Highlights

Accurate RR-interval extraction from single-lead, telehealth electrocardiogram signals

Sharon Yuen Shan Ho, Zixuan Ding, David C. Wong, Florian Kristof, James Brimicombe, Martin R. Cowie, Andrew Dymond, Hannah Clair Lindén, Gregory Y. H. Lip, Kate Williams, Jonathan Mant, Peter H. Charlton

- Algorithm extracts RR-intervals from ECGs and assesses their accuracy
- Algorithm was developed using two datasets of ECGs collected using different devices
- The impacts of arrhythmia and noise on algorithm performance were assessed
- The algorithm uses a pair of openly available QRS detection algorithms

Accurate RR-interval extraction from single-lead, telehealth electrocardiogram signals

Sharon Yuen Shan Ho[a], Zixuan Ding[a], David C. Wong[g], Florian Kristof[b], James Brimicombe[a], Martin R. Cowie[c], Andrew Dymond[a], Hannah Clair Lindén[d], Gregory Y. H. Lip[e,f], Kate Williams[a], Jonathan Mant[a], Peter H. Charlton[a]

[a] *Department of Public Health and Primary Care, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, CB1 8RN, United Kingdom*
[b] *TUM School of Computation, Information, and Technology, Technical University of Munich, Garching bei München, 85748, Germany*
[c] *School of Cardiovascular Medicine & Sciences, Faculty of Lifesciences & Medicine, King's College London, London, United Kingdom*
[d] *Zenicor Medical Systems AB, Stockholm, 113 59, Sweden*
[e] *Liverpool Centre for Cardiovascular Science at University of Liverpool, Liverpool John Moores University and Liverpool Heart & Chest Hospital, Liverpool, United Kingdom*
[f] *Department of Clinical Medicine, Aalborg University, Aalborg, Denmark*
[g] *Leeds Institute of Health Sciences, University of Leeds, Leeds, UK*

Abstract

Devices that record single-lead ECGs, such as smartwatches and handheld ECG recorders, hold promise for detecting undiagnosed atrial fibrillation (AF). Accurately extracting RR-intervals from telehealth ECGs is key for heart rhythm assessment. The aim of this study was to develop an algorithm to extract RR-intervals from telehealth ECGs, and assess whether the extracted RR-intervals are accurate and therefore suitable for analysis. Two datasets of 30-second handheld ECGs were used: TELE ECG Database (250 ECGs) and SAFER ECG dataset (479 ECGs). One of three high-performance primary QRS detectors, selected based on previous evidence, was used to detect QRS complexes and extract RR-intervals. These detections were compared to those from a secondary QRS detector to assess accuracy. All pairs of 3 primary and 18 secondary QRS detectors were tested. Accuracy was quantified using mean absolute error (MAE) and the proportion

Email address: ysh25@cam.ac.uk (Sharon Yuen Shan Ho)

of time RR-intervals were assessed as accurate (coverage). Best performance was achieved using *unsw* and *nk* as primary and secondary detectors, with MAEs of 24.6ms and 22.9ms, and coverages of 89% on TELE and SAFER respectively. Using a single detector alone produced higher MAEs (28.9ms and 48.0ms on TELE; 44.8ms and 48.4ms on SAFER). Accuracy was lower in AF (19.1 vs. 9.5ms, $p<0.001$) and low-quality signals (54.6 vs. 9.5ms, $p<0.001$). In conclusion, the recommended algorithm produced more accurate RR-intervals than using a single QRS detector, although accuracy was reduced in AF and low-quality signals.

Keywords: atrial fibrillation, ECG, Electrocardiography, inter-beat interval, mhealth, mobile, signal processing, signal quality

1. Introduction

Single-lead electrocardiogram (ECG) signals can now be recorded using mobile devices such as smartwatches [1] and handheld ECG recorders [2]. A promising application for such devices is to detect undiagnosed atrial fibrillation (AF), a common heart arrhythmia which confers an increased risk of stroke [3], and yet is often undiagnosed [4]. Indeed, it is feasible to use handheld ECG recorders in population-level AF screening of older adults [5, 6]. The large-scale use of such devices generates too many ECGs for them all to be manually reviewed, particularly when acquiring multiple ECGs per participant to detect paroxysmal AF. Consequently, automated algorithms are now commonly used to identify ECGs which show possible signs of AF and warrant clinical review [7].

RR-intervals are widely used in ECG analysis, with routine applications including heart rate estimation [8], heart rate variability analyses [9], and arrhythmia detection [10]. Our current interest is in using RR-intervals to assess the level of irregularity of a heart rhythm and to identify ECGs showing signs of AF [11]. RR-intervals can be automatically extracted from ECGs by using a QRS detection algorithm [12], followed by calculating the intervals between consecutive R-waves [13]. Statistical methods or machine learning models can then be used to determine whether a set of RR-intervals shows an irregular pattern consistent with AF [10]. Consequently, it is important to develop algorithms to extract RR-intervals accurately from ECG signals. This task is more challenging with telehealth ECGs than ECGs collected under clinical supervision, as telehealth ECG signals are more prone to noise

[14]. Consequently, QRS detection algorithms may be less accurate when used with telehealth ECGs [12], leading to errors in extracted RR-intervals.

The aim of this study was to develop an algorithm to extract RR-intervals from telehealth ECGs, and assess whether the extracted RR-intervals are accurate and therefore suitable for analysis. This work extends work presented at a conference [15] by using an additional dataset of ECGs collected during screening for AF, containing arrhythmias and noise. Some material has been reproduced or adapted from [15] under the CC BY 4.0 licence.

2. Methods

2.1. Datasets

In this study we used two datasets of telehealth single-lead ECGs: the publicly available TELE ECG Database (TELE), and ECGs from the SAFER AF Screening Programme (SAFER). In both cases ECGs were recorded at home, from the hands (specifically, using the thumbs in the case of SAFER), using devices with dry electrodes. Both datasets contain 30-second ECG signals sampled at 500Hz, as well as manual annotations of QRS complexes. These datasets are now described.

2.1.1. TELE ECG Database (TELE)

As described in [14, 16], the TELE ECG Database contains 250 ECGs recorded by home-dwelling patients suffering from chronic obstructive pulmonary disease and/or congestive heart failure. ECGs were recorded between the hands using the TeleMedCare Health Monitor (TeleMedCare Pty Ltd Sydney, Australia). The dataset includes 29 ECGs which were specifically selected as they were deemed to be poor quality [14]. One ECG lasted longer than 30s and was truncated to 30s for this study [12].

