

1 **Generalizability and Clinical Implications of Electrocardiogram Denoising**
2 **with Cardio-NAFNet**

3

4 Chanho Lim¹, Yunsung Chung², Jihun Hamm², Zhengming Ding², Mario Mekhael¹, Charbel
5 Noujaim¹, Ala Assaf¹, Hadi Younes¹, Nour Chouman¹, Noor Makan¹, Eoin Donnellan¹,
6 Nassir Marrouche¹

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 *Corresponding Author

20 Name: Chanho Lim

21 Email: clim@tulane.edu

22 Address: 1430 Tulane Ave, New Orleans, LA, 70112

23

24

25

26

27 Conflict of Interest

28 Dr. Marrouche reports receiving grant support from Abbott, Medtronic, Biosense

29 Webster, Boston Scientific, | receiving consulting fees from Preventice, biosense webster, atricure | lectures:

30 Biotronik, Bristol Myers Squibb and Biosense Webster All other authors have no conflicts of interest associated

31 with the content of this manuscript. No external funding was received in conduct with this analysis

¹Tulane University School of Medicine, New Orleans, LA, USA

²Tulane University Department of Computer Science, New Orleans, LA, USA

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

32

Abstract

33 The rise of mobile electrocardiogram (ECG) devices came with the rise of frequent large magnitudes of noise in
34 their recordings. Several artificial intelligence (AI) models have had great success in denoising, but the model's
35 generalizability and the enhancement in clinical interpretability are still questionable. We propose Cardio-
36 NAFNet, a novel AI-based approach to ECG denoising by employing a modified version of Non-Linear
37 Activation Free Network (NAFNET). We conducted three experiments for quantitative and qualitative
38 evaluation of denoising, clinical implications and generalizability. In the first experiment, Cardio-NAFNet
39 achieved 53.74dB average signal to noise ratio across varying magnitude of noise in beat-to-beat denoising,
40 which is a significant improvement over the current state of the art model in ECG denoising. In the second
41 experiment, we tested the enhancement in clinical interpretation of the ECG signals by utilizing a pretrained
42 ECG classifier using 8 second long noise-free ECG signals. When the classifier was tested using noisy ECG
43 signals and their denoised counterparts, Cardio-NAFNet's denoised signals provided 26% boost in classification
44 results. Lastly, we provide an external validation dataset composed of single-lead mobile ECG signals along
45 with signal quality evaluation from physician experts. Our paper suggests a settling method to capture and
46 reconstruct critical features of ECG signals not only in terms of quantitative evaluation, but also through
47 generalizable qualitative evaluation.

48

49

Introduction

50 With digital health evolution and numerous consumer electronics providing electrocardiograms (ECG), ECG
51 denoising plays a pivotal role in standardizing and stabilizing the signals recorded amongst a multitude of
52 devices and patients. Beyond providing a level of reliability of the mobile ECG recordings for physician's
53 interpretation, ECG denoising can play a critical role in translating the innovative artificial intelligence
54 approaches using 12-lead ECG signals to the digital health realm. Previously, to reach beyond traditional use
55 cases of electrocardiograms (ECG), numerous groups across the globe have provided methods to automate the
56 processes typically done by subject matter experts and method to augment undiscovered knowledge about ECG
57 signal's discriminative features. For automated methods, a cardiologist-level arrhythmia detection and
58 classification accuracy has been achieved using deep neural network [1]. Furthermore, the clinical implications
59 of ECG signals has been expanded by an AI model detecting low ejection fraction using 12-lead ECG
60 signals[2]. However, the AI models that were trained on clean 12-lead ECG in a hospital environment are bound
61 to be inaccurate when tested with mobile ECG recorded during a patient or a consumer's daily lives. Although
62 measuring ECG signals has become more available to the public than ever, these recordings are frequently
63 measured without any clinical staff's oversight and more easily exposed to various types of noise. We learned
64 throughout the years that ECG recordings are prone to three main types of noise - electrode motion (EM),
65 baseline wandering (BW) and muscle artifacts (MA). Hence, effective methods to denoise ECG signals and
66 experiments to evaluate its enhancements in clinical interpretability and generalizability in digital health realm
67 are imperative.

68

69 ECG denoising methods can be largely divided into two categories - traditional denoising that relies on
70 statistical methods and deep learning-based denoising models[3]. For example, traditional methods have seen

71 success in ECG denoising using bandpass filters[4], empirical mode decomposition (EMD), Wavelet
72 transformation methods[5, 6], adaptive filtering[7-10], and Bayesian filtering methods[11]. Simple bandpass
73 filtering may be capable of rejecting low frequency noise like small baseline wandering and some high
74 frequency noise such as jitters, but it often fails to cope with muscle artifacts and electrode motion artifacts that
75 sporadically create false peaks and valleys. Kabir et al suggested an approach based on noise reduction
76 algorithms in EMD and discrete wavelet transform domains, but the method is also limited to noise reduction
77 with jitters and baseline wandering[12]. The recent advances in deep learning has impacted how ECG signals
78 are processed, through new deep learning models such as autoencoders[13, 14], long short-term memory
79 (LSTM)[15], generative adversarial network (GAN)[16, 17]. For example, Xiong et al utilized a combination of
80 wavelet transform to deconstruct the signals and deep autoencoders (DAE)[18] to enhance the quality of
81 corrupted signals. Others have also proposed stacked contractive denoising auto-encoder[19]. Both autoencoder
82 based approaches were capable of removing BW, MA, EM and mixed noises at varying magnitudes. The
83 generalizability of these models has been questioned by Wang et al., as autoencoder's performances can be
84 sensitive to its sample selection, which led them to suggest a GAN based method. Since introduced by
85 Goodfellow et al in 2014, GAN variants have had remarkable contributions to the advancements of generative
86 models. Pratik et al proposed a GAN framework that contains convolution layers in its generator and
87 discriminator[20], but the model was only tested to prove its applications with individual types of noise, not any
88 mixtures at varying magnitude. Xu et al utilized ResNet based GAN model but has demonstrated that that the
89 model's denoising capabilities diminished with larger noise samples at lower signal to noise ratio[17]. Wang et
90 al proposed a conditional generative adversarial network (CAE-CGAN) framework where they utilize a
91 convolutional U-Net architecture as a generator, a discriminator with least squared loss, and a pretrained support
92 vector machine (SVM) based classifier that learns to classify each beat[21]. Upon our review, CAE-CGAN's
93 methods were deemed the most sound as it demonstrated promising improvement in SNR across individual and
94 mixture of noise at varying SNR while also proving that the denoised signal also enhances classification
95 accuracy for each denoised beat.

