

COVID-19 Cough Classification using Machine Learning and Global Smartphone Recordings

Madhurananda Pahar, Marisa Klopper, Robin Warren, and Thomas Niesler

Abstract—We present a machine learning based COVID-19 cough classifier which is able to discriminate COVID-19 positive coughs from both COVID-19 negative and healthy coughs recorded on a smartphone. This type of screening is non-contact and easily applied, and could help reduce workload in testing centers as well as limit transmission by recommending early self-isolation to those who have a cough suggestive of COVID-19. The two dataset used in this study include subjects from all six continents and contain both forced and natural coughs. The publicly available Coswara dataset contains 92 COVID-19 positive and 1079 healthy subjects, while the second smaller dataset was collected mostly in South Africa and contains 8 COVID-19 positive and 13 COVID-19 negative subjects who have undergone a SARS-CoV laboratory test. Dataset skew was addressed by applying synthetic minority oversampling (SMOTE) and leave-p-out cross validation was used to train and evaluate classifiers. Logistic regression (LR), support vector machines (SVM), multilayer perceptrons (MLP), convolutional neural networks (CNN), long-short term memory (LSTM) and a residual-based neural network architecture (Resnet50) were considered as classifiers. Our results show that the Resnet50 classifier was best able to discriminate between the COVID-19 positive and the healthy coughs with an area under the ROC curve (AUC) of 0.98 while a LSTM classifier was best able to discriminate between the COVID-19 positive and COVID-19 negative coughs with an AUC of 0.94. The LSTM classifier achieved these results using 13 features selected by sequential forward search (SFS). Since it can be implemented on a smartphone, cough audio classification is cost-effective and easy to apply and deploy, and therefore is potentially a useful and viable means of non-contact COVID-19 screening.

Index Terms—Cough, classification, machine learning, COVID-19, logistic regression (LR), support vector machine (SVM), convolutional neural network (CNN), long short term memory (LSTM), Resnet50

1 INTRODUCTION

COVID19 (COronaVirus Disease of 2019), caused by the Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS-CoV2) virus, was announced as a global pandemic on February 11, 2020 by the World Health Organisation (WHO). It is a new coronavirus but similar to other coronaviruses, including SARS-CoV (severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus) and MERS-CoV (Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus) which caused disease outbreaks in 2002 and 2012, respectively [1], [2].

The most common symptoms of COVID-19 are fever, fatigue and a dry cough [3]. Other symptoms include shortness of breath, joint pain, muscle pain, gastrointestinal symptoms and loss of smell or taste [4]. At the time of writing, there are 63 million active cases of COVID-19 globally, and there have been 1.5 million deaths, with the USA reporting the highest number of cases (13.4 million) and deaths (267,306) [5]. The scale of the pandemic has caused some health systems to be overrun by the need for testing and the management of cases.

Several attempts have been made to identify early symptoms of COVID-19 through the use of artificial intelligence applied to images. The residual neural network (Resnet50)

architecture has been shown to perform better than other pre-trained models such as AlexNet, GoogLeNet, VGG16 in these tasks. For example, COVID-19 was detected from computed tomography (CT) images by using a Resnet50 architecture with a 96.23% accuracy [6]. The same architecture was shown to detect pneumonia due to COVID-19 with an accuracy of 96.7% [7] and to detect COVID-19 from x-ray images with an accuracy of 96.30% [8].

Coughing is one of the predominant symptoms of COVID-19 [9]. However, coughing is also a symptom of more than 100 other diseases, and their effects on the respiratory system vary [10]. For example, lung diseases can cause the airway to be either restricted or obstructed and this can influence the acoustics of the cough [11]. It has also been postulated that the glottis behaves differently under different pathological conditions [12], [13] and that this makes it possible to distinguish between coughs due to TB [14], asthma [15], bronchitis and pertussis (whooping cough) [16], [17], [18], [19].

Respiratory data such as breathing, sneezing, speech, eating behaviour and coughs can be processed by machine learning algorithms to diagnose respiratory illness such as COVID-19 [20], [21], [22]. Simple machine learning tools, like a binary classifier, are able to distinguish COVID-19 respiratory sounds from healthy counterparts with an AUC exceeding 0.80 [23]. Detecting COVID-19 by analysing only the cough sounds is also possible. AI4COVID-19 is a mobile app which records 3 seconds of cough audio which is analysed automatically to provide an indication of COVID-19 status within 2 minutes [24]. A medical dataset containing 328 cough sounds have been recorded from 150 patients of four

- Madhurananda Pahar and Thomas Niesler works at Department of Electrical and Electronics Engineering, University of Stellenbosch, Stellenbosch, South Africa - 7600.
E-mail: mpahar@sun.ac.za, trn@sun.ac.za
- Marisa Klopper and Robin Warren works at SAMRC Centre for Tuberculosis Research, University of Stellenbosch, Cape Town, South Africa - 7505.
E-mail: marisat@sun.ac.za, rw1@sun.ac.za




Fig. 1. **Origin of participants in the Coswara and the Sarcos dataset:** Participants in the Coswara dataset come from five different continents, excluding Africa. The majority (91%) of participants in Coswara dataset are from Asia, as explained in Figure 2. Sarcos participants who supplied geographical information are mostly (62%) from South Africa, as shown in Figure 3.

different types: COVID-19, Asthma, Bronchitis and Healthy. A deep neural network (DNN) was shown to distinguish between COVID-19 and other coughs with an accuracy of 96.83% [25]. There appear to be unique patterns in COVID-19 coughs that allow a pre-trained Resnet18 classifier to identify COVID-19 coughs with an AUC of 0.72. In this case cough samples were collected over the phone from 3621 individuals with confirmed COVID-19 [26]. COVID-19 coughs were classified with a higher AUC of 0.97 (sensitivity = 98.5% and specificity = 94.2%) by a Resnet50 architecture trained on coughs from 4256 subjects and evaluated on 1064 subjects that included both COVID-19 positive and COVID-19 negative subjects [27].

Data collection from COVID-19 patients is challenging and often not publicly available. A database consisting of coughing sounds recorded during or after the acute phase of COVID-19 from patients via public media interviews has been developed in [28]. The Coswara dataset is publicly available and collected in a more controlled and targeted manner [29]. At the time of writing, this dataset included usable ‘deep cough’ recordings from 92 COVID-19 positive and from 1079 healthy subjects. We have also begun to compile our own dataset by collecting recordings from subjects who have undergone a SARS-CoV laboratory test in South Africa. This Sarcos (**SARS COVID-19 South Africa**) dataset is currently still small and includes 21 subjects (8 COVID-19 positive and 13 COVID-19 negative).