2.1.2. SAFER ECG Dataset (SAFER)

The SAFER ECG dataset contains 479 ECGs [12]. The ECGs were recorded by older adults aged 65 and over during the SAFER (Screening for Atrial Fibrillation with ECG to Reduce stroke) research programme (ISRCTN 16939438). The ECGs used in this study were collected in the SAFER Feasibility Study, which has been described in [6]. Briefly, ECGs were recorded between the thumbs using the Zenicor ONE device (Zenicor Medical Systems AB, Sweden). The dataset includes: 183 high-quality ECGs exhibiting AF (denoted SAFER-AF-HIGH); and 199 high-quality and

97 low-quality ECGs from subjects without AF (SAFER nonAF-HIGH and SAFER-nonAF-LOW respectively). Quality labels were generated using the Cardiolund ECG Parser algorithm (Cardiolund AB) [7], and the presence of AF was determined by clinicians with the aid of the Cardiolund algorithm as described in [17, 12].

The SAFER Feasibility Study in which the SAFER ECG dataset was acquired was approved by the London Central NHS Research Ethics Committee (18/LO/2066). All participants gave written informed consent to participate in the study. The study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki.

2.2. QRS Detection

We used three high-performance QRS detection algorithms to detect QRS complexes and extract RR-intervals. These were the Neurokit (*nk*) [18, 19], two-average (*two-avg*) [20], and University of New South Wales (*unsw*) [14] algorithms. These have previously been found to perform well on the TELE and SAFER datasets in [12], achieving F_1 scores of $\geq$0.96 on high-quality ECGs, and $\geq$0.70 on low-quality ECGs. The original *unsw* implementation was written in MATLAB. For this study we translated *unsw* into Python, and report results obtained using the new Python version in the main text (with corresponding results for the original MATLAB implementation in an appendix). To account for primary QRS detectors not providing the precise locations of R-wave peaks, each detected R-wave location was refined by identifying the point of highest amplitude within $\pm$ 50ms of the initial R-wave detection.

A total of 18 QRS detection algorithms were used to assess the accuracy of extracted RR-intervals. These consisted of: (i) the three aforementioned algorithms; (ii) 13 of the 15 remaining algorithms used in a recent study of open-source QRS detectors [12] (two algorithms denoted *gamb* and *mart* were excluded due to their poor performance in [12]); and (iii) two further algorithms included to ensure all of the top-performing QRS detectors in a comparison study [21] were included: the U3 transform algorithm (*u3*) [22] and the difference operation algorithm (*dom*) [23]. All algorithms were implemented in Python, except *jqrs*, *rdeco*, and *rpeak*, which were implemented in MATLAB.

2.3. RR-Interval Extraction and Accuracy Assessment

The process for RR-interval extraction and accuracy assessment is summarised in Figure 1 and now described.

RR-intervals were extracted using a single, high-performance 'primary' QRS detector (*i.e. nk*, *two-avg*, or *unsw*). To do so, QRS complexes were detected, and then RR-intervals were calculated as the time delays between consecutive QRS complexes. Next, the accuracy of each RR-interval was assessed by comparing the locations of the QRS complexes marking its beginning and end with those detected by a secondary detector (which could be any one of the 18 QRS detectors). Briefly, if the two detectors agreed on the locations of both the QRS complexes, then that RR-interval was assessed to be accurate, as demonstrated in Figure 2. To give further detail: an RR-interval was deemed to be accurate if the QRS complexes marking its beginning and end were detected by both the primary and secondary detector, and no further QRS complexes were detected by either detector within the RR-interval. When assessing whether a QRS complex was detected by both the primary and secondary detector, we allowed a tolerance of $\pm$ 50ms, *i.e.* if the secondary detector detected a QRS complex within 50ms either side of the time of that detected by the primary detector, then this QRS complex was deemed to have been detected by both detectors. A value of $\pm$ 50ms was chosen as a compromise between lower values which result in higher accuracy, and higher values which result in RR-intervals being assessed to be accurate for a higher proportion of the time. The preliminary analysis which informed this decision is shown in Appendix A.

The proposed approach for assessing the accuracy of RR-intervals is a modification of the *bSQI* approach to ECG signal quality assessment [24]. The *bSQI* approach provides a quantitative assessment of signal quality, defined as "a sliding-window ratio of consensus beats to total beats (consensus and non-consensus)" [24]. This approach has been used in several studies [25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 21], albeit possibly with slight variations in the calculation (such as calculating the ratio of consensus beats to total beats detected by one beat detector [26, 32]). In this work we modified the original approach to produce a binary classification for each RR-interval, rather than a quantitative assessment for a window of ECG signal (*e.g.* a 10-second window).

RR-intervals were extracted and their accuracy assessed for each combination of the three primary detectors and 18 secondary detectors, resulting in 54 pairs of QRS detectors. However, we note that the three combinations



* An RR-interval is predicted to be accurate if: (i) the secondary QRS detector detects one R-wave within ±50ms of each of the R-waves marking its beginning and end; and (ii) the secondary QRS detector does not detect any additional R-waves within the RR-interval.

Figure 1: **Algorithm for extracting RR-intervals and assessing whether they are accurate.**



(a) High-quality ECG



(b) Low-quality ECG

Figure 2: **Using two QRS detectors to assess the accuracy of RR-intervals**: (a) and (b) show examples of using the approach on high and low-quality ECGs respectively. RR-intervals were assessed to be accurate if the primary and secondary detections were in agreement. For comparison, the actual manual annotations of QRS complexes are shown in black.

which used the same primary and secondary detectors are equivalent to using a single QRS detector with no accuracy assessment.

2.4. Performance Evaluation

The performance of the algorithm when using each pair of QRS detectors was assessed as follows. A set of RR-intervals, alongside algorithm assessments of whether each RR-interval was accurate or not, were obtained for each ECG and each pair of QRS detectors. In addition, reference RR-intervals were calculated as the time delays between manually annotated QRS complexes.

To facilitate comparison, the reference and algorithm-extracted time series of RR-intervals were interpolated (using sample and hold interpolation) at 500 Hz at the same points in time. Any time points for which either time series was not available were discarded, thus ensuring the two time series had the same start and end times. To account for un-annotated portions of ECG signals, any periods with reference RR-intervals of >3 seconds were excluded from the analysis.

Performance was assessed using two metrics: (i) the proportion of time for which RR-intervals were assessed to be accurate, and therefore would be available for analysis (known as the 'coverage'); and (ii) the mean absolute error (MAE) between reference and extracted RR-intervals (in ms). Each metric was calculated for each ECG. Then the 'mean coverage' and the 'mean MAE' were calculated for each pair of QRS detectors on each dataset. The calculation for MAE was based solely on periods of time in which the algorithm assessed that the extracted RR-intervals were accurate, mimicking the intended real-world use of the algorithm, where only those RR-intervals assessed to be accurate would be analysed.

