Published in final edited form as:

J Tissue Viability. 2019 February ; 28(1): 7–13. doi:10.1016/j.jtv.2018.12.001.

DETECTION AND CLASSIFICATION METHODOLOGY FOR MOVEMENTS IN THE BED THAT SUPPORTS CONTINUOUS PRESSURE INJURY RISK ASSESSMENT AND REPOSITIONING COMPLIANCE

Jonathan Duvall, PhD, Patricia Karg, MSE, David Brienza, PhD, and Jon Pearlman, PhD
University of Pittsburgh, Department of Rehabilitation Science and Technology, 6425 Penn Ave, Suite 400, Pittsburgh, PA 15206, jad75@pitt.edu

Abstract

Pressure injuries are costly to the healthcare system and mostly preventable, yet incidence rates remain high. Recommendations for improved care and prevention of pressure injuries from the Joint Commission revolve around continuous monitoring of prevention protocols and prompts for the care team. The E-scale is a bed weight monitoring system with load cells placed under the legs of a bed. This study investigated the feasibility of the E-scale system for detecting and classifying movements in bed which are relevant for pressure injury risk assessment using a threshold-based detection algorithm and a K-nearest neighbor classification approach. The E-scale was able to detect and classify four types of movements (rolls, turns in place, extremity movements and assisted turns) with > 94% accuracy. This analysis showed that the E-scale could be used to monitor movements in bed, which could be used to prompt the care team when interventions are needed and support research investigating the effectiveness of care plans.

Introduction:

Pressure injuries are costly, dangerous, and mostly preventable complications that occur in nursing homes, hospitals, and the home. People with pressure injuries are generally more than two and a half times as likely to die as those without pressure injuries [1][2]. The average cost for treating a pressure injury was reported to be \$38,000 [2], which equates to \$11 billion annually to the US healthcare system [3]. In the US, the incidence of pressure injuries has been reported as 3.3% in intensive and progressive care units [4], 5.1% (stage 2 and above) in community-based nursing homes [5], and 4% in VA Community Living Centers [6]. These numbers are similar or larger internationally. One review found the

Publisher's Disclaimer: This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

Authors Jonathan Duvall and Jon Pearlman were inventors of the E-scale technology. The technology was licensed by the University of Pittsburgh to a startup company called Nexaware.
None of the authors have financial interests in the company.

incidence of pressure ulcers to be 16% in Norway, 11% in Ireland, 1.8% in Denmark, and 20% in Sweden [7].

Pressure injuries normally occur over bony prominences that are in contact with beds and chairs with locations being indicative of the etiology. Typical sites of pressure injuries from lying on the back would be the back of the head, sacral area and back of the heel while typical sites of pressure injuries from lying on the side are the ear, outsides of the shoulder, hip, knees and ankles. Typical pressure injury sites from sitting up in a chair are the ischial tuberosities, bottom of the heel, and balls of the feet[8].

The Braden Scale is a tool to predict the risk of development of pressure injuries along with the Norton and Waterlow Scales [9] [4, 10-12]. The Braden Scale has six sub-scores, and each sub-score has four levels, except for friction and shear, which only has three levels. The total score can range from 6 (highest risk) to 23 (lowest risk). To determine whether the predictive value can be improved, researchers have performed secondary analyses on Braden Scale sub-scores and other patient-related factors. These studies have revealed that while all sub-scores are significant predictors of pressure injuries, some are substantially more powerful than others [4, 13]. Tescher et al (2012) found that the strongest predictor, by far, is the friction and shear sub-score. Patients with a score of 1 (requires moderate to maximum assistance in moving ...) on friction and shear were 126 times more likely to develop a pressure injury compared to those with a score of 3 (moves in bed and in chair independently ...) [4]. Those with a score of 2 (moves feebly or requires minimum assistance ...) were 8 times more likely to develop a pressure injury than those with a score of 3 [4]. Similar hazard scores were noted with the activity sub-score (4.25 times more likely with a 2 (chairfast) vs. 3 (walks occasionally) or 4 (walks frequently)), and mobility sub-score (~3 times more likely with a 1 or 2 (none or occasional slight changes in body position) vs. 3 (frequent slight changes) or 4 (frequent major changes)) [4]. These important sub-scores are all related to mobility and movement.

