execution time for each mother wavelet, the black dash-dot graph represents the value of  $\frac{\text{mean}}{\text{std}}$  for shown box-plot. Outliers are drawn in red plus.




FIG. 5: A sample of an original fHS signal before and after filtering: (a) Original signal, (b) Denoised signal using proposed method, and (c) Extracted S-peaks. Red graph shows obtained envelop and red bullets represent all local maxima. Green bullets illustrate the position of selected S.

$$fHR(bpm) = \frac{60}{T_{ss}(sec)} \quad (8)$$

where,  $T_{ss}$  is the time duration between two S.

Finally, to plot obtained fHR, it would be appropriate if outliers [40] are replaced with a proper value. In this study, in order to increase the accuracy of the obtained fHR, two methods of outliers detection including moving median and moving mean are investigated with various Window Sizes (WS). In addition, different fillers including 'previous', 'next', 'nearest', 'linear', 'spline', 'pchip', and 'makima' are considered to find an alternative value for detected outliers. As it is shown

in table III, moving median acts better than moving mean. The lowest Mean Square Error (MSE) firstly happens when  $WS=10$ , and secondly when  $WS=8$ . In this study, because the analysis is real time, having a smaller WS will cause less delay. Therefore, moving median outlier detector with a 'nearest' filler of  $WS=8$  is chosen.

#### IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The analysis and validation of this study is applied on a personal computer using Matlab R2020a on two datasets. Firstly, the public standard simulated fHS database [22] is used for algorithm implementation. This dataset contains 37 simulated

TABLE III: The effect of various methods for outliers replacement on final MSE error.

replace with	WS=1	WS=2	WS=3	WS=4	WS=5	WS=6	WS=7	WS=8	WS=9	WS=10	WS=11
	Moving Mean										
previous	20.54	20.54	20.54	20.54	20.54	20.54	20.54	20.54	20.54	20.54	18.19
next	20.54	20.54	20.54	20.54	20.54	20.54	20.54	20.54	20.54	20.54	18.19
nearest	20.54	20.54	20.54	20.54	20.54	20.54	20.54	20.54	20.54	20.54	18.19
linear	20.54	20.54	20.54	20.54	20.54	20.54	20.54	20.54	20.54	20.54	18.19
spline	20.54	20.54	20.54	20.54	20.54	20.54	20.54	20.54	20.54	20.54	18.19
pchip	20.54	20.54	20.54	20.54	20.54	20.54	20.54	20.54	20.54	20.54	18.19
makima	20.54	20.54	20.54	20.54	20.54	20.54	20.54	20.54	20.54	20.54	18.19
Moving Median											
previous	20.54	20.54	15.92	16.09	7.16	6.57	6.25	4.58	5.45	3.12	5.45
next	20.54	20.54	15.91	16.09	7.16	6.67	6.12	3.50	9.44	2.58	9.46
nearest	20.54	20.54	15.91	16.07	7.14	6.67	6.13	3.51	7.56	2.69	7.57
linear	20.54	20.54	15.91	16.07	7.24	6.55	6.14	3.77	6.82	2.62	6.83
spline	20.54	20.54	15.95	16.20	7.50	6.64	6.16	3.79	10.6	3.16	10.62
pchip	20.54	20.54	15.91	16.07	7.26	6.57	6.14	3.82	7.40	2.67	7.40
makima	20.54	20.54	15.91	16.08	7.25	6.55	6.13	3.76	7.26	2.65	7.27

\* All the numbers are in (bpm).




FIG. 6: The results of beat to beat cross correlation analysis and Bland-Altman plot for obtained fHR by proposed algorithm and the reference for simulated data. (a) Beat to beat cross correlation analysis, and (b) Bland-Altman plot. We use a test statistic known as the p-value to determine statistical significance: if the p-value falls below the significance level, then the result is statistically significant.

fPCG signals. Each signal has a duration of 8 minutes, and the sampling frequency is 1KHz. In order to obtain the functionality of proposed algorithm, the analysis of beat-to-beat correlation and Bland-Altman plot [41] is performed between obtained fHR and manually extracted fHR from reference (see figure 6)

Secondly, the algorithm is clinically validated using a real fHS dataset. For this purpose, a portable fetal Doppler device [18] is used to save fHS signals. Simultaneously, a clinical device, Bionet model FC-1400 [21] is used for fetal monitoring. Final fHR reported by the clinical device is saved in image format. Using image processing techniques in MAT-




FIG. 7: The use of image processing techniques for validation of the proposed algorithm. A) Saved image from clinical device. B,C) fHR graph extraction, D) Confidence interval definition, and E) Adding fHR results obtained from proposed algorithm in red.




