

Table 1: Hurst exponent comparison

	CTL		MCI		Mixed ANOVA					
	NREM	REM	NREM	REM	Group		Stage		Group×Stage	
	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	F	p	F	p	F	p
Fp2	1.34 (0.15)	1.29 (0.13)	1.35 (0.11)	1.42 (0.17)	1.31	0.276	0.10	0.754	5.81	<b>0.035</b>
Fp1	1.37 (0.15)	1.29 (0.12)	1.35 (0.12)	1.40 (0.16)	0.56	0.471	0.37	0.555	4.55	0.056
F8	1.33 (0.16)	1.29 (0.14)	1.34 (0.19)	1.41 (0.18)	0.71	0.417	0.11	0.750	6.35	<b>0.029</b>
F7	1.38 (0.21)	1.31 (0.13)	1.30 (0.11)	1.41 (0.14)	0.04	0.852	0.12	0.734	7.49	<b>0.019</b>
F4	1.30 (0.19)	1.24 (0.15)	1.30 (0.12)	1.36 (0.17)	0.54	0.476	0.11	0.742	8.79	<b>0.013</b>
F3	1.34 (0.21)	1.25 (0.14)	1.29 (0.12)	1.30 (0.15)	0.00	0.996	3.11	0.106	4.23	0.064
T4	1.30 (0.12)	1.27 (0.14)	1.28 (0.12)	1.37 (0.13)	0.38	0.549	1.54	0.241	6.82	<b>0.024</b>
T3	1.35 (0.20)	1.24 (0.13)	1.26 (0.13)	1.30 (0.19)	0.02	0.890	1.75	0.213	5.30	<b>0.042</b>
C4	1.29 (0.17)	1.22 (0.13)	1.28 (0.10)	1.30 (0.13)	0.35	0.568	1.22	0.293	3.93	0.073
C3	1.30 (0.15)	1.24 (0.14)	1.26 (0.13)	1.26 (0.14)	0.06	0.809	2.03	0.182	1.82	0.205
T6	1.19 (0.26)	1.11 (0.22)	1.29 (0.14)	1.25 (0.44)	0.86	0.374	2.15	0.171	0.25	0.626
T5	1.26 (0.13)	1.22 (0.14)	1.24 (0.12)	1.30 (0.16)	0.28	0.609	0.07	0.803	3.27	0.098
P4	1.26 (0.17)	1.18 (0.11)	1.26 (0.12)	1.26 (0.16)	0.37	0.557	2.97	0.113	2.88	0.118
P3	1.27 (0.17)	1.19 (0.11)	1.24 (0.11)	1.25 (0.16)	0.06	0.805	2.61	0.135	2.98	0.112
O2	1.29 (0.13)	1.19 (0.10)	1.26 (0.10)	1.26 (0.17)	0.20	0.660	3.41	0.092	2.70	0.129
O1	1.29 (0.13)	1.20 (0.12)	1.25 (0.12)	1.23 (0.16)	0.00	0.980	5.66	<b>0.037</b>	1.94	0.191
FZ	1.32 (0.15)	1.25 (0.14)	1.28 (0.12)	1.29 (0.15)	0.00	0.986	2.32	0.156	4.13	0.067
CZ	1.27 (0.13)	1.24 (0.16)	1.27 (0.12)	1.28 (0.14)	0.14	0.717	0.30	0.594	1.23	0.291
PZ	1.29 (0.21)	1.19 (0.12)	1.27 (0.11)	1.24 (0.16)	0.03	0.872	3.67	0.082	1.07	0.322
LOG	1.41 (0.18)	1.41 (0.17)	1.41 (0.09)	1.56 (0.18)	1.07	0.324	3.93	0.073	4.96	<b>0.048</b>
ROG	1.40 (0.16)	1.37 (0.17)	1.37 (0.12)	1.51 (0.18)	0.76	0.401	2.20	0.166	6.19	<b>0.030</b>
EMG	0.69 (0.38)	0.71 (0.35)	0.50 (0.12)	0.73 (0.33)	0.24	0.633	1.79	0.213	1.33	0.278
Fp1-Fp2	1.31 (0.17)	1.27 (0.14)	1.35 (0.16)	1.38 (0.17)	0.87	0.371	0.11	0.747	1.24	0.290
F7-F8	1.34 (0.20)	1.29 (0.15)	1.33 (0.23)	1.41 (0.19)	0.31	0.590	0.05	0.834	5.03	<b>0.047</b>
F3-F4	1.28 (0.21)	1.22 (0.16)	1.27 (0.17)	1.29 (0.15)	0.08	0.786	0.86	0.373	2.87	0.118
T3-T4	1.30 (0.18)	1.25 (0.14)	1.25 (0.16)	1.31 (0.13)	0.00	0.991	0.03	0.872	4.57	0.056
C3-C4	1.26 (0.16)	1.20 (0.16)	1.23 (0.14)	1.23 (0.11)	0.00	0.990	2.08	0.177	1.73	0.216
T5-T6	1.25 (0.13)	1.20 (0.15)	1.24 (0.17)	1.28 (0.21)	0.20	0.660	0.13	0.722	1.83	0.204
P3-P4	1.21 (0.18)	1.15 (0.15)	1.21 (0.15)	1.20 (0.13)	0.08	0.776	1.86	0.199	1.16	0.305
O1-O2	1.25 (0.13)	1.17 (0.13)	1.22 (0.15)	1.20 (0.14)	0.00	0.958	3.64	0.083	0.88	0.368
LOG-ROG	1.34 (0.18)	1.32 (0.16)	1.37 (0.14)	1.47 (0.18)	1.36	0.268	0.98	0.343	2.10	0.176
Fp2-P4	1.27 (0.18)	1.22 (0.15)	1.26 (0.15)	1.33 (0.17)	0.32	0.583	0.17	0.685	7.22	<b>0.021</b>
Fp1-P3	1.28 (0.17)	1.23 (0.12)	1.26 (0.15)	1.31 (0.14)	0.14	0.712	0.02	0.877	4.39	0.060
O2-P4-T4	1.25 (0.14)	1.22 (0.15)	1.25 (0.16)	1.27 (0.14)	0.09	0.771	0.09	0.775	0.87	0.370
O1-P3-T3	1.28 (0.16)	1.21 (0.15)	1.20 (0.15)	1.21 (0.13)	0.37	0.557	1.40	0.262	2.43	0.147

