

# Noninvasive Extraction of Maternal and Fetal ECG using Periodic Progressive FastICA Peel-off

Yao Li#, Xuanyu Luo#, Haowen Zhao, Jiawen Cui, Yangfan She, Dongfang Li, Lai Jiang\*, Xu Zhang\*

**Abstract**—The abdominal electrocardiogram (AECG) gives a safe and non-invasive way to monitor fetal well-being during pregnancy. However, due to the overlap with maternal ECG (MECG) as well as significant external noise, it is challenging to extract weak fetal ECG (FECG) using surface electrodes. In this study, we introduce a novel periodic progressive FastICA peel-off (PPFP) method for noninvasive extraction of weak surface FECG signals, leveraging the two-step FastICA method and a peel-off strategy from the progressive FastICA peel-off (PFP) approach. Specifically, for ECG signals, the periodic constrained FastICA that integrates ECG signal characteristics enables precise extraction of MECG and FECG spike trains. Additionally, a peel-off strategy incorporating SVD waveform reconstruction ensures comprehensive identification of subtle source signals. The performance of the proposed method was examined on public datasets with reference, synthetic data and clinical data, with an F1-scores for FECG extraction on public dataset of 99.59%, on synthetic data with the highest noise level of 99.50%, which are all superior to other comparative methods. Furthermore, clearly periodic and physiologically consistent FECG signals were extracted from clinically collected data. The results indicates that our proposed method has potential and effectiveness to separate MECG and weak FECG from multichannel AECG with high precision in high noise condition, which is of vital importance for ensuring the safety of both the fetus and the mother, as well as the advancement of artificial intelligent clinical monitoring.

**Index Terms**—Multichannel abdominal ECG, fetal ECG, periodic constrained FastICA

## I. INTRODUCTION

ANNUALLY, around 2 million stillbirths occur worldwide [1]. The monitoring of fetal heart activities which plays a crucial role in reducing perinatal morbidity and mortality associated with a wide range of fetal heart anomalies [2]. To obtain the clinical information on activities of the fetal heart non-invasively, many electronic devices have been applied for fetal cardiac assessment, including cardiocography (CTG) [3], Doppler ultrasound [4], fetal magnetocardiography

(FMCG) [5], fetal phonocardiography (PCG) [6] and fetal electrocardiography (FECG) [7]. However, CTG, although widely used, is susceptible to signal loss and inaccurate heart rate estimation [8]. Additionally, both CTG and Doppler ultrasound carry inherent safety concerns due to the use of high-frequency ultrasound signals directed towards the fetus [9, 10]. Fetal PCG, while useful, is sensitive to sensor placement and requires extensive data processing to distinguish fetal cardiac signals from background noise [11]. Considering the limitations of existing tools, FECG emerges as a recommended and safe technology for accurately capturing fetal cardiac activity [12], offering precise beat-to-beat fetal heart rate (FHR) acquisition and promising prospects for long-term monitoring.

Although FECG collection is relatively safe, convenient and can non-invasively reflect the fetal heartbeat, it still faces challenges. As FECG signals propagate from the body to the surface, they pass through a series of body tissues, therefore have relatively small amplitudes [13]. Moreover, the abdominal electrocardiogram (AECG) signals we collect from the surface of the maternal skins are signals mixed with various sources and noise, include maternal ECG (MECG) signal, fetal peristalsis, electromyographic (EMG) signal, power line interference and motion artifacts, overlapping the FECG in both frequency and time domains [14-16]. Therefore, extracting the R-peak from the mixed signal is a crucial step in using FECG for fetal heart monitoring.

In order to make convenient, non-invasive fetal heart monitoring available via surface-collected FECG signals, researchers have explored numerous methods to extract accurate FECG signals from high-noise surface environments [17-19]. Methods based on adaptive filtering (AF) [20] suppresses the influence of MECG with the help of reference signal recorded on the chest. However, literature [21, 22] shows that the final FECG still contains the MECG signal after the above methods. Template subtraction (TS) methods eliminate MECG components by subtracting MECG template from original signal. However, the average MECG template may be distorted by overlapping or false heartbeat detection cycle, and the MECG morphology is also sensitive to many factors including electrode configuration and body posture [19]. The wavelet -based methods [23, 24] make use of intrinsic multifaceted property to manipulate R-peak identification. Nevertheless, a suitable wavelet base should be selected before, showing low robustness. Deep learning (DL) methods [12, 25, 26] extract nonlinear feature and map FECG and MECG from AECG simultaneously. Although good performances are reported in the DL solution, it is very

This work was supported in part by the Anhui Provincial Key Research and Development Project under Grant 2022k07020002. (Corresponding authors: Lai Jiang and Xu Zhang.)

# The two authors contribute equally to this work.

Y. Li, H. Zhao, Y. She, D. Li, X. Zhang are with the School of Microelectronics at University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui, China. (xuzhang90@ustc.edu.cn).

X. Luo, J. Cui are with the School of Information Science and Technology at University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui, China.

L. Jiang is with the Anhui Provincial Hospital (the first affiliated hospital of University of Science and Technology of China), Hefei, Anhui, China.

time-consuming and the result heavily relies on the training data.

Due to the nature of the collected electrophysiological signals being a superposition of different sources, we can also consider using blind source separation (BSS) based methods when extracting FECG signals. Independent component analysis (ICA) [18], principal component analysis (PCA) and non-negative matrix factorization (NMF) [27] have been used to extract FECG signals. Despite traditional BSS methods operated well in some of records, in some cases these methods could not detect a clean FECG sufficiently [28]. By incorporating the reasonable assumption of pseudo-periodicity, the performance of periodic component analysis ( $\pi$ CA) [29] have been significantly improved. Unfortunately, even with the addition assumption of pseudo-periodicity to the basic blind source separation algorithm, it still struggles to perform well in high-noise environments due to lack of sufficient understanding and precise description of the concerned signal sources.

In recent years, Chen and colleagues[30-33] introduced a novel method known as progressive FastICA peel-off (PFP) within the realm of EMG decomposition. This approach addresses a range of challenges in EMG decomposition by employing an innovative framework. Their approach involves refining more accurate motor unit (MU) spikes from the spikes initially extracted by FastICA, utilizing constrained FastICA. Furthermore, they employ a peel-off strategy to avoid local convergence to larger MU spikes. Inspired by their work, we can learn from their ideas to tackle the challenges we face in extracting weak FECG signals.