96
97 We note that the majority of the denoising work has been done by combining the noise from MIT-BIH noise
98 stress database with clean ECG signals from various ECG databases in Physionet's MIT-BIH Databases[22, 23],
99 specifically the Arrhythmia Database. Despite numerous authors highlighting the rise of wearables and other
100 mobile devices for ECG recordings as one of the primary motivations for denoising, the majority of the models
101 are only evaluated internally within the arrhythmia database that was collected during 1970s. Also, most of the
102 models prioritize on the quantitative evaluation of denoising using signal to noise ratio (SNR), but the
103 qualitative evaluation of the signals is often missing as only a few have performed tests to confirm that
104 denoising also improves clinical interpretability.

105
106 To address these issues, we propose Cardio-NAFNet, a non-linear activation free network for ECG denoising.
107 Cardio-NAFNet utilizes the current (SOTA) framework used in image denoising domain with reduced
108 dimensionality and complexity along with separate loss functions to tailor the framework towards ECG signal
109 denoising. We conducted three experiments designed to independently prove Cardio-NAFNet's superior
110 performance to the current SOTA model in an identical environment using the arrhythmia database, enhanced

111 clinical interpretability through rhythm-based classification, and generalizability with an external validation
112 dataset composed of real-world mobile ECG signals.

113

114 **Method**

115 **Experiment Design**

116 The first experiment's objective is to evaluate Cardio-Net's performance against that of the current
117 SOTA model (CAE-CGAN)[21] in an identical testing environment. We prepared 10 records from Physionet's
118 arrhythmia database[24]. The 10 records are 100, 101, 106, 112, 117, 121, 123, 209, 220, and 228 and uses
119 MLII lead. Then we split each record into samples with lengths of 512, which is about 1.2 seconds with the
120 dataset's sampling rate of 360Hz. For training and testing, we used 8:2 random split.

121

122 The second experiment's objective is to validate our argument that denoised samples should not only
123 have enhanced SNR, but also improved interpretability. We aim to demonstrate improved classification results
124 with beat and rhythm labels. The records were resampled to 64Hz, then split into samples length of 512, which
125 is 8 seconds long. To split the signals, we visited every annotation point, which exists with every beat, then
126 chose point at random to be the center of the sample, where the distance from the center to the annotation point
127 was always less than the quarter of the total sample length. With this method, we were able to create samples
128 that were multi-labeled with their rhythm types and their beat types. We trained a convolution neural network
129 (CNN) classifier with clean ECG samples from the arrhythmia database, then evaluated its performance using
130 unseen clean samples, noisy samples, and denoised samples.

131

132 The third experiment was designed to highlight the generalizability of our model by utilizing an
133 independent dataset from DECAAF-II[25]. We retrained Cardio-NAFNet to suit the samples from DECAAF-
134 II[25], which are measured at 200Hz with a 20 second window, providing sample length of 4000. The training
135 data was generated using the same framework as the second experiment, but with sampling rate of 200Hz and
136 sample length of 20 seconds. After the samples were denoised, we handed the samples over to the expert
137 reviewers at Tulane University's Heart and Vascular Institute.

138

139

140 **Study Data**

141 The internal training and validation data are from two databases on Physionet. We pulled the ECG recordings
142 from MIT-BIH Arrhythmia Database[24], and the three different types of noises from MIT-BIH Noise Stress
143 Database[26]. The MIT-BIH Arrhythmia database is from 4000 long-term Holter recordings that were obtained
144 from Beth Israel Hospital Arrhythmia Laboratory. The arrhythmia database contains 23 records that were
145 chosen at random from the aforementioned dataset, and 25 recordings that were selected for containing
146 clinically important phenomena. Overall, the database contains 48 records where the average length of the
147 records is around 30 minutes long. While most records have modified limb lead II (MLII) as the first lead, a few
148 records did not contain MLII due to surgical dressings on the patients, hence we removed records 102, and 104
149 from the dataset. All recordings are digitized at a sampling rate of 360Hz. The recordings in the database are

150 labeled with 20 categories of beat annotations and 15 categories of rhythm annotations. The subjects were 25
151 men aged 32 to 89 years, and 22 women aged 23 to 89 years.

152

153 The MIT-BIH Noise Stress Database includes three half hour recordings of 3 types of noise typical in
154 ambulatory ECG recordings. The three noise records are baseline wander (BW), muscle artifact (MA), and
155 electrode motion (EM) artifact. To evaluate the denoising capabilities of our model in comparison with the
156 results in CAE-CGAN[21], we created 42 different scenarios of denoising which are combinations of the three
157 noise types (EM, BW, MA, EM+BW, MA+BW, EM+MA, EM+MA+BW) and varying levels of signal to noise
158 ratio (SNR) from 0dB to 5dB.

159

160 An external validation dataset was prepared to ensure the generalizability of Cardio-NAFNet. We
161 randomly selected 222 ECG strips from the DECAAF-II Trial[25], which are the recordings used to track the
162 outcome of 843 patients who received atrial fibrillation ablation from 44 sites around the world. The strips are
163 recorded using single-lead handheld devices called “ECG Check”. The length of the recordings are generally
164 around 30 seconds with a sampling rate of 200Hz. As the strips are unfiltered raw recordings from a handheld
165 device, we deem the recordings here to be “real world” examples of noisy ECG signals with large variance in
166 noise types and magnitude. The strips were thoroughly reviewed by intra and inter reviewers that were all expert
167 physicians.

168

169

170 **Preprocessing**

171 As the objective of the three experiments differ, the length of the samples in each experiment also differs. In the
172 first experiment, we pulled record 103, 105, 111, 116, 122, 205, 213, 219, 223, 230 for training and sliced the
173 records to sample lengths of 512. Considering the sampling rate of 360Hz in the arrhythmia database, each input
174 signals are roughly 1.4 seconds long. For the second experiment, we wanted to preserve the rhythm labels;
175 hence, we resampled the records to 64Hz, then the sample lengths of 512 again, resulting with 8 second strips.
176 For the final experiment, we resampled the signals to 200Hz to match the sampling rate of the records in the
177 external validation dataset, then sliced the records to sample lengths of 4000, resulting with 20 second strips.
178 After resampling and slicing, all training and internal validation samples went through the steps below to
179 generate simulated noisy signals.

180

181 The generation of the training data is intuitive. We inject the combinations of noise into the clean ECG
182 samples from the arrhythmia database, arriving at three different variations of the signals – the clean ECG
183 samples, the injected noise, and the simulated noisy ECG sample. The objective of the Cardio-NAFNet is to
184 receive simulated noisy ECG samples and generate denoised samples that closely resemble their corresponding
185 original ECG samples. When injecting the noise into the original ECG signals, we measure the signal to noise
186 ratio (SNR) by the following equation.