CTL, Control group; MCI, Mild Cognitive Impairment

Author & year	Analysis employed	Differences with our study	Similarities with our study
Weiss et al. 2009	To compute the Hurst Exponent: R/S statistics (rescaled adjusted range of Mandelbrot and Taqq, 1979) To compute the range of fractal spectra: Alfred Renyi Generalized Entropy.	Healty subjects only. The purpose of the study is to use fractal methods to classify sleep stages.	'Very few' subjects in their study to validate data: ONLY 10.
Weiss et al. 2011	Spearman's correlation analysis	This paper is a follow up of a previous work, using healty subjects and a correlation between Hurst exponent and range of fractal expectra to strengthen their previous results. Now they use 22 healty subjects.	The use of fractal analysis to emphysize known phenomena about human sleep, in this case by proving that fractal range is a better estimating measure for classifing sleep stages.
Ma et al. 2017	Survey of results of the use of nonlinear methods for sleep EEG. MUST READ.	This article is a survey, not a research article as ours.	As a good survey, it includes citations of work where DFA is used.
Lee et al. 2004	They used DFA	Similar research.	They calculated the Hurst exponent of recording of normal sleep stage of six healthy subjects against the Hurst exponent of six recordings of apnea from MIT/BIH polysomnography database. The scaling exponent of apnea was found to be lower than those of healthy subjects
Acharya U. et al. 2005	They computed several parameters, including the Hurst exponent (but no through DFA)	Didn't use DFA	They worked out they analysis with ONLY eight EEG data from the sleep-EDF database from the PhysioBank, a data resource.