Both the Coswara and Sarcos dataset are imbalanced since COVID-19 positive subjects are outnumbered by non-COVID-19 subjects. Nevertheless, collectively these two dataset contain recordings from all six continents, as shown in Figure 1. To improve our machine learning classifier’s performance, we have applied the Synthetic Minority Over-sampling Technique (SMOTE) to balance our dataset. Subsequently, classifier hyperparameters were optimised by using a leave-p-out cross validation, followed by training and evaluation of artificial neural networks (ANN), such as LR, SVM, MLP and deep neural networks (DNN) such as CNN, LSTM, Resnet50 classifiers. Resnet50 produced the highest area under the ROC curve value of $0.9759 \approx 0.98$ while trained and evaluated on the Coswara dataset. No classifier has been trained on the Sarcos dataset as it is small, but has been used to evaluate the performance of the best-performed DNN classifiers on the Coswara dataset. It has also been found that highest AUC of $0.9375 \approx 0.94$ has been achieved from best 13 features extracted from the Sarcos dataset after running a greedy search algorithm such as a sequential forward search (SFS). We conclude that

diagnosis of COVID-19 is possible from only cough audio recorded via smartphone, as our AI based cough classifier can discriminate COVID-19 positive coughs from both COVID-19 negative and healthy coughs anywhere on the planet. However, additional validation is required to obtain approval from regulatory bodies for use as a diagnostic tool.

2 DATA COLLECTION

2.1 Collected Dataset

2.1.1 Dataset 1: Coswara Dataset

The Coswara project is aimed at developing a diagnostic tool for COVID-19 based on respiratory, cough and speech sounds [29]. The public can contribute to this web-based data collection effort using their smartphones (<https://coswara.iisc.ac.in>). The collected audio data includes fast and slow breathing, deep and shallow coughing, phonation of sustained vowels and spoken digits. Age, gender, geographical location, current health status and pre-existing medical conditions are also recorded. Health status includes ‘healthy’, ‘exposed’, ‘cured’ or ‘infected’. Audio recordings were sampled at 44.1 KHz and subjects were from all continents except Africa, as shown in Figure 2. The collected data is currently being annotated and will be released in due course. In this study we have made use of the raw audio recordings and applied preprocessing as described in Section 2.2.

2.1.2 Dataset 2: Sarcos Dataset

Like Coswara, this dataset was collected using an online platform: <https://coughtest.online>. Subjects were prompted to record their cough using their smartphone. Only coughs were collected as audio samples, and only subjects who had recently undergone a SARS-CoV laboratory test were asked to participate. The sampling rate for the audio recordings was 44.1 KHz. In addition to the cough audio recordings, subjects were presented with a voluntary and anonymous questionnaire, providing informed consent. The questionnaire prompted for the following information.

- Age and gender.
- If tested by an authorised COVID-19 testing centre.
- Days since the test was performed.
- Lab result (COVID-19 positive or negative).
- Country of residence.
- Known contact with COVID-19 positive patient.
- Known lung disease.
- Symptoms and temperature.




Fig. 2. **Coswara dataset at the time of experimentation:** There are 1079 healthy and 92 COVID-19 positive subjects in the processed dataset, used for feature extraction and classifier training. Most of the subjects are middle aged, between 20 to 50. There are 282 female and 889 male subjects and most of them are from Asia. Subjects are from these five continents: **Asia** (Bahrain, Bangladesh, China, India, Indonesia, Iran, Japan, Malaysia, Oman, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Sri Lanka, United Arab Emirates), **Australia**, **Europe** (Belgium, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Netherlands, Norway, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Kingdom), **North America** (Canada, United States), **South America** (Argentina, Mexico)

- If they are a regular smoker.
- If they have a current cough and for how many days.

There were 13 (62%) subjects who asserted that they are South African residents representing the African continent, as shown in Figure 3. There were no subject from Africa in the Coswara dataset. Thus, together, the Coswara and Sarcos dataset include subjects from all six continents.

2.2 Data Preprocessing

The amplitudes of the raw audio data in the Coswara and the Sarcos dataset were normalised, after which periods of silence were removed from the signal to within a 50 ms margin using a simple energy detector. Figure 4 shows an example of the original raw audio, as well as the preprocessed audio.

The coughs in both Coswara and Sarcos dataset after preprocessing are shown in Table 1. The Coswara dataset contains 92 COVID-19 positive and 1079 healthy subjects and the Sarcos dataset contains 8 COVID-19 positive and 13 COVID-19 negative subjects.

2.3 Dataset Balancing

Table 1 shows that COVID-19 positive subjects are under-represented in both dataset. To compensate for this imbalance, which can detrimentally affect machine learning [30], [31], we have applied SMOTE data balancing during training [32], [33]. This technique has previously been successfully applied to cough detection and classification based on audio recording [17]. SMOTE oversamples the minor class by generating synthetic examples, instead of for example random oversampling.

In our dataset, for each COVID-19 positive cough, 5 other COVID-19 positive coughs were randomly chosen and the one with the smallest Euclidean distance from the



Fig. 3. **Sarcos dataset at the time of experimentation:** There are 13 COVID-negative and 8 COVID-positive subjects in the processed dataset. Unlike Coswara dataset, there are more female than male subjects. Most of the subjects had their lab test performed less than two weeks ago. Of the 21 subjects, 12 had been in contact with another COVID-19 positive person. Only 9 of the subjects reported coughing as a symptom, and for these the reported duration of coughing symptoms was variable. There were 13 subjects from **Africa** (South Africa), 1 from **South America** (Brazil), and the rest declined to specify their geographic location.




Fig. 4. **A processed COVID-19 cough audio** which is shorter than the original cough but keeps all spectrum resolution.

original cough $\mathbf{x}^{NN}$ is selected. We note the COVID-19 positive class as $\mathbf{x}$. Then, the synthetic samples are created according to Equation 1.

$$\mathbf{x}^{SMOTE} = \mathbf{x} + u \cdot (\mathbf{x}^{NN} - \mathbf{x}) \quad (1)$$

The multiplicative factor u is uniformly distributed between 0 and 1 [34].

We have also implemented other extensions of SMOTE such as borderline-SMOTE [35], [36] and adaptive synthetic sampling [37]. However, the best results were obtained by using SMOTE without any extension.

