https://doi.org/ 10.33472/AFJBS.6.7.2024.491-501

African Journal of Biological Sciences

Journal homepage: http://www.afjbs.com

Research Paper Open Access

Machine Learning in Atrial Fibrillation Prediction

Dr. Gurmanik Kaur[1], Dr. Pallavi Sharma[2], Dr. AjatShatru Arora[3]

[1]*Department of Electrical Engineering, Sant Baba Bhag Singh University, Jalandhar, Punjab, INDIA*

mannsliet@gmail.com

[2]*Dept. of Electronics and Communication Engineering, Lyallpur Khalsa College Technical Campus, Jalandhar, Punjab, INDIA*

pallavi.engg10@gmail.com

[3]*Dept. of Electrical and Instrumentation Engineering, Sant Longowal Institute of Engineering & Technology, Longowal, Sangrur, Punjab, INDIA*

ajatsliet@yahoo.com

Article History

Received Date: 1st April, 2024

Accepted Date: 10th May, 2024

Published Date: 25th July, 2024

doi: 10.33472/AF5BS.6.7.2024.491-501

Abstract: - Utilizing machine learning approaches for the estimation and detection of atrial fibrillation, a prevalent rhythm disease having substantial clinical consequences, especially associated with a higher risk of ischemic cerebral ischemia and cardiac arrest, has sparked a lot of attention recently. Earlier studies have identified many clinical indicators that may be used to anticipate the onset of atrial fibrillation prior to the introduction of artificial intelligence in healthcare delivery. Prior diagnostics, laboratory findings, imaging data, and electrophysiological measurements are all examples of clinical features. The electronic medical record has a lot of information like this, and artificial intelligence systems may query it automatically. We discuss the latest state of machine learning methods for atrial fibrillation detection and prediction, as well as the consequences and future outlook for this rapidly developing area, using the technologically advanced computational capabilities.

Keywords: Atrial fibrillation, electrocardiogram, echocardiography, risk factor, prediction, machine learning.

I. Introduction

The most prevalent arrhythmia in the world is atrial fibrillation (AF), and its prevalence is predicted to rise as the world's population ages. AF is clinically diagnosed, with formal electrocardiographic test required to detect the arrhythmia. Advances in monitoring technologies, such as high-fidelity long-term monitoring, have boosted the probability for detecting AF, allowing us to learn more about the real clinical impact of the condition. In addition to diagnosis, there has been a lot of research in predicting AF utilizing clinical risk factors and objective assessment. Several clinical risk scores have been suggested that include widely accessible data based on the patient's medical background [1-8]. Diagnostic scores' ability to predict outcomes is found to be enhanced by anomalies in myocardial and inflammation indicators [9]. Atrial fibrosis and hypertrophy, and also accompanying effects on physiologic variables such mitral inflow, are structural cardiac disorders. Doppler and atrium straining can be used to predict the onset of AF [10-12]. Similarly, P wave morphological characteristics have been extensively researched and proven to be predictive. Overall, a plethora of clinical indicators demonstrated to predict AF, either separately or in limited combinations.

Machine learning can examine and synthesize apparently diverse characteristics to estimate AF in a manner that greatly outperforms traditional techniques, because to artificial intelligence technological advancements and the expanding volume of digital medical information [13].Machine learning approaches may be capable to include and analyze vast volumes of clinical data, as well as identify novel clinical patterns and ideas, in addition to assisting in the processing of images or electrocardiographic statistics. We want to give you the most up-to-date information on traditional and machine learning approaches for predicting AF.