187

$$SNR = 10 \log_{10} \frac{\sum_{i=0}^N x_i^2}{\sum_{i=0}^N n_i^2}$$

188 To provide various mixtures of noise by providing a random length, a random signal to noise
189 (SNR) to a randomized segment in an ECG signal. For validating samples, we created 42 different testing
190 environments by fixing the signal to ratio to integers from 0dB to 5dB and providing all combinations of
191 baseline wander, muscle artifacts, and electrode motion artifacts. We fixed the signal to ratio of generated noisy
192 signals by calculating α that is provided by the following equation:

193
194
195

$$\dot{x} = x_i + n_i * \alpha$$

196

$$\alpha = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=0}^N x_i^2}{\sum_{i=0}^N n_i * 10^{SNR/10}}}$$

197 where \dot{x} represents the simulated noisy signals, x represents individual clean ECG sample from the arrhythmia
198 database, n is the noise, N is the number of samples, and α represents the constant that is multiplied to the noise
199 to generate noisy samples at fixed SNR. With the formulas above, we generate combinations of simulated noisy
200 ECG samples at fixed SNR from 0dB to 5dB with all combinations of noise types. We then normalized the
201 signals using min-max normalization:

202

203

$$Norm(x) = \frac{x_n - x_{min}}{x_{max} - x_{min}}$$

204 For the external validation dataset, we chose to slice the recordings into 20 second windows by
205 choosing the starting point of the window to be a random point in the first 10 seconds of the signal due to a
206 small variance in the length of the recordings. We also performed min-max normalization to all samples.

207

208

209 Network Architecture

210 Our Cardio-NAFNet resembles the original structure of NAFNet[27] with reduced complexity and dimension to
211 transform the model's original framework dedicated to 2-dimensional image restoration to ECG signal
212 restoration. The network follows U-Net architecture where we utilize an encoder and a decoder with skip
213 connections. The encoder is comprised of 10 NAFBlocks and the decoder is comprised of 4 NAFBlocks as
214 shown in Figure 1b. The generalizability of encoder-decoder architecture has been questioned before, and we
215 provide evidence that model performance holds with an external validation dataset.

216 For training, Cardio-NAFNet receives batches that comprise pairs of noisy ECG signal generated from
217 the preprocessing steps and their corresponding original ECG strips unaltered by noise. The matching original
218 ECG signals are only used to calculate the loss by taking the distance of the denoised output to the original
219 signal.

220

221 Each NafNet's Block consists of layers without nonlinear activation functions (e.g., sigmoid, softmax,
222 ReLu, etc). The block consists of Layer Normalization, pointwise convolution, depth wise convolution, simple
223 channel attention, simple gate, elementwise multiplication/addition, and dropout layers in the order described in
224 figure. The core difference between NAFNet's Block versus the feed forward networks (FFN) in transformers is

225 in the simple gate, which allows the entire block to be free of nonlinear activation functions. See Figure 1a for
226 the structure of NAFBlock.

227

228 Mean Squared Error (MSE) L_{MSE} is adopted to measure the differences between denoised signals and clean
229 signals. Similar to Wang et al., L_{max} is used to measure the maximum difference between denoised and clean
230 signals. It helps the model to capture the local characteristics of ECG signals.

$$231 \quad L_{MSE} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N (\tilde{x}_n - x_n)$$

232

$$233 \quad L_{max} = \max(|\hat{x}_1 - x_1|, |\hat{x}_2 - x_2|, \dots, |\hat{x}_N - x_N|)$$

234

235 where \hat{x} indicates denoised signals and x indicates clean signals. N represents the total number of samples. Our
236 total loss function is defined as:

$$237 \quad L = \lambda_1 L_{MSE} + \lambda_2 L_{max}$$

238 where λ_1 and λ_2 are weighted coefficients. Through our experiments, we chose $\lambda_1 = 0.8$ and $\lambda_2 = 0.2$.

239 We train models with AdamW optimizer with learning rate of 0.0001 ($\beta_1 = 0.9, \beta_2 = 0.999$). The batch size is
240 256.

241

242 Evaluation

243 The performance is measured by root mean square error (RMSE) and SNR as follows:

$$244 \quad RMSE = \sqrt{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N (\tilde{x}_n - x_n)^2}$$

$$245 \quad SNR = 10 \log_{10} \frac{\sum_{n=1}^N x_n^2}{(\tilde{x}_n - x_n)^2}$$

246 where x is the original clean signal, \tilde{x} is denoised signal, and N is the number of samples. RMSE indicates the
247 difference between two signals. While the SNR formula for the evaluation may seem different from the one
248 introduced to prepare the training samples, both formulas essentially represent the same ratio of the ECG signal
249 to the noise as $\tilde{x} - x$ is the remaining noise after the signal was denoised. The RMSE and SNR possess an
250 inverse relationship where smaller RMSE values indicate larger SNR. Cardio-NAFNet's objective is to
251 minimize RMSE and maximize SNR, which indicates a stronger power of the ECG signal to the noise.

252

253 The samples from DECAAF-II dataset were only used for external validation. We highlight that the
254 samples from DECAAF-II dataset are real world examples of unfiltered mobile ECG samples as the patients
255 submitted the data from home during the follow up period of the trial; thus, it is impossible to measure the SNR
256 of these samples as we do not have a clean version, nor the noise separated from the signal. We provided 222
257 original samples and their corresponding denoised samples to the physicians at Tulane University's Heart and
258 Vascular institute to review the quality of denoising with the following scale.

259

260 Signal Quality Scale:

- 261 1. Uninterpretable
- 262 2. Signal suffers from heavy combinations of baseline wandering, muscle artifacts and etc. Some beats
- 263 are not recoverable, but the trend of the rhythm is identifiable to make an educated guess
- 264 3. Signal demonstrates heavy amplitudes of noise, but all beats are clear and rhythm is identifiable
- 265 4. Signal contains very minor noise but the rhythm is interpretable
- 266 5. Signal shows no presence of noise

267
268

269

Results

270 In the first experiment, we created an identical environment to that of CAE-CGAN's experiment to provide a
271 direct comparison of Cardio-NAFNet's performance to CAE-CGAN's performance[21]. Table 1 demonstrates
272 that Cardio-NAFNet's performance has a significant improvement in all noise combinations at all noise levels,
273 resulting in a combined average difference of 11.76dB. In the supplement, we also provide results to compare
274 the results with not only CGAN, but also with Improved denoising autoencoder[13], and adversarial method[21,
275 28, 29]. We note that while our model follows the general autoencoder architecture, the skip connections from
276 the encoder to the decoder and utilizing NAFBlocks instead of ConvBlocks provide a significant improvement
277 in results.