In this study, we present a novel FECG progressive FastICA Peel-off framework consists of FastICA, periodic constrained FastICA, singular value decomposition (SVD) waveform reconstruction and peel-off strategy to achieve high robustness and good-quality FECG detection. The combination of FastICA and periodic constrained FastICA can correct the obtained MEGG and FECG spikes, resulting in more accurate MEGG and FECG spikes. By estimating the waveforms of spikes in the corresponding channels using SVD and subtracting them, a peel-off effect is achieved, preventing the algorithm from converging to larger MEGG and noise, thereby improving the extraction performance of faint FECG signals. Our method gives path to reliable non-invasive fetal monitoring in clinical practice, plays a crucial role in ensuring the health of the fetus and pregnant women, as well as promoting intelligent clinical monitoring.

## II. METHODS

### A. Dataset Description

#### 1) . Public databases

Two public databases were utilized to validate the effectiveness of the proposed method, which are described as follows.

1) ADFECG. ADFECG database [34] has 5 multichannel records, acquired from 5 subjects between 38 and 41 weeks of gestation. Each record composed four channels abdominal signals taken from pregnant women's abdomen with a sampling rate of 500 Hz and one reference signal taken from

fetal scalp with a sampling rate of 1 kHz. Annotations of fetal R-peak location for datasets were verified by medical experts and provided in the dataset. A bandpass filter(1-100Hz) was applied to the signals during acquisition with filtering of the power-line interference.

2) NIFECGA. Set-A of the 2013 Physionet/Computing in Cardiology Challenge [35] has 75 AECG recordings with a duration of 60s. Each has four-channel abdominal signals along and one observation obtained from direct fetal scalp ECG with the reference fetal R-peak annotation obtained from the proficient cardiologist. The recording signals are observed at 1 kHz with 16 bits resolution. As suggested in [10, 11, 25], a few records a33, a38, a52, a54, a71, and a74 are discarded from the dataset due to inaccurate fetal R-peak annotations, leaving 69 records for assessment.

Before the actual separation process of AECG signals, several preprocessing steps were undertaken to reduce noise contamination. The impulsive artifacts were removed from each AECG channel, as suggested in [36]. After that, the AECG was filtered with a bandpass filter with the cut-off frequencies of 3 Hz and 100 Hz. Power-line interference as well as its harmonics were removed using a series of notch digital filters. All records in ADFECG database were divided into a series of 15-60s segments without overlap. These segments were upsampled at 1 KHz for subsequent method.

#### II) . Clinical data

All clinical data used in this paper were collected at Anhui Provincial Hospital (the first affiliated hospital of University of Science and Technology of China), China. We collected 5 groups of data from the abdominal surface of five healthy pregnant women with gestational ages of 36-40 weeks for subsequent processing and analysis, each collection session lasted for 15-20 minutes. All the experiment procedures were approved by the institutional ethics committee of Anhui Provincial Hospital (the first affiliated hospital of University of Science and Technology of China), and the participants' or their conservators' informed consent were given before the experiment.

Multi-channel AECG signals which contains FECG were collected from the upper abdomen of the participants, using a flexible 4×4 grid electrode array, as shown in Figure 1(a). Each electrode contact has a diameter of 8mm, and the spacing between electrodes is 17.5mm, as shown in Figure 1(b). A wireless multichannel surface electromyogram data recording system (FlexMatrix Inc., Shanghai, China) was used for data recording. It was built with a two-stage amplifier at a total gain of 24, a band-pass filter set at 1-500Hz for each channel and an analog-to-digital converter (ADS1299, Texas Instruments), with a sampling rate of 200Hz, as shown in Figure 1(c). During the experiment, we attached the electrodes of the device to the pregnant women's abdomen, as shown in Figure 1(d) and transmitted the data to a mobile app via Bluetooth for storage and processing. All data were divided into segments of 1-3 minutes in length for further processing.




Figure 1 (a) Data recording system. (b) Illustration of electrode placement.

Several steps were taken to reduce the noise contamination in the pre-processing procedure. The recorded sEMGdi signals were filtered by a Butterworth bandpass filter set at 3-99 Hz to eliminate the potential low-frequency motion artifacts and high-frequency interferences. Then, a set of notch filters were utilized to reduce the effect of power line interference as well as its harmonics.

### III) . Synthetic data

The synthetic data used in this study are sourced from the Fetal ECG Synthetic Database (FECGSYNDB) [37], obtains fetal-maternal mixtures by treating each abdominal signal component (e.g. fetal/maternal ECG or noise signals) as an individual source, whose signal is propagated onto the observational points (electrodes). Each recording includes 16-channel AECG signals along with separate ground-truth MECG and FECG signals, which consists of 1-5 minutes of data sampled at 250 Hz. For more details, please refer to [38].

In this study, 16 channels ranged in  $4 \times 4$  array distributed across the abdominal region were utilized. Since the ratio between MECG and FECG remains relatively constant in practical cases, five sets of data with signal to noise ratio of the FECG relative to MECG ( $\text{SNR}_{fm}$ ) of -9dB and signal to noise ratio of the MECG over noise ( $\text{SNR}_{mn}$ ) of 6, 3, 0, -3 and -6 dB, therefore achieve signal to noise ratio of FECG over all noises and interference ( $\text{SNR}_{fn}$ ) of -3, -6, -9, -12, -15 dB. These data were employed to investigate the performance of the methods under different levels of noise.

### B. FECG extraction framework

Figure 2 illustrates the flowchart of framework used in this study, which includes preprocessing, a FastICA followed by periodic constrained FastICA, SVD and a peel-off strategy, as well as necessary component identification and selection modules.

The collected AECG  $X(t) = [x_1(t), x_2(t), \dots, x_m(t)]^T$ , which conform the convolutive model [39] are subjected to high-pass, low-pass and band-stop filtering, finally acquired the preprocessed AECG. The AECG is then feed into source separation module as the initial residual signal. FastICA is used on extended and whitened residual signal to get preliminary source signals. With the clustering and selection module ECG source signals which may be MECG or FECG signals are selected. Then the spike train of ECG signals get from QRS detection module is fed into the periodic constrained FastICA to get verified spike train. SVD is then used to reconstruct ECG waveforms and be subtracted from residual signals as peel-off operation. The reliability judgement module is used to determine whether the output is FECG or MECG. Then the updated residual signal is used for next round of source separation.