2.5. Identifying the Best-Performing Pairs of QRS Detectors

The best-performing pairs of QRS detectors were identified for two use cases. In the first use case, we identified the pair with the lowest mean MAE. This approach prioritises the accuracy of RR-intervals, at the expense of potentially identifying pairs of QRS detectors which may make a lower proportion of RR-intervals available for analysis. The pair identified using this approach could be suitable in scenarios where ECG data are plentiful and it is acceptable to discard a high proportion of RR-intervals. In the second use case, we identified the pair with the lowest mean MAE whilst achieving a sufficiently high mean coverage (chosen to be ≥85%). The pair

identified using this approach could be suitable in scenarios where accuracy requirements are not as strict, and greater priority is placed on retaining a higher proportion of RR-intervals.

The following subgroup analyses were performed. First, we investigated how performance varied between high and low quality signals by comparing performance between the SAFER nonAF-HIGH (high-quality) and SAFER nonAF-LOW (low-quality) subgroups. Second, we investigated how performance varied in the presence of arrhythmia by considering the SAFER AF-HIGH (AF present) and SAFER nonAF-HIGH (AF not present) subgroups. The MAE and coverage when using each pair of QRS detectors were compared between subgroups using the Mann-Whitney U test with a significance level of $p = 0.05$.

3. Results

3.1. Overall performance

The results for the mean MAE and mean coverage (proportion of time for which the algorithm assessed RR-intervals would be accurate) on the TELE and SAFER datasets are presented in Figure 3.

Figure 3(a) and 3(c) show that there was a wide range of mean MAEs when using different pairs of QRS detectors, ranging from 19ms to 82ms on the TELE dataset, and 17ms to 194ms on the SAFER dataset. Furthermore, it shows that RR-intervals were generally more accurate (lower mean MAEs) when using *unsw* or *nk* as the primary QRS detector, compared to using *two-avg*. There were minimal differences in accuracy when using *unsw* or *nk* as the primary QRS detector: the only significant difference was when the primary and secondary detectors were the same (*e.g.* [*nk*, *nk*]).

MAEs were generally lower when using a pair of QRS detectors to exclude RR-intervals assessed to be inaccurate, in comparison to using a single QRS detector without accuracy assessment. For instance, the [*nk*, *unsw*] pair produced mean MAEs of 24.2 and 24.3ms on TELE and SAFER datasets, compared to MAEs of 48.0 and 48.4ms when using [*nk*, *nk*] (*i.e.* using *nk* alone without accuracy assessment) ($p=0.001$ and $p<0.001$ respectively). Similarly, mean MAEs were significantly lower for [*unsw*, *nk*] than [*unsw*, *unsw*] on SAFER ($p<0.001$), although there was no significant difference on TELE.

Figures 3(b) and 3(d) show that there was a wide range of proportions of time for which RR-intervals were assessed to be accurate, ranging from 9 to



(a) Mean MAEs on the TELE dataset.



(b) Mean coverage on the TELE dataset.



(c) Mean MAEs on the SAFER dataset.



(d) Mean coverage on the SAFER dataset.

Figure 3: **Overall performance:** Heatmaps showing the mean MAE ((a) and (c)) and mean coverage ((b) and (d)) for each pair of QRS detectors on the TELE ((a) and (b)) and SAFER ((c) and (d)) datasets. Here, the 'coverage' is the proportion of time for which RR-intervals were assessed to be accurate.

90% on the TELE dataset, and 3 to 89% on the SAFER dataset (ignoring pairs of the same QRS detectors).

The results shown in this section were obtained using the new Python implementation of *unsw*. The corresponding results for the original MATLAB implementation were similar, and are provided in Appendix B.

3.2. Best-performing pairs of QRS detectors

Figure 4 illustrates the relative performance of pairs of QRS detectors when considering both their mean MAE and mean coverage. Each point represents a pair of different QRS detectors (where pairs of the same QRS detectors have been removed).

3.2.1. Pairs of QRS detectors producing the lowest MAEs

The most accurate RR-intervals were obtained on the TELE dataset when using [*unsw*, *dom*] as [primary, secondary] QRS detectors, with a mean MAE of 19.1ms; and on the SAFER dataset when using [*unsw*, *engz*], with a mean MAE of 17.2ms. Whilst these pairs provided the lowest mean MAEs, they assessed that only 30% and 40% of RR-intervals were accurate respectively. In contrast, many other pairs of QRS detectors achieved a much higher mean coverage, with only a slight increase in mean MAE (see Figure 4).

3.2.2. Pairs of QRS detectors producing the lowest MAEs and sufficient coverage

Considering our second approach to selecting the best-performing pair of QRS detectors: the most suitable pairs are those in the top left corners of the scatter plots in Figure 4, *i.e.* those pairs which assessed a high proportion of RR-intervals to be accurate, and achieved a low mean MAE. Our requirement of providing $\geq 85\%$ coverage was achieved on the TELE dataset when using: *nk* or *unsw* as the primary QRS detector, and *gqrs*, *nk* or *unsw* as the secondary QRS detector. Of these, [*unsw*, *gqrs*] was the best-performing pair, followed by [*nk*, *unsw*]. These assessed RR-intervals to be accurate for 88% and 90% of the time, and achieved mean MAEs of 23.6ms and 24.2ms respectively. On the SAFER dataset, the requirement of $\geq 85\%$ coverage was only achieved when using either combination of *nk* and *unsw*. The best performing pair was [*unsw*, *nk*], followed by [*nk*, *unsw*], both achieving a coverage of 89%, and achieving mean MAEs of 22.9ms and 24.3ms respectively.



(a) TELE dataset: Four pairs of QRS detectors achieved ≥85% coverage and are annotated in red. The pair with the lowest mean MAE is also annotated.



(b) SAFER dataset: Two pairs of QRS detectors achieved ≥85% coverage and are annotated in red. The pair with the lowest mean MAE is also annotated.

Figure 4: **Identifying the best-performing pairs:** Scatter plots showing the mean coverage against the mean MAE for all pairs of different QRS detectors on: (a) the TELE dataset, and (b) the SAFER dataset.

