

Smartphone Movement Sensors for Remote Monitoring of Respiratory Rate: Observational Study

Sophie Valentine¹, Benjamin Klasmer¹, Mohammad Dabbah¹, Marko Balabanovic¹, David Plans^{1, 2*}

1: Huma Therapeutics, 13-14th Floor, Millbank Tower, 21-24 Millbank, London SW1P 4QP, UK.

2: Department of Science, Innovation, Technology and Entrepreneurship, University of Exeter, Rennes Drive, Exeter, EX4 4PU, UK.

***Address Correspondence to:** David Plans, PhD, Huma Therapeutics Ltd, London, United Kingdom [david.plans@psy.ox.ac.uk], +44 7527016574

Keywords: Smartphone; Mobile phone; mHealth; Digital health; Mobile apps; Remote monitoring; Respiratory rate; Gyroscope; Sensors; Accuracy; Usability; Software validation.

Short Title: Smartphone Based Remote Monitoring of Respiratory Rate.

Funding: This research was funded by Huma Therapeutics Ltd.

Conflict of Interest: SV, BK, MD, MB, DP, are or were employees of Huma Therapeutics Ltd at the time of writing.

Abstract

Background: Mobile health offers potential benefits to patients and healthcare systems alike.

Existing remote technologies to measure respiratory rate (RR) have limitations, such as cost, accessibility and reliability. Using smartphone sensors to measure RR may offer a potential solution.

Objective: The aim of this study was to conduct a comprehensive assessment of a novel mHealth smartphone application designed to measure RR using movement sensors.

Methods: In Study 1, 15 participants simultaneously measured their RR with the app, and an FDA cleared reference device. A novel reference method to allow the app to be evaluated ‘in the wild’ was also developed. In Study 2, 165 participants measured their RR using the app, and these measures were compared to the novel reference. Usability of the app was also assessed in both studies.

Results: The app, when compared to the FDA-cleared and novel references, respectively, showed a mean absolute error (MAE) of 1.65 (SD=1.49) and 1.14 (1.44), relative MAE of 12.2 (9.23) and 9.5 (18.70) and bias of 0.81 (limits of agreement (LoA) =-3.27-4.89) and 0.08 (-3.68-3.51). Pearson correlation coefficients were 0.700 and 0.885. 93% of participants successfully operated the app on their first use.

Conclusions: The accuracy and usability of the app demonstrated here show promise for the use of mHealth solutions employing smartphone sensors to remotely monitor RR. Further research should validate the benefits that this technology may offer patients and healthcare systems.

Introduction

Extensive growth in the development and adoption of remote healthcare tools has been seen in recent years in response to increasing demand for traditional offerings. Notably, the COVID-19 global health pandemic has made salient how these mobile health (mHealth) tools may support healthcare systems to manage their patients when resources are pushed to breaking point.¹⁻³ As more widely accessible tools can be used by more people - and therefore offer greater impact - many mHealth smartphone applications (apps) have been developed, due to the high global penetration of smartphones. These systems offer a wide variety of services from telemedicine to remote monitoring and self-care, and evidence suggests they may produce improved economic⁴ and health outcomes.⁵

Respiratory rate (RR) is a fundamental indicator of health status for many health conditions, both general and specific to the respiratory system.⁶⁻¹¹ As such, mHealth solutions for monitoring of RR may offer significant value to patients and healthcare professionals (HCPs) alike. Although several such solutions exist, many fall short on various factors. Hardware-based solutions, including piezoelectric sensors¹² pulse oximeters,¹³ and multi-sensor devices,¹⁴⁻¹⁵ are typically expensive, vulnerable to limited means of manufacture and distribution,¹⁶ and may lack interoperability with other health records, which is cited as a critical risk to decentralisation of national healthcare systems.¹⁷ Software-based solutions address limitations of cost, manufacture and distribution; however, they typically employ less-stable mechanisms of action. These mHealth apps often use smartphone cameras or microphones,¹⁸⁻²⁰ the latter of which have been evidenced to be vulnerable to environmental noise at the cost of accuracy and usability.²¹⁻²²

Movement sensors may present a promising alternative software-based solution for mHealth RR monitoring. Research indicates that multi-axial accelerometers and gyroscopes - as found ubiquitously in modern smartphones - can accurately capture RR based on chest movements.²³⁻³⁰ Additionally, due to their mechanism of action, these sensors are significantly less affected by environmental noise. Overall, smartphone-based measurement of RR provides a potential low cost, and widely available method for RR measurement, both in a remote monitoring environment, or in locations where specialised hardware and software are not available.

This article presents an observational assessment of a novel user-centric mHealth smartphone app that measures RR using smartphone movement sensors. We first conducted a preliminary evaluation of the device and study methods via a small lab-based study, then jointly assessed accuracy and usability on a greater scale and ecological valid environment via a remote study. Ethical approval was provided by the University of Exeter's Research Ethics Board (application ID eUEBS004088) and all research was conducted in compliance with the Declaration of Helsinki.