The balanced processed coughs from all the subjects are used in the feature extraction process and then used for

TABLE 1

Coughs in the both Coswara and Sarcos Dataset: Of 1171 subjects with usable ‘deep cough’ recordings, 92 were COVID-19 positive while 1079 subjects were healthy. The Coswara dataset has total 1.05 hours of cough audio recording used in the data balancing, feature extraction and classifier training and evaluation process. Sarcos dataset has 1.28 minutes of cough audio recordings used for data balancing, feature extraction and classifier evaluation.

	No. of Subjects	Total Lengths	Average Length	STD Length
Coswara COVID Positive	92	4.24 mins	2.77 sec	1.62 sec
Coswara Healthy	1079	0.98 hours	3.26 sec	1.66 sec
Coswara Total	1171	1.05 hours	3.22 sec	1.67 sec
Sarcos COVID Positive	8	0.5 mins	3.75 sec	2.61 sec
Sarcos COVID Negative	13	0.78 mins	3.59 sec	3.04 sec
Sarcos Total	21	1.28 mins	3.65 sec	2.82 sec




Fig. 5. **Feature Extraction:** Processed cough recordings, shown in Figure 4, are split into individual sections after which features including MFCCs (including velocity and acceleration), log energies, ZCR and kurtosis are extracted.

training and evaluating our classifiers.

3 FEATURE EXTRACTION

The feature extraction process is illustrated in Figure 5. We have considered mel frequency cepstral coefficients (MFCCs), log energies, zero-crossing rate (ZCR) and kurtosis as features.

3.1 Mel frequency cepstral coefficients (MFCCs)

Mel-frequency cepstral coefficients (MFCCs) have been used very successfully as features in audio analysis and especially in automatic speech recognition [38]. They have also been found to be useful for differentiating dry coughs from wet coughs [39].

We have used the traditional MFCC extraction method considering higher resolution MFCCs, while mel-scaled filters are calculated by following Equation 2, along with velocity and acceleration.

$$f_{mel}(f) = 2595 \times \left(1 + \frac{f}{700}\right) \quad (2)$$

3.2 Log Energies

This feature [40] is well used in improving performance of neural networks. If the input signal is $s(t)$ and N is the total number of samples in the signal, then log energy is L , defined by Equation 3.

$$L = \log_{10}\left(0.001 + \frac{\sum |s(t)|^2}{N}\right) \quad (3)$$

3.3 Zero-crossing rate (ZCR)

The zero-crossing rate (ZCR) [41] is the number of times the signal changes sign within a frame, as indicated in Equation 4. ZCR indicates the variability present in the signal.

$$ZCR = \frac{1}{T-1} \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \lambda(s_t s_{t-1} < 0) \quad (4)$$

where $\lambda = 1$ when the sign of s_t and s_{t-1} differ and $\lambda = 0$ when the sign of s_t and s_{t-1} is the same.

3.4 Kurtosis

The kurtosis [42] indicates the tailedness of a probability density. For the samples of an audio signal, it indicates the prevalence of higher amplitudes. Kurtosis has been calculated according to Equation 5.

$$\Lambda_x = \frac{E[(x_i[k] - \mu)^4]}{\sigma^4} \quad (5)$$

These features have been extracted by using the hyperparameters explained in Table 2 for all cough recordings.

4 CLASSIFIER ARCHITECTURES

In the following we will briefly describe the classifiers which were evaluated in our experimental evaluation.

4.1 Logistic Regression (LR)

Logistic regression (LR) models have been found to outperform other state-of-the-art classifiers such as classification trees, random forests, artificial neural networks such as SVM in some clinical prediction tasks [14], [43], [44]. The output P of a LR model is given by Equation 6, where a and b are the model parameters.

$$P = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-(a+bx)}} \quad (6)$$

Since P varies between 0 and 1, it can be interpreted as a probability and is very useful in binary classification.

We have used gradient descent weight regularisation as well as lasso ($l1$ penalty) and ridge ($l2$ penalty) estimators during training [45], [46]. These regularisation hyperparameters are optimised during cross validation, explained in Section 5.2.

This LR classifier has been intended primarily as a baseline against which any improvements offered by the more complex architectures can be measured.

4.2 Support Vector Machine (SVM)

Support vector machine (SVM) classifiers have performed well in both detecting [47], [48] and classifying [49] cough events.

We have used both linear and non-linear SVM classifiers $\phi(w)$ which is computed in the Equation 7.

$$\phi(w) = \frac{1}{2} w^T w - J(w, b, a) \quad (7)$$

and where, $J(w, b, a)$ is the term to minimise by the hyperparameter optimization for the parameters mentioned in Table 3.




Fig. 6. **CNN Classifier:** Our CNN classifier uses α_1 two-dimensional convolutional layers with kernel size α_2 , rectified linear units as activation functions and a dropout rate of α_3 . After max-pooling, two dense layers with α_4 and 8 units respectively and rectified linear activation functions follow. The network is terminated by a two-dimensional softmax where one output represents the COVID-19 positive class and the other Healthy or COVID-19 negative class. During training, features are presented to the neural network in batches of size ξ_1 for ξ_2 epochs.

4.3 Multilayer Perceptron (MLP)

A multilayer perceptron (MLP) is a neural network with multiple layers of neurons separating input and output [50]. These models are capable of learning non-linear relationships and have for example been shown to be effective when discriminating Influenza coughs from other coughs [51]. MLP have also been applied to tuberculosis coughs [48] and to cough detection in general [52], [53]. The MLP classifier is based on the computation in Equation 8.

$$y = \phi\left(\sum_{i=1}^n w_i x_i + b\right) = \phi(\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{x} + b) \quad (8)$$

where $\mathbf{x}$ is the input-vector, $\mathbf{w}$ is the weight-vector, b is the bias and ϕ is the non-linear activation function. The weights and the bias are optimised during supervised training.

During training, we have applied stochastic gradient descent with the inclusion of an l_2 penalty. This penalty, along with the number of hidden layers have been considered as the hyperparameters which were tuned using the leave-p-out cross validation process (Figure 8 and Section 5.2).

4.4 Convolutional Neural Network (CNN)

A convolutional neural network (CNN) is a popular deep neural network architecture which is primarily used in image classification [54]. For example, in the past two decades CNNs have been applied successfully to complex tasks such as face recognition [55]. The core of a CNN can be expressed by Equation 9, where $net(t, f)$ is the output of the convolutional layer [56].

$$net(t, f) = (\mathbf{x} * \mathbf{w})[t, f] = \sum_m \sum_n \mathbf{x}[m, n] \mathbf{w}[t-m, f-n] \quad (9)$$

where $*$ is the convolution operation, $\mathbf{w}$ is the filter or kernel matrix and $\mathbf{x}$ is the input image. In the final layer, the softmax activation function is applied [57].