FIG. 8: A comparison sample between algorithm's final graph (in red) and the result of clinical device (in black). Confidence interval is shown in green. Outliers are shown by red arrows.

LAB, clinical fHR graph is extracted from each image and a confidence interval of  $\pm 7bpm$  [42] is shown on the same image. Finally, obtained fHR is depicted on the image to find the number of outliers (see figure 7). Figure 8 shows another example in which outliers are depicted by red arrows.

In this paper, each clinical signal has a different length. Therefore, in order to validate the proposed algorithm, normalized accuracy is calculated (eq.9).

$$NormalizedAccuracy = \sum_{t=1}^K \left(1 - \frac{N_o}{N_t}\right) \times \left(\frac{N_o}{N_T}\right) \quad (9)$$

in where,  $N_o$  is the number of outliers in signal number  $t$ .  $N_t$  is the length of signal, and  $N_T$  shows the total length of the used

dataset. In this paper, 130 minutes data are investigated which means  $N_T=60*130=7800$ . The number of reported outliers is only 509 that shows an accuracy of 94.21 % and, consequently, an error of 5.79 %. Distribution of data length and obtained error is shown in figure 9. Just to mention that high error rate in some cases were due to missing datapoint with the clinical device, where our algorithm could perform much better for those corner cases. We believe that further tuning our algorithm with more clinical data, we would be able to build a groundbreaking approach for the fetal monitoring.

#### A. Conclusions and Future Works

Fetal heart sound signals, generally, have low amplitude and are hidden by high-amplitude noises that may come from the sounds of mother breathes, fetal movements and other ambient sounds. In the present paper, an algorithm has been developed for the estimation of fHR from fHS signals. Firstly, a pre-processing task has been done for denoising based on wavelet transformation. Then, a combination of enveloping and finding local maximum is applied for the extraction of systole and diastole peaks. Further, systole peaks have been selected using distance information between S-peaks and D-peaks. Finally, fHR was calculated through a computation of interval times between the S-peaks.

On the basis of the obtained results and the comparison between those and the ones obtained from simulated/clinical signals, we can conclude that our proposed method is a promising tool for the identification of reliable fHR. In future, by collecting more hours of annotated data with abnormalities, we would like to address fetal anomaly classification analysis with sophisticated machine learning techniques.

#### B. Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful to the team of Mehr-e-Madar hospital and dedicated gynecology clinic, for the clinical data acquisition.




FIG. 9: The percentage of error obtained for each data. Orange graph shows the percentage of obtained error. Blue bars illustrate the length of each data in second.