Study 1

Methods

The preliminary evaluation pursued three aims: (1) to establish the accuracy of the novel mHealth smartphone app relative to a reference device cleared by the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA), (2) to understand the usability of the mHealth app and (3) to evaluate the suitability of a novel reference method that would permit accuracy assessments to be conducted via remote and real-world studies. Through a prospective, non-interventional, non-

randomised study conducted on healthy volunteers, RR estimates provided by the FDA-cleared reference device were compared to those from the novel mHealth smartphone app and the novel reference.

Measurements

Novel mHealth smartphone app

The mHealth app contained a purpose-built user interface (Figure 1). The user is instructed to hold their smartphone to their upper-middle chest with the screen facing outwards while sitting still and breathing normally for the duration of the 30-second sensor recording. Data is captured from the smartphone's tri-axial gyroscope and interpolated to achieve an even 100Hz sample frequency. A low-pass Butterworth filter with 0.4 Hz cut-off is applied to remove high-frequency noise while retaining activity associated with breathing, typically in the 0.16-0.33Hz range (10-20 breaths per minute (BPM)). RR is calculated by performing an autocorrelation before normalising the resulting signal. A peak-finding routine then identifies prominent peaks corresponding to the cyclical property of breathing movements. The mean inter-peak interval (IPI) is then calculated and converted to a 'per minute' RR estimation by division by 60 (seconds) (Figure 2).




Figure 1. Selected wireframes from the user interface of the mHealth app, depicting (from left to right) an option given to the user to view operation instructions in video or written format, an instruction for the user to hold their smartphone to their chest, a clinical safety feature allowing the user to retake a recording if they were disturbed while taking the original recording, and feedback given to the user if their recording fails the signal check.




Figure 2. Graphical depiction of peak finding following application of an autocorrelation method. The grey line shows an example of correlation coefficients for a movement sensor (gyroscope) signal correlated with itself at progressive temporal shifts. Black crosses indicate prominent peaks corresponding to the cyclical property of breathing movements. IPIs are depicted by d_i .

An additional ‘signal check’ routine assesses whether the signal quality is sufficient to accurately derive RR, based on whether the number of autocorrelation peaks or standard deviation (SD) of the individual IPIs meet predetermined thresholds identified via preliminary bench-testing. If a recording fails the signal check, the user is informed via the app’s UI, redirected to the operation instructions and prompted to try again. Passing the signal check within three recordings attempts constitutes a successful use of the system, and three consecutive signal check failures constitute an unsuccessful use of the system, after which the user is instructed to seek support or try again later.

FDA-cleared reference

The *MightySat Rx*¹³, developed by Masimo Corporation, was selected as a reference due to its FDA-cleared status, continuous measurement and ease of use. The fingertip pulse oximeter derives RR using photoplethysmography (an optical measure of volumetric changes in peripheral blood flow). Continuous estimates of RR produced by this reference were converted to single weighted averages to facilitate comparison with data derived from the mHealth app.

Novel reference

The novel reference method involves identification of repeated cyclical peak-trough complexes within smartphone movement sensor signals (Figure 3). Signals of insufficient quality to derive RR are considered to fail the reference method. This method is conceptually similar to reference methods described in peer-reviewed literature reporting accuracy assessments of multiple RR devices, including successful FDA market clearance applications.^{13; 31-33} This method would permit accuracy assessments to be conducted via remote and real-world studies without a need for additional hardware, offering significant value in terms of research scale, cost and ecological validity via avoidance of observation bias.




Figure 3. Graphical depiction of the novel reference method involving visual inspection of smartphone movement sensor signals by trained clinical and scientific researchers. The grey solid line shows an example of a smartphone movement sensor (gyroscope) signal, with black solid arrows depicting nine full repeated cyclical peak-trough complexes. The grey dotted line indicates the projected continuation of the movement sensor signal past the end of the

recording period, with the grey dashed arrow indicating where a tenth full peak-trough complex would end. Hence, the movement sensor signal depicts a total of approximately 9.75 peak-trough complexes, with the final .75 peak-trough complex indicated by the black dashed arrow.

Participants and recruitment

Participants were recruited via convenience sampling. All were employees of the mHealth app manufacturer. Inclusion criteria included being aged 18 or over and being willing and able to follow the study protocol and complete an informed consent form.

Procedure

The study took place at the offices of the mHealth app manufacturer. Participants were provided with complete information concerning the study procedures and gave written informed consent to participate. The FDA-cleared reference device was applied to the forefinger of the participant's left hand. Participants were provided with an iPhone XR with the mHealth app installed and received verbal instructions on operating the device: namely, to hold the smartphone to their upper middle chest with the screen facing outwards while sitting still and breathing normally during the 30-second recording. Participants were instructed to capture six recordings, disregarding whether each recording passed or failed the signal check. Audiovisual footage was captured during the study and used for offline synchronisation of data captured via the mHealth app and FDA-cleared reference. Specifically, this included sounds produced by the mHealth app indicating the start and end of the app's recording period and depicting RR estimates displayed on the FDA-cleared reference's monitor. Participation took around 10 minutes per participant.