#### 1) . Two-step FastICA for precise spike detection

The data segment was separated into source signals that contain information of maternal or fetal ECG using a unmixing matrix acquired by FastICA describe as [40]:

$$w^+ = E\{xG'(w^T x)\} - E\{G''(w^T x)\}w \quad (1)$$

$$w = w^+ / \|w^+\|_2$$

until  $|w_{k+1} - w_k| < \theta$ , where  $\theta$  is the convergence threshold,  $w$  is the unmixing matrix,  $x$  is the input signal,  $G$  is a nonquadratic function where we can use  $G(x) = \log(\cosh(x))$  as default. The source signals were extracted by iterative threshold Otsu algorithm and sampling points with amplitude lower than threshold were labeled as no R-peak firing event. Then the initial spike trains were clustered by successor valley seeking approach to distinguish the spikes from the same source signal.

The output of FastICA may just be preliminarily separated source signals which still contain some noise therefore cannot accurately extract spikes. Based on the characteristics of the ECG signal, we introduced a periodicity constraint termed periodic constrained FastICA, which combines equality and periodicity constraints, achieved convergence to a reliable spike train.

For equality constraint, the initial spike trains served as an equality constraint to guarantee the convergence toward the




Figure 2. Flowchart of proposed method for FECG and MECG extraction based on general PFP framework consist of: (a) two-step FastICA for precise spike detection, (b) ECG source signal waveform estimation, and (c) a peel-off strategy. The red boxes indicating our innovative designs specific for MECG and FECG extraction.

component. For periodicity constraint, autocorrelation was used as a loose constraint so that the algorithm tends to converge toward the high periodic component.

Considering constraints mentioned above, the general problem of periodic constrained FastICA is given as:

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & J_G(w) = [E\{G(w^T x)\} - E\{G(v)\}]^2 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & g_1(y) = \xi_1 - E\{y^T r\} \leq 0 \\ & g_2(y) = \xi_2 - E\{y^k\} \leq 0 \\ & H(w) = \|w\|^2 - 1 = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where  $J_G(w)$  is the same objective function defined as Eq. 2;  $g_1(y)$  is an equality constraint that measures the correlation between the estimated independent component  $y = w^T x$  and the reference spike train  $r$ ;  $g_2(y)$  is the periodicity constraint with respect to the signal  $y$  and its delay signal  $y^k$  for time lag  $k = 0, 1, \dots, N - 1$ ;  $\xi_j (j = 1, 2)$  denotes the threshold for the lower bound of the constraints. The optimization problem was solved by augmented Lagrangian method. After the periodic constrained FastICA converged, the calibrated spike train was obtained using R-peak detection procedure proposed in [41].

#### II) . Waveform estimation using SVD

Considering the variable beat to beat interval and periodic ECG waveform, SVD was introduced to estimate the new identified ECG spike train waveform from the spike train.

For each channel in signal with  $q$  beat period, we utilize the reliable ECG spikes estimation from constrained FastICA to calculate the mean RR interval value  $p$  to construct a  $p \times q (p > q)$  signal matrix  $X$ . And then,  $X$  was divided by SVD to obtain the singular value matrix and two orthogonal matrices:

$$X = USV^T \quad (3)$$

where  $S = [\text{diag}(\delta_1, \delta_2, \dots, \delta_q, 0)]$ ,  $\delta_1 > \delta_2 > \dots > \delta_q$

#### Algorithm 1. Framework of PFPF for FECG extraction

```

1: Initialize residual signal  $\bar{x}$  as AECG. Initialize candidate spike
   train set  $\varphi = \emptyset$ . Flag=1.
2: Extend and whiten  $\bar{x}$  then perform FastICA to extract spike
   train  $\tilde{v}_1, \tilde{v}_2, \dots, \tilde{v}_n$ 
3: while Flag=1 do
   Flag=0
   for  $i=1; i < N+1; i++$  do
     Apply periodic constrained FastICA on  $\bar{x}$  using  $\tilde{v}_i$  as
     constraint to obtain calibration version (termed as  $\tilde{\tilde{v}}_i$ ) of  $\tilde{v}_i$ 
     if  $Fr(\tilde{\tilde{v}}_i) < 1.11\text{Hz}$  or  $Fr(\tilde{\tilde{v}}_i) > 3.33\text{Hz}$ 
       continue
     end if
     while  $\varphi_i \neq \text{None}$ :
       if  $COR(\tilde{\tilde{v}}_i, \varphi_i) > 0.5$ 
         continue
       end if
       if  $IOQ(\tilde{\tilde{v}}_i) > 6$  or  $SC(\tilde{\tilde{v}}_i) < 5$ 
         Flag=1
         add  $\tilde{\tilde{v}}_i$  into  $\varphi_j$ 
         estimate the waveform  $\vartheta$  of  $\tilde{\tilde{v}}_i$ 
         update  $\bar{x} = \bar{x} - \vartheta$  and continue
       end if
     end for
   Extend and whiten  $\bar{x}$  then perform FastICA to extract spike
   train  $\tilde{v}_1, \tilde{v}_2, \dots, \tilde{v}_n$ 
4: Select maternal and fetal ECG spike train from  $\varphi$ .

```

Table 1 The determination of modules in the ablation study

Method	equality constraint	periodicity constraint	SVD
cfICA	✓	-	-
pcfICA	✓	✓	-
Proposed method	✓	✓	✓

denotes singular value matrix;  $U = [u_1, u_2, \dots, u_q]$ ,  $v = [v_1, v_2, \dots, v_q]$  denotes the left and right singular matrix.  $X$  can be indicated by the multiplication of  $u_i$ ,  $v_i$  and  $\delta_i$ , while  $\delta_i$  represents the energy distribution of different matrix. Empirically, a subspace of dimension 3 was selected.