- [1] J. Bai, F. W. Wong, A. Bauman, and M. Mohsin, "Parity and pregnancy outcomes," *American journal of obstetrics and gynecology*, vol. 186, no. 2, pp. 274–278, 2002.
- [2] S. M. Abman, *Fetal and neonatal physiology*. Elsevier Publisher, 2011.
- [3] N. E. Reichman, H. Corman, K. Noonan, and O. Schwartz-Soicher, "Parity and pregnancy outcomes," *Review of economics of the household*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 171–297, 2010.
- [4] R. M. Grivell, Z. Alfirevic, G. M. Gyte, and D. Devane, "Antenatal cardiotocography for fetal assessment," *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, no. 9, 2015.
- [5] M. Peters, J. Crowe, J.-F. Piéri, H. Quartero, B. Hayes-Gill, D. James, J. Stinstra, and S. Shakespeare, "Monitoring the fetal heart non-invasively: a review of methods," 2001.
- [6] M. Nassit and H. Berbia, "Non-invasive technologies of fetal heart rate diagnosis," in *2015 Third World Conference on Complex Systems (WCCS)*. IEEE, 2015, pp. 1–5.
- [7] L. W. Organ, "Scalp lead fetal electrocardiography," *Canadian Medical Association Journal*, vol. 98, no. 4, p. 199, 1968.
- [8] M. P. Nageotte, "Fetal heart rate monitoring," in *Seminars in Fetal and Neonatal Medicine*, vol. 20, no. 3. Elsevier, 2015, pp. 144–148.
- [9] T. Y. Euliano, M. T. Nguyen, S. Darmanjian, S. P. McGorray, N. Euliano, A. Onkala, and A. R. Gregg, "Monitoring uterine activity during labor: a comparison of 3 methods," *American journal of obstetrics and gynecology*, vol. 208, no. 1, pp. 66–e1, 2013.
- [10] S. Alnuaimi, S. Jimaa, Y. Kimura, L. J. Hadjileontiadis, and A. H. Khandoker, "Fetal cardiac timing events estimation from doppler ultrasound signal cepstrum analysis," in *2019 41st Annual International Conference of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society (EMBC)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 4677–4681.
- [11] D. Lanssens, S. Vonck, V. Storms, I. M. Thijs, L. Grieten, and W. Gyselaers, "The impact of a remote monitoring program on the prenatal follow-up of women with gestational hypertensive disorders," *European Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology and Reproductive Biology*, vol. 223, pp. 72–78, 2018.
- [12] J. F. Van Den Heuvel, T. K. Groenhof, J. H. Veerbeek, W. W. Van Solinge, A. T. Lely, A. Franx, and M. N. Bekker, "ehealth as the next-generation perinatal care: an overview of the literature," *Journal of medical Internet research*, vol. 20, no. 6, p. e9262, 2018.
- [13] A. Strazza, A. Sbröllini, V. Di Battista, R. Ricci, L. Trillini, I. Marcantoni, M. Morettini, S. Fioretti, and L. Burattini, "Peg-delineator: an efficient algorithm for automatic heart sounds detection in fetal phonocardiography," in *2018 Computing in Cardiology Conference (CinC)*, vol. 45. IEEE, 2018, pp. 1–4.
- [14] H. Tang, J. Zhang, J. Sun, T. Qiu, and Y. Park, "Phonocardiogram signal compression using sound repetition and vector quantization," *Computers in biology and medicine*, vol. 71, pp. 24–34, 2016.
- [15] N. Dia, J. Fontecave-Jallon, P.-Y. Guméry, and B. Rivet, "Heart rate estimation from phonocardiogram signals using non-negative matrix factorization," in *ICASSP 2019-2019 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 1293–1297.
- [16] M. Samieinasab and R. Sameni, "Fetal phonocardiogram extraction using single channel blind source separation," in *2015 23rd Iranian Conference on Electrical Engineering*. IEEE, 2015, pp. 78–83.
- [17] A. Khandoker, E. Ibrahim, S. Oshio, and Y. Kimura, "Validation of beat by beat fetal heart signals acquired from four-channel fetal phonocardiogram with fetal electrocardiogram in healthy late pregnancy," *Scientific reports*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 1–11, 2018.
- [18] C. M. Company. Baby sound a pocket fetal doppler device. [Online]. Available: [https://www.contecmed.com/index.php?page=shop.product\\_details&flypage=flypage.tpl&product\\_id=66&category\\_id=14&option=com\\_virtuemart&Itemid=606](https://www.contecmed.com/index.php?page=shop.product_details&flypage=flypage.tpl&product_id=66&category_id=14&option=com_virtuemart&Itemid=606)
- [19] Sana meditech company. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sanameditech.com/>
- [20] Baby heart beat device. [Online]. Available: <http://www.oepm.es/es/signos.distintivos/detalle.html?mod=N&exp=0402889&bis=>
- [21] Bionet fc1400 fetal monitor. [Online]. Available: <https://www.bionetus.com/fc1400-touch-screen-fetal-monitor/>
- [22] M. Cesarelli, M. Ruffo, M. Romano, and P. Bifulco, "Simulation of foetal phonocardiographic recordings for testing of fhr extraction algorithms," *Computer methods and programs in*