278

279 For the second experiment, we demonstrate that not only our model performance holds when we
280 stretch the input to 8 seconds, but also the ECG rhythm classifications drastically improved after denoising. The
281 detailed SNR and RMSE results with 8 second samples can be found in Table 5 and 6. Figure 2 shows the
282 original clean ECG from the arrhythmia database, a simulated ECG through our preprocessing, and the output of
283 Cardio-NAFNet when it receives the simulated ECGs. As shown in the figure, while the simulated noisy signals
284 contain a significant amount of noise, the denoised samples are nearly indistinguishable from the clean ECG
285 signals during validation. Also, a pretrained 4 label classifier that achieved .98 F-1 score with clean signals from
286 the arrhythmia database was applied to the noisy signals and corresponding denoised signals. When applied with
287 different noise types demonstrated in Table7, denoised signals had 26% average improvement compared to the
288 noisy signals.

289

290 For the third experiment, we highlight the generalizability of Cardio-NAFNet's by providing the
291 denoised results from single-lead mobile ECG samples. The original samples and corresponding denoised
292 examples can be found in Figure 3. Above visual representation, the denoised signals were reviewed by expert
293 physicians with the metric provided in Evaluation. The improved results can be found in Table 3. In our
294 proposed metric scaling from 1 to 5, the expert physicians' scored the unfiltered signals from the DECAAF-II a
295 mean of 3.18 with a variance of 0.94, while the denoised signals achieved 4.46 with a variance of 0.91. We
296 noticed that majority of the unfiltered recordings that were in 3 or 4 range, meaning individual beats were
297 identifiable, but with the presence of noise, was scored 5 after denoising.

298

299

300

Discussion

301 In this work, we present Cardio-NAFNet that outperforms existing state-of-the-art methods in quantitative
302 measures. We also augment the conventional experiment design of quantitative ECG denoising performance
303 evaluation by qualitative evaluation methods and an external validation of mobile ECG signals for
304 generalizability. SNR served as a popular metric to evaluate the quality of a signal or image samples, but we
305 believe that the most critical piece of ECG denoising is not to generate signals that are just visibly good, but to
306 enhance the clinical interpretability of the signals. Previous literature demonstrated the average SNR and the
307 classification results of the model's denoised outputs when the ECG records are broken down into nearly a
308 single second[20, 21, 30, 31], containing one to two beats. While Wang et al created an extensive design to test
309 CAE-CGAN, we believe that the model performance should be also evaluated with longer signals as the
310 irregularities in rhythm that cannot be captured in a single beat can have significant clinical implications. Also,
311 generalizability has been regularly concerned in numerous publications when it comes to the AI models used in
312 medicine[29, 32, 33]. AI models within ECG domain are no exception as different device types and patient
313 population can cause AI models to underperform when it is exposed to an unseen dataset. Demonstrating the
314 generalizability of denoising models with mobile ECGs has been a difficult task due to a limited number of
315 datasets with clean ECG samples and noise samples that are publicly available. Since the rise of consumer level
316 ECG devices such as AliveCor Kardia or Apple Watch, the validation of AI-based ECG model's
317 generalizability with single lead mobile ECG signals has been imperative. Numerous authors have addressed the
318 generalizability of their models by stratifying the dataset at a patient level and providing unseen leads to the
319 model during tests using MIT-BIH Physionet's Arrhythmia database [5-10, 12-14, 17-21, 30, 31, 34-37].
320 Despite the attempt, these models prove its generalizability within the Arrhythmia database, which contains
321 Holter recordings from 48 patients recorded at a single lab during 1975 to 1979. We argue that previously
322 suggested experimental framework does not suffice to prove the model's generalizability, especially when the
323 large demands arise from mobile ECG signals.

324

325 Cardio-NAFNet, with three experiments, validated its performance and addressed all the limitations above. The
326 three experiments were designed with the following objectives:

- 327 1. Confirm superior performance in an identical training and testing environment to the current SOTA
328 model.
- 329 2. Validate Cardio-NAFNet's capabilities with 8 second recordings with SNR and enhanced classification
330 results.
- 331 3. Prove the generalizability of Cardio-NAFNet through an external validation.

332

333 Our external validation highlights Cardio-NAFNet's generalizability not only at the device level, but also at a
334 patient population level as the data was collected from 44 sites around the world. We also note that most of the
335 original samples that were hardly interpretable stayed uninterpretable after denoising, which is reasonable.

336

Conclusion

337 In this paper, we propose a novel AI ECG denoising method based on NAFNet architecture and extensive
338 experiment designs to evaluate the denoised signal's clinical interpretability and generalizability. Cardio-

339 NAFNet further contributes to ECG denoising where the previous methods have been limited by employing the
340 structure of simplified attention blocks in a U-Net architecture with loss functions tailored to ECG denoising.
341 Cardio-NAFNet consistently achieved SNR above 50dB in majority of the extensive testing environment, which
342 is a mark that no other model in literature has achieved so far. The ECG denoising performance was not only
343 evaluated by SNR, but also qualitatively with a pre-trained ECG classification model and expert physicians to
344 demonstrate improved classification results and enhanced signal quality. Overall, Cardio-NAFNet shows
345 promising results in ECG denoising in both Holter recordings and mobile single lead recordings, proving its
346 generalizability and clinical significance.


347 Overall, Cardio-NAFNet provides a denoising method to standardize and stabilize the ECG recordings
348 from mobile devices. In our future studies, we plan to apply Cardio-NAFNet to the mobile ECG data and
349 translate innovative AI works that have been done with 12-lead ECG signals in clinics or labs to be applicable to
350 the mobile ECG recordings.

351

352
353
354

Figures and Tables:


Figure 1



355
356
357
358
359
360
361

Figure 1: Figure 1a describes the structure of the Block using Mobile Convolution (MB Block) and Feed Forward Network (FFN) Block with changes to the attention layers using simple channel attention (SCA) and simple gate along with drop out layers. Figure 2b describes the overall U-shaped architecture of Cardio-NAFNet where the left side represents encoder with 10 NAFBlocks and the right side is the decoder with 4 NAFBlocks. The decoder also receives maps from the encoder blocks using skip connection.

Figure 2:




362
363
364
365
366

Figure 2: The denoised outputs from Cardio-NAFNet are in green, the clean ECG signals from the arrhythmia database are in blue, and the simulated noisy signals are in red. Cardio-NAFNet takes the signals in red as an input and uses the signals in blue only to calculate the loss to produce the signals in green. The denoised outputs here are nearly indistinguishable from the original clean ECG samples.

367

368

Figure 3



369

370

371

372

Figure 3: The denoised outputs from Cardio-NAFNet are in green and the unfiltered mobile ECG signals from DECAAF-II trial are in red.

The records are in an order by their original signal quality score ranging from one to four.