3.3. Factors influencing algorithm performance

The impact of factors on algorithm performance was investigated by comparing performance across the SAFER subgroups: AF-HIGH (high quality ECGs exhibiting AF); nonAF-HIGH (high quality ECGs not exhibiting AF); and nonAF-LOW (low quality ECGs not exhibiting AF). Figure 5 provides numerical results for the mean MAE and mean coverage of each pair of QRS detectors on each subgroup. Figure 6 shows scatter plots of mean coverage against mean MAE for each subgroup.

3.3.1. The impact of atrial fibrillation on algorithm performance

Considering the impact of atrial fibrillation, mean MAEs on SAFER AF-HIGH and SAFER nonAF-HIGH are shown in Figure 5(a) and 5(b) respectively. The previously identified best-performing pairs which produced a mean coverage of ≥89% on the entire dataset, [*nk*, *unsw*] and [*unsw*, *nk*], both achieved MAEs of 19.1ms on AF-HIGH and 9.5ms on nonAF-HIGH, and achieved mean coverages of 96 and 95% on AF-HIGH and 95% for both on nonAF-HIGH. There was a significant difference between MAEs on AF-HIGH and nonAF-HIGH subgroups for all pairs, of which the mean MAE was higher in AF for 45 out of 54 pairs, including both the [*unsw*, *nk*] and [*nk*, *unsw*] pairs in AF-HIGH compared to nonAF-HIGH. The coverage was significantly lower in AF than non-AF for 48 out of 54 pairs but not for the recommended [*unsw*, *nk*] and [*nk*, *unsw*] pairs.

Figures 6(a) and 6(b) illustrate that the best-performing pairs on SAFER AF-HIGH and SAFER nonAF-HIGH remained the same as those identified on the entire SAFER dataset: [*nk*, *unsw*] followed by [*unsw*, *nk*].

3.3.2. The impact of signal quality on algorithm performance

Considering the impact of signal quality, mean MAEs on SAFER nonAF-HIGH and SAFER nonAF-LOW are shown in Figure 5(b) and 5(c) respectively. MAEs were much higher on low quality ECGs (nonAF-LOW) than high quality ECGs (nonAF-HIGH). For instance, the lowest mean MAEs were 7.1ms on SAFER nonAF-HIGH, compared to 35.1ms on SAFER nonAF-LOW. Mean MAEs were significantly higher in nonAF-LOW compared to nonAF-HIGH for 53 out of 54 pairs.

The proportion of time for which RR-intervals were assessed to be accurate (the mean coverage) was much lower on low quality ECGs. The highest proportions were achieved by the previously identified best-performing pairs, [*nk*, *unsw*] and [*unsw*, *nk*], which achieved mean coverages of 66% and 64%



(a) Mean MAEs on AF-HIGH.

(b) Mean MAEs on nonAF-HIGH.

(c) Mean MAEs on nonAF-LOW.

(d) Mean coverage on AF-HIGH.

(e) Mean coverage on nonAF-HIGH.

(f) Mean coverage on nonAF-LOW.

Figure 5: **Comparing performance across SAFER subgroups:** Heatmaps showing the mean MAE ((a), (b) and (c) and mean coverage ((d), (e) and (f)) for each pair of QRS detectors on the SAFER AF-HIGH ((a) and (d)), SAFER nonAF-HIGH ((b) and (e)), and SAFER nonAF-LOW ((c) and (f)) subgroups.



(a) AF-HIGH



(b) nonAF-HIGH



(c) nonAF-LOW

Figure 6: **Identifying the best-performing pairs on SAFER subgroups:** Scatter plots showing the mean coverage against the mean MAE for all pairs of different QRS detectors on (a) SAFER AF-HIGH, (b) SAFER-nonAF-HIGH, and (c) SAFER-nonAF-LOW.

resepectively on nonAF-LOW compared to 95% for both on nonAF-HIGH. The mean coverage was significantly higher on nonAF-HIGH than nonAF-LOW for 51 out of 54 pairs.

Figure 6(c) illustrates that the best-performing pairs on SAFER nonAF-LOW remained the same as those identified on the entire SAFER dataset: [*unsw*, *nk*] followed by [*nk*, *unsw*].

4. Discussion

4.1. Summary of Findings

This study demonstrates the feasibility of extracting RR-intervals accurately from telehealth ECG signals using a pair of QRS detectors. This was demonstrated across two datasets, with the extracted RR-intervals having MAEs of <25ms. We found that the performance of this approach was highly dependent on the choice of primary and secondary QRS detectors, which greatly influenced the accuracy of RR-intervals and the proportion of time for which RR-intervals were assessed to be accurate.

This approach could be used to automatically exclude inaccurate RR-intervals from analysis. Indeed, the accuracy of retained RR-intervals increased when using a pair of QRS detectors in comparison to using a single QRS detector. We observed a trade-off between the accuracy of RR-intervals and the proportion of time for which they were assessed to be accurate: the highest accuracy was obtained when using pairs of QRS detectors which resulted in RR-intervals being available for less than half of the time, whereas lower, but still reasonable accuracy was achieved when using pairs of QRS detectors which resulted in RR-intervals being available for the vast majority of the time. The approach performed sufficiently well during AF, although performance was even better in the absence of AF. The approach also showed benefit on low quality ECGs, greatly improving the accuracy of RR-intervals in comparison to using a single QRS detector alone. However, RR-intervals derived from low-quality ECGs were not as accurate as those extracted from high-quality ECGs.

4.2. Recommended Algorithms

When requiring accurate RR-intervals for a high proportion of the time, we recommend *unsw* as the primary QRS detector, and *nk* as the secondary QRS detector (denoted as [*unsw*, *nk*]). [*unsw*, *nk*] achieved a mean MAE of <25ms and mean coverage of ≥95% across both datasets and all SAFER

subgroups except low quality SAFER ECGs. On low quality ECGs, this pair achieved slightly better rejection of RR-intervals than the reverse pair of [*nk*, *unsw*]. However, overall the order of the nk and unsw QRS detectors had little impact on performance, and the [*unsw*, *nk*] and [*nk*, *unsw*] combinations were the top two performing combinations across both datasets and all SAFER subgroups. The recommended pair of [*unsw*, *nk*] can be used in Python. If using MATLAB only then [*unsw*, *rdeco*] is recommended as it was consistently the best performing pair using MATLAB implementations. However, this pair is a compromise in comparison to [*unsw*, *nk*], as it resulted in much less accurate RR-intervals on SAFER, and approximately twice as many RR-intervals being unavailable for analysis on both datasets.