II. Machine learning approaches in their present state

The combination of statistical analytics and computer engineering lies at the heart of machine learning. Machine learning algorithms can evaluate complicated inputs, like images, and detect subtle associations that standard statistical methods may miss. The three main types of machine learning approaches are supervised learning, unsupervised learning, and reinforcement learning. During supervised learning, markers like the existence or non-existence of AF are required. As a result, the algorithm is given both the input parameters and the outcome categories. Unsupervised learning aims to discover associations within data without the use of labeling. This type of learning has been demonstrated using a range of methodologies, including clustering. Reinforcement learning is based on the idea of reward maximizing, wherein a machine learning algorithm acts as an agent receiving either positive or negative reinforcement can have an impact on a decision [14-16]. We'll discuss about the most common learning approach, supervised learning, in this review. Regression models, random forests, and artificial neural are some of the approaches used in supervised learning. Pre-selected parameters are subjected to regression analysis in regression modeling, with and without machine learning, to test their capacity to estimate an outcomes. Because of its ability to evaluate big and complicated datasets, machine learning outperforms traditional modeling techniques. Support Vector Machine and K-Nearest Neighbor are two examples of classification algorithms. Random forest generates thresholds empirically to find data segregation using decision trees [15-17].

The field of machine learning has been dramatically altered by neural networks. Layers and nodes, make up the network structure. The structure of the network is made up of layers and nodes, which are processing units in each layer. Before moving on to the next layer, information is analysed in the previous layer so that a node inside it can receive data from the preceding layer. In order to analyze information, most neural networks include input and output layers, but deep learning models have numerous "hidden" intermediary structures and nodes. The idea of "convolutions" is used in convolutional neural networks, where nodes in deeper levels exclusively receive data from a set of units from preceding layer. As a result, such networks try to find local associations and maintain local specific dependencies, which is crucial for processing images. Additionally, it facilitates more efficient computer analysis by employing dimensionality reduction techniques to break down input information into manageable localized convolved properties.There is numerous different machine learning techniques exist. However, Table 1 summarizes the names of the most often used supervised machine learning techniques as well as their overall pros and cons for clinicians.

Table 1-Various supervised machine learning technique's pros and cons.

Technique	**Pros**	**Cons**
Regression (Linear/logistic)	Simple and quick to execute	Variables with a complicated interaction have a lower accuracy.
k-Nearest Neighbor	Utilizable and tolerant of noisy or missing feature values	Computationally intensive and does not identify significant variables for categorization.
Support vector machine	It can categorize semi structured and unstructured data and is more resilient than traditional regression.	It is computationally demanding and does not identify significant categorization variables.
Random forest	Efficiently operates on enormous datasets as well as finds key	Computationally demanding and easy to avoid over - fitting

	classifying features	
Neural network	Establishes intricate non-linear relationships between variables.	It's computationally demanding, and you can't see the decision-making process ("black box").

III. Prediction of the onset of AF from clinical data

Age, race, stature, obesity, blood pressure, lifestyle factors, drug usage, diabetes history, cardiac disease myocardial infarction, as well as other clinical characteristics are used in validated clinical assessments to identify AF. The above risk factors have shown sufficient model differentiation for the forecasting of episode AF depending on the easily accessible characteristics from patients' data [1-8].

In investigations of diagnostic test effectiveness, the area under the receiver operator curve (AUC) is typically employed as al measure of test scores [19]. Accuracy, precision, and recall are further test performance metrics. We will primarily focus on AUCs due to the variation in providing these other test performance indicators that restricts comparison among investigations. Table 2 summarizes the research for such validated clinical risk factors to detect AF.

Serologic screening of common cardiac indicators has been demonstrated to improve the estimation power of clinical risk scores [20]. Other biomarkers of chronic kidney disease have also been linked to AF, albeit no research proved that adding them to current clinical risk scores improves their predictive power [9].

Recent researchers have begun to explore the application of machine learning in detecting AF utilizing electronic medical information. Organizations have established common data frameworks for research to help with this, one of which is the Observational Medical Outcomes Partnership Common Data Model, which aims to synchronize information from diverse references for systematic assessment [21]. A predictive model was developed by Tiwari et al. [22]to analyze the 200 most prevalent health information attributes. The developed model can identify AF in a 6-month period with an AUC of 0.79.

