Deep learning enables diagnosis of atrial cardiomyopathy from routine 12-lead electrocardiogram

Julian Deseoe[1], Ezequiel de la Rosa, PhD[2], Martin Haensel, MD[1], Lisa Herzog, PhD[1], Andreas R. Luft, MD[1], Beate Sick, PhD[3,4], Jan Steffel, MD[5], Alexander Breitenstein, MD[6], Gregory Y. H. Lip, MD[7,8,9], Björn Menze, PhD[2], Susanne Wegener, MD[1*]

[1]Department of Neurology and Neuroscience Center Zurich, University Hospital Zurich and University of Zurich, Switzerland
[2]Department of Quantitative Biomedicine, University of Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland
[3]Epidemiology, Biostatistics & Prevention Institute, University of Zürich, Zürich, Switzerland
[4]TIDIT, Thurgau Institute for Digital Transformation, Kreuzlingen, Switzerland
[5]HerzKlinik Hirslanden, Zurich, Switzerland
[6]Department of Cardiology, University Hospital Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland
[7]Liverpool Centre for Cardiovascular Science at University of Liverpool, Liverpool John Moores University and Liverpool Heart & Chest Hospital, Liverpool, UK.
[8]Department of Clinical Medicine, Aalborg University, Aalborg, Denmark.
[9]Department of Cardiology, Lipidology and Internal Medicine with Intensive Coronary Care Unit, Medical University of Bialystok, Bialystok, Poland

Short title: Deep learning ECG diagnosis of atrial cardiomyopathy

***Corresponding Author:**
Susanne Wegener
Department of Neurology
University Hospital Zurich
Frauenklinikstrasse 26
8091 Zurich, Switzerland
Phone: +41 44 255 1111
Email: Susanne.wegener@usz.ch

Word count: 172 words (Title Page); 308 words (Abstract); 98 words (Clinical Perspective); 3’960 words (main manuscript); 621 words (Table and Figure Legends) Figures: 6; Tables: 2 References: 46

Abstract

Background: Atrial cardiomyopathy (AtCM) is both a cause and a consequence of atrial fibrillation and flutter (AF) and can lead to ischemic stroke. Imaging derived left atrial (LA) structure and function are used to diagnose AtCM. Considering the tight coupling of heart structure and rhythm generation, this information might also be derived from 12-lead electrocardiogram (ECG), which is low-cost and readily available.

Methods: First, we finetuned a deep learning ECG foundational model (ECG-FM) pretrained on over 1 million ECG samples to predict LA imaging indices based on 26'134 ECGs from the UK Biobank cohort. We then investigated if the ECG-predicted imaging features improved detection of patients with previous diagnosis of AF as well as prediction of incident AF beyond the CHARGE-AF Score on a test set from the UK Biobank. We externally validated our model on a Brazilian cohort of primary care ECGs (n = 64'851) as well as a cohort of ischemic stroke patients from the University Hospital Zurich (n = 312)

Results: Our deep learning model successfully predicted LA imaging indices from 12 lead ECG with Pearson correlation of predictions and ground truths ranging from 0.41 – 0.52 ($p < 0.001$). In the UK Biobank test set, the ECG-predicted imaging features significantly improved detection of participants with previous AF diagnosis and five-year risk prediction of incident AF beyond the CHARGE-AF score. ECG-predicted imaging markers showed superior test performance compared to established ECG markers of AtCM and an alternative deep learning approach trained to detect patients with previous diagnosis of AF directly. This also held on external validation sets. We further successfully validated our model on Holter-ECG with reduced number of leads.

Discussion: We established a novel deep learning approach for the diagnosis of AtCM from 12 lead ECG. Due to the wide availability of ECG, our approach has the potential to improve screening and diagnosis of AtCM.

Key words: Artificial intelligence, atrial cardiomyopathy, atrial fibrillation, cardiac magnetic resonance imaging, deep learning, electrocardiogram

The code for the analysis is available under: https://github.com/jul-des/DL-AtCM.git

Clinical Perspective

What is new?

- Left atrial imaging indices derived from cardiac magnetic resonance imaging can be predicted from 12 lead sinus rhythm ECG using deep learning.
- The predicted imaging indices allow improved diagnosis of patients with previous episodes of atrial fibrillation, as well as prediction of incident atrial fibrillation.
- Further, they allow improved detection atrial fibrillation as cause of stroke in a cohort of ischemic stroke patients.

What are the clinical implications?

- We developed and validated a novel approach for diagnosing atrial cardiomyopathy from 12 lead ECG.
- It has the potential to improve diagnosis of atrial cardiomyopathy, which is key for preventing atrial fibrillation and ischemic stroke.

1. Introduction

Atrial cardiomyopathy (AtCM) is a condition arising from pathological structural and electrophysiological remodeling of the heart, particularly affecting the left atrium. Since AtCM potentially results in atrial fibrillation (AF) and ischemic stroke [1,2], early detection is essential. However, diagnosis of AtCM remains challenging [3]. Imaging markers including increased left atrial maximum volume (LA max) or left atrial minimum volume (LA min) indexed to body surface area (BSA), increased left atrial to left ventricular volume ratio (LALV) and reduced left atrial ejection fraction (LAEF) have been used to diagnose AtCM [3-7]. However, cardiac imaging is costly and not accessible in many regions. Blood biomarkers such as NTproBNP or MRproANP could aid in AtCM diagnosis, but they lack specificity and may fluctuate due to comorbidities or adjunctive drug therapies [1].

An electrocardiogram (ECG) based diagnosis of AtCM could address these limitations. ECG is a basic diagnostic tool in emergency departments and medical practices around the world. Specific ECG changes point towards the presence of AtCM, such as changes in P wave indices [8-12], but due to substantial variability, their use is not part of clinical routine [13].

Recently, the potential of artificial intelligence (AI) based analysis of ECG for diagnosis of AtCM has been recognized [1]. So far, in the field of ECG-based AI tools, deep learning approaches have focused on identifying patients with previous or incident AF [14-20], but not on the diagnosis of AtCM. However, the binary outcome (AF yes/no) does not capture the complex spectrum of changes that occur in AtCM, which include changes in atrial size and ejection fraction. This is reflected in current expert consensus, which highlights the importance of viewing AF and AtCM as separate entities [1]. A deep learning approach with focus on the underlying structural and functional remodeling of the left atrium can likely capture greater amounts of valuable information allowing a more accurate diagnosis of AtCM and an improved risk stratification for its sequelae.