When requiring the highest possible accuracy regardless of the proportion of time for which RR-intervals are deemed suitable for analysis, we tentatively recommend [*unsw*, *jqrs*]. This combination uses two MATLAB QRS detectors. When using Python only, we tentatively recommend [*nk*, *nab*] or [*unsw*, *nab*]. We describe these recommendations as 'tentative', because these only achieved small improvements in accuracy in comparison to the pairs chosen when requiring accurate RR-intervals for a high proportion of the time. For instance, [*unsw*, *jqrs*] achieved an MAE in RR-intervals of 20.3ms and 19.1ms on TELE and SAFER respectively, compared to 24.6 and 22.9ms on TELE and SAFER for the previously recommended [*unsw*, *nk*]. This small improvement was achieved at the expense of making RR-intervals available for analysis for only 63 and 62% of the time on TELE and SAFER, compared to 89% for [*unsw*, *nk*]. Similarly, [*nk*, *nab*] achieved MAEs of 28.9 and 17.5ms on TELE and SAFER, which was a debatable improvement compared to [*unsw*, *nk*]. Therefore, we expect the most useful QRS detector pairs will be those recommended for obtaining accurate RR-intervals for a high proportion of the time.

Future work should assess whether the best-performing QRS detector pairs continue to perform well across additional datasets and different recording scenarios.

4.3. Comparison with Literature

The importance of signal quality assessment techniques in the analysis of telehealth ECG signals has been well-documented in the literature. The use of signal quality assessment algorithms to exclude low-quality ECG signals from manual review during ECG-based AF screening has been proposed as a strategy to: (i) reduce cardiologist reviewing workload [33, 34]; (ii) improve

the reliability of cardiologist diagnoses [35]; and (iii) improve the performance of automated AF detection algorithms [36]. Indeed, such algorithms are now commercially available and in use in large trials [37]. Whilst there has been much work on developing ECG signal quality assessment techniques [38], less work has focused on developing techniques specifically to assess whether RR-intervals can be accurately extracted from ECGs.

This work extends previous research into QRS detection and ECG signal quality assessment. We used the QRS detection algorithms which have previously been identified as the best-performing in telehealth settings in [12, 39]. We employed these in an adaptation of the previously proposed *bSQI* signal quality assessment approach [24]. The *bSQI* approach has previously been used to assess signal quality on windows of 1s duration [31] and 10s duration [21, 25]. In this work, we adapted the *bSQI* approach to assess whether individual RR-intervals had been accurately extracted. We believe our recommendation of the [*unsw*, *nk*] QRS detector pair is novel since to our knowledge previous work has not considered the *nk* QRS detector in *bSQI* algorithms [21]. We have extended our own previous work [15] by assessing algorithm performance on multiple datasets, investigating the impact of arrhythmia and noise on performance, and refining the duration of tolerance window used for signal quality assessment. This has led to a more informed recommendation of the [*unsw*, *nk*] QRS detector pair, and increased confidence about its generalisability.

One shortcoming of the proposed approach is that it produced less accurate RR-intervals on low quality ECGs. However, it should be noted that the low quality ECGs used in this assessment represent the lowest quality ECGs encountered in AF screening, extracted from the 2.8% of ECGs identified as poor quality in the SAFER Feasibility Study [33]. Therefore, this shortcoming will only be encountered for a small minority of real-world ECGs.

The proposed approach to assessing which RR-intervals are likely to be accurate relies on a tolerance window - the maximum permissible difference in the timings of QRS complex detections between the two QRS detectors. In this study we used a tolerance window of 50ms, which differs from the 150ms used in previous studies [15, 21]. The choice of tolerance window duration is significant for two reasons. First, a longer tolerance window tends to increase the proportion of time for which RR-intervals are assessed to be accurate, because there is greater tolerance of differences in QRS detections. Second, a longer tolerance window tends to result in a higher mean MAE in RR-intervals, because QRS complexes do not need to be detected as accurately

for RR-intervals to be deemed suitable for analysis. The choice of 50ms was based on a preliminary analysis of performance when using different tolerance window durations, striking a balance between maintaining a high mean coverage and relatively low mean MAE.

4.4. Strengths and Limitations

The key strengths of this study are as follows. First, algorithm performance was assessed on real-world telehealth ECG signals recorded by patients at home. Second, we used open-source QRS detection algorithms, allowing others to implement the proposed approach in their own applications. Third, we have made the code used in this study publicly available at https://github.com/sharonho1215/ecg-signal-quality/, ensuring others can reproduce the study. Fourth, we have provided a Python implementation of *unsw* and showed that this provides similar results to the original MATLAB version. This ensures that our recommended [*unsw*, *nk*] pair is in a single language (Python), and thus has greater utility.

The key limitations of this study are as follows. First, performance was assessed on data collected from handheld devices at rest. It may be prudent to investigate performance in additional telehealth settings, such as with wrist-worn or chest-strap devices, rather than assuming that the tool will generalise to such settings. Second, the *unsw* QRS detector was developed using the TELE dataset [14]. For this reason, we have placed greater emphasis on results obtained using the SAFER dataset. Third, we did not compare the proposed tool with alternative ECG signal quality assessment techniques (such as [40, 34] - see [38] for a review), or combine it with other techniques to improve performance [25, 28, 26]. We also did not assess the utility of the tool for tasks other than RR-interval extraction, such as ECG signal quality assessment prior to extraction of other features. Fourth, we did not investigate whether the extracted RR-intervals are of sufficient accuracy for purposes such as heart rate variability analysis. Finally, the proposed tool is based on the assumption that when two QRS detectors agree on the timing of QRS complexes, then it is likely that the detected QRS complexes are accurate. Whilst the results indicate that this assumption is reasonable on high-quality ECGs, the results on low-quality ECGs indicate that it is not always valid.

4.5. Implications

This study reports a simple algorithm to accurately extract RR-intervals from telehealth ECGs. This algorithm could form part of a pipeline for automated analysis of single-lead ECGs recorded using devices such as handheld ECG recorders and smartwatches. Potential applications include detecting AF in daily life [5], and potentially identifying signs of other heart conditions such as supraventricular tachycardia [41]. In these contexts, algorithms could be used to: (i) identify ECGs which show signs of pathology, and safely exclude the remainder from clinical review [7]; (ii) make preliminary ECG interpretations for confirmation in clinical review [42]; and (iii) prioritise ECGs for clinical review according to their likelihood of showing pathology [43].

Future work should investigate whether the extracted RR-intervals are sufficiently accurate for particular use cases. Whilst in this study the extracted RR-intervals were found to be less accurate during AF, the accuracy during AF (MAE of 19.1ms) may still be sufficient for AF detection. It is not yet clear whether the extracted RR-intervals remain accurate at elevated heart rates such as those encountered in supraventricular tachycardia. Nor is it clear whether the extracted RR-intervals would be sufficiently accurate for any heart rate variability analyses.