Table 2- Original and validation research findings of clinical AF risk scores.

Clinical AF risk score	Original research	Validation research
Age, gender, body mass index, blood pressure, hypertension therapy, PR duration, clinically significant heart murmur, congestive heart failure	AUC 0.78 (95% CI: 0.76–0.80) in 4,764 participants from the United States [1]	AUC 0.734 (95% CI: 0.724–0.744) in 49,599 individuals from the United States [23]
Age, ethnicity, stature, blood pressure, high blood pressure therapy, smoking habits, pre-	AUC 0.765 (95% CI: 0.748–0.781) in 14,546	None

cordial murmur, left ventricular hypertrophy, left atrial expansion, diabetes mellitus, coronary artery disease, and heart failure	participants from the United States [2]	
Age, race, stature, weight, high blood pressure, smoking, antihypertensive medication usage, diabetes, heart failure, and myocardial infarction	AUC 0.765 (95% CI: 0.748–0.781) in 18,556 participants from the United States [3]	AUC 0.74 (95% CI: 0.73–0.74) in 114,475 participants from the Netherlands [8]
Coronary artery disease, high BP, age, congestive heart failure, hyperthyroidism	AUC 0.75 (95% CI: 0.73–0.77) in 471,446 Chinese patients [5]	AUC 0.588 (95 % CI: 0.585–0.591) in 1,047,330 Danish patients [7]
(High blood pressure, advanced age, stroke/ transient ischemic attack, transient ischemic attack, congestive heart failure	AUC0.716 (95% CI: 0.710–0.723) among 670,804 Taiwanese patients [4]	AUC 0.771 (no CI reported) in 692,691 Taiwanese patients [6]

In a study by Sekelj et al. [24] of more than 2 million patients from the United Kingdom, another model achieved an AUC of 0.83 in the design set of data and 0.87 in the test data to identify AF in a database spanning 7 years, representing improved results than conventional risk scores. Many variables influence and restrict the understanding of results while comparing AI algorithms to conventional risk assessments. To begin with, each study's follow-up period varies significantly. This had a clear influence on the amount of cases experiencing recurrent AF at the end of the study [1, 22]. In a study including about 3 million people in the United Kingdom, Hill et al. [25] evaluated the CHARGE-AF risk score against a machine learning approach with time-varying variables. The inclusion of time-varying covariates is another neural network technique wherein the input variables are not fixed but allows for the incorporation into the model at different times throughout the course of the study. This indicates that throughout the formation of these neural networks, the temporal relationship between a variable and the output has become another essential component. The time-varying model's AUC in this study was 0.827, compared to the traditional CHARGE-AF risk score's AUC of 0.725. They were capable of determining that using a time-varying technique, heart failure identified within last 91-day quarter contributes significantly to the forecast of the incidence of AF. The study not just to show the advantages of machine learning approach to find signs that could have clinical significance (such time-dependent variables), and it also demonstrated that these techniques outperformed conventional risk scores. The scale and scope of these enormous projects dwarf previous studies of traditional clinical estimation methods for AF, despite the fact that these methods have not even been evaluated in outside healthcare systems. This shows the growing potential of estimating the risk of developing AF using readily available information from the electronic medical record.