Statistics

The error of the mHealth app and novel reference relative to the FDA-cleared reference was assessed through measures of mean absolute error (MAE), relative MAE and using the Bland-Altman method.³⁴ Due to the non-normal distribution of absolute error data, confidence intervals for MAE and relative MAE were derived via bootstrapping with replacement employing 1000-iterations and a sample size of 100%. The proportion of clinically significant errors, defined as an absolute error greater than three breaths per minute,³⁵⁻³⁶ was also calculated. Direct relationships between RR estimates generated through the mHealth app, novel reference and FDA-cleared reference were assessed via Pearson Product Moment Correlation (PPMC). The usability of the mHealth app was assessed using the proportion and position of recordings that failed the signal check.

Results

Participants and data

15 participants took part in Study 1 (9 female), for whom 6 recordings each were collected for a total of 90. 26 (28%) mHealth app recordings failed the signal check and were excluded from analyses, resulting in a dataset of 64 paired samples. 29 (32%) of recordings failed the novel reference method, so were excluded from analyses, resulting in a dataset of 61 paired samples.

Accuracy

mHealth app versus FDA-cleared reference

Error results indicated an MAE of 1.65 BPM (SD = 1.49) with a 95% confidence interval (CI) of 1.32-2.06. Relative MAE was 12.2% (SD = 9.23) with 95% CI of 10.06 - 14.57. Bias (FDA-cleared reference - mHealth app) was 0.81 (SD = 2.08) with limits of agreement (LoA) of -3.27 - 4.89, indicating RR underestimation by the mHealth app. 8 comparisons (12.5%)

had an absolute error greater than 3 BPM. A Bland-Altman plot indicated error values as a function of RR averaged between the reference and mHealth app (Figure 4). PPMC produced a coefficient of $r(63) = 0.700$, $p < .000$, indicating a high or strong association between the reference RR estimates and mHealth app RR estimate³⁷ (Figure 5).




Figure 4. Bland-Altman plot for RR estimates provided by the mHealth app and FDA-cleared reference. The x-axis indicates RR estimates averaged between the mHealth app and FDA-cleared reference and the y-axis indicates the difference between RR estimates from each source (FDA-cleared reference - mHealth app). The solid horizontal line depicts a mean difference (bias) of 0 and dashed lines from top to bottom represent the upper limit of agreement (4.89), the observed mean difference (bias; 0.81), and the lower limit of agreement (-3.27). Marker size is proportional to the number of observations for each combination of values.




Figure 5. Scatterplot for simultaneous RR estimates provided by the mHealth app (x-axis) and FDA-cleared reference (y-axis). The solid line indicates the gradient $y=x$. Marker size is proportional to the number of observations for each combination of values.

Novel reference versus FDA-cleared reference

Error results indicated that MAE was 1.69 BPM (SD = 1.61) with a 95% CI of 1.23 - 2.22.

Relative MAE was 12.8% (SD = 11.60) with 95% CI of 9.96 - 15.64. Bias (FDA-cleared reference - novel reference) was 0.22 (SD = 2.34) with LoA of -4.36 - 4.79, indicating slight RR underestimation by the mHealth app. 9 comparisons (15%) had an absolute error greater than 3 BPM. A Bland-Altman plot indicated error values as a function of RR averaged between the FDA-cleared and novel references (Figure 6). PPMC produced a coefficient of $r(59) = 0.701$, $p < .000$, indicating a high or strong association³⁷ (Figure 7).




Figure 6. Bland-Altman plot for RR estimates provided by the novel reference and FDA-cleared reference. The x-axis indicates RR estimates averaged between the novel and FDA-cleared references and the y-axis indicates the difference between RR estimates from each source (FDA-cleared reference - novel reference). The solid horizontal line depicts a mean difference (bias) of 0 and dashed lines from top to bottom represent the upper limit of agreement (4.79), the observed mean difference (bias; 0.22), and the lower limit of agreement (-4.36). Marker size is proportional to the number of observations for each combination of values.




Figure 7. Scatterplot for simultaneous RR estimates provided by the novel reference (x-axis) and FDA-cleared reference (y-axis). The solid line indicates the gradient $y=x$. Marker size is proportional to the number of observations for each combination of values.

Usability

14 of a total of 15 participants (93.3%) were able to use the system successfully on their first try (Table 1; Figure 8). Specifically, this indicates that they could capture one or more recordings that passed the signal check within the first three attempts. All participants were able to use the system successfully by the end of their second try.

Table 1. Number and proportion of participants able to use the system successfully on consecutive attempts in Study 1 (n = 15).

Use of system, n (%)	Recording attempt			
	1st	2nd	3rd	Total
First	11 (73.3)	12 (80.0)	10 (66.7)	14 (93.3)
Second	12 (80.0)	8 (53.3)	11 (73.3)	15 (100)




Figure 8. Line graph indicating the proportion of Study 1 participants who were able to generate a recording that passed the signal check on each of six consecutive recording attempts. The black dashed line indicates the proportion of individuals who were able to generate a recording that passed the signal check by the end of their first use of the system

(three consecutive recordings), and the grey dashed line indicates the proportion of individuals who were able to do so by the end of their second use of the system.

Interim conclusion

Study 1 results indicated strong relationships between the FDA-cleared reference and both the mHealth app and the novel reference. Notably, these relationships were highly comparable to functional outcomes for alternative FDA-cleared RR monitoring devices.^{12, 14, 36, 38} Accordingly, these results supported both continued assessment of the mHealth app and application of the novel reference to accuracy analyses in Study 2, as described below.