Tables

SNR	Methods	Denoised Metrics	Noise Type							Avg.
			BW	EM	MA	BW+EM	BW+MA	MA+EM	BW+MA+E M	
0dB	CGAN	SNR(dB)	39.59	40.09	39.09	40.08	40.43	40.38	39.49	39.88
		RMSE	0.0031	0.0029	0.0033	0.0029	0.0028	0.0029	0.0031	0.0030
	Cardio-NAFNET (proposed)	SNR(dB)	53.38	52.97	51.70	51.80	52.19	51.31	51.55	52.13
		RMSE	0.0027	0.0014	0.0024	0.0018	0.0026	0.0016	0.0017	0.0020
1dB	CGAN	SNR(dB)	41.29	42.31	41.21	42.42	42.57	42.67	41.92	42.06
		RMSE	0.0025	0.0022	0.0025	0.0022	0.0021	0.0022	0.0023	0.0023
	Cardio-NAFNET (proposed)	SNR(dB)	54.69	54.45	53.27	53.05	53.75	52.75	53.04	53.57
		RMSE	0.0016	0.0010	0.0018	0.0013	0.0020	0.0013	0.0013	0.0015
2dB	CGAN	SNR(dB)	41.87	43.04	41.78	43.22	43.23	43.38	42.66	42.77
		RMSE	0.0023	0.0020	0.0023	0.0020	0.0020	0.0020	0.0021	0.0021
	Cardio-NAFNET (proposed)	SNR(dB)	55.39	54.89	53.89	53.54	54.52	53.28	53.66	54.17
		RMSE	0.0013	0.0010	0.0014	0.0012	0.0015	0.0013	0.0011	0.0013
3dB	CGAN	SNR(dB)	42.09	43.26	41.96	43.41	43.36	43.65	42.86	42.94
		RMSE	0.0023	0.0020	0.0023	0.0019	0.0020	0.0019	0.0021	0.0021

	Cardio-NAFNET (proposed)	SNR(dB)	55.86	55.07	54.10	53.72	54.99	53.47	53.96	54.45
		RMSE	0.0010	0.0009	0.0013	0.0011	0.0012	0.0013	0.0010	0.0011
4dB	CGAN	SNR(dB)	41.96	43.04	41.74	43.20	43.13	43.40	42.65	42.73
		RMSE	0.0023	0.0021	0.0024	0.0020	0.0020	0.0020	0.0021	0.0021
	Cardio-NAFNET (proposed)	SNR(dB)	55.92	54.95	54.04	53.63	55.09	53.37	53.87	54.41
		RMSE	0.0012	0.0010	0.0021	0.0014	0.0017	0.0014	0.0012	0.0014
5dB	CGAN	SNR(dB)	41.10	41.75	40.59	41.80	41.93	42.03	41.28	41.50
		RMSE	0.0026	0.0024	0.0027	0.0024	0.0023	0.0023	0.0025	0.0025
	Cardio-NAFNET (proposed)	SNR(dB)	55.52	54.26	53.14	53.04	54.41	52.56	53.17	53.73
		RMSE	0.0024	0.0011	0.0033	0.0017	0.0021	0.0016	0.0014	0.0019

Table 1: Denoising results of 360Hz sampling rate by noise type and SNR

373
374

Methods	Input SNR	Denoised Metrics	Record Number											
			103	105	111	116	122	205	213	219	223	230	Avg.	
Improved DAE	0dB	SNR(dB)	22.75	23.70	23.39	21.34	17.70	23.47	19.33	18.38	23.17	22.40	21.56	
		RMSE	0.0290	0.0330	0.0340	0.0350	0.0500	0.0330	0.0400	0.0410	0.0310	0.0390	0.0365	
Adversarial Method		SNR(dB)	38.09	34.27	33.07	30.02	28.74	38.44	30.27	28.24	31.75	30.87	32.38	
		RMSE	0.0050	0.0080	0.0093	0.0115	0.0134	0.0048	0.0125	0.0150	0.0101	0.0119	0.0102	
CGAN		SNR(dB)	39.49	38.89	39.65	40.97	39.76	38.45	41.28	40.40	39.72	42.34	40.09	
		RMSE	0.0022	0.0032	0.0040	0.0027	0.0026	0.0026	0.0031	0.0027	0.0029	0.0034	0.0029	
Cardio-NAFNET (proposed)		SNR(dB)	51.73	47.30	45.46	46.97	49.21	53.04	46.09	47.95	49.16	49.82	48.67	
		RMSE	0.0022	0.0036	0.0058	0.0045	0.0039	0.0017	0.0054	0.0042	0.0061	0.0036	0.0041	
Improved DAE		1.25dB	SNR(dB)	22.97	23.94	23.57	21.82	18.76	23.57	19.79	19.07	23.55	22.54	21.96
			RMSE	0.0290	0.0330	0.0330	0.0330	0.0420	0.0330	0.0370	0.0380	0.0300	0.0380	0.0346
Adversarial Method	SNR(dB)		38.56	34.79	33.45	30.77	29.28	38.96	30.68	29.21	32.19	31.11	32.90	
	RMSE		0.0049	0.0075	0.0089	0.0105	0.0126	0.0046	0.0119	0.0134	0.0096	0.0116	0.0096	
CGAN	SNR(dB)		42.34	42.26	42.75	44.20	43.00	41.46	44.93	43.69	42.74	45.48	43.28	
	RMSE		0.0016	0.0021	0.0027	0.0018	0.0018	0.0017	0.0020	0.0018	0.0020	0.0023	0.0020	
Cardio-NAFNET (proposed)	SNR(dB)		53.32	49.05	48.91	49.03	51.06	54.98	47.31	49.31	51.15	52.57	50.67	
	RMSE		0.0016	0.0030	0.0059	0.0025	0.0021	0.0013	0.0053	0.0037	0.0034	0.0036	0.0032	
Improved DAE	5dB		SNR(dB)	23.45	24.66	23.65	23.08	20.81	23.66	20.69	21.01	24.00	22.81	22.78
			RMSE	0.0270	0.0300	0.0330	0.0300	0.0350	0.0300	0.0340	0.0300	0.0280	0.0370	0.0314
Adversarial Method		SNR(dB)	39.39	35.67	34.10	21.72	30.01	39.89	31.37	31.23	32.96	31.53	32.79	
		RMSE	0.0044	0.0068	0.0082	0.0095	0.0116	0.0041	0.0110	0.0106	0.0088	0.0111	0.0086	
CGAN		SNR(dB)	41.05	40.72	41.18	42.65	41.89	40.29	42.72	42.03	41.43	43.56	41.75	
		RMSE	0.0018	0.0033	0.0056	0.0022	0.0020	0.0021	0.0026	0.0022	0.0024	0.0029	0.0027	
Cardio-NAFNET (proposed)		SNR(dB)	54.31	50.01	51.37	50.20	52.12	55.79	49.42	51.08	52.45	52.93	51.97	
		RMSE	0.0010	0.0028	0.0016	0.0015	0.0011	0.0008	0.0023	0.0023	0.0013	0.0012	0.0015	

Table 2: Comparison of EM denoising results.