When risk for a pressure injury is established, typically signaled by a Braden score of 18, a series of strategies are put in place to try to address and reduce that risk. The most recent guidelines indicate four categories related to prevention: skin care, nutrition, repositioning and mobilization, and education [14]. The most intensive part of the prevention plan is related to repositioning and mobilization, because it often recommends a clinician to turn the patient every two hours while in bed. Adherence with these prevention protocols is low, likely because they require intense effort of the already over-extended clinical staff. Studies, for instance, have indicated adherence ranging from 4.4% [15] to 41% [16]. Adherence related specifically to turning was estimated to be 32% [2] in a study of 835 patients in 35 of the VA's Community Living Centers. These low adherence rates put people at risk for preventable pressure injuries and should be addressed. A research team investigating the barriers to successful implementation of the pressure injury prevention guidelines published by the Joint Commission [17] list four recommendations to improve pressure injury prevention protocols.

1. Observe turning practices to gain specific information about problems with maintaining turning schedules and explore with staff why adherence may be problematic.
2. Evaluate whether a two-hour turning schedule is indicated for all patients or whether there should be a plan to individualize patient-specific turning schedules.
3. Provide a prompt (for example, music, screen saver, timekeeper) to remind the nursing care team to reposition patients.
4. Consider the development of a special team to reposition and mobilize patients.

The first 3 of these recommendations can be accomplished by continuous monitoring of the person's motion in bed and then using that data to determine the best turning schedules and to prompt the nursing care team based on that schedule. Zimlichman et al (2011) used an EverOn system (Earlysense LTD, Ramat Gan, Israel) to continuously monitor motion in bed and found that motion was significantly related to pressure injury risk based on Norton Scale (similar to Braden Scale) [18]. Other Researchers have used load cell technology under the legs of beds to monitor movements in bed for sleep quality and classifying large and small movements [19, 20]. Table 1 details two such studies.

Adami et al (2005) used a two-algorithm approach where one algorithm detects a movement in bed and the other classifies the movements as large or small [19]. The movement detection algorithm found times where the energy (short-term mean square differences) of the load cell signals was above a threshold. Movement intervals less than 3 seconds apart were combined to be one movement. The window size and thresholds were optimized by testing multiple values and identifying the ones with the best results. The classification algorithm used a wavelet based multiresolution analysis of the data and then a Bayesian combination rule. They achieved a 2.9% equal error rate for the event detection algorithm and 94-96% correct classification rate for the classification algorithm.

Alaziz et al (2016) investigated 3 different feature extraction methods (Log-Peak, Energy-Peak and Zero-X Valley) from the load cell signals and then used a threshold-based approach to detect and classify movements as large or small [20]. They found that using the Log-Peak method, they were able to detect movements at a 6.3% error rate and classify them as large or small movements with a 4.2% error rate.

Zimlichman et al (2011) demonstrated the clinical feasibility of continuous monitoring and Adami et al (2005) and Alaziz (2016) have demonstrated that general motion features can be extracted from load cell data but currently there is no evidence that motion related to pressure injury risk can be extracted from load cell data. Therefore, the goal of this study was to evaluate the feasibility of using load cell technology (E-Scale) to support pressure injury prevention by determining whether load cells can provide insight into when and what type of position changes occur for an individual in bed. The E-scale is a set of load cell sensors that are placed under the legs of a bed and was designed to be able to weigh someone who is getting into or out of bed [21]. The E-scale was developed at our research laboratory by the authors and has been licensed to a company (Nexaware.com) with plans of

commercialization. It has an accuracy of 1.7 lbs. and a precision of 0.4 lbs [21]. A photo of the E-scale is provided in Figure 1. Continuous automated movement monitoring tools will improve the assessment of risk, early identification of changes in risk and monitoring of turning schedules. This work extends the previous work of classifying large vs. small motions by Adami et al. (2005) and Alaziz et al. (2016), by investigating whether E-Scale data can be used to identify position changes that are clinically known to be pressure redistributing.