The hyperparameters optimised for the CNN classifier used in this study is mentioned in Table 3 and visually explained in Figure 6.




Fig. 7. **LSTM classifier:** Our LSTM classifier has β_1 LSTM units, each with rectified linear activation functions and a dropout rate of α_3 . This is followed by two dense layers with α_4 and 8 units respectively and rectified linear activation functions. The network is terminated by a two-dimensional softmax where one output represents the COVID-19 positive class and the other Healthy or COVID-19 negative class. During training, features are presented to the neural network in batches of size ξ_1 for ξ_2 epochs.

4.5 Long Short Term Memory (LSTM) Neural Network

A long short term memory (LSTM) model is a type of recurrent neural network whose architecture allows it to remember previously-seen inputs when making its classification decision [58]. It has been successfully used in automatic cough detection [59], and also in other types of acoustic event detection [60], [61].

If $\vec{\phi}$ is a constant d-dimensional vector, $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and $\vec{s}(t)$ is the value of the d-dimensional state signal vector, then the LSTM can be described by Equation 10.

$$\frac{d\vec{s}(t)}{dt} = \vec{h}(\vec{s}(t), \vec{x}(t)) + \vec{\phi} \quad (10)$$

where, $\vec{h}(\vec{s}(t), \vec{x}(t))$ is a vector-valued function of vector-valued arguments [62].

The hyperparameters optimised for the LSTM classifier used in this study is mentioned in Table 3 and illustrated in Figure 7.

4.6 Resnet50 Classifier

The deep residual learning (Resnet) neural network [63] is a very deep architecture that contains skip layers, and has been found to outperform other very deep architectures. It performs particularly well on image classification tasks on the dataset such as ILSVRC, the CIFAR10 dataset and the COCO object detection dataset [64]. Resnet50 has already been used in successfully detecting COVID-19 from CT images [6], coughs [27] and also other detection tasks such as Alzheimer's [65]. We have used the default Resnet50 structure mentioned in Table 1 of [63].

5 CLASSIFICATION PROCESS

5.1 Hyperparameter Optimisation

Both feature extraction and classifier architectures have a number of hyperparameters that must be optimised. These hyperparameters are listed in Tables 2 and 3.

As the sampling rate is 44.1 KHz for all audio; by varying the frame lengths from 2^8 to 2^{12} i.e. 256 to 4096, features are extracted from frames whose duration varies from approximately 5 to 100 ms. Different phases in a cough

TABLE 2
Feature extraction hyperparameters used in feature extraction process, explained in Section 3

Hyperparameter	Description	Range
No. of MFCCs (MFCC=)	Number of lower order MFCCs to keep	$13 \times k$, where $k = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5$
Frame length (Frame=)	Frame-size in which audio is segmented	2^k where $k = 8, \dots, 12$
No. of Segments (Seg=)	No. of segments in which frames were grouped	$10 \times k$, where $k = 5, 7, 10, 12, 15$

carry important features [39] and thus has been segmented into parts, as shown in Figure 5, which varies from 50 to 150 with steps of 20 to 30. By varying the number of lower order MFCCs to keep (from 13 to 65, with steps of 13), the spectral resolution of the features was varied.

TABLE 3
Classifier hyperparameters, optimised using leave-p-out cross validation shown in Figure 8 and explained in Section 5.2. For regularisation strength (ν_1) and l_2 penalty (ζ_1), i has the range -7 to 7 with steps of 1.

Hyperparameters	Classifier	Range
Regularisation strength (ν_1)	LR	10^{-7} to 10^7 in steps of 10^i
l_1 penalty (ν_2)	LR	0 to 1 in steps of 0.05
l_2 penalty (ν_3)	LR	0 to 1 in steps of 0.05
No. of hidden layers (η)	MLP	10 to 100 in steps of 10
l_2 penalty (ζ_1)	MLP	10^{-7} to 10^7 in steps of 10^i
Stochastic gradient decent (ζ_2)	MLP	0 to 1 in steps of 0.05
Batch Size (ξ_1)	CNN, LSTM	2^k where $k = 6, 7, 8$
No. of epochs (ξ_2)	CNN, LSTM	10 to 20 in steps of 20
No. of Conv filters (α_1)	CNN	3×2^k where $k = 3, 4, 5$
Kernel size (α_2)	CNN	2 and 3
Dropout rate (α_3)	CNN, LSTM	0.1 to 0.5 in steps of 0.2
Dense layer size (α_4)	CNN, LSTM	2^k where $k = 4, 5$
LSTM units (β_1)	LSTM	2^k where $k = 6, 7, 8$
Learning rate (β_2)	LSTM	10^k where $k = -2, -3, -4$

5.2 Cross Validation

All our classifiers have been trained and evaluated by using a nested leave- p -out cross validation scheme, as shown in Figure 8 [66]. Since only the Coswara dataset was used for training and parameter optimisation, $N = 1171$. As the train and test split is 4 : 1; $J = 234$ and $K = 187$.

The figure shows that, in an outer loop, J patients are removed from the complete set N to be used for later independent testing. Then, a further K patients are removed from the remaining $N - J$ to serve as a development set to optimise the hyperparameters listed in Table 3. The inner loop considers all such sets of K patients, and the optimal hyperparameters are chosen on the basis of all these partitions. The resulting optimal hyperparameters are used to train a final system on all $N - J$ patients which is evaluated on the test set consisting of J patients. This entire procedure is repeated for all possible non-overlapping test sets in the




Fig. 8. Leave p -out cross validation has been used to train and evaluate the classifiers. The train and test split ratio has been 4 : 1.

outer loop. Final performance is calculated by averaging over these outer loops.

This cross-validation procedure makes best use of our small dataset by allowing all patients to be used for both training and testing purposes while ensuring unbiased hyperparameter optimisation and a strict per-patient separation between cross-validation folds.

5.3 Classifier Evaluation

Receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curves were calculated within the inner and outer loops in Figure 8. The area under the ROC curve (AUC) indicates how well the classifier has performed over a range of decision thresholds [67]. From these ROC curves, the decision that achieves an equal error rate (γ_{EE}) was computed. This is the threshold for which the difference between the classifier's true positive rate (TPR) and false positive rate (FPR) is minimised.