375
376

Methods	Input SNR	Denoised Metrics	Record Number										
			103	105	111	116	122	205	213	219	223	230	Avg.
Improved DAE	0dB	SNR(dB)	21.38	24.72	23.15	19.22	19.57	24.23	19.59	18.80	22.91	22.58	21.62
		RMSE	0.0340	0.0300	0.0350	0.0450	0.0400	0.0310	0.0380	0.0390	0.0320	0.0380	0.0360
Adversarial Method		SNR(dB)	41.36	36.49	35.90	35.47	31.06	40.58	33.73	32.37	33.46	33.98	35.14
		RMSE	0.0042	0.0073	0.0079	0.0107	0.0126	0.0045	0.0100	0.0112	0.0100	0.0098	0.0088
CGAN		SNR(dB)	37.94	38.28	39.21	39.81	38.28	36.98	40.31	39.65	39.00	41.42	39.09
		RMSE	0.0027	0.0035	0.0042	0.0030	0.0031	0.0029	0.0035	0.0030	0.0031	0.0039	0.0033
Cardio-NAFNET		SNR(dB)	53.66	50.29	51.20	49.55	51.19	54.73	48.74	50.14	52.49	52.28	51.43
		RMSE	0.0023	0.0025	0.0030	0.0025	0.0019	0.0017	0.0047	0.0039	0.0013	0.0020	0.0026

(proposed)														
Improved DAE	1.25dB	SNR(dB)	22.41	24.86	23.27	20.22	20.02	24.49	19.78	19.63	23.41	22.60	22.07	
		RMSE	0.0310	0.0290	0.0340	0.0400	0.0380	0.0300	0.0370	0.0340	0.0300	0.0380	0.0340	
Adversarial Method		SNR(dB)	42.10	37.46	36.16	33.67	31.88	41.19	34.26	33.40	34.36	34.22	35.87	
		RMSE	0.0038	0.0065	0.0076	0.0093	0.0115	0.0042	0.0094	0.0100	0.0090	0.0096	0.0081	
CGAN		SNR(dB)	40.59	41.43	42.74	42.50	41.33	39.67	43.79	42.68	41.75	44.88	42.14	
		RMSE	0.0019	0.0023	0.0027	0.0022	0.0021	0.0021	0.0022	0.0021	0.0022	0.0024	0.0022	
Cardio-NAFNET (proposed)		SNR(dB)	55.02	51.66	52.12	50.72	52.18	56.21	49.86	51.15	53.75	53.26	52.59	
		RMSE	0.0010	0.0020	0.0019	0.0021	0.0019	0.0009	0.0039	0.0047	0.0010	0.0019	0.0021	
Improved DAE		5dB	SNR(dB)	23.33	25.13	23.33	22.41	20.63	24.67	20.63	21.97	24.21	22.63	22.89
			RMSE	0.0270	0.0280	0.0340	0.0310	0.0360	0.0300	0.0340	0.0270	0.0280	0.0380	0.0310
Adversarial Method			SNR(dB)	43.24	39.55	36.66	35.88	33.50	42.22	34.95	35.38	36.35	34.55	37.23
			RMSE	0.0033	0.0050	0.0072	0.0072	0.0096	0.0037	0.0087	0.0080	0.0072	0.0092	0.0069
CGAN			SNR(dB)	39.34	39.65	40.66	40.92	40.08	38.25	42.18	41.08	40.42	43.23	40.59
			RMSE	0.0023	0.0030	0.0035	0.0026	0.0025	0.0026	0.0028	0.0025	0.0025	0.0030	0.0027
Cardio-NAFNET (proposed)	SNR(dB)		55.50	51.77	53.28	51.37	52.84	56.33	51.24	52.36	54.16	53.79	53.26	
	RMSE		0.0008	0.0016	0.0011	0.0013	0.0010	0.0008	0.0014	0.0012	0.0009	0.0011	0.0011	

Table3: Comparison of MA denoising results.

377

378

379

Methods	Input SNR	Denoised Metrics	Record Number											
			103	105	111	116	122	205	213	219	223	230	Avg.	
Improved DAE	0dB	SNR(dB)	23.78	25.40	23.31	23.51	20.07	20.07	21.30	23.02	24.25	22.72	22.74	
		RMSE	0.0260	0.0280	0.0340	0.0270	0.0500	0.0500	0.0320	0.0240	0.0270	0.0370	0.0340	
Adversarial Method		SNR(dB)	40.26	39.49	34.13	32.81	32.09	39.70	31.64	31.23	34.59	32.36	34.83	
		RMSE	0.0032	0.0035	0.0066	0.0068	0.0075	0.0034	0.0086	0.0086	0.0059	0.0081	0.0062	
CGAN		SNR(dB)	38.62	39.07	39.44	39.99	39.31	37.74	40.86	39.70	39.64	41.52	39.59	
		RMSE	0.0025	0.0031	0.0040	0.0030	0.0027	0.0027	0.0032	0.0030	0.0028	0.0039	0.0031	
Cardio-NAFNET (proposed)		SNR(dB)	53.29	48.96	49.13	46.49	50.25	54.30	45.68	44.19	51.66	51.02	49.50	
		RMSE	0.0023	0.0038	0.0070	0.0083	0.0026	0.0019	0.0105	0.0119	0.0034	0.0026	0.0054	
Improved DAE		1.25dB	SNR(dB)	22.82	25.42	23.32	23.59	20.08	20.08	21.36	23.31	24.41	22.74	22.81
			RMSE	0.0260	0.0280	0.0340	0.0270	0.0500	0.0500	0.0320	0.0270	0.0370	0.0370	0.0330
Adversarial Method			SNR(dB)	40.72	39.87	34.53	33.51	32.42	40.34	32.05	32.09	35.12	32.44	35.31
			RMSE	0.0031	0.0034	0.0063	0.0063	0.0072	0.0031	0.0082	0.0078	0.0056	0.0080	0.0059
CGAN			SNR(dB)	40.83	41.56	42.42	42.68	41.70	40.06	43.63	41.95	41.92	44.47	42.12
			RMSE	0.0019	0.0023	0.0028	0.0021	0.0021	0.0020	0.0023	0.0023	0.0022	0.0026	0.0022
Cardio-NAFNET (proposed)	SNR(dB)		53.92	50.29	49.66	48.59	51.38	55.06	47.87	46.93	52.16	51.78	50.76	
	RMSE		0.0025	0.0029	0.0077	0.0066	0.0014	0.0024	0.0076	0.0104	0.0035	0.0036	0.0049	
Improved DAE	5dB		SNR(dB)	23.89	25.45	23.35	23.76	20.08	20.08	21.46	24.08	24.64	22.79	22.96
			RMSE	0.0250	0.0270	0.0340	0.0260	0.0500	0.0500	0.0310	0.0210	0.0260	0.0370	0.0330
Adversarial Method			SNR(dB)	41.60	40.56	35.27	34.99	32.89	41.73	32.89	34.05	36.33	35.58	36.29
			RMSE	0.0027	0.0031	0.0058	0.0053	0.0068	0.0027	0.0074	0.0062	0.0048	0.0079	0.0053
CGAN			SNR(dB)	40.09	40.29	41.18	41.79	40.72	39.52	42.63	40.71	40.87	43.15	41.10
			RMSE	0.0021	0.0027	0.0033	0.0024	0.0023	0.0022	0.0026	0.0027	0.0025	0.0031	0.0026
Cardio-NAFNET (proposed)		SNR(dB)	54.25	50.20	51.37	48.87	51.56	55.23	49.96	49.25	52.65	52.04	51.54	
		RMSE	0.0016	0.0027	0.0045	0.0094	0.0012	0.0009	0.0040	0.0051	0.0021	0.0015	0.0033	

Table4: Comparison of BW denoising results.