Methods:

Subjects and study protocol

Ten able-bodied subjects were recruited into this IRB-approved pilot study to complete a movement protocol while lying on a full-size bed with an E-Scale placed underneath each of four supports. The first movement protocol included a total of 62 independent movements of a combination of rolling, turning in place, and extremity movements. A fourth movement was added for five subjects where a clinician with experience in repositioning protocols [22] turned participants from their back to side (and vice versa) lying with a 30-degree positioning wedge placed behind the subject's torso and a bed pillow placed between their legs. This was added mid-way through the study to include non-independent position changes to the protocol. The list and order of movements performed during the protocol is described in Table 2. The participants were instructed to remain still in each position for 10 seconds. Example drawing depictions of the changes in positions from before and after the 4 movements are shown in Figure 2. The data collection sessions were video recorded, so the absolute timing of the movements could be synced with the measurements.

Data analysis

Event detection—The E-scale recorded the weight on the four individual bed legs at approximately 33 Hz. This frequency was chosen based on processing capabilities and to be on par or higher than the previous bed movement studies which sampled at 10 Hz (Adami et al.) and 30 Hz (Alaziz et al.).

The data were then combined to determine a total weight and a weight for each side of the bed as shown in Table 3 and Figure 3.

An initial algorithm detected an “event”, which was anytime a movement occurred. This algorithm was designed to identify events where the total weight on the bed deviated by an amount greater than a specified threshold (T) during a specified window of data (W). W and T were varied to find the most accurate event detection equations. Since movements are dynamic and require a force to cause the motion, this algorithm only used the total weight data set described in Table 3. The algorithm is applied at each individual total weight data point of the E-scale, meaning the windows significantly overlap. For the entire string of data, every window of data was classified as above the threshold or below the threshold.

After the data string was classified as above or below the threshold, all successive windows classified as above the threshold were combined to be a single event which started at the end of the first window above the threshold and ended at the beginning of the last window above

the threshold. This was done to identify steady-state periods before and after events. Accuracy was determined by how many of the total movement timestamps were within a window of a determined event. Accuracy was defined as a one-to-one match, meaning the event detected only had one movement timestamp in its window and the timestamp was only in one event window.

Event Classification—A second algorithm was developed to classify the events by type of movement. The data that were used from the E-scale for the algorithm development are listed in Table 4. These data all relate to a specific movement, which is why there was the 10 second rest period between movements in the protocol. Figure 4 shows a sample of two movements with the data identified.

A K-nearest neighbor approach [23] was used to evaluate the prediction algorithm. For the training set for the algorithm, we used two standard approaches. The first is called ‘leave-one-out’ which uses all other data points to classify each individual movement [24, 25]. The second used a random selection of 5 movements from each of the 4 movement types performed by each subject. That created a total of 175 movements in the training set (50 for each of the roll, turn in place and extremity movements and 25 of the assisted turns, which were only completed by 5 subjects). This analysis was conducted 10 times since the training data is randomly selected and is different for each trial. The accuracy of the algorithm was then evaluated with the remaining data points. Both approaches used a standardized Euclidean distance of all three variables to find the closest K neighbors. The K neighbors were then weighted by the inverse of the distance and the movement with the largest sum of weights was chosen as the classification. A parametric study was conducted on the number of K neighbors that would result in the highest accuracy, with K varied from 1-25. The percentage of data points that were classified correctly was determined for each approach. The goal was for the event detection algorithm and the classification approaches to be greater than 90% accurate.

Results:

Movement detection

686 movements were completed by the 10 subjects. The variables W and T were varied from 3 seconds to 8 seconds and from 5 lbs. to 10 lbs, respectively. The movement detection accuracies for these parameters are shown in Table 5. The combination of W=6 or 7 seconds and T=7 lbs. gave the highest accuracy at 97.7%. Of the 16 total movements missed with that configuration, 13 were from the extremity movements category in Table 2.

Movement Classification

Using the 670 movements that were detected, two different classification approaches were conducted. The ‘leave one out’ analysis was conducted with K varying from 1-25. Table 6 indicates the classification accuracies for all values of K for these two analyses. The maximum accuracy of the leave one out analysis was 96.4% when K=9 and 10 and the minimum was 95.8%. The random training set analysis resulted in the highest accuracy of

96% when K=16 and the minimum was 94.8%. The range of accuracy only varied < 2% across all values of K for both analyses.