Study 2

Methods

Study 2 aimed to establish the accuracy of the mHealth app ‘in the wild’ via remote data capture, compared to the novel reference validated in the Study 1. The usability of the mHealth app was additionally assessed in a larger sample. Measures and statistics were as described for Study 1.

Participants and recruitment

Participants were recruited via an online research platform, with study enrollment controlled to ensure a proportionate distribution of age, gender and smartphone ownership (iOS versus Android). Inclusion criteria included being aged 18 or over, having access to a smartphone of minimum requirements to download the mHealth app and being willing and able to follow the study protocol and complete an informed consent form. As researchers would not monitor participants during their participation, additional safety criteria excluded individuals who were pregnant, breastfeeding, had a pacemaker, or a chest or spine problem that could affect their breathing.

Procedure

Participants were directed to online documentation containing full information about the study procedures before completing an online eConsent procedure. They then completed a baseline questionnaire concerning their demographics, including age, sex, ethnicity, height and weight, before receiving instructions to download and activate the mHealth app.

Participants were requested to follow instructions provided within the mHealth app to capture 10 RR recordings, including recordings that both passed and failed the signal check, before completing a System Usability Scale (SUS)³⁹ and providing separate qualitative feedback on their experience using the mHealth app. Study-specific procedures took approximately 20 minutes, for which participants were reimbursed £2.50 through the research platform.

Results

Participants and data

165 participants enrolled in the study, of whom 152 completed the baseline questionnaire concerning their demographics (Table 2). Medical conditions reported included asthma (respiratory), arthritis and Parkinson's disease (movement). 5 participants were excluded due to significant deviation from the study protocol, resulting in a participant cohort of 160, for whom a mode of 11 mHealth app recordings each was captured. 987 recordings passed the signal check and were included in accuracy analyses. Recordings were submitted from 64 unique smartphone models, 46 (71.9%) of which were Android and the rest were iPhone models.

Table 2. Demographic characteristics for Study 2 participants ($n = 152$).

Characteristic	Female ($n = 67$)	Male ($n = 85$)	Total ($n = 152$)
Age in years, mean (SD, range)	43.5 (14.85, 18-73)	40.7 (14.70, 19-69)	41.9 (14.78, 18-73)
Weight in kg, mean (SD, range)	70.2 (19.45, 47-159)	87.9 (22.31, 52-203)	80.1 (22.08, 47-203)
Height in m, mean (SD, range)	1.66 (0.108, 1.45-2.16)	1.78 (0.660, 1.56-1.93)	1.73 (1.061, 1.45-2.16)
BMI in kg/m^2 , mean (SD, range)	25.4 (6.28, 17.8-58.4)	27.7 (6.80, 17.4-62.5)	26.7 (6.65, 17.4-62.7)
Ethnicity, n (%)			
White	57 (85.1)	72 (84.7)	129 (84.9)
Asian	4 (6.0)	7 (8.2)	11 (7.2)
Black	3 (4.5)	2 (2.4)	5 (3.3)
Mixed/multiple	3 (4.5)	4 (4.7)	7 (4.6)
Medical conditions, n (%)			
Respiratory disorder	9 (13.4)	7 (8.2)	16 (10.5)
Movement disorder	2 (3.0)	0 (0)	2 (1.3)
Cognitive disorder	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

Accuracy

Error results indicated an MAE of 1.14 BPM (SD = 1.44) with a 95% CI of 1.02 - 1.26. Relative MAE was 9.5% (SD = 18.70) with 95% CI of 8.38 - 10.72. Bias (novel reference – mHealth app) was 0.08 (SD = 1.84) with LoA of -3.68 - 3.51, indicating slight RR underestimation by the mHealth app. 61 comparisons (6.2%) had an absolute error greater than 3 BPM. A Bland-Altman plot indicated error values as a function of RR averaged between the reference and mHealth app (Figure 9). PPMC produced a coefficient of $r(986) = 0.855$, $p < .000$, indicating a high or strong association³⁷ (Figure 10).




Figure 9. Bland-Altman plot for RR estimates provided by the mHealth app and novel reference. The x-axis indicates RR estimates averaged between the mHealth app and novel reference and the y-axis indicates the difference between RR estimates from each source (novel reference - mHealth app). The solid horizontal line depicts a mean difference (bias) of 0 and dashed lines from top to bottom represent the upper limit of agreement (3.51), the observed mean difference (bias; 0.08), and the lower limit of agreement (-3.68). Marker size is proportional to the number of observations for each combination of values.




Figure 10. Scatterplot for simultaneous RR estimates provided by the mHealth app (x-axis) and novel reference (y-axis). The solid line indicates the gradient $y=x$. Marker size is proportional to the number of observations for each combination of values.

Usability

149 (93.1%) of a total of 160 participants who captured mHealth app recordings were able to use the system successfully on their first try (Table 3; Figure 11). 155 (96.9%) did so by their second try.

Table 3. Number and proportion of participants able to use the system successfully on consecutive attempts in Study 2 ($n = 160$).