Denote the mean per-frame probability that a cough is from a COVID-19 positive patient by $\hat{P}$:

$$\hat{P} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^K P(Y = 1|X, \theta)}{\kappa} \quad (11)$$

where κ indicates the number of frames in the cough and $P(Y = 1|X, \theta)$ is the output of the classifier for input X and parameters θ . Now define the indicator variable C as:

$$C = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \hat{P} \geq \gamma_{EE} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

We now define two COVID-19 index scores ($COVID_I_1$ and $COVID_I_2$) in Equations 13 and 14 respectively.

$$COVID_I_1 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N_1} C}{N_1} \quad (13)$$

$$COVID_I_2 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N_2} P(Y = 1|X)}{N_2} \quad (14)$$

In Equation 13, N_1 is the number of coughs from the patient in question while in Equation 14, N_2 indicates the total number of frames of cough audio gathered from the patient. Hence Equation 11 computes a per-cough average probability while and Equation 14 computes a per-frame average probability.

The COVID-19 index scored given by Equations 13 and 14 can both be used to make classification decisions. We have found that, for some classifier architectures one will lead to better performance than the other. Therefore, we have made the choice of the scoring function an additional hyperparameter to be optimised during cross validation.

We have calculated the specificity and sensitivity from these predicted values and then comparing them with the actual values and finally AUC has been calculated and used as a method of evaluation. These results are shown in Table 4 and 5.

6 RESULTS

Classification performance for the Coswara dataset is shown in Table 4 and for the Sarcos dataset in Table 5. The Coswara results are averages calculated over the outer loop test-sets during cross validation. The Sarcos results, are classifiers trained on the Coswara data and evaluated on the 21 patients in the Sarcos dataset. These tables also show the optimal values of the hyperparameters determined during cross-validation.




Fig. 9. Mean ROC curve for the classifiers trained and evaluated on the Coswara dataset: The highest AUC of 0.98 was obtained from the Resnet50. LR classifier has the lowest AUC of 0.74.

Table 4 shows that the Resnet50 classifier exhibits best performance, with an AUC of 0.976 when using a 117-dimensional feature vector consisting of 39 MFCCs with appended velocity and acceleration extracted from frames that are 1024 samples long and when grouping the coughs into 50 segments. The corresponding accuracy is 95.3% with sensitivity 93% and specificity 98%. This exceeds the minimum requirements for a community-based triage test as determined by the WHO. The CNN and LSTM classifiers also exhibited good performance, with AUCs of 0.953 and 0.942 respectively, thus comfortably outperformed the MLP,

which achieved an AUC of 0.897. The optimised LR and SVM classifiers showed substantially weaker performance, with AUCs of 0.736 and 0.815 respectively.

We also see from Table 4 that using a larger number of MFCCs consistently leads to improved performance. Since the spectral resolution used to compute the 39-dimensional MFCCs surpasses that of the human auditory system, we conclude that the classifiers are using information not generally perceivable to the human listener in their decisions. We have come to similar conclusions in previous work considering the coughing sounds of tuberculosis patients [14].

The mean ROC curves for the optimised classifier of each architecture are shown in Figure 9. We see that LSTM, CNN and Resnet50 classifiers achieve better performance than the remaining architectures at most operating points. Furthermore, the figure confirms that the Resnet50 architecture also in most cases achieved better classification performance than the CNN and LSTM. There appears to be a small region of the curve where the CNN outperforms the Resnet50 classifier, but this will need to be verified by future further experimentation with larger dataset.

When the CNN, LSTM and Resnet50 classifiers trained on the Coswara dataset (as shown in Table 4) were applied to the Sarcos dataset, the performance shown in Table 5 is achieved. We see that performance has in all cases deteriorated relative to the better-matched Coswara dataset. Best performance was achieved by the LSTM classifier, which achieved an AUC of 0.7786. Next, we improve this classifier by applying feature selection.

6.1 Feature Selection

Sequential Forward Search (SFS) is a greedy search for the individual features dimensions that contribute the most towards the classifier performance [68]. The application of SFS to the LSTM classifier allowed performance on the Sarcos dataset to improve from an AUC of 0.779 to 0.938, as shown in Figure 10.




Fig. 10. Sequential Forward Search when applied to a feature vector composed of 13 MFCCs with appended velocity and acceleration, log energies, ZCR and kurtosis. Peak performance is observed when using the first 13 features.

The feature selection hyperparameters in these experiments were 13 MFCCs, 2048 samples (i.e. 0.46 sec) long frames and coughs grouped into 70 segments. Thus, SFS could select from a total of 42 features: MFCCs along with their velocity and accelerations, log energy, ZCR and

TABLE 4

Classifier performance while trained and evaluated on the Coswara dataset: The best-two performing neural network classifiers along with their feature extraction hyperparameters after optimising classifier hyperparameters. Resnet50 has performed the best.

Classifiers	Features	Performance			
		Specificity	Sensitivity	Accuracy	AUC
LR	MFCC=13, Frame=1024, Seg=120	57%	94%	75.7%	0.7362
LR	MFCC=26, Frame=1024, Seg=70	59%	74%	66.3%	0.7288
SVM	MFCC=39, Frame=2048, Seg=100	74%	71%	72.28%	0.8154
SVM	MFCC=26, Frame=1024, Seg=50	74%	74%	73.91%	0.8044
MLP	MFCC=26, Frame=2048, Seg=100	87%	88%	87.5%	0.8969
MLP	MFCC=13, Frame=1024, Seg=100	84%	68%	76.02%	0.8329
CNN	MFCC=26, Frame=1024, Seg=70	99%	90%	94.57%	0.9530
CNN	MFCC=39, Frame=1024, Seg=50	98%	90%	94.35%	0.9499
LSTM	MFCC=13, Frame=2048, Seg=70	97%	91%	94.02%	0.9419
LSTM	MFCC=26, Frame=2048, Seg=100	97%	90%	93.65%	0.9319
<i>Resnet50</i>	<i>MFCC=39, Frame=1024, Seg=50</i>	<i>98%</i>	<i>93%</i>	<i>95.3%</i>	<i>0.9759</i>
Resnet50	MFCC=26, Frame=1024, Seg=70	98%	93%	95.01%	0.9632

TABLE 5

Best Classifier performance while trained on the Coswara dataset and evaluated on the Sarcos dataset: along with their feature extraction hyperparameters after optimising classifier hyperparameters. The LSTM classifier has outperformed the other classifiers and after applying SFS, it has achieved the AUC 0.9375. Only performance from deep architectures are shown here, as they are significantly better than other classifiers.