We here demonstrate development and validation of a new deep learning approach for diagnosing AtCM based on ECG. We finetuned an ECG foundational model (ECG-FM), pretrained on over 1 million ECG samples [21] to predict four left atrial imaging indices (indexed LA max, indexed LA min, LAEF and LALV) measured by

cardiac magnetic resonance (CMR) imaging, which reflect atrial structure and function and were all previously linked to AtCM [3-7], based on non-AF ECGs. We then leveraged the predicted left atrial imaging indices to build multivariate models to tackle different clinical challenges. An overview is shown in Figure 1. Finally, we also validate our model on Holter-ECG with reduced leads.

2. Methods

Data

Model training and evaluations were done on 12 lead ECGs. All ECGs which showed current AF were excluded. We performed preprocessing according to the specifications of McKeen et al. [21]. ECGs were resampled to 500 Hz using linear interpolation. As ECG-FM is based on 5 second 12 lead ECG segments, all ECGs were segmented into non-overlapping 12 lead 5 second segments. If ECGs were shorter than 10 seconds, the first 5 seconds were retained and the rest discarded. At test time, if two segments were available for a participant, the predictions of the model were averaged to obtain the final prediction. The datasets used are described in greater detail below.

The UK Biobank (UKBB)

The UKBB is a large population-based cohort. The recruitment protocol is publicly available [22]. We worked with the data release from March 2025. As part of assessments, a portion of the participants underwent CMR imaging and ECG according to standardized protocols [23,24]. From CMR imaging atrial and ventricular volumes have been previously segmented using deep learning and made available to researchers [25]. Details on measurement protocols and calculation of left atrial indices can be found in the supplemental methods.

Data of all participants with available imaging features and ECGs was divided into train, validation and test data using a 0.6/0.2/0.2 split. To avoid data leakage, both 5 second segments of each participant were allocated to the same split.

141 Primary care cohort from Brazil

142 The Code15% dataset is a large, public ECG dataset consisting of 12 lead ECGs
143 collected by the Telehealth Network of Minas Gerais between 2010 and 2016 and is
144 comprised mainly of ECGs from primary care [26]. ECG diagnoses have been
145 labelled by healthcare experts. All participants with multiple ECGs available were
146 included. The earliest ECG of each included patient was taken as baseline and
147 used for predicting left atrial imaging features. If the ECG showed AF, the patient
148 was excluded. The dataset contains both 10 second and 7 second ECGs.

149

150 Cohort of ischemic stroke patients from the USZ

151 Data of all ischemic stroke patients treated at the USZ in 2023 and 2024, who had
152 not refused the use of their routine clinical data for research, were retrospectively
153 collected. We received permission from the Cantonal Ethics committee Zurich to
154 perform this data collection (PREDICT, BASEC-ID: PB_2016_01751). All participants
155 with at least one available non-AF ECG during in hospital stay and a determined
156 stroke etiology were included in the analysis. The ECG with the highest quality
157 control score as determined by a finetuned version of ECG FM described in [21] was
158 selected per patient. Most ECGs were 10s in length. However, some were shorter.

159 In the USZ cohort, the downstream task was to identify patients where AF was
160 identified as the cause of stroke by clinicians after complete diagnostic work up.
161 Definition of stroke cause was done as in previous studies [27]. Details can be found
162 in the supplemental methods.

163

164 Holter ECG dataset

165 As all 12 leads of an ECG are not always available in clinical practice, we aimed to
166 evaluate our model in a setting with reduced leads. The SHDB-AF dataset is a Holter
167 ECG dataset containing 128 24-hour, 2 lead Holter ECGs as well as clinical data and
168 left atrial diameter as measured by echocardiography. [28]. The two leads are NASA
169 lead and CC5 lead. For 98 of the ECGs, beat level rhythm classifications are
170 available. We selected these ECGs and extracted the first five minutes of

consecutive non-AF recordings. We excluded all recordings without five minutes of consecutive non-AF recordings. We preprocessed these ECGs as described above, obtaining 60 5-second segments per ECG record. We inputted the CC5 lead as lead V5 and NASA lead ad lead II [29]. The missing leads were inputted as zeroes.

Model Training and finetuning

We decided to finetune an ECG foundational model instead of training from scratch. Foundational models are trained on large datasets usually in a self-supervised way, thus reducing the need for labelled data. Numerous studies have shown that leveraging ECG foundational models improves results compared to training from scratch for different downstream tasks. [21, 30-32]. Model finetuning was done using PyTorch 2.7.1. We used ECG-FM for our experiments [21]. ECG-FM was trained on over 1 million training samples employing a hybrid self-supervised learning approach, which contained a contrastive learning task. To obtain positive pairs for contrastive learning, 10 second ECGs were segmented into two 5 second segments. Hence, the model requires 5 second segments as input. Importantly, neither UK Biobank data nor the Code15% dataset were used to pretrain ECG-FM.

We finetuned the model using multitask learning to predict indexed LA max, indexed LA min, LAEF and LALV from 12 lead ECG. Details can be found in the supplemental methods.

For model evaluation on the test set, we averaged the two predictions per patient (one for each 5 second segment). We plotted predicted versus ground truth values and calculated Pearson correlation coefficients as well as R^2 values.

Comparison models

We compared our novel method to two alternative approaches for diagnosing AtCM from 12 lead ECGs. The first is by extracting four P wave indices (P wave duration, PR Interval, P wave amplitude and P Axis) which have been associated with atrial cardiopathy in literature [8-12]. A deeper discussion including the methods of ascertainment of P wave indices can be found in the supplementary material.

Second, as an alternative deep learning approach based on cross-sectional data, we finetune ECG-FM to identify patients with previous diagnosis of AF based on identical training and validation data and using identical training parameters. The only adjustment we made is to change the loss function from mean squared error loss to binary cross entropy loss, as we now have a classification rather than a regression task. We call this model deep learning AF (DL-AF). This approach reflects previous approaches to diagnose incident of previous AF from non-AF ECG using deep learning [14-20].