#### III) . Peel-off Strategy for Weak FECG Separation

By using the two-step combination of FastICA and periodic constrained FastICA, we can separate the desired sources from the signals. However, considering that FastICA is easily affected by initialization and usually converges to local optimal value, it is difficult for FastICA to find weak FECG. The peel-off strategy was introduced to mitigate the influence of identified ECG spike trains. In each iteration, we first calculate the accurate MECG or FECG spike, and then use SVD to obtain its estimated waveform  $\tilde{X}$  in each channel. Then the residual signal  $X = X - \tilde{X}$  can be updated, where  $X$  represents the residual signal from the previous iteration and  $\tilde{X}$  represents the estimated waveform of MECG or FECG in this iteration.

#### IV) . ECG Spike Train Reliability Judgement

To ensure the separated spike train is true ECG spike train or not, the successive judgement was designed for our clinical PFP method. First, we defined a candidate spike train set  $\varphi$  at the start of procedure. Then, after the convergence of periodic constrained FastICA, the following criteria was considered: (1) If the R-peak firing rate (denote as  $Fr$ ) of candidate spike train was lower than 1.11Hz or higher than 3.33Hz, we abandoned the spike train to avoid potential interference. (2) If the correlation (denoted as  $COR$ ) between two spike trains higher than 0.5, we processed the duplicated spike train by discarding one of them. (3) If the spike train with the index of quality (denoted as  $IOQ$ ) for the best MECG component identification higher than 6, we added the spike train into  $\varphi$ . (4) The stability coefficient (denoted as  $SC$ ) which composed of the variation of R-R interval (denoted as  $cov_{rri}$ ) and the variation of ECG spike amplitude (denoted as  $cov_{amp}$ ) was defined as follows:  $SC = \alpha_1 cov_{rri} + \alpha_2 cov_{amp}$ , where  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2$  were set to 100, 1 respectively. If  $SC$  was lower than 5, we added the spike train into  $\varphi$ .

For the above criteria, once a validity spike train was added into  $\varphi$ , the residual AECG signals were update by employing peel-off procedure to subtract the waveform of the identified spike train from itself. The pseudocode of the proposed FECG extraction framework is illustrated in Algorithm 1.

#### C. Performance evaluation

For public dataset and synthetic data, statistical analyses were conducted to evaluate the performance of proposed method and comparison methods of FECG extraction. Following the detection of R-peaks in both reference and extracted FECG signals, positive predictive value (PPV),

sensitivity (Sen), accuracy (ACC) and F1 score to assess the performance of different methods which are defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} Sen &= \frac{TP}{TP + FN} \times 100\% \\ PPV &= \frac{TP}{TP + FP} \times 100\% \\ ACC &= \frac{TP}{TP + FP + FN} \times 100\% \\ F1 &= \frac{2 \times PPV \times Sen}{PPV + Sen} \times 100\% \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where TP, FP, and FN denote true positives, true negatives, false positives, and false negatives, respectively. TP denote the number of correctly detected R-peak, FN denote the number of missed R-peak and FP denote the number of incorrect detected R-peak. According to [37], if the extracted ECG spike is within 50 ms from the fetal R-peak annotation, it is counted as a fetal R-peak prediction.

For the synthetic signals, due to the ground truth FECG waveform is available, we also use SNR to evaluate the level of noise suppression after applying different methods on synthetic data with different noise levels, which is defined as:

$$SNR = 10 \log \frac{\|FECG\|^2}{\|FECG - \widehat{FECG}\|^2} \quad (6)$$

For synthetic data, FECG root mean square error ( $RMSE_{FECG}$ ) is also used to assess the degree of difference between the waveform of extracted FECG and the ground truth.  $RMSE_{FECG}$  is defined as:

$$RMSE_{FECG} = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n [\widehat{FECG}_i - FECG_i]^2}{n}} \times 100\% \quad (7)$$

where  $FECG_i$  represents the  $i$  th point of ground truth FECG

waveform,  $\widehat{FECG}_i$  represents the  $i$  th point of estimated FECG waveform, and  $n$  represents the total sample number. The smaller the RMSE value, the closer the estimated FECG is to the reference, demonstrating the method's greater accuracy.

Three representative comparison methods were selected besides proposed method, which includes FastICA, representing traditional blind source separation methods, LMS, representing adaptive filtering, and CycleGAN, a commonly used method.

In addition, we used ablation experiments on public datasets to determine the necessity of each component in the proposed FECG extraction framework. As shown in Table 1, the ablation experiments included two different constraint modules and two different waveform estimation modules. Firstly, for each method, FastICA was used to output preliminary separations of MEGG and FECG spike trains. Based on this, we first devised the PFP method, with the constrained FastICA (cfICA) module, which employed equality constraints for reliability assessment, while the waveform estimation method remained the least squares method originally used in PFP to estimate the averaged waveform of spike locations. The second method, with the periodic constrained FastICA module (PCFICA), utilized periodicity constraints for reliability assessment, while keeping other parts unchanged. For all methods, the final FECG extraction performance was evaluated.

#### D. Statistical Analysis

In order to better examine the performance of different FECG extraction methods in clinical conditions, a one-way repeated-measure ANOVA was applied on the PPV, Sen, ACC and F1 score with the three comparative methods: FastICA, LMS, CycleGAN, two ablation method: PFP, PCFICA and proposed method. If necessary, multiple pairwise comparisons




Figure 3. An example of result of FECG extraction on public dataset. (a) Two channels of original signals of 15 second. (b) Two channels of preprocessed signals. (c) Extracted MEGG. (d) Preliminary extracted FECG with its spike train. (e) Verified FECG using periodic constrained FastICA with its spike train.

with LSD corrections were performed. The level of significant difference was set as  $p < 0.05$ . All statistical analyses were performed using SPSS software (version 27.0, SPSS Inc. Chicago, IL, USA) in this study.

### III. RESULTS

#### A. Results of public databases

For public databases, Figure 3 illustrates an example of 15sec raw multi-channel AECG of two channels from ADFECG, estimated MCEG and FECG. In Figure 3 (a), two of the four-channel AECG signals from public dataset used in this study are represented. MCEG (Figure 3 (c)) and preliminary FECG (Figure 3 (d)) were extracted from preprocessed AECG (Figure 3 (b)) using FastICA. FECG spike in Figure 3 (d) represents the spike train of the preliminary FECG, which obviously have some miss or inaccurate spikes. Figure 3 (e) represents the verified FECG and corresponded spike train

obtained by periodic constrained FastICA module. It can be observed that miss or incorrect spikes in the preliminary FECG are corrected, resulting in a more accurate spike train.