Classifiers	Features	Performance			
		Specificity	Sensitivity	Accuracy	AUC
CNN	MFCC=26, Frame=1024, Seg=70	61%	85%	73.02%	0.755
LSTM	MFCC=13, Frame=2048, Seg=70	73%	75%	73.78%	0.7786
Resnet50	MFCC=39, Frame=1024, Seg=50	57%	93%	74.58%	0.74
<i>LSTM + SFS</i>	<i>MFCC=13, Frame=2048, Seg=70</i>	<i>96%</i>	<i>91%</i>	<i>92.91%</i>	<i>0.9375</i>

Kurtosis. After performing SFS, a peak AUC of 0.9375 was observed on the Sarcos dataset when using the best 13 features among the 42, as shown in Figure 11.




Fig. 11. Mean ROC curve for the best performing classifier in Figure 9 when evaluated on the Sarcos dataset when using all 42 features and when using the best 13 features.

7 CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

We have developed COVID-19 cough classifiers using smartphone audio recordings and a number of machine learning architectures. To train and evaluate these classifiers, we have used two dataset. The first, larger, dataset is publicly available contains data from 1171 subjects (92 COVID-19 positive and 1079 healthy) coming from all six continents except Africa. The second, smaller, dataset contains 62% of subjects from South Africa and data from 8 COVID-19 positive and 13 COVID-19 negative subjects. Thus, together the two dataset include data from subjects residing on all six

continents. After preprocessing and extracting MFCC, frame energy, ZCR and kurtosis features from the cough audio recordings, we have trained and evaluated six classifiers using a leave-p-out cross validation. Our best performing classifier is based on the Resnet50 architecture and is able to discriminate between COVID-19 coughs and healthy coughs with an AUC of 0.98. The LSTM model performed the best in discriminating COVID-19 positive coughs from COVID-19 negative coughs with AUC 0.94 after determining the 13 best features using sequential forward search (SFS).

Although these systems require more stringent validation on larger dataset, the results we have presented are very promising and indicate that COVID-19 screening based on automatic classification of coughing sounds is viable. Since the data has been captured on smartphones, and since the classifier can in principle also be implemented on such device, such cough classification is cost-efficient, easy to apply and easy to deploy. It therefore has the potential of being particularly useful in a practical developing-world scenario.

In ongoing work, we are continuing to enlarge our dataset, and to update our best systems as this happens. We are also beginning to consider the best means of implementing the classifier on a readily-available consumer smartphone platform.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank South African Medical Research Council (SAMRC) for providing funds to support this research and South African Centre for High Performance Computing (CHPC) for providing computational resources on their Lengau cluster for this research.