Table 7 shows the classifications broken down by movement for the random analysis when K=16. All movements were classified correctly more than 91% of the time. The only misclassification that occurred more than 2% of the time was when independent turns in place and assisted turns were misclassified as each other. Two-dimensional plots comparing the four movements over the three variables (defined in Table 4) are shown in Figure 5. These plots show the clustering of data.

Discussion:

These results indicate that using load cells under the legs of a bed can be used to detect and classify movements in bed. The movements were classified into 4 categories: roll, turn in place, extremity movements and assisted turn. Overall, 670 out of 686 (97.7%) of movements were detected. The lowest detected movement was the extremity movements which were detected at a rate of 93.2%. The movements could also be aggregated to be classified as pressure redistribution movements or non-pressure redistribution movements. Since the rolls and turns in place were full rotations (back to side) and the assisted turns were conducted in the same manner as recommended turning and positioning protocols, they would all be considered effective pressure redistribution movements [22]. The extremity movements would not effectively redistribute pressure from one part of the pelvis or body to another since the person's overall posture did not change [22]. The sensitivity and specificity of the extremity movements vs. any other classification was 95.0% and 99.2%, respectively.

The optimal movement detection algorithm detected 97.7% of the movements. Of the 16 movements that were not detected, 13 of them were extremity movements which means the algorithm was 99.6% accurate in detecting movements which redistribute pressure around the pelvis. Two of the other 3 movements were assisted turns and were detected, but as two movements (one for the roll and wedge placement and another for pillow placement). The last movement was a roll that was so smooth, that the total weight never fluctuated by more than the 7-pound threshold.

The classification of the movements using a K-nearest neighbor approach resulted in 94.8% or higher accuracy for all permutations. The 'leave one out' approach is thought of as an optimistic approach [24], but the random training set analysis also showed high accuracy for classification. Varying the value of K had a small effect on the accuracy of the classification, which means the variables are highly clustered. Combining the optimal movement detection and movement classification parameters, 646 out of 686 movements (94.2%) were detected and classified correctly.

The highest misclassification was between turns in place and assisted turns. This is a result of the data for assisted turns being the least clustered and the overlapping of clusters seen in Figure 5. Clinically, it is unlikely that someone who is capable of performing a turn in place, which requires lifting portions of the body off of the mattress, would be in need of assisted turns. However, secondary analyses could be developed to better distinguish these two

movements. One such approach would be to identify movements that were classified with low certainty (i.e. the total weighted classification of the first and second most likely classifications were close). Then the analysis could be reconducted using only the nearest neighbors of those two classifications or the variable which most highly distinguishes those two movements could be weighted more heavily.

Other technologies have been developed to attempt to monitor pressure in the bed. Some are real-time pressure monitors which display areas of high pressure to clinicians for interventions, such as the ForeSitePT from Xsensor (xsensor.com) which is a pressure mapping mattress overlay [26]. Another sensor, the Leaf sensor (leafhealthcare.com), is adhered to a person's chest and monitors the angle of their torso over time [27]. The E-scale could be another option along with these technologies which works with most any bed, yet is non-contact and does not impact the pressure-redistributing surface characteristics. It also has the dual purpose of measuring weight.

Limitations:

Generalization of the results from this study is limited because it was conducted with able-bodied people performing prescribed movements on one type of bed. People in nursing homes or assisted living facilities who are at risk for pressure injuries may not be capable of performing some of these movements, such as the turns in place. Also, this study only had one person performing the assisted turns, and techniques may vary by facility and/or by clinician assisting with repositioning. Future studies should expand this research by conducting studies in the real-world environment.

Conclusion:

This pilot study found that the E-scale could detect and classify four movements (rolls, turns in place, extremity movements, and assisted turns) with greater than 94% accuracy. This shows that the E-scale has good feasibility for detecting and classifying movements occurring in the bed. With some further research, it could be used in facilities to continuously monitor movements in bed to evaluate pressure injury risk and compliance with pressure injury prevention protocols.