In Figure 4 (a), the quantitative metrics for the proposed method and the comparative methods on ADFECG and NIFECGA databases are listed, showing that the proposed method achieves the highest level of performance, with the SEN of  $99.66 \pm 0.37\%$ , PPV of  $99.53 \pm 0.10\%$ , ACC of  $99.19 \pm 0.44\%$  and an F1 score of  $99.59 \pm 0.22\%$  ( $p < 0.05$ ), compared to other comparative methods. Compared to the two ablation methods PFP and PCFICA, proposed method integrating periodic constrained FastICA module and SVD, module also achieves superior extraction performance.




Figure 4. The results of statistical analysis on the processing efficacy using different methods on public datasets and synthetic data. (a) The statistic metrics on public dataset. (b) The statistic metrics on synthetic data with different noise level. (c) Comparison of SNR and RMSE of different methods at different noise level.




Figure 5 (a) Pure MECG. (b) Pure FECG. (c) AECG with SNR<sub>mn</sub> of 6dB, corresponded extracted MECG and extracted FECG. (d) AECG with SNR<sub>mn</sub> of 3dB, corresponded extracted MECG and extracted FECG. (e) AECG with SNR<sub>mn</sub> of 0dB, corresponded extracted MECG and extracted FECG. (f) AECG with SNR<sub>mn</sub> of -3dB, corresponded extracted MECG and extracted FECG. (g) AECG with SNR<sub>mn</sub> of -6dB, corresponded extracted MECG and extracted FECG

*B. Results of synthetic data*

Figure 5 shows an example of synthetic data with different SNR. Figure 5 (a) represents the pure MECG, (b) represents the pure FECG, and mixed AECG in (c), (d), (e), (f) and (g)

represent the mixed signal of MECG, AECG and noise, with noise levels of 6, 3, 0, -3, and -6dB, respectively. After each set of mixed AECG signals, the corresponding extracted MECG and FECG using the proposed method were displayed. Note that the FECG and MECG contained in each set of noise level




Figure 6. (a) A group of the overall clinical data. (b) Two channels of a 50 second segment from clinical data. (c) Extracted MECG with its spike. (d) Two channels from the 16-channel residual signal obtained through MECG peel-off. (e) Extracted FECG from residual signals. (f) An example of FHR from clinical data.

signals are specific and are not directly synthesized by (a) and (b), which are just pure signals display and do not represent a specific waveform of a certain group of signals.

Figure 4 (b) shows the quantitative metrics of different methods in extracting FECG on synthetic signals, with the pure FECG of each group of simulated signals as the ground truth. It can be observed that for data with higher SNR, although the proposed method outperforms other methods, the other methods still achieve acceptable results. However, as the SNR decreases, the performance of morphology-based processing methods such as LMS significantly declines. The performance of FastICA is less affected by the SNR. However, excessive FP and FN resulting from incomplete separation still have a certain impact on its accuracy, especially in high-noise situations where noise is more difficult to remove completely. CycleGAN, as a representative of deep learning methods, still performs well when the FECG is somewhat overlapped. However, it still cannot achieve good extraction results when the entire data segment is covered by significant noise and artifacts, thereby affecting the overall extraction performance. The proposed method, which integrates PCFICA and SVD, achieved superior results compared to all comparative methods and ablation methods, reaching the SEN of  $99.42 \pm 0.48\%$ , PPV of  $99.59 \pm 0.48\%$ , ACC of  $99.02 \pm 0.68\%$  and F1 score of  $99.50 \pm 0.34\%$ .

Figure 4 (c) I illustrates the change in SNR after processing synthetic signals with different noise levels using various methods. Compared to other methods, the proposed method shows significant SNR improvement across all noise levels, while other methods exhibit limited SNR enhancement. In some cases, they even have a negative impact on SNR due to poor signal reconstruction performance, leading to inaccurate noise calculation during computation. At lower levels of noise, CycleGAN demonstrates denoising performance similar to, and at times surpassing, that of the proposed method. However, at the highest noise levels, its effectiveness does not match that of the proposed method. Figure 4 (c) II illustrates  $RMSE_{FECG}$

different signal-to-noise ratios using different waveform reconstruction methods: SVD and least squares method used in PFP. It can be observed that waveforms reconstructed using SVD outperform least squares under any noise conditions.

### C. Results of clinical data

For clinical data, although the lack of precise ground truth prevents us from quantitatively calculating metrics, we process and display a segment of clinical signal. As shown in Figure 6, (a) is a long period of clinical data, (b) is a selected segment of 50 seconds from (a). We displayed two representative channel waveforms from it. (c) is the extracted MECG and its corresponding spike train. (d) is the residual signal obtained by subtracting (c) from (b). Further execute FastICA and periodic constrained FastICA on (d), we can yield accurate FECG and spike train in (e). Figure 6 (f) displays the extracted FHR of the signal over a fifteen-minute interval, indicating values consistently within the range of 120-140, which align with normal fetal heart rates.

## IV. DISCUSSIONS

FECG measurement plays a crucial role in fetal activity monitoring. In this study, we present a novel FastICA-based FECG extracting framework to extract the weak FECG signals from compound signals acquired from high noise environment. In the proposed framework, the periodic constrained FastICA module, which incorporates the physiological characteristics of FECG signals, can utilize the prior information obtained from FastICA to extract more precise FECG spike trains and ensure the accuracy of FECG extraction. Moreover, the peel-off strategy with SVD waveform reconstruction ensures that the algorithm does not converge locally to large components such as MECG and noise, thus guaranteeing that smaller amplitude FECG can be accurately detected.