REFERENCES

- [1] WHO *et al.*, "Summary of probable sars cases with onset of illness from 1 November 2002 to 31 July 2003," http://www.who.int/csr/sars/country/table2004_04_21/en/index.html, 2003.
- [2] R. Miyata, N. Tanuma, M. Hayashi, T. Imamura, J.-i. Takanashi, R. Nagata, A. Okumura, H. Kashii, S. Tomita, S. Kumada *et al.*, "Oxidative stress in patients with clinically mild encephalitis/encephalopathy with a reversible splenic lesion (mers)," *Brain and Development*, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 124–127, 2012.
- [3] D. Wang, B. Hu, C. Hu, F. Zhu, X. Liu, J. Zhang, B. Wang, H. Xiang, Z. Cheng, Y. Xiong *et al.*, "Clinical characteristics of 138 hospitalized patients with 2019 novel coronavirus-infected pneumonia in Wuhan, China," *JAMA*, vol. 323, no. 11, pp. 1061–1069, 2020.
- [4] A. Carfi, R. Bernabei, F. Landi *et al.*, "Persistent symptoms in patients after acute COVID-19," *JAMA*, vol. 324, no. 6, pp. 603–605, 2020.
- [5] (2020, Nov.) COVID-19 dashboard by the center for systems science and engineering (csse). John Hopkins University. [Online]. Available: <https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/map.html>
- [6] S. Walvekar, D. Shinde *et al.*, "Detection of COVID-19 from CT images using resnet50," *Detection of COVID-19 from CT Images Using resnet50 (May 30, 2020)*, 2020.
- [7] H. Sotoudeh, M. Tabatabaei, B. Tasorian, K. Tavakol, E. Sotoudeh, and A. L. Moini, "Artificial intelligence empowers radiologists to differentiate pneumonia induced by COVID-19 versus influenza viruses," *Acta Informatica Medica*, vol. 28, no. 3, p. 190, 2020.
- [8] M. Yildirim and A. Cinar, "A deep learning based hybrid approach for COVID-19 disease detections," *Traitement du Signal*, vol. 37, no. 3, pp. 461–468, 2020.
- [9] A. Chang, G. Redding, and M. Everard, "Chronic wet cough: protracted bronchitis, chronic suppurative lung disease and bronchiectasis," *Pediatric Pulmonology*, vol. 43, no. 6, pp. 519–531, 2008.
- [10] T. Higenbottam, "Chronic cough and the cough reflex in common lung diseases," *Pulmonary pharmacology & therapeutics*, vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 241–247, 2002.
- [11] K. F. Chung and I. D. Pavord, "Prevalence, pathogenesis, and causes of chronic cough," *The Lancet*, vol. 371, no. 9621, pp. 1364–1374, 2008.
- [12] J. Korpáš, J. Sadloňová, and M. Vrabec, "Analysis of the cough sound: an overview," *Pulmonary Pharmacology*, vol. 9, no. 5–6, pp. 261–268, 1996.
- [13] J. Knocikova, J. Korpas, M. Vrabec, and M. Javorka, "Wavelet analysis of voluntary cough sound in patients with respiratory diseases," *Journal of Physiology and Pharmacology*, vol. 59, no. Suppl 6, pp. 331–40, 2008.
- [14] G. Botha, G. Theron, R. Warren, M. Klopper, K. Dheda, P. Van Helden, and T. Niesler, "Detection of tuberculosis by automatic cough sound analysis," *Physiological Measurement*, vol. 39, no. 4, p. 045005, 2018.
- [15] M. Al-khassawneh and R. Bani Abdelrahman, "A signal processing approach for the diagnosis of asthma from cough sounds," *Journal of Medical Engineering & Technology*, vol. 37, no. 3, pp. 165–171, 2013.
- [16] R. X. A. Pramono, S. A. Imtiaz, and E. Rodriguez-Villegas, "A cough-based algorithm for automatic diagnosis of pertussis," *PloS one*, vol. 11, no. 9, p. e0162128, 2016.
- [17] A. Windmon, M. Minakshi, P. Bharti, S. Chellappan, M. Johansson, B. A. Jenkins, and P. R. Athilingam, "Tussiswatch: A smart-phone system to identify cough episodes as early symptoms of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease and congestive heart failure," *IEEE Journal of Biomedical and Health Informatics*, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 1566–1573, 2018.
- [18] R. V. Sharan, U. R. Abeyratne, V. R. Swarnkar, and P. Porter, "Automatic croup diagnosis using cough sound recognition," *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering*, vol. 66, no. 2, pp. 485–495, 2018.
- [19] G. Rudraraju, S. Palreddy, B. Mamidgi, N. R. Sripada, Y. P. Sai, N. K. Vodnala, and S. P. Haranath, "Cough sound analysis and objective correlation with spirometry and clinical diagnosis," *Informatics in Medicine Unlocked*, p. 100319, 2020.
- [20] G. Deshpande and B. Schuller, "An overview on audio, signal, speech, & language processing for COVID-19," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.08579*, 2020.
- [21] A. N. Belkacem, S. Ouhbi, A. Lakas, E. Benkhelifa, and C. Chen, "End-to-end ai-based point-of-care diagnosis system for classifying respiratory illnesses and early detection of COVID-19," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.15469*, 2020.
- [22] B. W. Schuller, D. M. Schuller, K. Qian, J. Liu, H. Zheng, and X. Li, "COVID-19 and computer audition: An overview on what speech & sound analysis could contribute in the sars-cov-2 corona crisis," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.11117*, 2020.
- [23] C. Brown, J. Chauhan, A. Grammenos, J. Han, A. Hasthanasombat, D. Spathis, T. Xia, P. Cicuta, and C. Mascolo, "Exploring automatic diagnosis of COVID-19 from crowdsourced respiratory sound data," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.05919*, 2020.
- [24] A. Imran, I. Posokhova, H. N. Qureshi, U. Masood, S. Riaz, K. Ali, C. N. John, and M. Nabeel, "AI4COVID-19: AI enabled preliminary diagnosis for COVID-19 from cough samples via an app," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.01275*, 2020.
- [25] A. Pal and M. Sankarasubbu, "Pay attention to the cough: Early diagnosis of COVID-19 using interpretable symptoms embeddings with cough sound signal processing," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.02417*, 2020.
- [26] P. Bagad, A. Dalmia, J. Doshi, A. Nagrani, P. Bhamare, A. Mahale, S. Rane, N. Agarwal, and R. Panicker, "Cough against COVID: Evidence of COVID-19 signature in cough sounds," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.08790*, 2020.
- [27] J. Laguarda, F. Hueto, and B. Subirana, "COVID-19 artificial intelligence diagnosis using only cough recordings," *IEEE Open Journal of Engineering in Medicine and Biology*, 2020.
- [28] M. Cohen-McFarlane, R. Goubran, and F. Knoefel, "Novel coronavirus cough database: Nococoda," *IEEE Access*, vol. 8, pp. 154087–154094, 2020.
- [29] N. Sharma, P. Krishnan, R. Kumar, S. Ramoji, S. R. Chetupalli, P. K. Ghosh, S. Ganapathy *et al.*, "Coswara—a database of breathing, cough, and voice sounds for COVID-19 diagnosis," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.10548*, 2020.
- [30] J. Van Hulse, T. M. Khoshgoftaar, and A. Napolitano, "Experimental perspectives on learning from imbalanced data," in *Proceedings of the 24th international conference on Machine learning*, 2007, pp. 935–942.
- [31] B. Krawczyk, "Learning from imbalanced data: open challenges and future directions," *Progress in Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 221–232, 2016.
- [32] N. V. Chawla, K. W. Bowyer, L. O. Hall, and W. P. Kegelmeyer, "Smote: synthetic minority over-sampling technique," *Journal of artificial intelligence research*, vol. 16, pp. 321–357, 2002.
- [33] G. Lemaître, F. Nogueira, and C. K. Aridas, "Imbalanced-learn: A python toolbox to tackle the curse of imbalanced datasets in machine learning," *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 559–563, 2017.
- [34] L. L. Blagus, R., "Smote for high-dimensional class-imbalanced data," *BMC Bioinformatics*, vol. 14, p. 106, 2013.
- [35] H. Han, W.-Y. Wang, and B.-H. Mao, "Borderline-smote: a new over-sampling method in imbalanced data sets learning," in *International conference on intelligent computing*. Springer, 2005, pp. 878–887.
- [36] H. M. Nguyen, E. W. Cooper, and K. Kamei, "Borderline over-sampling for imbalanced data classification," *International Journal of Knowledge Engineering and Soft Data Paradigms*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 4–21, 2011.
- [37] H. He, Y. Bai, E. A. Garcia, and S. Li, "Adasyn: Adaptive synthetic sampling approach for imbalanced learning," in *2008 IEEE international joint conference on neural networks (IEEE world congress on computational intelligence)*. IEEE, 2008, pp. 1322–1328.
- [38] Wei Han, Cheong-Fat Chan, Chiu-Sing Choy, and Kong-Pang Pun, "An efficient MFCC extraction method in speech recognition," in *IEEE International Symposium on Circuits and Systems*, 2006.
- [39] H. Chatzarrin, A. Arcelus, R. Goubran, and F. Knoefel, "Feature extraction for the differentiation of dry and wet cough sounds," in *IEEE International Symposium on Medical Measurements and Applications*. IEEE, 2011.
- [40] S. Aydın, H. M. Saraoglu, and S. Kara, "Log energy entropy-based eeg classification with multilayer neural networks in seizure," *Annals of biomedical engineering*, vol. 37, no. 12, p. 2626, 2009.
- [41] R. Bachu, S. Kopparthi, B. Adapa, and B. D. Barkana, "Voiced/unvoiced decision for speech signals based on zero-crossing rate and energy," in *Advanced techniques in computing sciences and software engineering*. Springer, 2010, pp. 279–282.