Clinical tasks and statistical analysis

All analysis of downstream tasks was done using R version 4.4.0

Using the predicted imaging indices, we tackled to clinically important tasks in the UK Biobank cohort. Only participants not included in train or validation set were included for fitting and evaluating multivariate models. We excluded participants with missing covariates. The first task was to identify participants with previous episodes of AF from non-AF ECG.

As complete clinical information is not always available, especially when performing population-based screening, we evaluated this task in two settings: one with limited clinical information comprised only of age and sex, the second with complete information on medical history and blood pressure measurements. For the limited setting we first built a logistic regression model using only age and sex, for the full information setting the base model contained all clinical parameters from the previously validated Cohorts for Heart and Aging Research in Genomic Epidemiology Atrial Fibrillation (CHARGE-AF) score [33]. Then we built three new logistic regression models by adding the four predicted imaging markers, the four P wave indices and the predicted probability of the DL-AF model respectively to the base model. We evaluated all four models using 10-fold cross validation. We calculate area under the receiver operating characteristic curve (ROC AUC) and area under the precision recall curve (PR AUC) with 95% confidence intervals for each of the models. We calculate P values for differences between ROC AUC values of the model with the predicted imaging features and the other features using DeLongs test [34]. Finally, we trained the logistic regression models on the

complete hold-out data from the UK Biobank and used the coefficients to calculate risk scores for external validation.

The second task in the UK Biobank was the prediction of five-year risk of incident AF. Participants with prior diagnosis of AF were excluded for this analysis. Instead of logistic regression models, cause specific hazard models were employed treating death as a competing event using the *survival* and *riskRegression* packages. Participants experiencing neither event until 01.01.2025 were censored. When evaluating predictive performance of the survival models we employed inverse probability of censoring weighting to account for censoring. ROC-AUC was calculated using the *riskRegression* package, PR-AUC was calculated using the *APtools* package. We evaluated the models using 10-fold cross validation. Again, we trained the cause specific hazard models on the complete hold-out data and used the coefficients to calculate risk scores for external validation.

We externally validated the multivariate model for predicting incident AF in the Brazilian primary care cohort. We used the regression coefficients of the multivariate models for prediction of incident AF, containing age and sex as clinical parameters from the UK Biobank. No other clinical parameters are available in this cohort.

In the cohort of ischemic stroke patients, the downstream task was to identify patients in which AF was diagnosed as stroke cause. We evaluated both the models including only age and sex and including the full clinical information (excluding race, as this was not available) for detecting patients with previous episodes of AF.

Details on definition of covariates can be found in the supplementary material.

In the SHDB-AF dataset we averaged the predictions per recording over all 60 samples. We then investigated if the average predicted indexed LA maximum volumes and predicted LA minimum volumes correlated with the left atrial diameter measured in echocardiography. Left atrial diameter and left atrial volume have been shown to be correlated [35].

Model explainability

To visualize which parts of the ECG were important for prediction of the four imaging markers, we employed vanilla gradients [36] calculating saliency maps for each of the four predicted outputs based on the ECGs from the University Hospital Zurich ischemic stroke patient cohort. To quantify the results, ECGs were segmented into P wave, PQ interval, QRS complex, ST segment, T wave and end of T wave to next P wave onset using neurokit2. Details can be found in the supplementary methods. Absolute saliency values were averaged for each segment, then averaged over all 12 leads and finally divided by total average saliency for each ECG. Boxplots were used to show the results.

3. Results

Predicting left atrial imaging indices from routine 12 lead ECG

First, to predict atrial imaging indices from routine 12 lead ECG, we finetuned the ECG-FM model [21] on 19'600 ECGs from the UK Biobank (UKBB) cohort in the train set, 6'534 ECGs in the validation set and 6'534 ECGs in the test set. An overview of inclusion and exclusion criteria for the data used can be found in Figure 2. The finetuned model's predictions of atrial imaging indices showed highly significant ($p < 0.001$) correlations with the ground truths from cardiac imaging, ranging from 0.41 – 0.52. (Figure 3)

Identifying patients with previous episodes of AF and incident AF in the UKBB

To apply the predicted atrial imaging indices to the prediction of previous and incident AF, we trained and evaluated multivariate regression models, based on model predictions and clinical parameters. We trained these multivariate models on the holdout dataset from the UKBB. Population characteristics can be found in Table 1, inclusion and exclusion criteria in Figure 2. Results of multivariate models for identifying participants with previous AF and predicting incident AF are shown in Table 2 and Figure 4. Adding the four predicted imaging markers to the clinical

parameters from the CHARGE-AF score [33], significantly improved both detection of patients with previous episodes of AF from non-AF ECG (ROC-AUC 0.756 (0.742 – 0.771) vs. 0.720 (0.706 – 0.735), $p < 0.001$) and 5-year risk prediction of incident AF (ROC-AUC: 0.777 (0.747 – 0.807) vs. 0.758 (0.728 – 0.788), $p = 0.018$). Further, to compare our novel approach to previously reported approaches of diagnosing AtCM from ECG, we trained two comparison models on the UKBB data. The first is based on traditional P wave indices extracted from 12 lead ECG which have been previously linked to AtCM [8-12], the other is an alternative deep learning approach which reflects previous approaches reported in literature (DL-AF) [14-20]. Our novel approach of predicting left atrial indices, outperformed both alternative approaches (Table 2, Figure 4). When only using limited clinical parameters (age + sex) results were similar, with the model including predicted imaging indices outperforming all comparison models (Table S1). Regression coefficients of the multivariate models can be found in the Supplementary Data Table 1.

External validation in a primary care cohort

While the UKBB is a valuable resource, its highly standardized protocol does not necessarily reflect real world clinical practice. Hence, we aimed to validate our model in real world healthcare cohorts. First, we validated our model in the Code15% dataset, comprised of ECGs collected mainly during primary care assessments in Brazil [26]. 64’851 of the patients in the cohort had a follow-up ECG. Patients in the primary care cohort were younger on average (59 years ± 19 years) with a larger age range represented than in the UKBB. Also, patients were predominantly female (62%). In the primary care cohort, the model containing the predicted imaging indices significantly outperformed the three comparison models for identifying patients with incident AF ($p < 0.001$) (Table 2 and Figure 5A).