The proposed algorithm may also have utility in real-time ECG signal quality assessment. Since the algorithm is relatively efficient (see [12] for QRS detector execution time assessments), it could potentially be used in near real-time to assess the proportion of an ECG from which RR-intervals can be accurately extracted. The user could then be prompted to finish recording if sufficient high quality data had been obtained, or to continue recording to obtain more data.

The characteristics of optimal QRS detector pairs varied according to use case. In some use cases such as AF screening, multiple ECGs are available per patient, presenting the possibility of discarding more data to prioritise even more accurate RR-intervals. Considering this use case: accurate RR-intervals were obtained for the highest proportion of time when using a pair of the most accurate QRS detectors (*e.g.* *unsw*, *nk*, *two-avg*, or *rdeco*, all of which performed reasonably well in our previous benchmarking study [12]). In some use cases only a single ECG may be available, making it important to extract accurate RR-intervals from a high proportion of the available data. For this use case, the most accurate RR-intervals were obtained, albeit for a smaller proportion of the time, when pairing a more accurate QRS detector with a less accurate QRS detector. This pairing is more consistent with the

original design of the *bSQI* approach, in which a pair of QRS detectors was chosen where one was less sensitive to noise, and the other more sensitive to noise [25]. In contrast, in this study we found that obtaining accurate RR-intervals for a higher proportion of time requires two QRS detectors which are less sensitive to noise, diverging from the original *bSQI* approach. Consequently, this study adds to our understanding of how to select optimal QRS detectors for the *bSQI* approach.

5. Conclusion

In this study we developed an algorithm to accurately extract RR-intervals from single-lead, telehealth ECGs collected by home-dwelling patients using hand-held devices. The algorithm uses a primary QRS detector for RR-interval extraction, and a secondary QRS detector to assess which RR-intervals have been extracted accurately and therefore should be included in analysis. Based on results from two datasets, we recommend using the [*unsw*, *nk*] pair of QRS detectors. This produced mean MAEs in RR-intervals of 24.6 and 22.9ms on TELE and SAFER datasets respectively, and assessed 89% of RR-intervals to be accurate on both datasets. These MAEs were lower than when using either *unsw* or *nk* alone without quality assessment, demonstrating the benefit of using this algorithm for quality assessment. The RR-intervals derived using this algorithm were less accurate in atrial fibrillation and on low quality signals.

Acknowledgment

This study is funded by the British Heart Foundation (FS/20/20/34626 awarded to PHC), the National Institute for Health and Care Research (NIHR) Programme Grants for Applied Research Programme (RP-PG0217-20007 awarded to JM), and the NIHR School for Primary Care Research (SPCR-2014-10043, project 410 awarded to JM), and by a W.D. Armstong Trust Fund studentship awarded to ZD. The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NIHR or the Department of Health and Social Care. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

Competing Interests

MRC is employed by Astrazeneca PLC. HCL was employed by Zenicor Medical Systems AB at the time of the work.

Data Statement

The TELE ECG Database is publicly available at https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/QTG0EP. Requests for access to the SAFER dataset should be directed to the SAFER study coordinator (SAFER @medschl.cam.ac.uk) and will be considered by the investigators, in accordance with participant consent.

Appendix A. Selecting the tolerance window size

A tolerance window size of ±50ms was chosen based on the preliminary analysis shown in Figure A.7. On the SAFER dataset it was found to provide a relatively high mean coverage, whilst also maintaining a relatively low mean MAE (see Figure 7(b)). This selection was subjective, and any value between approximately 20 and 80 ms would have achieved similar results.



(a) TELE dataset (b) SAFER dataset

Figure A.7: **The effect of window size on performance:** The plots show how mean MAE and mean coverage varied with different tolerance window sizes for the [*unsw*, *nk*] QRS detector pair.

Appendix B. Results obtained using the original MATLAB implementation of *unsw*

The results reported in the main text were obtained using a new Python implementation of *unsw*. Here we report corresponding results obtained using the original MATLAB implementation. Results were similar when using MATLAB and Python implementations.

The overall performance when using the MATLAB implementation of *unsw* is shown in Figure B.8, which corresponds to the results obtained using the Python implementation of *unsw* in 3. The differences between *unsw* implementations were minimal: differences in MAEs of $\leq$ 0.3ms on TELE and $\leq$ 3ms on SAFER; and differences in mean coverage of $\leq$ 1%.

Similarly, the performance on each of the SAFER subgroups when using the MATLAB implementation of *unsw* is shown in Figure B.9, which corresponds to the results obtained using the Python implementation of *unsw* in 5. The differences between *unsw* implementations were again minimal: differences in MAEs of <1ms on high-quality ECGs (SAFER AF-HIGH and SAFER nonAF-HIGH), and <6ms on low-quality ECGs (SAFER nonAF-LOW); and differences in mean coverage of $\leq$ 1%.



(a) Mean MAEs on the TELE dataset.



(b) Mean coverage on the TELE dataset.



(c) Mean MAEs on the SAFER dataset.



(d) Mean coverage on the SAFER dataset.

Figure B.8: **Overall performance:** Heatmaps showing the mean MAE ((a) and (c)) and mean coverage ((b) and (d)) for each pair of QRS detectors on the TELE ((a) and (b)) and SAFER ((c) and (d)) datasets. Here, the 'coverage' is the proportion of time for which RR-intervals were assessed to be accurate.



(a) Mean MAEs on AF-HIGH.



(b) Mean MAEs on nonAF-HIGH.



(c) Mean MAEs on nonAF-LOW.



(d) Mean coverage on AF-HIGH.



(e) Mean coverage on nonAF-HIGH.



(f) Mean coverage on nonAF-LOW.

Figure B.9: **Comparing performance across SAFER subgroups:** Heatmaps showing the mean MAE ((a), (b) and (c) and mean coverage ((d), (e) and (f)) for each pair of QRS detectors on the SAFER AF-HIGH ((a) and (d)), SAFER nonAF-HIGH ((b) and (e)), and SAFER nonAF-LOW ((c) and (f)) subgroups.

References

[1] N. Isakadze, S. S. Martin, How useful is the smartwatch ECG?, Trends in Cardiovascular Medicine 30 (7) (2020) 442–448. doi:10.1016/j.tcm.2019.10.010.