IV. Prediction of the onset of AF from cardiovascular imaging data

AF is frequently caused by structural heart defects seen on cardiovascular image data such as echocardiography, CT, and MRI. The architectural heart defects are frequently caused by diseases that predispose people to AF, although AF can indeed cause valve regurgitation on its own. Previous research has linked left atrial volumes, markers of diastolic dysfunction, ventricular wall thickness, and strain echocardiography to the likelihood of new-onset AF [26, 27, and 11]. In a smaller sample of 249 individuals, newer, non-traditional parameters like total atrial conduction time, a sign of atriopathy, were also linked to the emergence of AF [28]. Heart CT scans used to assess the left atrial appendages yielded inconsistent outcomes in terms of predicting AF post AF ablation [29]. Nevertheless, left atrial thickness (a biomarker of atriopathy) on heart CT linked to a higher likelihood of paroxysmal to chronic AF transition, and also low-voltage regions as prospective ablation locations [30,31]. Left atrium fibrosis with late gadolinium increase on heart MRI has indeed been linked to new-onset AF, owing to its unique potential of MRI to analyse tissue features. An AUC of 0.67 was obtained after incorporating history of high blood pressure and left ventricular ejection fraction to a research including 182 individuals that examined the predictability of left atrial fibrosis>6% [32]. Ultimately, the utilization of such imaging measures to identify AF has been limited to small correlation and procedural investigations, and imaging data has not been used to construct or modify current risk scores for diagnosing AF in a systematic way. Image analysis has also seen some progress owing to machine learning. Although images demand more advanced approaches when implementing machine learning than categorical data from electronic health data, the essential idea remains the same [33]. Small-scale research into the application of machine learning in cardiac imaging has begun. In a short study using myocardial CT using machine learning to analyse left atrial and pulmonary vein morphology in 203 patients receiving AF ablation, the machine learning model was successful at predicting AF relapse after ablation utilizing CT image dataset with an AUC of 0.87 [34]. When imaging and clinical data were combined in a research of 68 patients utilizing myocardial CT left atrial anatomy to estimate AF relapse following ablation, the AUC was 0.78 [35]. However, no research has been done on using artificial intelligence to detect newly onset AF in cardiac imaging.In cardiac imaging, machine learning has mostly concentrated on image acquisition, analysis, and assessment due to several factors, such as the complexities of image processing [36]. Machine learning's function in prediction and identification of non-imaging illnesses like AF would need to be explored further in future studies. It might not be possible to conduct large population-based studies due to the increased selection bias for patient populations who need cardiac image analysis testing. However, periprocedural prognosis and treatment will probably be greatly impacted by machine learning in cardiac imaging for AF, and it may potentially help predict AF in well-designed trials.

V. Prediction of the onset of AF from electrophysiological data

Electrophysiology test anomalies can reveal pathophysiologic alterations in AF. Previous research has found that ECG abnormalities can predict incident AF, with AUCs ranging from 0.69 to 0.87[37-39]. With an AUC of 0.58, one study looked at the features of preterm atrial contractions and % burden as a potential cause for AF in 652 patients underwent Holter monitoring [40].

VI. Future Direction

Although still in early infancy, machine learning has obviously started to significantly increase our potential to forecast AF. Around the world, initiatives and clinical studies are presently being conducted to systematically evaluate and utilize AI's potential in therapeutic settings for AF. The Batch Enrollment for AI-Guided Intervention to Lower Neurologic Events or BEAGLE trial in unrecognized AF is a study in the United States that aims to see how effective AI is at finding AF on normal sinus ECGs in adult individuals who has never had AF before but was eligible for anticoagulation after performing the usual stroke risk assessment [41]. Parallel initiatives have been carried out by other countries with some attempting to assess the usefulness of AI used to ECGs received via wearable devices [42-46]. Despite substantial breakthroughs, this field still has a lot of opportunities for improvement.

1. Data integration across all modalities: Traditional studies have shown that combining data often leads to high prediction accuracy for any diagnostic risk score, even though siloed strategies are frequently essential in the starting to optimize methodological approaches since they relate to multiple modalities of data. A similar idea must be implemented to machine learning methods, which will result in the creation of a machine learning model which can include all data kinds and boost the existing AI algorithms' high predictive efficacy.
2. Advancements in human knowledge and machine learning algorithms: Considering the nature of several sophisticated classes of machine learning, the signal attributes chosen by the AI considered essential predictive characteristics in an approach can’t be

determined at this preliminary stage. Future techniques may make it possible for algorithms to be more specific and insightful about their own methods, both to inform health care professionals about novel trends that can improve human knowledge and to alert scientists of potential future problems,