External validation in a cohort of ischemic stroke patients

In a next step, we validated our multivariate models in a cohort of ischemic stroke patients from the University Hospital Zurich (USZ), aiming to identify stroke patients

with AF as cause of stroke. 312 patients (mean age 64 ± 17 years; 61% male) treated for ischemic stroke at the USZ in 2023 and 2024 with identified cause of ischemic stroke were included for the model evaluation. Results when combining the predicted imaging features with the CHARGE-AF score (Table 2, Figure 5B) and age and sex (Table S1) were similar, with the model containing the predicted imaging indices consistently outperforming the comparison models.

Analyzing Holter ECG with reduced leads

While 12 lead ECG is most widely performed in clinical practice, there are numerous scenarios in which only a reduced number of leads is available, for example in long term rhythm monitoring. Hence, we evaluated the applicability of the model for analyzing Holter ECG with only two instead of 12 leads. We analyzed data from the Saitama Heart Database Atrial Fibrillation (SHDB-AF) dataset [28]. This dataset contains 24h Holter ECGs with beat level labels, clinical data and echocardiographic findings including left atrial diameter. The two recorded leads NASA and CC5 are similar, although not identical to lead II and lead V5 in standard 12 lead ECG [29]. In the SHDB-AF dataset, two recordings were removed due to no 5-minute interval of consecutive non-AF ECG being available, leaving 96 recordings to analyze. Average age was 68 ± 11 years and 54% of patients were male. Both average, predicted indexed LA max ($r = 0.47$, 95% CI 0.29 - 0.61, $p < 0.001$) and predicted indexed LA min ($r = 0.42$, 95% CI 0.23 – 0.57, $p < 0.001$) were highly significantly correlated with the left atrial diameter measured in echocardiography as would be expected for left atrial volumes [35], meaning our model made plausible predictions even with a reduced number of ECG leads.

Model Explainability

We then analyzed which parts of the ECG were important for the model's predictions of atrial imaging indices using vanilla gradients [36], based on the 5 second segments of the ECGs from the USZ stroke patients. Looking at the saliency maps, the P wave morphology was important for predictions. An example is shown in Figure 6F. To quantify this, we segmented ECGs into P wave, PQ

interval (end P wave to Q peak), QRS complex (Q peak to S peak), ST segment (S peak to T wave onset) and TP interval (T wave offset to next p wave onset). A schematic is shown in Figure 6E. We then calculated mean absolute saliency for each segment per lead, divided by mean saliency of the whole 5 second ECG segment per lead. We then averaged results from all 12 leads. This confirmed our qualitative findings as mean relative saliency was highest for the P wave segment. (Figure 6)

4. Discussion

Our study demonstrates that left atrial CMR indices indicative of AtCM can be predicted from routine 12 lead non-AF ECG. The predicted imaging indices improved established models for tackling important clinical tasks, including the identification of participants with previous and incident AF and the detection of ischemic stroke patients with AF as underlying stroke etiology, based on a short, standard non-AF ECG. Hence, we provide a promising new approach for diagnosing AtCM from 12 lead ECG in patients who require timely detection and who may benefit from adjustment in preventive treatments.

Identifying patients at risk of developing future AF could lead to more stringent controls and better prevention of AF or AF-related complications [37]. For primary prevention of ischemic stroke, detecting patients with previous episodes of AF is important as AF is associated with an approximately five-fold increase in risk of ischemic stroke, which can be reduced through targeted prophylaxis with anticoagulation. [38,39]. However, detecting patients with previous episodes of AF is challenging in clinical practice as it is commonly asymptomatic and intermittent, requiring long-term rhythm monitoring [40]. In patients with ischemic stroke with AF as the underlying etiology, anticoagulation is even more important, as it reduces the risk of stroke recurrence by more than half [41]. Hence, our presented multivariate models can be valuable tools for 1) preventing AF and 2) preventing ischemic stroke.

We further demonstrate that our model also provides meaningful predictions when analyzing Holter ECG, when only two leads are available, different to the ones the

model was trained on. This highlights the versatility of our model and broadens the range of potential applications.

Prior studies have analyzed ECG using deep learning [14-20]. However, these studies have focused on identifying participants with previous or incident AF, not on diagnosing AtCM. To compare our approach to these previously described ones, we finetuned the ECG-FM model [21] to identify patients with previous episodes of AF directly, based on 12 lead ECG using identical training and test data. Our newly proposed approach based on predicting atrial imaging indices consistently outperformed this comparison model, across different cohorts and tasks. (Table 2)

There are several potential reasons why prediction of atrial imaging indices may be superior to prediction of AF when attempting to diagnose AtCM. Firstly, there is increasing evidence that AtCM can develop (accompanied by changes in ECG and cardiac imaging) even in the absence of AF [1]. Secondly, a binary classification of AF does not adequately reflect the different severities of AF from short-lasting paroxysmal AF to long lasting permanent AF. These limitations can lead to bias in model training. Atrial imaging markers on the other hand, can identify AtCM even if it does not manifest as AF [1] and correlate more strongly with more severe, long-lasting forms of AF [42, 43]. Hence, our approach better captures the full spectrum of AtCM, leading to an improved risk stratification.

The fact that the P wave segment was the most important ECG segment for model prediction makes sense, as the P wave represents the depolarization and conduction of the electric impulse from the atria to the ventricle. Thus, saliency maps allowed insights into variables important for model classification, increasing confidence in our model.

Strengths and Limitations

One strength of our model is that CMR imaging is considered gold standard for measurement of cardiac chamber volumes, meaning that the UK Biobank data provided a qualitatively sound, reliable ground truth for diagnosis of AtCM [44]. Further, we validated our model across varying real world healthcare cohorts, including a primary care and an in-hospital cohort, demonstrating the potential for

clinical applicability. Importantly, we also validated our model on two non-European cohorts, a primary care cohort from Brazil and the Japanese SHDB-AF dataset. Finally, working with an ECG foundational model allowed us to leverage large amounts of unlabeled ECG data. We opted to use ECG-FM for finetuning, as training methods and model weights are all publicly available, enhancing reproducibility of our findings.

A limitation of our study is that in the UKBB and in the primary care cohort no systematic long-term rhythm monitoring was undertaken. Therefore, some participants might have had undiagnosed, paroxysmal AF. Further, the UKBB is a population-based cohort and hence showed low prevalence of AtCM and AF. Training our model on datasets with higher prevalence of AtCM might further improve results. Finally, additional imaging parameters such as left atrial strain are increasingly employed to diagnose AtCM [45]. Predicting left atrial strain from 12 lead ECG could further improve diagnosis of AtCM from 12 lead ECG. However, atrial strain was not measured as part of the UKBB imaging protocol.