- biomedicine*, vol. 107, no. 3, pp. 513–523, 2012.
- [23] Simulated fetal phonocardiograms data set. [Online]. Available: <https://physionet.org/content/simfpcgdb/1.0.0/>
- [24] S. Schmidt, C. Holst-Hansen, C. Graff, E. Toft, and J. Struijk, “Detection of coronary artery disease with an electronic stethoscope,” in *2007 Computers in Cardiology*. IEEE, 2007, pp. 757–760.
- [25] I. Daubechies, *Ten lectures on wavelets*. Society for industrial and applied mathematics, 1992.
- [26] M. Nielsen, “On the construction and frequency localization of finite orthogonal quadrature filters,” *Journal of Approximation Theory*, vol. 108, no. 1, pp. 36–52, 2001.
- [27] C.-C. Chen and F. R. Tsui, “Comparing different wavelet transforms on removing electrocardiogram baseline wanders and special trends,” *BMC medical informatics and decision making*, vol. 20, no. 11, pp. 1–10, 2020.
- [28] S. Mallat, *A wavelet tour of signal processing*. Elsevier, 1999.
- [29] G. Leigh, “Fast fir algorithms for the continuous wavelet transform from constrained least squares,” *Signal Processing, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 61, pp. 28–37, 2013.
- [30] A. Teolis and J. J. Benedetto, *Computational signal processing with wavelets*. Springer, 1998, vol. 182.
- [31] M. Rhif, A. Ben Abbes, I. R. Farah, B. Martínez, and Y. Sang, “Wavelet transform application for/in non-stationary time-series analysis: a review,” *Applied Sciences*, vol. 9, no. 7, p. 1345, 2019.
- [32] Y. Kozachenko, A. Olenko, and O. Polosmak, “Uniform convergence of compactly supported wavelet expansions of gaussian random processes,” *Communications in Statistics-Theory and Methods*, vol. 43, no. 10-12, pp. 2549–2562, 2014.
- [33] O. O. Anoh, R. A. Abd-Alhameed, S. Jones, J. M. Noras, Y. A. Dama, A. Altimimi, N. T. Ali, and M. Alkhambashi, “Comparison of orthogonal and biorthogonal wavelets for multicarrier systems,” in *2013 8th IEEE Design and Test Symposium*. IEEE, 2013, pp. 1–4.
- [34] Y. Yang, Z. Peng, W. Zhang, and G. Meng, “Parameterised time-frequency analysis methods and their engineering applications: A review of recent advances,” *Mechanical Systems and Signal Processing*, vol. 119, pp. 182–221, 2019.
- [35] T. Omari and F. Berekci-Reguig, “An automatic wavelet selection scheme for heart sounds denoising,” in *2014 International Work-Conference on Bioinformatics and Biomedical Engineering*, 2014, pp. 1450–1462.
- [36] M. Salwani and Y. Jasmy, “Relative wavelet energy as a tool to select suitable wavelet for artifact removal in eeg,” in *2005 1st International Conference on Computers, Communications, & Signal Processing with Special Track on Biomedical Engineering*. IEEE, 2005, pp. 282–287.
- [37] O. A. Rosso, S. Blanco, J. Yordanova, V. Kolev, A. Figliola, M. Schürmann, and E. Başar, “Wavelet entropy: a new tool for analysis of short duration brain electrical signals,” *Journal of neuroscience methods*, vol. 105, no. 1, pp. 65–75, 2001.
- [38] E. Koutsiana, L. Hadjileontiadis, I. Chouvarda, and A. Khandoker, “Fetal heart sounds detection using wavelet transform and fractal dimension,” *Frontiers Bioengineering and Biotechnology*, vol. 5, pp. 1–8, 2017.
- [39] F. Kovács, C. Horváth, Á. T. Balogh, and G. Hosszú, “Fetal phonocardiography—past and future possibilities,” *Computer methods and programs in biomedicine*, vol. 104, no. 1, pp. 19–25, 2011.
- [40] H. Yang, P. Antonante, V. Tzoumas, and L. Carlone, “Graduated non-convexity for robust spatial perception: From non-minimal solvers to global outlier rejection,” *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 1127–1134, 2020.
- [41] D. Giavarina, “Understanding bland altman analysis,” *Biochemia medica*, vol. 25, no. 2, pp. 141–151, 2015.
- [42] B. Hayes-Gill, S. Hassan, F. G. Mirza, S. Ommani, J. Himsworth, M. Solomon, R. Brown, B. S. Schifrin, and W. R. Cohen, “Accuracy and reliability of uterine contraction identification using abdominal surface electrodes,” *Clinical Medicine Insights: Women’s Health*, vol. 5, pp. CMWH–S10 444, 2012.