Acknowledgments

This research was supported by the University of Pittsburgh's Clinical and Translational Science Institute by the National Institutes of Health through Grant Number UL1TR001857 and in part through funding received from the SHRS Research Development Fund, School of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences, University of Pittsburgh.

References

1. Lyder CH, Wang Y, Metersky M, Curry M, Kliman R, Verzier NR, and Hunt DR, Hospital-acquired pressure ulcers: results from the national Medicare Patient Safety Monitoring System study. *J Am Geriatr Soc*, 2012 60(9): p. 1603–8. [PubMed: 22985136]
2. Russo A and Elixhauser A, Hospitalizations Related to Pressure Sores, 2003. Healthcare Cost and Utilization Project Statistical Brief #3. 2006, Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality.

3. Russo CA, Steiner C, and Spector W, Hospitalizations Related to Pressure Ulcers, 2006. Healthcare Cost and Utilization Project Statistical Brief #64. 2008, Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality.
4. Tescher AN, Branda ME, Byrne TJO, and Naessens JM, All at-risk patients are not created equal: analysis of Braden pressure ulcer risk scores to identify specific risks. *J. Wound Ostomy Continence Nurs*, 2012 39(3): p. 282–291. [PubMed: 22552104]
5. Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. Nursing Home Data Compendium 2015 Edition. 2015; Available from: https://www.cms.gov/Medicare/Provider-Enrollment-and-Certification/CertificationandCompliance/Downloads/nursinghomedatacompendium_508-2015.pdf.
6. Hartmann CW, Shwartz M, Zhao S, Palmer JA, and Berlowitz DR, Longitudinal Pressure Ulcer Rates After Adoption of Culture Change in Veterans Health Administration Nursing Homes. *J. Am. Geriatr. Soc*, 2016 64(1): p. 151–155. [PubMed: 26782865]
7. Moore Z, Johanssen E, and van Etten M, A review of PU prevalence and incidence across Scandinavia, Iceland and Ireland (Part I). *J Wound Care*, 2013 22(7): p. 361–2, 364–8. [PubMed: 24159658]
8. [Drugs.com](https://www.drugs.com/health-guide/bedsores-decubitus-ulcers.html), Bedsores (Decubitus Ulcers). [Updated Oct. 8, 2018; cited 11 7, 2018]. Available from: <https://www.drugs.com/health-guide/bedsores-decubitus-ulcers.html>.
9. Pancorbo-Hidalgo PL, Garcia-Fernandez FP, Lopez-Medina IM, and Alvarez-Nieto C, Risk assessment scales for pressure ulcer prevention: a systematic review. *J Adv Nurs*, 2006 54(1): p. 94–110. [PubMed: 16553695]
10. Bergstrom N, Braden BJ, Languzza A, and Holman V, The Braden Scale for Predicting Pressure Sore Risk. *Nursing Research*, 1987 36(4): p. 205–210. [PubMed: 3299278]
11. Horn SD, Bender SA, Ferguson ML, Smout RJ, Bergstrom N, Taler G, Cook AS, Sharkey SS, and Voss AC, The National Pressure Ulcer Long-Term Care Study: pressure ulcer development in long-term care residents. *J Am Geriatr Soc*, 2004 52(3): p. 359–67. [PubMed: 14962149]
12. Lahmann NA and Kottner J, Relation between pressure, friction and pressure ulcer categories: a secondary data analysis of hospital patients using CHAID methods. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 2011 48: p. 1487–1494. [PubMed: 21839999]
13. Bergquist S, Subscales, subscores, or summative score: evaluating the contribution of Braden Scale items for predicting pressure ulcer risk in older adults receiving home health care. *J Wound Ostomy Continence Nurs*, 2001 28(6): p. 279–89. [PubMed: 11707760]
14. National Pressure Ulcer Advisory Panel. Pressure Injury Prevention Points. 2016 [cited 2016; Available from: <http://www.npuap.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/Pressure-Injury-Prevention-Points-2016.pdf>.
15. Paquay L, Wouters R, Defloor T, Buntinx F, Debaillie R, and Geys L, Adherence to pressure ulcer prevention guidelines in home care: a survey of current practice. *J Clin Nurs*, 2008 17(5): p. 627–36. [PubMed: 18279295]
16. Saliba D, Rubenstein LV, Simon B, Hickey E, Ferrell B, Czarnowski E, Berlowitz D, Adherence to pressure ulcer prevention guidelines: implications for nursing home quality. *J Am Geriatr Soc*, 2003 51(1): p. 56–62. [PubMed: 12534846]
17. Jankowski IM and Nadzam DM, Identifying gaps, barriers, and solutions in implementing pressure ulcer prevention programs. *Jt Comm J Qual Patient Saf*, 2011 37(6): p. 253–64. [PubMed: 21706985]
18. Zimlichman E, Shinar Z, Rozenblum R, Levkovich S, Skiano S, Szyper-Kravitz M, Altman A, Amital H, and Shoenfeld Y, Using Continuous Motion Monitoring Technology to Determine Patient's Risk for Development of Pressure Ulcers. *Journal of Patient Safety*, 2011 7(4): p. 181–184. [PubMed: 21926639]
19. Adami A, Hayes T, Pavel M, Singer C, Detection and Classification of Movements in Bed using Load Cells. *Conf Proc IEEE Eng Med Biol Soc*, 2005 1: p. 589–92. [PubMed: 17282250]
20. Alaziz M, Zhenhua J, Jian L, Richard H, Yingying C, and Yangyong Z, Motion Scale: A Body Motion Monitoring System Using Bed-Mounted Wireless Load Cells. *IEEE First International Conference on Connected Health: Applications, Systems and Engineering Technologies (CHASE)*, 2016 00(0): p. 183–192.