Conclusions

We describe a novel, promising deep learning approach for diagnosing AtCM from 12 lead ECG and demonstrate the utility of the derived multivariate regression models across multiple cohorts and clinical tasks. As AI models for the analysis of ECG have already been successfully evaluated in prospective clinical trials [46] our model and the derived multivariate models have the potential to improve the diagnosis of patients with previous episodes of AF and the identification of patients at risk of future AF in clinical practice. This is key for targeted prophylaxis to prevent cardiovascular events, especially ischemic stroke.

5. Acknowledgements

This research has been conducted using the UK Biobank Resource under application number 467527. This work uses data provided by patients and collected by the NHS as part of their care and support. Figure 1 was created using BioRender.

6. Sources of Funding

This work was supported by the UK Biobank Platform Credits Programme for covering computational costs, the Swiss National Science Foundation (SNSF 310030_200703) and the UZH Candoc Grant (25-024).

7. Disclosures

JS has received consultant and / or speaker fees from Abbott, Bayer, Berlin-Chemie, Biosense Webster, Biotronik, Boehringer-Ingelheim, Boston Scientific, Daiichi Sankyo, Medscape, Medtronic, Menarini, Pfizer, Saja, and WebMD. He reports ownership of Swiss EP and CorXL.

AB has received consulting/presenter fees from Abbott, Angiodynamics, Bayer Health Care, Biosense Webster, Biotronik, BMS/Pfizer, Boston Scientific, Cook Medical, Daiichi Sankyo, Medtronic, Philips, and Zoll.

SW received research funds by the Swiss National Science Foundation, the UZH Clinical research priority program (CRPP) stroke, the Zurich Neuroscience Center (ZNZ), the Baugarten foundation, the Hartmann Müller Foundation, the Koetser Foundation, the Philas Foundation, the Swiss Heart Foundation; and speaker honoraria from Amgen, Springer, Advisis AG, Teva Pharma, Boehringer Ingelheim, Lundbeck, Astra Zeneca, FoMF, and a consultancy fee from Bayer and Novartis via institution for research.
The remaining authors report no conflicts of interest.

8. Data availability statement

UK Biobank will make the data available to all bona fide researchers for all types of health-related research that is in the public interest. For more details on

the access procedure, see the UK Biobank website: http://www.ukbiobank.ac.uk/register-apply/. Data from the Code15% dataset is publicly available under https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4916205. The SHDB-AF dataset is publicly available under https://doi.org/10.13026/f5mp-gx65. The clinical data analyzed in this study will be made available upon reasonable request

The code for the analysis is available under: https://github.com/jul-des/DL-AtCM.git

The finetuned model weights will be made available via the UK Biobank, in accordance with its rules and regulations.

9. Supplemental Material

Detailed Methods

Tables S1-S5

Supplemental Data Table 1

10. References

1. Goette A, Corradi D, Dobrev D, Aguinaga L, Cabrera JA, Chugh SS, et al. Atrial cardiomyopathy revisited-evolution of a concept: a clinical consensus statement of the European Heart Rhythm Association (EHRA) of the ESC, the Heart Rhythm Society (HRS), the Asian Pacific Heart Rhythm Society (APHRS), and the Latin American Heart Rhythm Society (LAHRS). Europace. 2024 Aug 30;26(9). DOI: 10.1093/europace/euae204
2. Edwards JD, Healey JS, Fang J, Yip K, Gladstone DJ. Atrial Cardiopathy in the Absence of Atrial Fibrillation Increases Risk of Ischemic Stroke, Incident Atrial Fibrillation, and Mortality and Improves Stroke Risk Prediction. J Am Heart Assoc. 2020 Jun 2;9(11):e013227. DOI: 10.1161/jaha.119.013227
3. Xu Y, Zhao L, Zhang L, Han Y, Wang P, Yu S. Left Atrial Enlargement and the Risk of Stroke: A Meta-Analysis of Prospective Cohort Studies. Front Neurol. 2020;11:26. DOI: 10.3389/fneur.2020.00026
4. Kreimer F, Gotzmann M. Left Atrial Cardiomyopathy - A Challenging Diagnosis. Front Cardiovasc Med. 2022;9:942385. DOI: 10.3389/fcvm.2022.942385
5. Larsen BS, Olsen FJ, Andersen DM, Madsen CV, Møgelvang R, Jensen GB, et al. Left Atrial Volumes and Function, and Long-Term Incidence of Ischemic Stroke in the General Population. J Am Heart Assoc. 2022 Sep 20;11(18):e027031. DOI: 10.1161/jaha.122.027031
6. Vad OB, van Vreeswijk N, Yassin AS, Blaauw Y, Paludan-Müller C, Kanters JK, et al. Atrial cardiomyopathy: markers and outcomes. Eur Heart J. 2025 Oct 15. DOI: 10.1093/eurheartj/ehaf793
7. Deseoe J, Hänsel M, Herzog L, Davoudi N, Luft AR, Gebhard C et al. Left atrial to ventricular volume ratio is a specific marker of atrial cardiopathy. Evidence from the UK Biobank and an ischemic stroke patient cohort. medRxiv; 2025. Available under: https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.64898/2025.12.18.25342359v1
8. Nielsen JB, Kühl JT, Pietersen A, Graff C, Lind B, Struijk JJ, et al. P-wave duration and the risk of atrial fibrillation: Results from the Copenhagen ECG Study. Heart Rhythm. 2015 Sep;12(9):1887-95. DOI: 10.1016/j.hrthm.2015.04.026

9. Schnabel RB, Aspelund T, Li G, Sullivan LM, Suchy-Dicey A, Harris TB, et al. Validation of an atrial fibrillation risk algorithm in whites and African Americans. Arch Intern Med. 2010 Nov 22;170(21):1909-17. DOI: 10.1001/archinternmed.2010.434

10. Maheshwari A, Norby FL, Soliman EZ, Koene R, Rooney M, O'Neal WT, et al. Refining Prediction of Atrial Fibrillation Risk in the General Population With Analysis of P-Wave Axis (from the Atherosclerosis Risk in Communities Study). Am J Cardiol. 2017 Dec 1;120(11):1980-4. DOI: 10.1016/j.amjcard.2017.08.015

