

INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF AN ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE-POWERED ECG MODEL DETECTING OCCLUSION MYOCARDIAL INFARCTION

Robert Herman MD^{1,2,3}, H. Pendell Meyers MD⁴, Stephen W. Smith MD^{5,6}, Dario T. Bertolone MD^{1,2}, Attilio Leone MD^{1,2}, Konstantinos Bermpeis MD^{1,2}, Michele M. Viscusi MD^{1,2}, Marta Belmonte MD^{1,2}, Anthony Demolder MD, PhD³, Vladimir Boza MSc, PhD^{3,7}, Boris Vavrik MSc³, Viera Kresnakova MSc, PhD^{3,8}, Andrej Iring MSc³, Michal Martonak MSc³, Jakub Bahyl MSc³, Timea Kisova BSc^{3,9}, Dan Schelfaut, MD², Marc Vanderheyden, MD², Leor Perl, MD¹⁰, Emre K. Aslanger, MD¹¹, Robert Hatala, MD, PhD¹², Wojtek Wojakowski MD, PhD¹³, Jozef Bartunek MD, PhD², Emanuele Barbato MD, PhD¹⁴

¹Department of Advanced Biomedical Sciences, University of Naples Federico II, Naples, Italy; ²Cardiovascular Centre Aalst, Aalst, Belgium; ³Powerful Medical, Bratislava, Slovakia; ⁴Department of Emergency Medicine, Carolinas Medical Center, North Carolina, USA; ⁵Department of Emergency Medicine, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota, USA; ⁶Department of Emergency Medicine, Hennepin Healthcare, Minneapolis, Minnesota, USA; ⁷Faculty of Mathematics, Physics and Informatics, Comenius University in Bratislava, Bratislava, Slovakia; ⁸Department of Cybernetics and Artificial Intelligence, Technical University of Kosice, Kosice, Slovakia; ⁹Barts and The London School of Medicine and Dentistry, London, United Kingdom; ¹⁰Department of Cardiology, Rabin Medical Center, Petah Tikvah, Israel; ¹¹Department of Cardiology, Basaksehir Cam and Sakura City Hospital, Istanbul, Turkey; ¹²Department of Arrhythmia and Pacing, National Institute of Cardiovascular Diseases, Bratislava, Slovakia; ¹³Department of Cardiology and Structural Heart Diseases, Medical University of Silesia, Katowice, Poland; ¹⁴Department of Clinical and Molecular Medicine, Faculty of Medicine and Psychology, Sapienza University of Rome, Italy.

Short title: AI ECG Detecting Occlusion Myocardial Infarction

Word count: 3,543

Address for correspondence:

Robert Herman, MD
Powerful Medical
Bratislavská 81/37, Šamorín, Slovakia
Phone: +43 676 374 6517
Email: robert@powerfulmedical.com

Emanuele Barbato, MD, PhD
Department of Clinical and Molecular Medicine
Sapienza University of Rome
Via di Grottarossa 1035, 00189 Rome, Italy
Phone: +39 349 812 0123
Email: emanuele.barbato@uniroma1.it

ABSTRACT

Background. One third of Non-ST-elevation myocardial infarction (NSTEMI) patients present with an acutely occluded culprit coronary artery (occlusion myocardial infarction [OMI]), which is associated with poor short and long-term outcomes due to delayed identification and consequent delayed invasive management. We sought to develop and validate a versatile artificial intelligence (AI)-model detecting OMI on single standard 12-lead electrocardiograms (ECGs) and compare its performance to existing state-of-the-art diagnostic criteria.

Methods. An AI model was developed using 18,616 ECGs from 10,692 unique contacts (22.9% OMI) of 10,543 patients (age 66 ± 14 years, 65.9% males) with acute coronary syndrome (ACS) originating from an international online database and a tertiary care center. This AI model was tested on an international test set of 3,254 ECGs from 2,263 unique contacts (20% OMI) of 2,222 patients (age 62 ± 14 years, 67% males) and compared with STEMI criteria and annotations of ECG experts in detecting OMI on 12-lead ECGs using sensitivity, specificity, predictive values and time to OMI diagnosis. OMI was based on a combination of angiographic and biomarker outcomes.