Figure 4 (a) represents the FECG extraction performance with different methods on public datasets. Our method achieves the highest level of performance among these

Table 2. Comparative evaluation for the FECG detection performance of different methods on public dataset

Method	Year	Channel	Database	Recordings	SEN (%)	PPV (%)	ACC (%)	F1 (%)
TS+PCA[20]	2014	1	NIFECGA	14	94.7	96	-	95.4
			Private data		89.9	88.8	-	89.3
Extended Kalman Smoother[42]	2014	3	NIFECGA	69	97.4	97.2	96	97.3
			private data	24	85.8	85	82.8	85.4
FastICA+SVD[41]	2014	4	NIFECGA	69	99.1	98.9	-	98.99
ANC+SVD[43]	2017	1	ADFECG	2	99.37	99.49	98.90	99.45
			Private data		98.31	98.86	97.21	98.58
NMF[27]	2020	1	ADFECG	5	95.3	94.6	-	94.8
nonlinear estimation[44]	2019	1	ADFECG	5	93.8	98.48	92.41	96.04
			NIFECGA	15	98.63	99.52	97.77	98.85
ST+Shannon Energy[16]	2022	1	ADFECG	4	96.6	96.6	100	98.27
			NIFECGA	20	97.37	98.61	98.72	98.67
CycleGAN[25]	2021	1	ADFECG	5	99.4	99.6	-	99.7
			NIFECGA	68	96.8	97.2	-	97.9
DP-LSTM network[10]	2022	1	ADFECG	22	97.3	98.09	95.53	97.7
			NIFECGA	69	94.2	96.5	91.34	95.3
PA <sup>2</sup> Net[26]	2022	1	ADFECG	5	99.58	99.67	-	99.62
			NIFECGA	68	98.9	98.83	-	98.86
CA-KICA[45]	2023	4	ADFECG	5	98.4	97.6	-	98.0
			NIFECGA	69	99.3	99.6	-	99.5
<b>Proposed Method</b>	<b>2024</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>ADFECG</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>99.71%</b>	<b>99.44%</b>	<b>99.16%</b>	<b>99.58%</b>
			<b>NIFECGA</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>99.25%</b>	<b>99.50%</b>	<b>98.77%</b>	<b>99.38%</b>



methods. As shown in Figure 3 and Figure 5, the FECG signals in the public datasets are still clearly visible. This is an ideal scenario in practical applications. For instance, Table 2 shows the result of different method for FECG extraction. While the methods in [20] and [42] achieve acceptable results on public datasets, their performance decreases on private data.

In Figure 4 (b), we observe that both our proposed method and other comparative methods achieve high performance on synthetic data when the signal quality is relatively good, in other words, when the  $\text{SNR}_{\text{min}}$  is high. However, as the noise level increases, we observe that FECG signals gradually become submerged in noise and are no longer observable from Figure 5(c) to Figure 5(g). At an MECG to noise SNR of -6dB, even the MECG cannot be observed. In such cases, the performance of LMS which based on the morphology of reference signals significantly deteriorates, from acceptable performance at 6dB to almost no extraction effect at -6dB. The performance of FastICA is also significantly affected, as well as PFP with equally constraint. Previous studies have addressed the issue of preliminary separation by proposing the use of constrained FastICA [35]. By using the sources preliminarily separated as constraints, more accurate spikes can be extracted. However, PFP was originally developed for EMG decomposition. Unlike ECG signals, EMG signals lack regularity and periodicity. Therefore, in this study, considering the physiological characteristics of extracting FECG and MECG signals, we applied a periodic constrained FastICA module, further adapting it for extracting periodic ECG signals. We also observe that although CycleGAN, a deep learning method, outperforms traditional LMS and FastICA, is data-driven and thus susceptible to the quality of training data. Additionally, they require large amounts of data and complex training progress. Moreover, this method uses single-channel signals, so when information in the channels is submerged by significant noise and artifacts, the algorithm cannot extract useful information. In contrast, our proposed method, based on BSS principles, integrates spatiotemporal information from multiple channels, resulting in better extraction performance under significant noise without the need for training.

It is worth mentioning that through two sets of ablation experiments involving PFP and PCFICA as well as the result shown in Figure 4 (c), we not only demonstrated the effectiveness of the periodic constrained FastICA module, but also validated the efficacy of SVD. By replacing least squares with SVD in the PCFICA method, the performance was further enhanced. This is because it is difficult to satisfy the assumption in the original data model that the sum of noises is white Gaussian noise with zero mean, as the AECG is interfered by various unpredictable noises like EMG noise and fetal movement. When directly estimating the waveform using the ECG spike train, the noise around the spike may be considered as the desired waveform, leading to inaccurate extraction. When using SVD, we applied a trapezoidal window (whose length depended on the mean RR-interval on the whole record) to select and weight the signal around each detected maternal QRS. This operation allows us to avoid artifacts due to abrupt signal truncation [41]. Therefore, the extracted signal has a better degree of reconstruction, leading to a better FECG extraction performance.

For clinical data shown in Figure 6, we can also observe that Figure 6 (b) represents two out of sixteen channels, where the FECG in these channels is not prominent, and there is significant baseline fluctuation. Consequently, even after removing MECG to get residual signals (d), the signals initially separated by FastICA still cannot accurately identify FECG. By utilizing the proposed method to refine the initially extracted signals with periodic constrained FastICA, the extracted FECG becomes more accurate and periodic. Figure 6 (f) shows a group of FECG-derived FHR from a 15-minute dataset, falling within the clinically normal range and validating the efficacy of our approach with clinical data.

Regarding the algorithm's peel-off strategy, its effect in avoiding local convergence of the algorithm is challenging to quantitatively describe. In experiments, for the preprocessed signals, when we initially execute FastICA for preliminary separation, the separated source signals often do not contain weak FECG sources (although sometimes FECG is extracted in the first round of peel-off). As shown in Figure 6, in the preprocessed original signals Figure 6 (b), the amplitudes of MECG and noise are much larger than FECG. Therefore, after the first round of separation, we obtain the MECG signal and its spikes. When we estimate waveforms using SVD and execute the peel-off to subtract them from the initial signals, we obtain the residual signals shown in Figure 6 (d) where FECG signals not discovered in the first round can be extracted from it. This is because removing larger components improves the problem of local convergence of the algorithm. [33] also explains the mechanism of peel-off and emphasizes its significant role in enabling the algorithm to identify weak signals.