Use of system, n (%)	Recording attempt			
	1st	2nd	3rd	Total
First	102 (63.8)	117 (74.1)	119 (77.3)	149 (93.1)
Second	102 (66.2)	104 (68.4)	105 (70.0)	155 (96.9)




Figure 11. Line graph indicating the proportion of Study 2 participants who were able to generate a recording that passed the signal check on each of ten consecutive recording attempts. The black dashed line indicates the proportion of individuals who were able to generate a recording that passed the signal check by the end of their first use of the system (three consecutive recordings), and the grey dashed line indicates the proportion of individuals who were able to do so by the end of their second use of the system.

The mean SUS score was 73.2 (SD = 5.39). Of the sub-scales, each scored between 0 and 4, those most agreed with by participants were: *I would imagine that most people would learn to use this system very quickly* (3.2), *I thought the system was easy to use* (3.1) and *I felt very confident using the system* (3.0). The lowest scoring, indicating participant disagreement, were: *I think that I would need the support of a technical person to be able to use this system* (0.5) and *I needed to learn a lot of things before I could get going with this system* (0.8).

Discussion

Principal findings

To the authors' knowledge, this is the first study to assess at scale a user-operated novel mHealth smartphone application designed to capture a user's RR using smartphone movement sensors, considering both accuracy and usability in an ecologically valid study environment. Outcomes for the mHealth app were highly comparable to results published for medical devices available on the market today (Table 4). In addition, as changes in breathing rate greater than 3 BPM may indicate clinical deterioration³⁵⁻³⁶, observations that error values for the mHealth app were typically less than this threshold suggest the device may carry low clinical risk. Study 2 revealed a small cluster of substantial overestimation errors (5-10 BPM) for lower RRs (8-14 BPM). Although this observation was not found in the Study 1, this may be due to the smaller sample size in that analysis. The nature of these overestimations is unclear based on the present analyses. Overestimation of RR carries clinical risk with regard to both underdiagnosis of bradypnea (low RR) and overdiagnosis of tachypnea (elevated RR) that may lead to clinical decision making based on misinformation, although it should be noted that RR is rarely used in isolation to inform clinical decision making. Future research should seek to identify and mitigate the cause of these errors.

Table 4. Comparison of mHealth app results to alternative devices available on the market today.

Comparison	MAE (SD, 95% CI)	Relative MAE (SD, 95% CI)	Bias (SD, LoA)	Correlation coefficient
mHealth app				
Compared to FDA-cleared reference	1.65 (1.49, 1.32 - 2.06)	12.2 (9.23, 10.06 - 14.57)	0.81 (2.08, - 3.27 - 4.89)	0.700
Compared to novel reference	1.14 (1.44, 1.02 - 1.26)	9.5 (18.70, 8.38 - 10.72)	0.08 (1.84, - 3.68 - 3.51)	0.885
Respirasense (PDM Solutions)				
Compared to capnography ¹²	-	-	0.38 (N/A, N/A, -1.0 - 1.8)	-
Compared to manual count ¹²	-	-	-0.70 (N/A, N/A, -4.9 - 3.5)	-
Compared to electrocardiogram ³⁶	-	-	-0.41 (1.79, - 0.73 - -0.08, - 3.9 - 3.1)	0.84
Compared to manual count ³⁶	-	-	-0.58 (2.5, - 1.04 - -0.12, - 5.5 - 4.3)	0.78
BioStamp nPoint (MC10) compared to capnography ¹⁴	1.3 (2.1, N/A)	-	-0.29 (N/A, N/A, -5.17 - 4.59)	0.697
Rad-87 (Masimo) compared to capnography ³⁸	-	10 (9, 7-13)	-	-

Concerning usability, most participants could successfully operate the mHealth app on their first or second use of the system. Although no industry standards for successful operation exist, results observed here appeared to be broadly similar to values that could be estimated from available literature regarding other physiological measurement mHealth apps, which were typically in the range of 95% or higher.⁴⁰⁻⁴² Subjective usability outcomes were also promising, with an overall SUS score well above the industry average of 68.⁴³ Study 2 revealed a general trend of high signal check pass rates for later sequential recording

attempts, suggesting that participants found it easier to capture RR recordings the more they used the mHealth app. Although this learning effect was not observed in the Study 1 results, this may be due to observer bias and a small sample size within that study setting. This observation holds promise for improved usability with long-term use of the mHealth app, although it may indicate greater clinical risk during early use of the system. Future research may seek to steepen the learning curve to minimise clinical risk.

Strengths of the present study include the application of a remote study design that lends ecological validity to the results and selective recruitment to ensure a heterogeneous participant cohort, which suggests good generalisability of the results. In addition, the inclusion of usability assessment allows a holistic perspective on the mHealth app to be generated. In all, these results hold promise for the use of smartphone movement sensors as a viable means of remote RR monitoring. Software-based mHealth may offer cost and scalability benefits compared to hardware-based monitoring. Additionally, movement sensors may better protect RR signal quality than alternative devices that use microphone and camera sensors, as these are vulnerable to noise from environmental light and sound that is difficult to control. These benefits suggest that RR monitoring based on smartphone movement sensors may support healthcare systems to care for their patients when they are outside of the clinic better than currently available alternatives.