380

381

382

Input SNR	Denoised Metrics	Noise Type							
		BW	EM	MA	BW+EM	BW+MA	MA+EM	BW+MA+EM	Avg.
0dB	SNR(dB)	49.33	51.00	46.81	51.70	49.47	50.99	51.34	50.09
	RMSE	0.0019	0.0015	0.0029	0.0013	0.0018	0.0015	0.0014	0.0018
1dB	SNR(dB)	50.98	52.52	49.22	52.71	51.35	52.79	52.86	51.78
	RMSE	0.0015	0.0013	0.0021	0.0012	0.0015	0.0012	0.0012	0.0014
2dB	SNR(dB)	51.69	53.22	50.38	53.33	52.19	53.24	53.14	52.47
	RMSE	0.0014	0.0012	0.0017	0.0011	0.0013	0.0011	0.0013	0.0013
3dB	SNR(dB)	51.75	53.52	50.69	53.72	52.03	53.42	53.61	52.68
	RMSE	0.0014	0.0011	0.0016	0.0011	0.0014	0.0011	0.0012	0.0013
4dB	SNR(dB)	51.19	53.89	50.55	53.51	51.71	53.38	53.33	52.51
	RMSE	0.0015	0.0011	0.0016	0.0012	0.0014	0.0011	0.0011	0.0013
5dB	SNR(dB)	50.41	53.11	49.54	52.82	51.05	53.31	52.88	51.87
	RMSE	0.0017	0.0012	0.0018	0.0012	0.0015	0.0011	0.0012	0.0014

Table 5: Denoising results of 8 secs samples with 64Hz sampling rate by noise type and SNR

383

384

Noise Type	Denoised Metrics	Record Number										
		103	105	111	116	122	205	213	219	223	230	Avg.
BW	SNR(dB)	54.22	48.74	51.10	48.60	51.84	53.96	48.64	48.30	51.64	49.79	50.68
	RMSE	0.0010	0.0028	0.0015	0.0019	0.0011	0.0011	0.0019	0.0019	0.0013	0.0018	0.0016
EM	SNR(dB)	55.90	54.38	53.86	49.46	53.66	55.75	50.48	51.33	53.08	52.93	53.08
	RMSE	0.0008	0.0011	0.0010	0.0019	0.0009	0.0008	0.0016	0.0013	0.0011	0.0012	0.0012
MA	SNR(dB)	51.93	49.55	50.08	47.10	50.70	52.71	47.14	47.90	50.72	48.43	49.63
	RMSE	0.0015	0.0020	0.0019	0.0022	0.0014	0.0016	0.0022	0.0020	0.0014	0.0021	0.0018
BW+EM	SNR(dB)	55.76	52.45	53.93	50.01	54.26	55.58	50.53	51.32	53.23	53.72	53.08
	RMSE	0.0008	0.0016	0.0010	0.0018	0.0008	0.0009	0.0016	0.0013	0.0011	0.0011	0.0012
BW+MA	SNR(dB)	53.72	50.16	51.65	48.60	52.06	53.94	49.40	49.14	52.04	48.03	50.87
	RMSE	0.0011	0.0021	0.0014	0.0020	0.0011	0.0011	0.0017	0.0016	0.0012	0.0021	0.0015
MA+EM	SNR(dB)	55.64	52.23	53.91	50.13	53.69	55.78	50.62	51.55	53.23	52.54	52.93
	RMSE	0.0009	0.0016	0.0010	0.0017	0.0009	0.0008	0.0015	0.0012	0.0011	0.0013	0.0012
BW+MA+EM	SNR(dB)	55.99	52.75	53.97	49.93	53.96	55.66	50.54	51.26	53.14	50.97	52.82
	RMSE	0.0008	0.0014	0.0010	0.0019	0.0009	0.0008	0.0015	0.0013	0.0011	0.0015	0.0012

Table 6: Denoising results of 8 secs samples with 64Hz sampling rate by record number and noise type

385

386


	Clean	Noisy	Denoised	Improved
BW	98.03%	73.27%	97.90%	24.62%
EM	98.02%	71.42%	97.88%	26.46%
MA	97.91%	73.10%	97.52%	24.42%
BW+EM	98.05%	70.25%	97.97%	27.72%
BW+MA	98.04%	73.36%	97.93%	24.57%
MA+EM	97.76%	70.28%	97.58%	27.30%
BW+MA+EM	97.83%	69.73%	97.83%	27.99%

387
388
389

Table 7: Classification comparison between clean, noisy, and denoised signals

Table 8

External Validation with Unfiltered Mobile Single Lead ECG Dataset



390
391
392
393
394
395
396

Table 5: The histogram demonstrates the distribution of signal quality when the unfiltered mobile ECG samples and their corresponding denoised outputs from Cardio-NAFNet when reviewed by physicians. While the majority of the signals that were uninterpretable stayed uninterpretable, Cardio-NAFNet was able to significantly improve the quality of the signals as shown in figure 3.