Currently, the limitation of our study is that it's an offline algorithm, hence unable to monitor fetal heart in real-time. However, inspired by Zhao et al.'s recent development of an online algorithm for EMG decomposition [30], in the future, we can design an online FECG extraction algorithm for real-time fetal heart monitoring.

## V. CONCLUSION

This research reported a FastICA based peel-off framework for ECG extraction from the AECG signal. By incorporating the periodic constrained FastICA and peel-off strategy, the proposed framework show efficiency in FECG extraction from the AECG. The framework was validated on public datasets, synthetic data and clinical data. It is indicated that our method is a promising technique for maternal and fetal ECG monitoring application, which offers a new method for non-invasive clinical monitoring.

## REFERENCES

- [1] C. Krüger, "Stillbirths and neonatal deaths: a neglected global pandemic," (in English), *Archives of Disease in Childhood*, vol. 108, no. 11, pp. 895-896, Nov 2023.
- [2] T. Li, "Fetal Electrocardiography Extraction Based on Improved Fast Independent Components Analysis Algorithm," *Critical Reviews in Biomedical Engineering*, Article vol. 49, no. 4, pp. 53-64, 2021.
- [3] P. Olofsson, "Current status of intrapartum fetal monitoring: cardiocography versus cardiotocography + ST analysis of the fetal ECG," *European Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology and Reproductive Biology*, vol. 110, pp. S113-S118, 2003/09/22/ 2003.
- [4] P. Hamelmann *et al.*, "Doppler Ultrasound Technology for Fetal Heart Rate Monitoring: A Review," *IEEE Transactions on*