3. Management aspects of machine learning approaches: While the main goal of this study is to assess the use of AI in forecasting AF, additional research ought to assess the potential use of these techniques in determining appropriate patient care strategies. In the case of AF, for example, AF identification has a major impact on preventing stroke through the administration of anticoagulation. Could the algorithm's results lead to significant changes in clinical outcomes and patient management that can be implemented in the future, possibly even before a medical diagnosis is made

VII. Conclusion

The use of machine learning in healthcare will likely increase because technology improves and human understanding of its implications expands. Machine learning demonstrated massive potential in enhancing our ability to predict AF, although it is still in its initial phases and has inherent limits. Future advances in the efficiency of these machine learning approaches will surely improve patient care throughout the world by integrating clinical, imaging, and electrophysiological information.

References

1. Schnabel, R. B., Sullivan, L. M., Levy, D., Pencina, M. J., Massaro, J. M., D'Agostino, R. B. Sr., et al. (2009). Development of a risk score for atrial fibrillation Framingham Heart Study): a community-based cohort study. Lancet 373, 739-745. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(09)60443-8.
2. Chamberlain, A. M., Agarwal, S. K., Folsom, A. R., Soliman, E. Z., Chambless, L. E., Crow, R., et al. (2011). A clinical risk score for atrial fibrillation in a biracial prospective cohort (from the Atherosclerosis Risk in Communities [ARIC] study). Am. J. Cardiol. 107, 85–91. doi: 10.1016/j.amjcard.2010.08.049
3. Alonso, A., Krijthe, B. P., Aspelund, T., Stepas, K. A., Pencina, M. J., Moser, C. B., et al. (2013). Simple risk model predicts incidence of atrial fibrillation in a racially and geographically diverse population: the CHARGE-AF consortium. J. Am. Heart Assoc. 2:e000102. doi: 10.1161/JAHA.112.000102
4. Suenari, K., Chao, T. F., Liu, C. J., Kihara, Y., Chen, T. J., and Chen, S. A. (2017). Usefulness of HATCH score in the prediction of new-onset atrial fibrillation for Asians. Medicine (Baltimore). 96, e5597. doi: 10.1097/MD.0000000000005597
5. Li, Y. G., Pastori, D., Farcomeni, A., Yang, P. S., Jang, E., Joung, B., et al. (2019). A Simple Clinical Risk Score (C2HEST) for Predicting Incident Atrial Fibrillation in Asian Subjects: Derivation in 471,446 Chinese Subjects. With Internal Validation and External Application in 451,199 Korean Subjects. Chest 155, 510–518. doi: 10.1016/j.chest.2018.09.011