11. Kreimer F, Aweimer A, Pflaumbaum A, Mügge A, Gotzmann M. Impact of P-wave indices in prediction of atrial fibrillation-Insight from loop recorder analysis. Ann Noninvasive Electrocardiol. 2021 Sep;26(5):e12854. DOI: 10.1111/anec.12854

12. Xing LY, Diederichsen SZ, Højberg S, Krieger DW, Graff C, Olesen MS, et al. Electrocardiographic markers of subclinical atrial fibrillation detected by implantable loop recorder: insights from the LOOP Study. Europace. 2023 May 19;25(5). DOI: 10.1093/europace/euad014

13. Magnani JW, Zhu L, Lopez F, Pencina MJ, Agarwal SK, Soliman EZ, et al. P-wave indices and atrial fibrillation: cross-cohort assessments from the Framingham Heart Study (FHS) and Atherosclerosis Risk in Communities (ARIC) study. Am Heart J. 2015 Jan;169(1):53-61.e1. DOI: 10.1016/j.ahj.2014.10.009

14. Khurshid S, Friedman S, Reeder C, Di Achille P, Diamant N, Singh P, et al. ECG-Based Deep Learning and Clinical Risk Factors to Predict Atrial Fibrillation. Circulation. 2022 Jan 11;145(2):122-33. DOI: 10.1161/circulationaha.121.057480

15. Yuan N, Duffy G, Dhruva SS, Oesterle A, Pellegrini CN, Theurer J, et al. Deep Learning of Electrocardiograms in Sinus Rhythm From US Veterans to Predict Atrial Fibrillation. JAMA Cardiol. 2023 Dec 1;8(12):1131-9. DOI: 10.1001/jamacardio.2023.3701

16. Christopoulos G, Graff-Radford J, Lopez CL, Yao X, Attia ZI, Rabinstein AA, et al. Artificial Intelligence-Electrocardiography to Predict Incident Atrial Fibrillation: A Population-Based Study. Circ Arrhythm Electrophysiol. 2020 Dec;13(12):e009355. DOI: 10.1161/circep.120.009355

17. Raghunath S, Pfeifer JM, Ulloa-Cerna AE, Nemani A, Carbonati T, Jing L, et al. Deep Neural Networks Can Predict New-Onset Atrial Fibrillation From the 12-Lead ECG and Help Identify Those at Risk of Atrial Fibrillation-Related Stroke. Circulation. 2021 Mar 30;143(13):1287-98. DOI: 10.1161/circulationaha.120.047829

18. Sau A, Sieliwonczyk E, Barker J, Zeidaabadi B, Pastika L, Patlatzoglou K, et al. Prediction of incident atrial fibrillation: A comprehensive evaluation of conventional and artificial intelligence-enhanced approaches. Heart Rhythm. 2025 Aug 22. DOI: 10.1016/j.hrthm.2025.08.024

19. Brant LCC, Ribeiro AH, Eromosele OB, Pinto-Filho MM, Barreto SM, Duncan BB, et al. Prediction of Atrial Fibrillation From the ECG in the Community Using Deep Learning: A Multinational Study. Circ Arrhythm Electrophysiol. 2025 Oct;18(10):e013734. DOI: 10.1161/circep.125.013734

20. Jabbour G, Nolin-Lapalme A, Tastet O, Corbin D, Jordà P, Sowa A, et al. Prediction of incident atrial fibrillation using deep learning, clinical models, and polygenic scores. Eur Heart J. 2024 Dec 7;45(46):4920-34. DOI: 10.1093/eurheartj/ehae595

21. McKeen K, Masood S, Toma A, Rubin B, Wang B. ECG-FM: an open electrocardiogram foundation model. JAMIA Open. 2025 Oct;8(5):ooaf122. DOI: 10.1093/jamiaopen/ooaf122

22. UK Biobank: Protocol for a Large-Scale Prospective Epidemiological Resource, 2007. https://www.ukbiobank.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2011/11/UK-Biobank-Protocol.pdf (06 February 2025, date last accessed)

23. Petersen SE, Matthews PM, Francis JM, Robson MD, Zemrak F, Boubertakh R, et al. UK Biobank's cardiovascular magnetic resonance protocol. J Cardiovasc Magn Reson. 2016 Feb 1;18:8. DOI: 10.1186/s12968-016-0227-4

24. UK Biobank 12-lead (at rest) ECG ,2015 https://biobank.ndph.ox.ac.uk/ukb/ukb/docs/12lead_ecg_explan_doc.pdf (22 November 2025, date last accessed)

25. Bai W, Suzuki H, Huang J, Francis C, Wang S, Tarroni G, et al. A population-based phenome-wide association study of cardiac and aortic structure and function. Nat Med. 2020 Oct;26(10):1654-62. DOI: 10.1038/s41591-020-1009-y

26. Lima EM, Ribeiro AH, Paixão GMM, Ribeiro MH, Pinto-Filho MM, Gomes PR, et al. Deep neural network-estimated electrocardiographic age as a mortality predictor. Nat Commun. 2021 Aug 25;12(1):5117. DOI: 10.1038/s41467-021-25351-7

27. Jordan K, Yaghi S, Poppas A, Chang AD, Mac Grory B, Cutting S, et al. Left Atrial Volume Index Is Associated With Cardioembolic Stroke and Atrial Fibrillation Detection After Embolic Stroke of Undetermined Source. Stroke. 2019 Aug;50(8):1997-2001. DOI: 10.1161/strokeaha.119.025384

28. Tsutsui K, Brimer SB, Ben-Moshe N, Sellal JM, Oster J, Mori H, et al. SHDB-AF: a Japanese Holter ECG database of atrial fibrillation. Sci Data. 2025 Mar 19;12(1):454. DOI: 10.1038/s41597-025-04777-4

29. Huang JY, Yang SH, Gu FS. [Evaluation of 3 chest leads CM5, CC5, and CL5 and factors which influence the results]. Zhonghua Xin Xue Guan Bing Za Zhi. 1989 Apr;17(2):103-6, 27-8.