- 397 1. Hannun, A.Y., et al., *Cardiologist-level arrhythmia detection and classification in*
398 *ambulatory electrocardiograms using a deep neural network*. Nat Med, 2019. **25**(1): p.
399 65-69.
- 400 2. Attia, Z.I., et al., *An artificial intelligence-enabled ECG algorithm for the identification*
401 *of patients with atrial fibrillation during sinus rhythm: a retrospective analysis of*
402 *outcome prediction*. Lancet, 2019. **394**(10201): p. 861-867.
- 403 3. Chatterjee, S., et al., *Review of noise removal techniques in ECG signals*. IET Signal
404 Processing, 2020. **14**(9): p. 569-590.
- 405 4. Luo, S. and P. Johnston, *A review of electrocardiogram filtering*. J Electrocardiol, 2010.
406 **43**(6): p. 486-96.
- 407 5. Poornachandra, S., *Wavelet-based denoising using subband dependent threshold for*
408 *ECG signals*. Digital signal processing, 2008. **18**(1): p. 49-55.
- 409 6. Singh, O. and R.K. Sunkaria, *ECG signal denoising via empirical wavelet transform*.
410 Australasian physical & engineering sciences in medicine, 2017. **40**(1): p. 219-229.
- 411 7. Dai, B. and W. Bai, *Denoising ECG by Adaptive Filter with Empirical Mode*
412 *Decomposition*. arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.08376, 2021.
- 413 8. Hermawan, I., et al. *Denoising noisy ECG signal based on adaptive Fourier*
414 *decomposition*. in *2018 3rd International Seminar on Sensors, Instrumentation,*
415 *Measurement and Metrology (ISSIMM)*. 2018. IEEE.
- 416 9. Hesar, H.D. and M. Mohebbi, *An adaptive particle weighting strategy for ECG*
417 *denoising using marginalized particle extended Kalman filter: An evaluation in*
418 *arrhythmia contexts*. IEEE Journal of Biomedical and Health Informatics, 2017. **21**(6):
419 p. 1581-1592.
- 420 10. Nguyen, P. and J.-M. Kim, *Adaptive ECG denoising using genetic algorithm-based*
421 *thresholding and ensemble empirical mode decomposition*. Information sciences, 2016.
422 **373**: p. 499-511.
- 423 11. Sameni, R., et al., *A nonlinear Bayesian filtering framework for ECG denoising*. IEEE
424 Trans Biomed Eng, 2007. **54**(12): p. 2172-85.
- 425 12. Kabir, A., *Denoising of ECG signals based on noise reduction algorithms in EMD and*
426 *wavelet domains*. 2012. **7**(5).
- 427 13. Chiang, H.-T., et al., *Noise reduction in ECG signals using fully convolutional denoising*
428 *autoencoders*. Ieee Access, 2019. **7**: p. 60806-60813.
- 429 14. Vincent, P., et al. *Extracting and composing robust features with denoising*
430 *autoencoders*. in *Proceedings of the 25th international conference on Machine*
431 *learning*. 2008.
- 432 15. Hochreiter, S. and J. Schmidhuber, *Long Short-Term Memory*. Neural Computation,
433 1997. **9**(8): p. 1735-1780.
- 434 16. Goodfellow, I., et al., *Generative Adversarial Nets*, Z. Ghahramani, et al., Editors. 2014.
- 435 17. Xu, B., et al., *An ECG denoising method based on the generative adversarial residual*
436 *network*. Computational and Mathematical Methods in Medicine, 2021. **2021**.
- 437 18. Xiong, P., et al., *ECG signal enhancement based on improved denoising auto-encoder*.
438 Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence, 2016. **52**: p. 194-202.
- 439 19. Xiong, P., et al., *A stacked contractive denoising auto-encoder for ECG signal denoising*.
440 Physiol Meas, 2016. **37**(12): p. 2214-2230.
- 441 20. Singh, P. and G. Pradhan, *A new ECG denoising framework using generative adversarial*
442 *network*. IEEE/ACM Transactions on Computational Biology and Bioinformatics, 2020.
443 **18**(2): p. 759-764.

- 444 21. Wang, X., et al., *An ECG Signal Denoising Method Using Conditional Generative*
445 *Adversarial Net*. IEEE Journal of Biomedical and Health Informatics, 2022.
- 446 22. Moody, G.B., R.G. Mark, and A.L. Goldberger, *PhysioNet: a Web-based resource for the*
447 *study of physiologic signals*. IEEE Eng Med Biol Mag, 2001. **20**(3): p. 70-5.
- 448 23. Moody, G.B., R.G. Mark, and A.L. Goldberger, *PhysioNet: a research resource for*
449 *studies of complex physiologic and biomedical signals*. Comput Cardiol, 2000. **27**: p.
450 179-82.
- 451 24. Moody, G.B. and R.G. Mark, *The impact of the MIT-BIH arrhythmia database*. IEEE Eng
452 Med Biol Mag, 2001. **20**(3): p. 45-50.
- 453 25. Marrouche, N.F., et al., *Effect of MRI-Guided Fibrosis Ablation vs Conventional*
454 *Catheter Ablation on Atrial Arrhythmia Recurrence in Patients With Persistent Atrial*
455 *Fibrillation: The DECAAF II Randomized Clinical Trial*. JAMA, 2022. **327**(23): p. 2296-
456 2305.
- 457 26. Goldberger, A.L., et al., *PhysioBank, PhysioToolkit, and PhysioNet: components of a*
458 *new research resource for complex physiologic signals*. Circulation, 2000. **101**(23): p.
459 E215-20.
- 460 27. Chen, L., et al. *Simple Baselines for Image Restoration*. 2022. arXiv:2204.04676.
- 461 28. Wang, J., et al., *Adversarial de-noising of electrocardiogram*. Neurocomputing, 2019.
462 **349**: p. 212-224.
- 463 29. Lai, C., S. Zhou, and N.A. Trayanova, *Optimal ECG-lead selection increases*
464 *generalizability of deep learning on ECG abnormality classification*. Philos Trans A
465 Math Phys Eng Sci, 2021. **379**(2212): p. 20200258.
- 466 30. Rasti-Meymandi, A. and A. Ghaffari, *A deep learning-based framework For ECG signal*
467 *denoising based on stacked cardiac cycle tensor*. Biomedical Signal Processing and
468 Control, 2022. **71**: p. 103275.
- 469 31. Ravichandran, V., et al. *Deep network for capacitive ECG denoising*. in *2019 IEEE*
470 *International Symposium on Medical Measurements and Applications (MeMeA)*. 2019.
471 IEEE.
- 472 32. Yang, J., A.A.S. Soltan, and D.A. Clifton, *Machine learning generalizability across*
473 *healthcare settings: insights from multi-site COVID-19 screening*. NPJ Digit Med, 2022.
474 **5**(1): p. 69.
- 475 33. Ryu, A.J., et al., *Assessing the Generalizability of a Clinical Machine Learning Model*
476 *Across Multiple Emergency Departments*. Mayo Clin Proc Innov Qual Outcomes, 2022.
477 **6**(3): p. 193-199.
- 478 34. AlMahamdy, M. and H.B. Riley, *Performance study of different denoising methods for*
479 *ECG signals*. Procedia Computer Science, 2014. **37**: p. 325-332.
- 480 35. Antczak, K., *Deep recurrent neural networks for ECG signal denoising*. arXiv preprint
481 arXiv:1807.11551, 2018.
- 482 36. Zhang, D., et al., *An efficient ECG denoising method based on empirical mode*
483 *decomposition, sample entropy, and improved threshold function*. Wireless
484 Communications and Mobile Computing, 2020. **2020**.
- 485 37. Hossain, M.-B., et al., *A robust ECG denoising technique using variable frequency*
486 *complex demodulation*. Computer Methods and Programs in Biomedicine, 2021. **200**:
487 p. 105856.
488
489