6. Hu, W. S., and Lin, C. L. (2020). Prediction of new-onset atrial fibrillation for general population in Asia: a comparison of C2HEST and HATCH scores. Int. J. Cardiol. 313, 60–63. doi: 10.1016/j.ijcard.2020.03.036
7. Lip, G. Y. H., Skjoth, F., Nielsen, P. B., and Larsen, T. B. (2020). Evaluation of the C2HEST Risk Score as a Possible Opportunistic Screening Tool for Incident Atrial Fibrillation in a Healthy Population (From a Nationwide Danish Cohort Study). Am. J. Cardiol. 125, 48–54. doi: 10.1016/j.amjcard.2019.09.034
8. Himmelreich, J. C. L., Lucassen, W. A. M., Harskamp, R. E., Aussems, C., van Weert, H., and Nielen, M. M. J. (2021). CHARGE-AF in a national routine primary care electronic health records database in the Netherlands: validation for 5-year risk of atrial fibrillation and implications for patient selection in atrial fibrillation screening. Open Heart 8:e001459. doi: 10.1136/openhrt-2020-001459
9. O'Neal, W. T., Venkatesh, S., Broughton, S. T., Griffin, W. F., and Soliman, E. Z. (2016). Biomarkers and the prediction of atrial fibrillation: state of the art. Vasc. Health Risk Manag. 12, 297–303. doi: 10.2147/VHRM.S75537
10. De Vos, C. B., Weijs, B., Crijns, H. J., Cheriex, E. C., Palmans, A., Habets, J., et al. (2009). Atrial tissue Doppler imaging for prediction of new-onset atrial fibrillation. Heart 95, 835–840. doi: 10.1136/hrt.2008.148528
11. Caputo, M., and Mondillo, S. (2012). Echocardiography in the prediction of atrial fibrillation recurrence: a review. J. Atr. Fibrillation. 5:675.
12. Hwang, S. H., Oh, Y. W., Lee, D. I., Shim, J., Park, S. W., and Kim, Y. H. (2015). Relation between left atrial wall composition by late gadolinium enhancement and complex fractionated atrial electrograms in patients with persistent atrial fibrillation: influence of non-fibrotic substrate in the left atrium. Int. J. Cardiovasc. Imaging 31, 1191–1199. doi: 10.1007/s10554-015-0675-1
13. Siontis, K. C., Yao, X., Pirruccello, J. P., Philippakis, A. A., and Noseworthy, P. A. (2020). How will machine learning inform the clinical care of atrial fibrillation? Circ. Res. 127, 155–169. doi: 10.1161/CIRCRESAHA.120.316401
14. Thrun, S., and Littman, M. L. (2000). Reinforcement Learning: An Introduction. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
15. Koohy, H. (2017). The rise and fall of machine learning methods in biomedical research. F1000Res. 6:2012. doi: 10.12688/f1000research.13016.1
16. Géron, A. (2019). Hands-on Machine Learning with Scikit-Learn, Keras, and TensorFlow: Concepts, Tools, and Techniques to Build Intelligent Systems. Newton, MA: O'Reilly Media.
17. Uddin, S., Khan, A., Hossain, M. E., and Moni, M. A. (2019). Comparing different supervised machine learning algorithms for disease prediction. BMC Med. Inform. Decis. Mak. 19:1–16. doi: 10.1186/s12911-019- 1004-8
18. Stankovic, L., and Mandic, D. (2021). Convolutional neural networks demystified: a matched filtering perspective based tutorial. arXiv [Preprint]. Available online at: https://arxiv.org/pdf/2108.11663.pdf (accessed June 1, 2021).
19. Bradley, A. P. (1997). The use of the area under the ROC curve in the evaluation of machine learning algorithms. Pattern Recogn. 30, 1145–1159. doi: 10.1016/ S0031-3203(96)00142-2
20. Sinner, M. F., Stepas, K. A., Moser, C. B., Krijthe, B. P., Aspelund, T., Sotoodehnia, N., et al. (2014). B-type natriuretic peptide and C-reactive protein in the prediction of atrial fibrillation risk: the CHARGE-AF Consortium of community-based cohort studies. Europace 16, 1426–1433. doi: 10.1093/ europace/euu175