21. Mhatre A, Duvall J, Ding D, Cooper R, and Pearlman J, Design and focus group evaluation of a bed-integrated weight measurement system for wheelchair users. *Assist Technol*, 2016: p. 1–9.
22. National Pressure Ulcer Advisory Panel/European Pressure Ulcer Advisory Panel/Pan Pacific Pressure Injury Alliance, Prevention and Treatment of Pressure Ulcers: Clinical Practice Guideline. 2014: Perth, Australia p. 1–308.
23. Altman NS, An Introduction to Kernel and Nearest-Neighbor Nonparametric Regression. *The American Statistician*, 1992 46(3): p. 175–185.
24. Vapnik V, Estimation of Dependences Based on Empirical Data. 1 ed. 2006: Springer-Verlag New York, Inc. 505.
25. Guyon I and Elisseeff A, An introduction to variable and feature selection. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 2003 3: p. 1157–1182.
26. Wong H, Kaufman J, Baylis B, Conly JM, Hogan DB, Stelfox HT, Southern DA, Ghali WA, and Ho CH, Efficacy of a pressure-sensing mattress cover system for reducing interface pressure: study protocol for a randomized controlled trial. *Trials*, 2015 16: p. 434. [PubMed: 26420303]
27. Pickham D, Pihulic M, Valdez A, Mayer B, Duhon P, and Larson B, Pressure Injury Prevention Practices in the Intensive Care Unit: Real-world Data Captured by a Wearable Patient Sensor. *Wounds*, 2018 30(8): p. 229–234. [PubMed: 30212372]

- The E-scale (weight scale under the legs of a bed) can monitor and detect postural movements in bed with 97% accuracy.
- The movements detected can be differentiated into 4 categories (i.e. Rolls, Turns, Extremity Movements and Assisted Turns) with 96% acc overall accuracy.
- The largest misclassification is between Assisted Turns and Turns.