30. Li J, Aguirre AD, Moura V, Jin J, Liu C, Zhong L, et al. An Electrocardiogram Foundation Model Built on over 10 Million Recordings. Nejm ai. 2025 Jul;2(7). DOI: 10.1056/aioa2401033

31. Tian Y, Li Z, Jin Y, Wang M, Wei X, Zhao L, et al. Foundation model of ECG diagnosis: Diagnostics and explanations of any form and rhythm on ECG. Cell Rep Med. 2024 Dec 17;5(12):101875. DOI: 10.1016/j.xcrm.2024.101875

32. Nguyen HD, Pham T-T, Le N, Nguyen V. TolerantECG: A Foundation Model for Imperfect Electrocardiogram. arXiv preprint arXiv:250709887. 2025.

33. Alonso A, Krijthe BP, Aspelund T, Stepas KA, Pencina MJ, Moser CB, et al. Simple risk model predicts incidence of atrial fibrillation in a racially and geographically diverse population: the CHARGE-AF consortium. J Am Heart Assoc. 2013 Mar 18;2(2):e000102. DOI: 10.1161/jaha.112.000102

34. DeLong ER, DeLong DM, Clarke-Pearson DL. Comparing the areas under two or more correlated receiver operating characteristic curves: a nonparametric approach. Biometrics. 1988 Sep;44(3):837-45.

35. Havránek tp, Bulková V, Fiala M, Škňouřil L, Chovančík J, Šimek J, et al. Poor relationship between left atrial diameter and volume in patients with atrial fibrillation. Cor et Vasa. 2012 2012/11/01/;54(6):e386-e92. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crvasa.2012.11.004

36. Simonyan K, Vedaldi A, Zisserman A. Deep inside convolutional networks: Visualising image classification models and saliency maps. arXiv preprint arXiv:13126034. 2013.

37. Elsheikh S, Hill A, Irving G, Lip GYH, Abdul-Rahim AH. Atrial fibrillation and stroke: State-of-the-art and future directions. Curr Probl Cardiol. 2024 Jan;49(1 Pt C):102181. DOI: 10.1016/j.cpcardiol.2023.102181

38. Alshehri AM. Stroke in atrial fibrillation: Review of risk stratification and preventive therapy. J Family Community Med. 2019 May-Aug;26(2):92-7. DOI: 10.4103/jfcm.JFCM_99_18

39. Kashou AH, May AM, Noseworthy PA. Artificial Intelligence-Enabled ECG: a Modern Lens on an Old Technology. Curr Cardiol Rep. 2020 Jun 19;22(8):57. DOI: 10.1007/s11886-020-01317-x

40. Kornej J, Börschel CS, Benjamin EJ, Schnabel RB. Epidemiology of Atrial Fibrillation in the 21st Century: Novel Methods and New Insights. Circ Res. 2020 Jun 19;127(1):4-20. DOI: 10.1161/circresaha.120.316340

41. Kleindorfer DO, Towfighi A, Chaturvedi S, Cockroft KM, Gutierrez J, Lombardi-Hill D, et al. 2021 Guideline for the Prevention of Stroke in Patients With Stroke and Transient Ischemic Attack: A Guideline From the American Heart Association/American Stroke Association. Stroke. 2021 Jul;52(7):e364-e467. DOI: 10.1161/str.0000000000000375

42. Chollet L, Iqbal SUR, Wittmer S, Thalmann G, Madaffari A, Kozhuharov N, et al. Impact of atrial fibrillation phenotype and left atrial volume on outcome after pulmonary vein isolation. Europace. 2024 Mar 30;26(4). DOI: 10.1093/europace/euae071

43. Lenart-Migdalska A, Kaźnica-Wiatr M, Drabik L, Knap K, Smaś-Suska M, Podolec PP, et al. Assessment of Left Atrial Function in Patients with Paroxysmal, Persistent, and Permanent Atrial Fibrillation using Two-Dimensional Strain. J Atr Fibrillation. 2019 Oct-Nov;12(3):2148. DOI: 10.4022/jafib.2148

44. Zhao D, Quill GM, Gilbert K, Wang VY, Houle HC, Legget ME, et al. Systematic Comparison of Left Ventricular Geometry Between 3D-Echocardiography and Cardiac Magnetic Resonance Imaging. Front Cardiovasc Med. 2021;8:728205. DOI: 10.3389/fcvm.2021.728205

45. Marincheva G, Iakobishvili Z, Valdman A, Laish-Farkash A. Left Atrial Strain: Clinical Use and Future Applications-A Focused Review Article. Rev Cardiovasc Med. May 2022;23(5):154.

46. Noseworthy PA, Attia ZI, Behnken EM, Giblon RE, Bews KA, Liu S, et al. Artificial intelligence-guided screening for atrial fibrillation using electrocardiogram during sinus rhythm: a prospective non-randomised interventional trial. Lancet. 2022 Oct 8;400(10359):1206-12.

11. Tables

	No prev. AF	Prev. AF	P-values*
n	42’223	1’221	
Age (mean (SD))	67.58 (7.76)	71.50 (7.07)	**<0.001**
Sex (male) (%)	19’928 (47.2)	760 (62.2)	**<0.001**
Ethnicity (White) (%)	40’455 (95.8)	1196 (98.0)	**<0.001**
Height (mean (SD)) [cm]	169.27 (9.41)	172.24 (9.61)	**<0.001**
Weight (mean (SD)) [kg]	75.99 (15.58)	79.56 (15.78)	**<0.001**
Sys. BP (mean (SD)) [mmHg]	144.16 (19.59)	145.70 (19.20)	**0.007**
Dias. BP (mean (SD)) [mmHg]	79.31 (10.15)	77.02 (9.61)	**<0.001**
Current Smoking (%)	1’322 (3.1)	27 (2.2)	0.081
Antihypertensive medication (%)	11’693 (27.7)	585 (47.9)	**<0.001**
Diabetes (%)	2’634 (6.2)	122 (10.0)	**<0.001**
Heart failure (%)	238 (0.6)	86 (7.0)	**<0.001**
Myocardial infarction (%)	984 (2.3)	114 (9.3)	**<0.001**

Table 1. Participant characteristics in the UK Biobank cohort used for evaluation of downstream tasks. Stratification was done according to previous episodes of atrial fibrillation documented in health records. Prev: Previous, SD: standard deviation, sys. BP: systolic blood pressure, dias. BP: diastolic blood pressure.