Study limitations

As only healthy participants were recruited, it is also unclear how the observed results may extrapolate to healthcare patients who would be likely real-world users of the mHealth app - particularly those with abnormal breathing rates and patterns due to a respiratory condition. Participants both from Study 1 (employees of the mHealth app manufacturer) and Study 2 (members of an online research community) were likely to be technologically confident and

may have therefore been predisposed to successfully operating the mHealth app. Future research should seek to incorporate individuals of low technical literacy and target end-users with relevant medical conditions to better understand these results' generalisability.

Concerning methodology, the FDA-cleared reference used in Study 1 has its own measurement error.¹³ Hence, error estimates presented here are, in fact, an unknown combination of errors associated with the FDA-cleared reference and mHealth app versus true RR. The Study 2 reference also underwent only limited validation in Study 1 and should be assessed more rigorously. Future research may wish to apply a wider range of reference methods, including gold and industry-standard references, to reduce the vulnerability of the mHealth app to shortcomings of any single reference.

Additionally, the present research design does not directly address potential benefits the mHealth app may offer if applied in a healthcare setting. Although expectations that moving health assessments outside of a clinical setting via mHealth technologies will improve healthcare economics have been somewhat supported by literature,⁴ clinical evidence suggests that mHealth technologies are highly heterogeneous in their ability to improve health outcomes.⁴⁴⁻⁴⁵ Suggestions that mHealth may help to overcome social, economic and geographical barriers to healthcare are also yet to be validated.⁴⁶⁻⁴⁸ Future research should seek to understand the clinical, economic and social outcomes associated with real-world use of the mHealth app.

Conclusions

Decentralised healthcare technology holds the potential to offer clinical and economic benefits to patients, HCPs and healthcare systems. Breathing is an important indicator of health, and although solutions for remote RR monitoring exist, many entail significant

shortcomings that may limit their ability to capitalise on potential benefits of mHealth.

Results from the present study hold promise for the use of smartphone movement sensors as a robust means for remote RR monitoring. However, future research should address residual questions and risks associated with the technology identified in this article and seek to validate the impact of similar technologies as applied in the real world.

Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful to Huma's wonderful developers Michele Colombo, Stanislas Heili, Leonardo Festa, Davide Mascitti, Emanuele Distefano, Matteo Puccinelli and Matteo Vigoni for their diligent efforts in preparing the mHealth app for this research. Additional thanks to Emily Binning for her continued strategic support that helped this research come to fruition.

Funding

This research was sponsored by Huma Therapeutics Ltd.

Ethical Approval

Ethical approval was provided by the University of Exeter's Research Ethics Board (application ID eUEBS004088) and all research was conducted in compliance with the Declaration of Helsinki.

Guarantor

DP accepts the responsibility of acting as Guarantor.

Conflicts of Interest

All authors are current or previous employees of Huma Therapeutics Ltd, which is the developer of the mHealth smartphone app. No additional conflicts of interest relevant to this study are declared.

Author Contributions

SP, BK, MD, and MB acquired, interpreted and aided in drafting and revising of the article for intellectual content. DP aided in data interpretation and drafting and revising of the article for intellectual content.

Abbreviations

apps: applications

BPM: breaths per minute

FDA: US Food and Drug Administration

HCP: healthcare professional

LoA: Limits of agreement

MAE: mean absolute error

mHealth: mobile health

PPMC: Pearson Product Moment Correlation

RR: respiratory rate

SD: standard deviation

SUS: System Usability Scale

References

1. Morgan AU, Balachandran M, Do D, et al. Remote Monitoring of Patients with Covid-19: Design, implementation, and outcomes of the first 3,000 patients in COVID Watch. NEJM Catalyst Innovations in Care Delivery. 2020;1(4). doi:10.1056/CAT.20.0342
2. Watson AR, Wah R, Thamman R. The Value of Remote Monitoring for the COVID-19 Pandemic. Telemed J E Health. 2020;26(9):1110-1112. doi:10.1089/tmj.2020.0134

3. Shah SS, Gvozdanovic A, Knight M, Gagnon J. Mobile App-Based Remote Patient Monitoring in Acute Medical Conditions: Prospective Feasibility Study Exploring Digital Health Solutions on Clinical Workload During the COVID Crisis. *JMIR Form Res.* 2021;5(1):e23190. doi:10.2196/23190
4. Iribarren SJ, Cato K, Falzon L, Stone PW. What is the economic evidence for mHealth? A systematic review of economic evaluations of mHealth solutions. *PLoS One.* 2017;12(2):e0170581. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0170581
5. Marcolino MS, Oliveira JAQ, D'Agostino M, Ribeiro AL, Alkmim MBM, Novillo-Ortiz D. The Impact of mHealth Interventions: Systematic Review of Systematic Reviews. *JMIR Mhealth Uhealth.* 2018;6(1):e23. doi:10.2196/mhealth.8873
6. Gravelyn TR, Weg JG. Respiratory rate as an indicator of acute respiratory dysfunction. *JAMA.* 1980;244(10):1123-1125. PMID:7411767
7. Chen L, Reisner AT, Gribok A, McKenna TM, Reifman J. Can we improve the clinical utility of respiratory rate as a monitored vital sign? *Shock.* 2009;31(6):574-580. doi:10.1097/SHK.0b013e318193e885
8. Fieselmann JF, Hendryx MS, Helms CM, Wakefield DS. Respiratory rate predicts cardiopulmonary arrest for internal medicine inpatients. *J Gen Intern Med.* 1993;8(7):354-360. doi:10.1007/BF02600071
9. Miller DJ, Capodilupo JV, Lastella M, et al. Analyzing changes in respiratory rate to predict the risk of COVID-19 infection. *PLoS One.* 2020;15(12):e0243693. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0243693
10. Roca O, Caralt B, Messika J, et al. An Index Combining Respiratory Rate and Oxygenation to Predict Outcome of Nasal High-Flow Therapy. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med.* 2019;199(11):1368-1376. doi:10.1164/rccm.201803-0589OC