- [42] L. T. DeCarlo, "On the meaning and use of kurtosis," *Psychological methods*, vol. 2, no. 3, p. 292, 1997.
- [43] E. Christodoulou, J. Ma, G. S. Collins, E. W. Steyerberg, J. Y. Verbakel, and B. Van Calster, "A systematic review shows no performance benefit of machine learning over logistic regression for clinical prediction models," *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, vol. 110, pp. 12–22, 2019.
- [44] S. Le Cessie and J. C. Van Houwelingen, "Ridge estimators in logistic regression," *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series C (Applied Statistics)*, vol. 41, no. 1, pp. 191–201, 1992.
- [45] Y. Tsuruoka, J. Tsujii, and S. Ananiadou, "Stochastic gradient descent training for l1-regularized log-linear models with cumulative penalty," in *Proceedings of the Joint Conference of the 47th Annual Meeting of the ACL and the 4th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing of the AFNLP*, 2009, pp. 477–485.
- [46] H. Yamashita and H. Yabe, "An interior point method with a primal-dual quadratic barrier penalty function for nonlinear optimization," *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 479–499, 2003.
- [47] V. Bhateja, A. Taqee, and D. K. Sharma, "Pre-processing and classification of cough sounds in noisy environment using svm," in *2019 4th International Conference on Information Systems and Computer Networks (ISCON)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 822–826.
- [48] B. H. Tracey, G. Comina, S. Larson, M. Bravard, J. W. López, and R. H. Gilman, "Cough detection algorithm for monitoring patient recovery from pulmonary tuberculosis," in *2011 Annual international conference of the IEEE engineering in medicine and biology society*. IEEE, 2011, pp. 6017–6020.
- [49] R. V. Sharan, U. R. Abeyratne, V. R. Swarnkar, and P. Porter, "Cough sound analysis for diagnosing croup in pediatric patients using biologically inspired features," in *2017 39th Annual International Conference of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society (EMBC)*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 4578–4581.
- [50] H. Taud and J. Mas, "Multilayer perceptron (mlp)," in *Geomatic Approaches for Modeling Land Change Scenarios*. Springer, 2018, pp. 451–455.
- [51] L. Sarangi, M. N. Mohanty, and S. Pattanayak, "Design of mlp based model for analysis of patient suffering from influenza," *Procedia Computer Science*, vol. 92, pp. 396–403, 2016.
- [52] J.-M. Liu, M. You, Z. Wang, G.-Z. Li, X. Xu, and Z. Qiu, "Cough detection using deep neural networks," in *2014 IEEE International Conference on Bioinformatics and Biomedicine (BIBM)*. IEEE, 2014, pp. 560–563.
- [53] J. Amoh and K. Odame, "Deepcough: A deep convolutional neural network in a wearable cough detection system," in *2015 IEEE Biomedical Circuits and Systems Conference (BioCAS)*. IEEE, 2015, pp. 1–4.
- [54] A. Krizhevsky, I. Sutskever, and G. E. Hinton, "Imagenet classification with deep convolutional neural networks," *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 60, no. 6, pp. 84–90, 2017.
- [55] S. Lawrence, C. L. Giles, A. C. Tsoi, and A. D. Back, "Face recognition: A convolutional neural-network approach," *IEEE transactions on neural networks*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 98–113, 1997.
- [56] S. Albawi, T. A. Mohammed, and S. Al-Zawi, "Understanding of a convolutional neural network," in *2017 International Conference on Engineering and Technology (ICET)*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 1–6.
- [57] X. Qi, T. Wang, and J. Liu, "Comparison of support vector machine and softmax classifiers in computer vision," in *2017 Second International Conference on Mechanical, Control and Computer Engineering (ICMCCE)*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 151–155.
- [58] S. Hochreiter and J. Schmidhuber, "Long short-term memory," *Neural computation*, vol. 9, no. 8, pp. 1735–1780, 1997.
- [59] I. D. Miranda, A. H. Diacon, and T. R. Niesler, "A comparative study of features for acoustic cough detection using deep architectures," in *2019 41st Annual International Conference of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society (EMBC)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 2601–2605.
- [60] E. Marchi, F. Vesperini, F. Weninger, F. Eyben, S. Squartini, and B. Schuller, "Non-linear prediction with lstm recurrent neural networks for acoustic novelty detection," in *2015 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN)*. IEEE, 2015, pp. 1–7.
- [61] J. Amoh and K. Odame, "Deep neural networks for identifying cough sounds," *IEEE transactions on biomedical circuits and systems*, vol. 10, no. 5, pp. 1003–1011, 2016.
- [62] A. Sherstinsky, "Fundamentals of recurrent neural network (rnn) and long short-term memory (lstm) network," *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena*, vol. 404, p. 132306, 2020.
- [63] K. He, X. Zhang, S. Ren, and J. Sun, "Deep residual learning for image recognition," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2016, pp. 770–778.
- [64] T.-Y. Lin, M. Maire, S. Belongie, J. Hays, P. Perona, D. Ramanan, P. Dollár, and C. L. Zitnick, "Microsoft coco: Common objects in context," in *European conference on computer vision*. Springer, 2014, pp. 740–755.
- [65] J. Laguarda, F. Hueto, P. Rajasekaran, S. Sarma, and B. Subirana, "Longitudinal speech biomarkers for automated alzheimer's detection," 2020.
- [66] S. Liu, "Leave-p-out cross-validation test for uncertain verhulst-pearl model with imprecise observations," *IEEE Access*, vol. 7, pp. 131 705–131 709, 2019.
- [67] T. Fawcett, "An introduction to ROC analysis," *Pattern Recognition Letters*, vol. 27, no. 8, pp. 861–874, 2006.
- [68] P. A. Devijver and J. Kittler, *Pattern recognition: A statistical approach*. Prentice Hall, 1982.



Madhurananda Pahar received his BSc in Mathematics from University of Calcutta, India; MSc in Computing for Financial Markets & PhD in Computational Neuroscience from University of Stirling, Scotland. Currently he is working as a post-doctoral fellow in the University of Stellenbosch, South Africa. His research interests are in machine learning and signal processing for audio signals and smart sensors in bio-medicine such as detection and classification of TB and COVID-19 coughs in real-world environment.



Marisa Klopfer is a researcher at the Division of Molecular Biology and Human Genetics of Stellenbosch University, South Africa. She holds a PhD in Molecular Biology from Stellenbosch University and her research interest is in TB and drug-resistant TB diagnosis, epidemiology and physiology. She has been involved in cough classification for the last 6 years, with application to TB and more recently COVID-19.



Robin Warren is the Unit Director of the South African Medical Research Council's Centre for Tuberculosis Research and Distinguished Professor at Stellenbosch University. He has a B2 rating by the National Research Council (NRF) and is a core member of the DSI-NRF Centre of Excellence for Biomedical Tuberculosis Research and head the TB Genomics research thrust. He has published over 320 papers in the field of TB and have an average H-index of 65.



Thomas Niesler obtained the B.Eng (1991) and M.Eng (1993) degrees in Electronic Engineering from the University of Stellenbosch, South Africa and a Ph.D. from the University of Cambridge, England, in 1998. He joined the Department of Engineering, University of Cambridge, as a lecturer in 1998 and subsequently the Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering, University of Stellenbosch, in 2000, where he has been Professor since 2012. His research interests lie in the areas of signal processing, pattern recognition and machine learning.