Results. The AI model achieved an area under the curve (AUC) of 0.941 (95% CI: 0.926-0.954) in identifying the primary outcome of OMI, with superior performance (accuracy 90.7% [95% CI: 89.5-91.9], sensitivity 82.6% [95% CI: 78.9-86.1], specificity 92.8 [95% CI: 91.5-93.9]) compared to STEMI criteria (accuracy 84.9% [95% CI: 83.5-86.3], sensitivity 34.4% [95% CI: 30.0-38.8], specificity 97.6% [95% CI: 96.8-98.2]) and similar performance compared to ECG experts (accuracy 91.2% [95% CI: 90.0-92.4], sensitivity 75.9% [95% CI: 71.9-80.0], specificity 95.0 [95% CI: 94.0-96.0]). The average time from presentation to a correct diagnosis of OMI was significantly shorter when relying on the AI model compared to STEMI criteria (2.0 vs. 4.9 hours, $p<0.001$).

Conclusions. The present novel ECG AI model demonstrates superior accuracy and earlier diagnosis of AI to detect acute OMI when compared to the STEMI criteria. Its external and international validation suggests its potential to improve ACS patient triage with timely referral for immediate revascularization.

KEYWORDS

Electrocardiogram, artificial intelligence, acute coronary syndrome, myocardial infarction, occlusion Myocardial Infarction, NSTEMI

CLINICAL PERSPECTIVE

What is new?

- A novel artificial intelligence (AI) model detecting acute occluded coronary artery (OMI) using standard 12-lead electrocardiograms (ECGs) was developed from an international cohort.
- The OMI AI model is the first of its kind to be validated in an external international cohort of patients using an objective angiographically confirmed endpoint of OMI.
- Our study demonstrated the OMI AI models superior accuracy in identifying OMI and shorter time to correct diagnosis compared to standard of care STEMI criteria.

What are the clinical implications?

- The OMI AI model has the potential to improve ACS triage and clinical decision-making by enabling timely and accurate detection of OMI in NSTEMI patients.
- The robustness and versatility of the OMI AI model indicate its potential for real-world clinical implementation in ECG devices from multiple vendors.
- Prospective studies are essential to evaluate the efficacy of the OMI AI model and its impact on patient outcomes in real-world settings.

1 INTRODUCTION

2 Patients with an acutely occluded coronary artery (Occlusion Myocardial Infarction, or OMI)
3 who will benefit from emergent reperfusion therapy are currently identified mainly on the
4 basis of electrocardiographic ST-segment elevation (ST Elevation Myocardial Infarction
5 [STEMI]), according to the universal guidelines.^{1,2} Growing evidence suggests that the
6 current acute coronary syndrome (ACS) classification dichotomizing patients as STEMI or
7 non-STEMI (NSTEMI) is unsatisfactory for the timely diagnosis of OMI, as also recognized
8 by the 2022 American College of Cardiology Chest Pain Expert Consensus.³ On one hand,
9 25% to 30% of NSTEMI patients present with acute coronary occlusion with insufficient
10 collateral circulation as discovered only on delayed coronary angiography.⁴ The delayed
11 invasive management in these patients is associated with higher short and long-term
12 mortality.^{4,5} On the other hand, catheterization laboratories are inappropriately activated in
13 15-35% of suspected STEMI where eventually no culprit lesions or a non-ischemic etiology
14 of ST elevation is found.⁶⁻⁸ A plethora of ECG criteria have been proposed to increase the
15 diagnostic sensitivity for OMI as compared to the current guideline-based STEMI criteria,
16 and to differentiate OMI from mimics.^{3,5,9-15} However, their adoption is limited due to their
17 complexity and unclear inter-evaluator reliability.

18 The application of artificial intelligence (AI) to ECG waveforms has demonstrated increased
19 diagnostic accuracy in various conditions and may offer a significant improvement in the
20 timely detection of OMI.¹⁶⁻²⁰ Therefore, we developed an automated deep learning AI model
21 detecting acute OMI using only single standard 12-lead ECGs as input, and hypothesized that
22 it would outperform the existing state-of-the-art ECG criteria for detection of acute OMI and
23 perform equally to interpreters with special expertise in ECG OMI diagnosis in patients with
24 suspected ACS.

25 **METHODS**

26 **Study design.** This is a retrospective study following three key stages: (1) development of a
27 Powerful Medical (PM)cardio-OMI AI model for the detection of acute OMI using only 12-
28 lead electrocardiograms as input (“derivation cohort”); (2) blinded AI model evaluation on an
29 internal European testing dataset (“EU internal test set”); (3) blinded AI model evaluation in
30 an independent external United States (“US external test set”). In the analysis, the term
31 "overall test set" encompasses all ECGs that were contained in the combined EU internal test
32 set and the US external test set. Each of these steps are described below.