11. Myint PK, Musonda P, Sankaran P, et al. Confusion, Urea, Respiratory Rate and Shock Index or Adjusted Shock Index (CURSI or CURASI) criteria predict mortality in community-acquired pneumonia. *Eur J Intern Med.* 2010;21(5):429-433.
doi:10.1016/j.ejim.2010.07.005
12. Subbe CP, Kinsella S. Continuous Monitoring of Respiratory Rate in Emergency Admissions: Evaluation of the RespiraSense™ Sensor in Acute Care Compared to the Industry Standard and Gold Standard. *Sensors* . 2018;18(8).
doi:10.3390/s18082700
13. US Food & Drug Administration. Response to 510(k) Premarket Notification for Masimo MightySat Rx Fingertip Pulse Oximeter (K181956). 2018.
https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf18/K181956.pdf [accessed June 1, 2021].
14. Sen-Gupta E, Wright DE, Caccese JW, et al. A Pivotal Study to Validate the Performance of a Novel Wearable Sensor and System for Biometric Monitoring in Clinical and Remote Environments. *Digit Biomark.* 2019;3(1):1-13.
doi:10.1159/000493642
15. Liu H, Allen J, Zheng D, Chen F. Recent development of respiratory rate measurement technologies. *Physiol Meas.* 2019;40(7):07TR01. doi:10.1088/1361-6579/ab299e
16. Khalid, A. Pulse oximeters are selling out because of the pandemic. Most people don't need them. *Quartz.* April 5, 2020. <https://qz.com/1832464/pulse-oximeters-for-coronavirusunnecessary-but-selling-strong/> [accessed June 1, 2021].
17. National Advisory Group on Health Information Technology in England. Making IT Work: Harnessing the Power of Health Information Technology to Improve Care in England. 2016.

- https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/550866/Wachter_Review_Accessible.pdf [accessed June 1, 2021].
18. Alafeef M, Fraiwan M. Smartphone-based respiratory rate estimation using photoplethysmographic imaging and discrete wavelet transform. *J Ambient Intell Humaniz Comput*. 2020;11(2):693-703. doi:10.1007/s12652-019-01339-6
 19. Nam Y, Lee J, Chon KH. Respiratory rate estimation from the built-in cameras of smartphones and tablets. *Ann Biomed Eng*. 2014;42(4):885-898. doi:10.1007/s10439-013-0944-x
 20. Sanyal S, Nundy KK. Algorithms for Monitoring Heart Rate and Respiratory Rate From the Video of a User's Face. *IEEE J Transl Eng Health Med*. 2018;6:2700111. doi:10.1109/JTEHM.2018.2818687
 21. Nam Y, Reyes BA, Chon KH. Estimation of Respiratory Rates Using the Built-in Microphone of a Smartphone or Headset. *IEEE J Biomed Health Inform*. 2016;20(6):1493-1501. doi:10.1109/JBHI.2015.2480838
 22. Phokela KK, Naik V. Use of Smartphone's Headset Microphone to Estimate the Rate of Respiration. In: 2020 International Conference on COMmunication Systems & NETworkS (COMSNETS). unknown; 2020:64-69. doi:10.1109/COMSNETS48256.2020.9027297
 23. Jin A, Yin B, Morren G, Duric H, Aarts RM. Performance evaluation of a tri-axial accelerometry-based respiration monitoring for ambient assisted living. *Conf Proc IEEE Eng Med Biol Soc*. 2009;2009:5677-5680. doi:10.1109/IEMBS.2009.5333116
 24. Nurmi S, Saaresranta T, Koivisto T, Meriheinä U, Palva L. Validation of an Accelerometer Based BCG Method for Sleep Analysis. Aalto University; 2016. ISBN:9789526068428