- Ultrasonics, Ferroelectrics, and Frequency Control*, vol. 67, no. 2, pp. 226-238, 2020.
- [5] A. Wacker-Gussmann, J. F. Strasburger, and R. T. Wakai, "Contribution of Fetal Magnetocardiography to Diagnosis, Risk Assessment, and Treatment of Fetal Arrhythmia," (in English), *Journal of the American Heart Association*, vol. 11, no. 15, Aug 2022.
- [6] R. Kahankova, M. Mikolasova, R. Jaros, K. Barnova, M. Ladrova, and R. Martinek, "A Review of Recent Advances and Future Developments in Fetal Phonocardiography," *IEEE Reviews in Biomedical Engineering*, vol. 16, pp. 653-671, 2023.
- [7] J. P. Neilson, "Fetal electrocardiogram (ECG) for fetal monitoring during labour," *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, no. 12, 2015.
- [8] Z. Alfrevic, G. M. L. Gyte, A. Cuthbert, and D. Devane, "Continuous cardiocography (CTG) as a form of electronic fetal monitoring (EFM) for fetal assessment during labour," *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, no. 2, 2017.
- [9] A. M. S. S. Kumar, E. E. Nithila, and B. M., "Detection of Fetal Cardiac Anomaly from Composite Abdominal Electrocardiogram," *Biomedical Signal Processing and Control*, Article vol. 65, 2021, Art. no. 102308.
- [10] A. Shokouhmand and N. Tavassolian, "Fetal electrocardiogram extraction using dual-path source separation of single-channel non-invasive abdominal recordings," *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering*, vol. 70, no. 1, pp. 283-295, 2022.
- [11] X. Wang, Y. Han, and Y. Deng, "ASW-Net: Adaptive Spectral Wavelet Network for Accurate Fetal ECG Extraction," *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Circuits and Systems*, vol. 16, no. 6, pp. 1387-1396, 2022.
- [12] X. Wang, Z. He, Z. Lin, Y. Han, W. Su, and S. Xie, "Correlation-Aware Attention CycleGAN for Accurate Fetal ECG Extraction," *IEEE Transactions on Instrumentation and Measurement*, Article pp. 1-1, 2023.
- [13] S. R. Breesha and S. S. Vinsley, "Automated Extraction of Fetal ECG Signal Features Using Twinned Filter and Integrated Methodologies," *Circuits, Systems, and Signal Processing*, Article 2023.
- [14] M. B. Hossain, S. K. Bashar, J. Lazaro, N. Reljin, Y. Noh, and K. H. Chon, "A robust ECG denoising technique using variable frequency complex demodulation," (in English), *Computer Methods and Programs in Biomedicine*, vol. 200, Mar 2021.
- [15] W. Zhong and W. Zhao, "Fetal ECG extraction using short time Fourier transform and generative adversarial networks," *Physiological Measurement*, Article vol. 42, no. 10, 2021, Art. no. 105011.
- [16] A. J. D. Krupa, S. Dhanalakshmi, and R. Kumar, "Joint time-frequency analysis and non-linear estimation for fetal ECG extraction," *Biomedical Signal Processing and Control*, vol. 75, p. 103569, 2022.
- [17] D. Edwin Dhas and M. Suchetha, "Extraction of Fetal ECG from Abdominal and Thorax ECG Using a Non-Causal Adaptive Filter Architecture," *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Circuits and Systems*, Article vol. 16, no. 5, pp. 981-990, 2022.
- [18] A. Jiménez-González and N. Castañeda-Villa, "Blind extraction of fetal and maternal components from the abdominal electrocardiogram: An ICA implementation for low-dimensional recordings," *Biomedical Signal Processing and Control*, Article vol. 58, 2020, Art. no. 101836.
- [19] L. Wang, C. Zhao, M. Dong, and K. Ota, "Fetal ECG Signal Extraction From Long-Term Abdominal Recordings Based on Adaptive QRS Removal and Joint Blind Source Separation," *IEEE Sensors Journal*, Article vol. 22, no. 21, pp. 20718-20729, 2022.
- [20] J. Behar, A. Johnson, G. Clifford, and J. Oster, "A Comparison of Single Channel Fetal ECG Extraction Methods," *Annals of biomedical engineering*, vol. 42, 03/07 2014.
- [21] S. Wu, Y. Shen, Z. Zhou, L. Lin, Y. Zeng, and X. Gao, "Research of fetal ECG extraction using wavelet analysis and adaptive filtering," *Computers in Biology and Medicine*, Article vol. 43, no. 10, pp. 1622-1627, 2013.
- [22] R. Jaros, R. Martinek, and R. Kahankova, "Non-Adaptive Methods for Fetal ECG Signal Processing: A Review and Appraisal," (in English), *Sensors*, vol. 18, no. 11, Nov 2018.
- [23] P. Darsana and V. N. Kumar, "Extracting Fetal ECG Signals Through a Hybrid Technique Utilizing Two Wavelet-Based Denoising Algorithms," *IEEE Access*, Article vol. 11, pp. 91696-91708, 2023.
- [24] Y. Zhang *et al.*, "Fetal Heart Rate Extraction from Abdominal Electrocardiography Recordings Based on Wavelet Transform and Adaptive Threshold Algorithm," in *2022 10th E-Health and Bioengineering Conference, EHB 2022*, 2022.
- [25] M. R. Mohebbian, S. S. Vedaei, K. A. Wahid, A. Dinh, H. R. Marateb, and K. Tavakolian, "Fetal ECG Extraction From Maternal ECG Using Attention-Based CycleGAN," *IEEE Journal of Biomedical and Health Informatics*, Article vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 515-526, 2022.
- [26] X. Wang *et al.*, "PA2Net: Period-Aware Attention Network for Robust Fetal ECG Detection," *IEEE Transactions on Instrumentation and Measurement*, Article vol. 71, 2022, Art. no. 2513812.
- [27] D. Gurve and S. Krishnan, "Separation of Fetal-ECG from Single-Channel Abdominal ECG Using Activation Scaled Non-Negative Matrix Factorization," *IEEE Journal of Biomedical and Health Informatics*, Article vol. 24, no. 3, pp. 669-680, 2020, Art. no. 8727520.
- [28] M. Varanini, G. Tartarisco, R. Balocchi, A. Macerata, G. Pioggia, and L. Billeci, "A new method for QRS complex detection in multichannel ECG: Application to self-monitoring of fetal health," *Computers in Biology and Medicine*, Article vol. 85, pp. 125-134, 2017.
- [29] R. Sameni, C. Jutten, and M. B. Shamsollahi, "Multichannel Electrocardiogram Decomposition Using Periodic Component Analysis," *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering*, vol. 55, no. 8, pp. 1935-1940, 2008.
- [30] H. Zhao, X. Zhang, M. Chen, and P. Zhou, "Online Decomposition of Surface Electromyogram Into Individual Motor Unit Activities Using Progressive FastICA Peel-Off," *IEEE Trans Biomed Eng*, vol. 71, no. 1, pp. 160-170, Jan 2024.
- [31] M. Chen, X. Zhang, and P. Zhou, "Automatic Multichannel Intramuscular Electromyogram Decomposition: Progressive FastICA Peel-Off and Performance Validation," *IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering*, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 76-84, 2019.
- [32] M. Q. Chen, X. Zhang, Z. Y. Lu, X. Y. Li, and P. Zhou, "Two-Source Validation of Progressive FastICA Peel-Off for Automatic Surface EMG Decomposition in Human First Dorsal Interosseous Muscle," (in English), *International Journal of Neural Systems*, vol. 28, no. 9, Nov 2018.
- [33] M. Chen and P. Zhou, "A Novel Framework Based on FastICA for High Density Surface EMG Decomposition," *IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering*, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 117-127, 2016.
- [34] A. L. Goldberger *et al.*, "PhysioBank, PhysioToolkit, and PhysioNet - Components of a new research resource for complex physiological signals," (in English), *Circulation*, vol. 101, no. 23, pp. E215-E220, Jun 13 2000.
- [35] I. Silva *et al.*, "Noninvasive Fetal ECG: the PhysioNet/Computing in Cardiology Challenge 2013," (in English), *2013 Computing in Cardiology Conference (Cinc)*, vol. 40, pp. 149-152, 2013.
- [36] M. Varanini, G. Tartarisco, L. Billeci, A. Macerata, G. Pioggia, and R. Balocchi, "A multi-step approach for non-invasive fetal ECG analysis," in *Computing in Cardiology*, 2013, vol. 40, pp. 281-284.
- [37] F. Andreotti, J. Behar, S. Zaunseeder, J. Oster, and G. D. Clifford, "An open-source framework for stress-testing non-invasive foetal ECG extraction algorithms," *Physiological Measurement*, vol. 37, no. 5, p. 627, 2016/04/12 2016.
- [38] J. Behar, F. Andreotti, S. Zaunseeder, Q. Li, J. Oster, and G. D. Clifford, "An ECG simulator for generating maternal-foetal activity mixtures on abdominal ECG recordings," *Physiological Measurement*, vol. 35, no. 8, p. 1537, 2014/07/28 2014.
- [39] F. Negro, S. Muceli, A. M. Castronovo, A. Holobar, and D. Farina, "Multi-channel intramuscular and surface EMG decomposition by convolutive blind source separation," (in English), *Journal of Neural Engineering*, vol. 13, no. 2, Apr 2016.
- [40] M. Chen, A. Holobar, X. Zhang, and P. J. N. p. Zhou, "Progressive FastICA Peel - Off and Convolution Kernel Compensation Demonstrate High Agreement for High Density Surface EMG Decomposition," vol. 2016, no. 1, p. 3489540, 2016.
- [41] M. Varanini, G. Tartarisco, L. Billeci, A. Macerata, G. Pioggia, and R. Balocchi, "An efficient unsupervised fetal QRS complex detection from abdominal maternal ECG," (in English), *Physiological Measurement*, vol. 35, no. 8, pp. 1607-1619, Aug 2014.
- [42] F. Andreotti *et al.*, "Robust fetal ECG extraction and detection from abdominal leads," *Physiological Measurement*, Article vol. 35, no. 8, pp. 1551-1567, 2014.
- [43] N. Zhang *et al.*, "A novel technique for fetal ECG extraction using single-channel abdominal recording," *Sensors*, vol. 17, no. 3, p. 457, 2017.
- [44] R. G. John and K. Ramachandran, "Extraction of foetal ECG from abdominal ECG by nonlinear transformation and estimations," *Computer Methods and Programs in Biomedicine*, vol. 175, pp. 193-204, 2019.
- [45] L. Qiao, S. Hu, B. Xiao, X. Bi, W. Li, and X. Gao, "A Dual Self-Calibrating Framework for Noninvasive Fetal ECG R-Peak Detection," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, Article vol. 10, no. 18, pp. 16579-16593, 2023.