[2] J. P. Halcox, K. Wareham, A. Cardew, M. Gilmore, J. P. Barry, C. Phillips, M. B. Gravenor, Assessment of remote heart rhythm sampling using the AliveCor heart monitor to screen for atrial fibrillation, Circulation 136 (19) (2017) 1784–1794. doi:10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.117.030583.

[3] T.-F. Chao, T. S. Potpara, G. Y. H. Lip, Atrial fibrillation: stroke prevention, The Lancet Regional Health – Europe 37 (2024) 100797. doi:10.1016/j.lanepe.2023.100797.
URL https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lanepe.2023.100797

[4] M. P. Turakhia, J. D. Guo, A. Keshishian, R. Delinger, X. Sun, M. Ferri, C. Russ, M. Cato, H. Yuce, P. Hlavacek, Contemporary prevalence estimates of undiagnosed and diagnosed atrial fibrillation in the United States, Clinical Cardiology 46 (5) (2023) 484–493. doi:10.1002/clc.23983.
URL https://doi.org/10.1002/clc.23983

[5] E. Svennberg, J. Engdahl, F. Al-Khalili, L. Friberg, V. Frykman, M. Rosenqvist, Mass screening for untreated atrial fibrillation: the STROKESTOP study, Circulation 131 (25) (2015) 2176–2184. doi:10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.114.014343.

[6] J. Mant, R. N. Modi, P. Charlton, A. Dymond, E. Massou, J. Brimicombe, B. Freedman, S. J. Griffin, F. D. R. Hobbs, G. Y. H. Lip, R. J. McManus, K. Williams, The feasibility of population screening for paroxysmal atrial fibrillation using handheld ECGs, EP Europace (2024) euae056doi:10.1093/europace/euae056.

[7] E. Svennberg, M. Stridh, J. Engdahl, F. Al-Khalili, L. Friberg, V. Frykman, M. Rosenqvist, Safe automatic one-lead electrocardiogram analysis in screening for atrial fibrillation, Europace 19 (9) (2017) 1449–1453. doi:10.1093/europace/euw286.

[8] H. Gao, C. Liu, X. Wang, L. Zhao, Q. Shen, E. Y. K. Ng, J. Li, An open-access ECG database for algorithm evaluation of QRS detection and heart rate estimation, Journal of Medical Imaging and Health Informatics 9 (9) (2019) 1853–1858. doi:10.1166/jmihi.2019.2800.
URL https://doi.org/10.1166/jmihi.2019.2800

[9] U. Rajendra Acharya, K. Paul Joseph, N. Kannathal, C. M. Lim, J. S. Suri, Heart rate variability: a review, Medical and Biological Engineering and Computing 44 (12) (2006) 1031–51. doi:10.1007/s11517-006-0119-0.
URL https://doi.org/10.1007/s11517-006-0119-0

[10] A. Rizwan, A. Zoha, I. B. Mabrouk, H. M. Sabbour, A. S. Al-Sumaiti, A. Alomainy, M. A. Imran, Q. H. Abbasi, A review on the state of the art in atrial fibrillation detection enabled by machine learning, IEEE Reviews in Biomedical Engineering 14 (2021) 219–239. doi:10.1109/RBME.2020.2976507.

[11] M. Stridh, M. Rosenqvist, Automatic screening of atrial fibrillation in thumb-ECG recordings, in: Proc CinC., IEEE, 2012, pp. 193–196.
URL https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/6420363

[12] F. Kristof, M. Kapsecker, L. Nissen, J. Brimicombe, M. R. Cowie, Z. Ding, A. Dymond, S. M. Jonas, H. C. Lindén, G. Y. H. Lip, K. Williams, J. Mant, P. H. Charlton, o. b. o. t. S. Investigators, QRS detection in single-lead, telehealth electrocardiogram signals: Benchmarking open-source algorithms, PLOS Digital Health 3 (8) (2024) e0000538. doi:10.1371/journal.pdig.0000538.

[13] J. Lian, L. Wang, D. Muessig, A simple method to detect atrial fibrillation using RR intervals, The American Journal of Cardiology 107 (10) (2011) 1494–7. doi:10.1016/j.amjcard.2011.01.028.

[14] H. Khamis, R. Weiss, Y. Xie, C.-W. Chang, N. H. Lovell, S. J. Redmond, QRS detection algorithm for telehealth electrocardiogram recordings, IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering 63 (7) (2016) 1377–1388.

[15] S. Y. S. Ho, F. Kristof, J. Mant, P. H. Charlton, Automated rr interval detection and quality assessment in telehealth electrocardiograms, in: Proc CinC, 2024.

[16] S. J. Redmond, Y. Xie, D. Chang, J. Basilakis, N. H. Lovell, Electrocardiogram signal quality measures for unsupervised telehealth environments, Physiological Measurement 33 (9) (2012) 1517–1533. doi:10.1088/0967-3334/33/9/1517.

[17] M. Pandiaraja, J. Brimicombe, M. Cowie, A. Dymond, H. C. Lindén, G. Y. H. Lip, J. Mant, K. Williams, P. H. Charlton, on behalf of the SAFER Investigators, Screening for atrial fibrillation: Improving efficiency of manual review of handheld electrocardiograms, Engineering Proceedings 2 (1) (2020). doi:10.3390/ecsa-7-08195.

[18] D. Makowski, T. Pham, Z. J. Lau, J. C. Brammer, F. Lespinasse, H. Pham, C. Schölzel, S. H. A. Chen, NeuroKit2: A Python toolbox for neurophysiological signal processing, Behavior Research Methods 53 (4) (2021) 1689–1696. doi:10.3758/s13428-020-01516-y.

[19] J. C. Brammer, biopeaks: a graphical user interface for feature extraction from heart- and breathing biosignals, Journal of Open Source Software 5 (54) (2020) 2621. doi:10.21105/joss.02621.

[20] M. Elgendi, M. Jonkman, F. Deboer, Frequency bands effects on QRS detection, in: BIOSIGNALS 2010 - Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Bio-inpsired Systems and Signal Processing, Proceedings, 2010, pp. 428–431. doi:10.5220/0002742704280431.

[21] F. Liu, C. Liu, L. Zhao, X. Jiang, Z. Zhang, J. Li, S. Wei, Y. Zhang, Dynamic ECG signal quality evaluation based on the generalized bSQI index, IEEE Access 6 (2018) 41892–41902. doi:10.1109/ACCESS.2018.2860056.

[22] M. Paoletti, C. Marchesi, Discovering dangerous patterns in long-term ambulatory ECG recordings using a fast QRS detection algorithm and explorative data analysis, Comput. Methods Programs Biomed. 82 (1) (2006) 20–30.