25. Jarchi D, Rodgers SJ, Tarassenko L, Clifton DA. Accelerometry-Based Estimation of Respiratory Rate for Post-Intensive Care Patient Monitoring. *IEEE Sens J*. 2018;18(12):4981-4989. doi:10.1109/JSEN.2018.2828599
26. Hernandez J, Li Y, Rehg JM, Picard RW. BioGlass: Physiological parameter estimation using a head-mounted wearable device. In: 2014 4th International Conference on Wireless Mobile Communication and Healthcare - Transforming Healthcare Through Innovations in Mobile and Wireless Technologies (MOBIHEALTH). *ieeexplore.ieee.org*; 2014:55-58. doi:10.1109/MOBIHEALTH.2014.7015908
27. Shen C-L, Huang T-H, Hsu P-C, et al. Respiratory Rate Estimation by Using ECG, Impedance, and Motion Sensing in Smart Clothing. *J Med Biol Eng*. 2017;37(6):826-842. doi:10.1007/s40846-017-0247-z
28. Aly H, Youssef M. Zephyr: Ubiquitous accurate multi-sensor fusion-based respiratory rate estimation using smartphones. In: IEEE INFOCOM 2016 - The 35th Annual IEEE International Conference on Computer Communications. *ieeexplore.ieee.org*; 2016:1-9. doi:10.1109/INFOCOM.2016.7524401
29. Rahman MM, Nemati E, Nathan V, Kuang J. InstantRR: Instantaneous Respiratory Rate Estimation on Context-Aware Mobile Devices. In: 13th EAI International Conference on Body Area Networks. Springer International Publishing; 2020:267-281. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-29897-5_22
30. Li X. Using mobile phone sensors to detect rapid respiratory rate in the diagnosis of pneumonia. *IACSIT int j eng technol*. 2016;8(4):293-296. doi:10.7763/ijet.2016.v6.900
31. US Food & Drug Administration. Response to 510(k) Premarket Notification for Masimo Centroid System (K191882). 2020.

- https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf19/K191882.pdf [accessed June 1, 2021].
32. Tal A, Shinar Z, Shaki D, Codish S, Goldbart A. Validation of Contact-Free Sleep Monitoring Device with Comparison to Polysomnography. *J Clin Sleep Med*. 2017;13(3):517-522. doi:10.5664/jcsm.6514
33. US Food & Drug Administration. Response to 510(k) Premarket Notification for EarlySense Bed Sensing Unit (K171836). 2017.
https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf17/K171836.pdf [accessed June 1, 2021].
34. Bland JM, Altman DG. Measuring agreement in method comparison studies. *Stat Methods Med Res*. 1999;8(2):135-160. doi:10.1177/096228029900800204
35. Dougherty L, Lister S. *The Royal Marsden Manual of Clinical Nursing Procedures*. John Wiley & Sons; 2015. ISBN:9781118745915
36. Lee PJ. Clinical evaluation of a novel respiratory rate monitor. *J Clin Monit Comput*. 2016;30(2):175-183. doi:10.1007/s10877-015-9697-4
37. Mason R, Lind D, Marchal W. *Statistics: An Introduction*. Cole Publishing Company; 1998. ISBN:9780155835368
38. Ramsay MAE, Usman M, Lagow E, Mendoza M, Untalan E, De Vol E. The accuracy, precision and reliability of measuring ventilatory rate and detecting ventilatory pause by rainbow acoustic monitoring and capnometry. *Anesth Analg*. 2013;117(1):69-75. doi:10.1213/ANE.0b013e318290c798
39. Brooke J. SUS: a “quick and dirty” usability scale. In: Jordan PW, Bruce Thomas ILM, Weerdmeester B, eds. *Usability Evaluation in Industry*. CRC Press; 1996:189. ISBN:9780748404605

40. Yan BP, Chan CK, Li CK, et al. Resting and Postexercise Heart Rate Detection From Fingertip and Facial Photoplethysmography Using a Smartphone Camera: A Validation Study. *JMIR Mhealth Uhealth*. 2017;5(3):e33. doi:10.2196/mhealth.7275
41. Coppetti T, Brauchlin A, Müggler S, et al. Accuracy of smartphone apps for heart rate measurement. *Eur J Prev Cardiol*. 2017;24(12):1287-1293. doi:10.1177/2047487317702044
42. Parpinel M, Scherling L, Lazzer S, Della Mea V. Reliability of heart rate mobile apps in young healthy adults: exploratory study and research directions. *J Innov Health Inform*. 2017;24(2):921. doi:10.14236/jhi.v24i2.921
43. Lewis JR, Sauro J. Item Benchmarks for the System Usability Scale. *Journal of Usability Studies*. 2018;13(3):158-167. doi:10.5555/3294033.3294037
44. Free C, Phillips G, Galli L, et al. The effectiveness of mobile-health technology-based health behaviour change or disease management interventions for health care consumers: a systematic review. *PLoS Med*. 2013;10(1):e1001362. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1001362
45. Carreiro S, Newcomb M, Leach R, Ostrowski S, Boudreaux ED, Amante D. Current reporting of usability and impact of mHealth interventions for substance use disorder: A systematic review. *Drug Alcohol Depend*. 2020;215:108201. doi:10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2020.108201
46. Hong AY, Cho J. Has the Digital Health Divide Widened? Trends of Health-Related Internet Use Among Older Adults From 2003 to 2011. *J Gerontol B Psychol Sci Soc Sci*. 2016;72(5):856-863. doi:10.1093/geronb/gbw100
47. Hall CS, Fottrell E, Wilkinson S, Byass P. Assessing the impact of mHealth interventions in low- and middle-income countries--what has been shown to work? *Glob Health Action*. 2014;7:25606. doi:10.3402/gha.v7.25606

48. Crawford A, Serhal E. Digital Health Equity and COVID-19: The Innovation Curve

Cannot Reinforce the Social Gradient of Health. J Med Internet Res.

2020;22(6):e19361. doi:10.2196/19361