21. FitzHenry, F., Resnic, F. S., Robbins, S. L., Denton, J., Nookala, L., Meeker, D., et al. (2015). Creating a common data model for comparative effectiveness with the FitzHenry, F., Resnic, F. S., Robbins, S. L., Denton, J., Nookala, L., Meeker, D., et al. (2015). Creating a common data model for comparative effectiveness with the observational medical outcomes partnership. Appl. Clin. Inform. 6, 536–547. doi: 10.4338/ACI-2014-12-CR-0121
22. Tiwari, P., Colborn, K. L., Smith, D. E., Xing, F., Ghosh, D., and Rosenberg, M. A. (2020). Assessment of a machine learning model applied to harmonized electronic health record data for the prediction of incident atrial fibrillation. JAMA Netw. Open 3:e1919396. doi: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2019. 19396
23. Shulman, E., Kargoli, F., Aagaard, P., Hoch, E., Di Biase, L., Fisher, J., et al. (2016). Validation of the Framingham heart study and CHARGE-AF risk scores for atrial fibrillation in Hispanics, African-Americans, and Non-Hispanic Whites. Am. J. Cardiol. 117, 76–83. doi: 10.1016/j.amjcard.2015.10.009
24. Sekelj, S., Sandler, B., Johnston, E., Pollock, K. G., Hill, N. R., Gordon, J., et al. (2021). Detecting undiagnosed atrial fibrillation in UK primary care: validation of a machine learning prediction algorithm in a retrospective cohort study. Eur. J. Prev. Cardiol. 28, 598–605. doi: 10.1177/2047487320942338
25. Hill, N. R., Ayoubkhani, D., McEwan, P., Sugrue, D. M., Farooqui, U., Lister, S., et al. (2019). Predicting atrial fibrillation in primary care using machine learning. PLoS One 14:e0224582. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0224582
26. Xu, H. F., He, Y. M., Qian, Y. X., Zhao, X., Li, X., and Yang, X. J. (2011). Left ventricular posterior wall thickness is an independent risk factor for paroxysmal atrial fibrillation. West. Indian Med. J. 60, 647–652.
27. Hirose, T., Kawasaki, M., Tanaka, R., Ono, K., Watanabe, T., Iwama, M., et al. (2012). Left atrial function assessed by speckle tracking echocardiography as a predictor of new-onset non-valvular atrial fibrillation: results from a prospective study in 580 adults. Eur. Heart J. Cardiovasc. Imaging 13, 243–250. doi: 10.1093/ejechocard/jer251
28. De Vos, C. B., Weijs, B., Crijns, H. J., Cheriex, E. C., Palmans, A., Habets, J., et al. (2009). Atrial tissue Doppler imaging for prediction of new-onset atrial fibrillation. Heart 95, 835–840. doi: 10.1136/hrt.2008.148528
29. Ebersberger, U., Bernard, M. L., Schoepf, U. J., Wince, W. B., Litwin, S. E., Wang, Y., et al. (2020). Cardiac computed tomography for atrial fibrillation patients undergoing ablation: implications for the prediction of early recurrence. J. Thorac. Imaging 35, 186–192. doi: 10.1097/RTI.0000000000000425
30. Nakamura, K., Funabashi, N., Uehara, M., Ueda, M., Murayama, T., Takaoka, H., et al. (2011). Left atrial wall thickness in paroxysmal atrial fibrillation by multislice-CT is initial marker of structural remodeling and predictor of transition from paroxysmal to chronic form. Int. J. Cardiol. 148, 139–147. doi: 10.1016/j.ijcard.2009.10.032
31. Nakatani, Y., Sakamoto, T., Yamaguchi, Y., Tsujino, Y., Kataoka, N., and Kinugawa, K. (2020). Left atrial wall thickness is associated with the low-voltage area in patients with paroxysmal atrial fibrillation. J. Interv. Card. Electrophysiol. 58, 315–321. doi: 10.1007/s10840-019-00611-1
32. Siebermair, J., Suksaranjit, P., McGann, C. J., Peterson, K. A., Kheirkhahan, M., Baher, A. A., et al. (2019). Atrial fibrosis in non-atrial fibrillation individuals and prediction of atrial fibrillation by use of late gadolinium enhancement magnetic resonance imaging. J. Cardiovasc. Electrophysiol. 30, 550–556. doi: 10.1111/jce.13846
33. Fu, G. S., Levin-Schwartz, Y., Lin, Q. H., and Zhang, D. (2019). Machine learning for medical imaging. J. Healthcare Eng. 2019:9874591. doi: 10.1155/2019/ 9874591