Figure 1:
Photo of E-scale display and 4 sensors which are placed under bed legs

Figure 2:
Depictions of positions after each movement

Figure 3:
Depiction of E-scale sensor placement under the 4 corners of the bed

Figure 4:
Plot of total weight and side 1 weight with variable data identified

Figure 5:
Scatter plots of four movements comparing the three variables

Table 1:

Summary of movement studies

Study	Goal	Technology	Methods	Achieved
Adami et al. (2005)	Detect movement in bed and classify them as large and small	Load cells under each bed leg	Detection: Identify windows where mean square differences is above threshold Classification: Wavelet based multi-resolution analysis with Bayesian rule	Detection: 2.9% equal error rate Classification: 94-96% correct
Alaziz et al. (2016)	Detect movement in bed and classify them as large and small	Load cells under each bed leg	Feature extraction of load cell data using Log-Peak, Energy-Peak, and Zero-X Valley. Detection and Classification: threshold approach to feature data	Detection: 6.3% error rate Classification: 4.2% error rate

Table 2:

Pressure risk pilot study protocol

Movement	Description	Number and Timing
Rolling	Rolling from back to side	16 movements with 10 seconds between
Turn in place (rotate)	Rotate from back to side while staying at the same location on the bed	16 movements with 10 seconds between
Extremity movements while supine	Movement of a single extremity (leg or arm) without changing position on bed or hip contact location	15 movements with 10 seconds between
Random generated movements	Random set of rolling, turn in place, and extremity movements	Up to 15 movements with 10 seconds between **
Assisted turn from back to side lying with positioning wedge *	Clinician rolled person from back to side lying using a 30-degree positioning wedge behind torso and pillow between legs	16 movements with 10 seconds between

* Only 5 of the 10 subjects performed this movement. Since it was done at a different time, we also had each of them complete the other 3 movements again 2 times each.

** The random set of 15 movements included a different assisted turn without a wedge, which was removed from analysis as it is not as realistic as an assisted turn with a wedge. Also, one participant's scale broke during the trial which resulted in lower numbers of movements.

Table 3:

E-scale sensor data streams used for algorithms

	Sum of weight from sensors
Total weight	1,2,3,4
Side 1	1,2
Side 2	3,4

Table 4:

Variables extracted from E-scale for pressure risk pilot study

Data from each Movement	Rationale
Weight Variance (standard deviation)	Shows consistency of forces during movement (a smooth movement vs. large force change)
Duration of movement (time)	Shows how long the movement lasted
Percent change in center of mass	Shows how far the position of the person changed across the bed

Table 5:

Results of movement detection parameters

Accuracy of event detection		Threshold (T) in lbs.					
		5	6	7	8	9	10
Window (W) in seconds	3	73.5%	91.5%	90.4%	81.3%	72.9%	67.2%
	4	64.0%	92.4%	92.6%	82.5%	73.9%	68.1%
	5	57.6%	94.3%	96.2%	86.0%	77.3%	71.1%
	6	50.7%	93.7%	97.7%	88.2%	80.0%	73.0%
	6.3	50.1%	92.9%	97.4%	88.3%	80.3%	73.3%
	6.5	49.6%	92.6%	97.4%	88.3%	80.5%	73.5%
	6.7	48.4%	92.4%	97.5%	88.5%	80.5%	73.5%
	7	47.4%	90.8%	97.7%	88.5%	80.8%	73.3%
	8	45.0%	84.8%	96.4%	88.3%	81.2%	74.5%

Table 6:

Accuracy of Classifications as a function of different K nearest-neighbors

K	Accuracy	
	Leave one out	Random
1	95.8%	94.9%
2	95.8%	94.8%
3	95.8%	95.6%
4	96.3%	95.9%
5	96.3%	95.9%
6	96.0%	95.5%
7	96.1%	95.5%
8	96.3%	95.9%
9	96.4%	95.6%
10	96.4%	95.6%
11	96.3%	95.7%
12	96.3%	95.5%
13	96.0%	95.8%
14	96.0%	95.9%
15	96.1%	95.5%
16	96.0%	96.0%
17	96.1%	95.6%
18	96.0%	95.8%
19	96.0%	95.4%
20	95.8%	95.4%
21	96.0%	95.7%
22	96.0%	95.7%
23	96.0%	95.3%
24	96.0%	95.8%
25	95.8%	95.8%

Table 7:

Classification accuracy by movement

Actual Movement	Classified as			
	Roll	Turn in place	Extremity	Assisted turn
Roll	98.5%	0.0%	0.4%	1.1%
Turn in place	0.0%	95.7%	0.8%	3.5%
Extremity	1.9%	2.0%	95.0%	1.1%
Assisted turn	0.0%	6.4%	1.8%	91.8%