* For age, height, weight, systolic blood pressure and diastolic blood pressure p-values were calculated using two-tailed unpaired T-test, for the other variables Pearsons chi-squared test was used.

	UKBB: Identifying participants with previous AF episodes		
Model	**ROC – AUC ***	**PR-AUC ***	**P - values †**
CHARGE-AF + Pred. indices	**0.756 (0.742 - 0.771)**	**0.115 (0.100 - 0.130)**	
CHARGE-AF + PWI	0.724 (0.710 - 0.738)	0.090 (0.077 - 0.102)	**< 0.001**
CHARGE-AF	0.720 (0.706 - 0.734)	0.087 (0.075 - 0.099)	**< 0.001**
CHARGE-AF + DL-AF	0.741 (0.727 - 0.755)	0.106 (0.092 - 0.120)	**< 0.001**
	N = 43'444, AF = 1'221	Prevalence: 0.028	
	UKBB: 5-year risk of AF		
Model	**ROC-AUC ***	**PR-AUC ***	**P – values**
CHARGE-AF + Pred. indices	**0.777 (0.747 - 0.807)**	**0.033 (0.026 - 0.047)**	
CHARGE-AF + PWI	0.760 (0.731 - 0.790)	0.025 (0.020 - 0.031)	**0.046**
CHARGE-AF	0.758 (0.728 - 0.788)	0.025 (0.020 - 0.031)	**0.018**
CHARGE-AF + DL-AF	0.770 (0.740 - 0.799)	0.029 (0.023 - 0.041)	0.27
	N = 42'223, AF = 248	Event rate = 0.013	
	Primary care cohort: Predicting future AF		
Model	**ROC-AUC ***	**PR-AUC ***	**P – values**
Age + Sex + Pred. indices	**0.849 (0.838 - 0.860)**	**0.220 (0.195 - 0.245)**	
Age + Sex + PWI	0.784 (0.773 - 0.796)	0.058 (0.053 - 0.064)	**< 0.001**
Age + Sex	0.771 (0.760 - 0.782)	0.051 (0.046 - 0.055)	**< 0.001**
Age + Sex + DL-AF	0.829 (0.818 - 0.840)	0.183 (0.160 - 0.207)	**< 0.001**
	N = 64'851, AF = 1'255	Prevalence: 0.019	
	USZ: Diagnosing patients with AF as cause of stroke		
Model	**ROC-AUC ***	**PR-AUC ***	**P – values**
CHARGE-AF + Pred. Indices	**0.767 (0.706 - 0.828)**	**0.429 (0.315 - 0.544)**	
CHARGE-AF + PWI	0.741 (0.681 - 0.800)	0.395 (0.287 - 0.504)	0.14
CHARGE-AF	0.732 (0.669 - 0.795)	0.390 (0.281 - 0.498)	**0.036**
CHARGE-AF + DL	0.745 (0.687 - 0.803)	0.415 (0.297 - 0.533)	0.12
	N = 312, AF = 65	Prevalence = 0.208	

Table 2. ROC-AUC and PR-AUC values with 95 % confidence intervals for model performances on the different downstream tasks in internal and external validation. Our new proposed method is shown in bold. AF: Atrial fibrillation, Pred. indices: predicted imaging indices. PWI: P wave indices, DL: deep learning, ROC-AUC area

under the receiver operating characteristic curve, PR-AUC: area under the precision recall curve. UKBB: UK Biobank, USZ: University Hospital Zurich.

* 95% confidence intervals were calculated using 1000 bootstrap samples.

† P-values were calculated by comparing ROC-AUC using DeLongs test. We performed pairwise comparisons between the model performance of the model containing the predicted imaging indices and the performance of the other models.

12. Figures with Figure Legends



Figure 1. Workflow overview for model training and evaluation. AF: Atrial fibrillation. PWI: P wave indices.



Figure 2. Overview over participant inclusion and exclusion for model finetuning (left) and clinical tasks (right). In the UK Biobank cohort, the two tasks included identifying patients with previous episodes of AF and predicting incident AF. In the primary care cohort, the task was to predict incident AF. In the USZ stroke cohort the task was to detect patients with AF as cause of stroke. LA: left atrial, Prep: preprocessing, AF: atrial fibrillation, PWI: P wave indices, ECG: electrocardiogram.



Figure 3. Scatter plot of ground truth and test set predictions for atrial imaging indices: indexed left atrium maximum volume (A), indexed left atrium minimum volume (B), left atrium ejection fraction (C) and left atrial to ventricular volume ratio (D). Dotted lines show perfect predictions. Colors indicate if atrial fibrillation had been diagnosed and documented in health records before the imaging date (blue) or if incident atrial fibrillation occurred at some point after imaging (red). Grey points indicate participants without any documented atrial fibrillation. LA max: indexed left atrial maximum volume, LA min: indexed left atrial minimum volume, LAEF: left atrial ejection fraction, LALV: left atrial to ventricular volume ratio.



Figure 4. Receiver operating characteristic curves for identifying patients with previous episodes of atrial fibrillation (A) and for predicting 5-year risk of new onset atrial fibrillation (B) in the UK Biobank cohort. AF: atrial fibrillation, pred. indices: predicted imaging indices, PWI: P wave indices, DL: deep learning. UKBB; UK Biobank.



704

705 **Figure 5**. External validation receiver operating characteristic curves for identifying
706 patients with incident AF in a primary care cohort (A) and for identifying patients with
707 atrial fibrillation as cause of stroke in an in-hospital cohort of ischemic stroke patients
708 (B). AF: atrial fibrillation, pred. indices: predicted imaging indices, PWI: P wave
709 indices, DL: deep learning.



Figure 6. Importance of different ECG segments for prediction of indexed left atrial maximum volume (A), indexed left atrial minimum volume (B), left atrial ejection fraction (C) and left atrial to ventricular volume ratio (D) evaluated on 1’077 5 second non-AF ECG samples from 653 patients from the USZ stroke cohort. Importance was calculated by averaging absolute saliency values over all 12 leads per segment and then dividing by average salience of the entire 5 second ECG sample. (E) Schematic representaion of the ECG segments evaluated in (A)-(D). (F) Example saliency map for leads I-III. Darker red indicates high absolute saliency. LA max: indexed left atrial maximum volume, LA min: indexed left atrial minimum volume, LAEF: left atrial ejection fraction, LALV: left atrial to ventricular volume ratio.