[23] Y.-C. Yeh, W.-J. Wang, QRS complexes detection for ECG signal: the difference operation method, Comput. Methods Programs Biomed. 91 (3) (2008) 245–254.

[24] M. B. Oefinger, Monitoring transient repolarization segment morphology deviations in mouse ECG, Thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

(2006).
URL https://dspace.mit.edu/handle/1721.1/38304

[25] Q. Li, R. G. Mark, G. D. Clifford, Robust heart rate estimation from multiple asynchronous noisy sources using signal quality indices and a kalman filter, Physiological Measurement 29 (1) (2008) 15–32.

[26] G. D. Clifford, J. Behar, Q. Li, I. Rezek, Signal quality indices and data fusion for determining clinical acceptability of electrocardiograms, Physiological Measurement 33 (9) (2012) 1419–1433. doi:10.1088/0967-3334/33/9/1419.

[27] J. Oster, J. Behar, R. Colloca, Q. Li, Open source Java-based ECG analysis software and Android app for atrial fibrillation screening, in: Proc CinC, 2013, pp. 731–734.
URL https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/6713481

[28] J. Behar, J. Oster, Q. Li, G. D. Clifford, ECG signal quality during arrhythmia and its application to false alarm reduction, IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering 60 (6) (2013) 1660–6. doi:10.1109/TBME.2013.2240452.

[29] J. Behar, A. Johnson, G. D. Clifford, J. Oster, A comparison of single channel fetal ECG extraction methods, Annals of Biomedical Engineering 42 (6) (2014) 1340–1353. doi:10.1007/s10439-014-0993-9.

[30] A. E. Johnson, J. Behar, F. Andreotti, G. D. Clifford, J. Oster, R-peak estimation using multimodal lead switching, in: Proc CinC, Vol. 41, 2014, pp. 281–284.

[31] A. E. Johnson, J. Behar, F. Andreotti, G. D. Clifford, J. Oster, Multimodal heart beat detection using signal quality indices, Physiological Measurement 36 (8) (2015) 1665–1677. doi:10.1088/0967-3334/36/8/1665.

[32] S. Parvaneh, J. Rubin, A. Rahman, B. Conroy, S. Babaeizadeh, Analyzing single-lead short ECG recordings using dense convolutional neural networks and feature-based post-processing to detect atrial fibrillation, Physiological Measurement 39 (8) (2018). doi:10.1088/1361-6579/aad5bd.

[33] M. Pandiaraja, J. Brimicombe, M. Cowie, A. Dymond, H. C. Lindén, G. Y. H. Lip, J. Mant, K. Williams, P. H. Charlton, on behalf of the SAFER Investigators, Screening for atrial fibrillation: Improving efficiency of manual review of handheld electrocardiograms, Engineering Proceedings 2 (1) (2020) 78. doi:10.3390/ecsa-7-08195.

[34] H. Halvaei, E. Svennberg, L. Sörnmo, M. Stridh, Identification of transient noise to reduce false detections in screening for atrial fibrillation, Frontiers in Physiology 12 (June) (2021) 1–10. doi:10.3389/fphys.2021.672875.

[35] K. Hibbitt, J. Brimicombe, M. R. Cowie, A. Dymond, B. Freedman, S. J. Griffin, F. D. R. i. Hobbs, H. C. Lindén, G. Y. H. Lip, J. Mant, R. J. McManus, M. Pandiaraja, K. Williams, P. H. Charlton, Reliability of single-lead electrocardiogram interpretation to detect atrial fibrillation: insights from the SAFER feasibility study, EP Europace 26 (7) (2024) euae181. doi:10.1093/europace/euae181.

[36] J. Oster, G. D. Clifford, Impact of the presence of noise on RR interval-based atrial fibrillation detection, Journal of Electrocardiology 48 (6) (2015) 947–951. doi:10.1016/j.jelectrocard.2015.08.013.

[37] K. Williams, R. N. Modi, A. Dymond, S. Hoare, A. Powell, J. Burt, D. Edwards, J. Lund, R. Johnson, T. Lobban, M. Lown, M. J. Sweeting, H. Thom, S. Kaptoge, F. Fusco, S. Morris, G. Lip, N. Armstrong, M. R. Cowie, D. A. Fitzmaurice, B. Freedman, S. J. Griffin, S. Sutton, F. R. Hobbs, R. J. McManus, J. Mant, T. SAFER Authorship Group, Cluster randomised controlled trial of screening for atrial fibrillation in people aged 70 years and over to reduce stroke: protocol for the pilot study for the SAFER trial, BMJ Open 12 (9) (2022) e065066. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2022-065066.

[38] U. Satija, B. Ramkumar, M. Sabarimalai Manikandan, A review of signal processing techniques for electrocardiogram signal quality assessment, IEEE Reviews in Biomedical Engineering 11 (2018) 36–52. doi:10.1109/RBME.2018.2810957.

[39] F. Liu, C. Liu, X. Jiang, Z. Zhang, Y. Zhang, J. Li, S. Wei, Performance analysis of ten common QRS detectors on different ECG application

cases, Journal of Healthcare Engineering 2018 (2018). doi:10.1155/2018/9050812.

[40] Z. Zhao, Y. Zhang, SQI quality evaluation mechanism of single-lead ECG signal based on simple heuristic fusion and fuzzy comprehensive evaluation, Frontiers in Physiology 9 (2018) 727. doi:10.3389/fphys.2018.00727.

[41] H. Halvaei, T. Hygrell, E. Svennberg, V. D. Corino, L. Sörnmo, M. Stridh, Detection of non-sustained supraventricular tachycardia in atrial fibrillation screening, IEEE Journal of Translational Engineering in Health and Medicine 12 (2024) 480–487. doi:10.1109/JTEHM.2024.3397739.

[42] A. Y. Hannun, P. Rajpurkar, M. Haghpanahi, G. H. Tison, C. Bourn, M. P. Turakhia, A. Y. Ng, Cardiologist-level arrhythmia detection and classification in ambulatory electrocardiograms using a deep neural network, Nature Medicine 25 (1) (2019) 65–69. doi:10.1038/s41591-018-0268-3.

[43] M. Adeniji, J. Brimicombe, M. Cowie, A. Dymond, H. Clair Lindén, G. Lip, J. Mant, M. Pandiaraja, K. Williams, P. Charlton, Prioritising electrocardiograms for manual review to improve the efficiency of atrial fibrillation screening, in: Proc IEEE EMBS, IEEE, 2022, pp. 3239–3242. doi:10.1109/EMBC48229.2022.9871092.