34. Firouznia, M., Feeny, A. K., LaBarbera, M. A., McHale, M., Cantlay, C., Kalfas, N., et al. (2021). Machine learning-derived fractal features of shape and texture of the left atrium and pulmonary veins from cardiac computed tomography scans are associated with risk of recurrence of atrial fibrillation postablation. Circ. Arrhythm. Electrophysiol. 14:e009265. doi: 10.1161/CIRCEP.120.00 9265
35. Atta-Fosu, T., LaBarbera, M., Ghose, S., Schoenhagen, P., Saliba, W., Tchou, P. J., et al. (2021). A new machine learning approach for predicting likelihood of recurrence following ablation for atrial fibrillation from CT. BMC Med. Imaging. 21:45. doi: 10.1186/s12880-021-00578-4
36. Chang, A., Cadaret, L. M., and Liu, K. (2020). Machine learning in electrocardiography and echocardiography: technological advances in clinical cardiology. Curr. Cardiol. Rep. 22:161. doi: 10.1007/s11886-020-01416-9
37. Dilaveris, P. E., Gialafos, E. J., Andrikopoulos, G. K., Richter, D. J., Papanikolaou, V., Poralis, K., et al. (2000). Clinical and electrocardiographic predictors of recurrent atrial fibrillation. Pacing Clin. Electrophysiol. 23, 352–358. doi: 10. 1111/j.1540-8159.2000.tb06761.x
38. Thong, T., McNames, J., Aboy, M., and Goldstein, B. (2004). Prediction of paroxysmal atrial fibrillation by analysis of atrial premature complexes. IEEE Trans. Biomed. Eng. 51, 561–569. doi: 10.1109/TBME.2003.821030
39. Yoshizawa, T., Niwano, S., Niwano, H., Igarashi, T., Fujiishi, T., Ishizue, N., et al. (2014). Prediction of new onset atrial fibrillation through P wave analysis in 12 lead ECG. Int. Heart J. 55, 422–427. doi: 10.1536/ihj.14-052
40. Im, S. I., Park, D. H., Kim, B. J., Cho, K. I., Kim, H. S., and Heo, J. H. (2018). Clinical and electrocardiographic characteristics for prediction of new-onset atrial fibrillation in asymptomatic patients with atrial premature complexes. Int. J. Cardiol. Heart Vasc. 19, 70–74. doi: 10.1016/j.ijcha.2018.05.002
41. Yao, X., Attia, Z. I., Behnken, E. M., Walvatne, K., Giblon, R. E., Liu, S., et al. (2021). Batch enrollment for an artificial intelligence-guided intervention to lower neurologic events in patients with undiagnosed atrial fibrillation: rationale and design of a digital clinical trial. Am. Heart J. 239, 73–79. doi: 10.1016/j.ahj.2021. 05.006
42. ClinicalTrials.gov (2021a). Artificial Intelligence Use for the Detection of Atrial Fibrillation Drivers. Available online at: https://ClinicalTrials.gov/show/ NCT03401931 (accessed June 1, 2021).
43. ClinicalTrials.gov (2021c). Predicting Patient-level New Onset Atrial Fibrillation. Available online at: https://ClinicalTrials.gov/show/NCT04657900 (accessed June 1, 2021).
44. ClinicalTrials.gov (2021e). Portable Measurement Methods Combined with Artificial Intelligence in Detection of Atrial Fibrillation. Available online at: https://ClinicalTrials.gov/show/NCT04917653 (accessed June 1, 2021).
45. ClinicalTrials.gov (2021b). Exploratory Study of Apple Watch Electrocardiographic Diagnostic Performance Enhanced by an Artificial Intelligence Algorithm. Available online at: https://ClinicalTrials.gov/show/NCT04792905 (accessed June 1, 2021).
46. ClinicalTrials.gov (2021d). Prevention of Stroke and Sudden Cardiac Death by Recording of 1-Channel Electrocardiograms. Available online at: https:// ClinicalTrials.gov/show/NCT04637230 (accessed June 1, 2021).