33 **Data sources and processing.** The derivation cohort included data from 12,241 patients
34 undergoing coronary angiography and serial troponin testing between 2011 and 2021 at the
35 Cardiovascular Centre Aalst in Belgium and an online international database of 2,368 ACS
36 patients (see Supplemental material for detailed description). Waveform data were exported
37 from the MUSE ECG data management system (GE Healthcare, Chicago, IL) in XML format
38 and sampled at 500 Hz. Patients without acute symptoms compatible with ACS undergoing
39 coronary angiogram (CAG) were identified using manual chart review and excluded. ECGs
40 recorded more than 24 hours before CAG and all ECGs post-CAG were removed. The
41 remaining patients and contacts retained in the final dataset were carefully split into a model
42 development (derivation) set and an internal EU testing dataset ensuring that patients with
43 more than one (recurrent) ACS contacts were present in only one of the sets. Time from the
44 first ECG to intervention was recorded for all cases if the patient underwent coronary
45 angiography. The derivation set included ECGs in the EU dataset which were classified as
46 OMI or not OMI by interpreters with special expertise in ECG OMI diagnosis (SWS, HPM),
47 and by outcome data (see details below under “model development”). “Not OMI” includes
48 patients who either have no acute MI or have acute Non-Occlusion MI (Non-OMI, or
49 NOMI). Images of ECG tracings from multiple device vendors within the online database of

50 ACS patients were converted to digital waveforms using proprietary CE-certified PMcardio
51 ECG digitization technology (Powerful Medical, Samorin, Slovakia). The full overview of
52 data sources and inclusions and exclusions are available in Figure 1.

53 **Primary and secondary outcomes.** The primary outcome was the AI model's ability to
54 identify patients with angiographically confirmed OMI using single standard 12-lead ECGs
55 alone. The primary definition of OMI was reproduced from previous studies^{5,9,10,21-24} and
56 consisted of coronary angiographic evidence of an acute culprit stenosis with either a)
57 Thrombolysis in Myocardial Infarction (TIMI) flow grade of 0-2 and any positive troponin;
58 or b) TIMI flow grade of 3 and a very high peak troponin elevation (hs-cTnT \geq 1,000 ng/L,
59 cTnI of $>$ 10.0 ng/mL, or cTnT of $>$ 1.0 ng/mL).²⁵ The primary outcome does not encompass
60 chronic total occlusions (CTO) and all types of acute myocardial infarctions (AMI) for 2
61 reasons: 1) AMI that is not OMI and without persistent severe ischemia is often undetectable
62 or nonspecific on the ECG and 2) such AMI without persistent occlusion or persistent severe
63 ischemia does not need emergent intervention and may be diagnosed with some delay based
64 on troponin assessment. This outcome was considered the reference standard for all analyses
65 unless otherwise specified.

66 Secondary outcomes included: i) AI model performance in the subgroup analyses; ii)
67 comparison of the AI model performance against existing criteria for detecting acute
68 coronary occlusion (ACO) from 12-lead ECGs, iii) analysis of AI model performance using
69 different definitions of OMI combining culprit vessel TIMI flow and peak troponin cut-offs,
70 and iv) analysis of misclassified cases.

71 **OMI AI model development.** Digital and digitized 12-lead ECG input data collected from
72 sources described above was standardized into 3x4 ECG format. The model derivation set
73 was further subdivided into a training and validation set. A deep convolutional neural

74 network (DCNN) architecture was deployed in model development and included two key
75 components: feature extraction and classification. The feature-extraction component,
76 comprised of 15 Convolutional layers, was designed to extract features in a lead-specific
77 manner. Lead-specific analysis was achieved by implementing parallel convolutional layers
78 focused on analyzing separate leads. The second component, classification, combined all
79 extracted features and processed them through 3 fully connected layers, interspersed with
80 dropouts. Analysis of each lead, and integration of the knowledge gained, mimics the
81 analytical approach of human experts to make a final diagnosis. The validation data set was
82 used for hyperparameter refinement and threshold selection. The optimal model threshold
83 was selected using receiver operating characteristics (ROC) curve analysis.²⁶ An additional
84 threshold was selected to match the specificity of the STEMI criteria.

85 **EU internal testing dataset.** Independent clinical reviewers verified the angiographic data of
86 all patients included in the EU internal testing dataset. Verification included blinded
87 identification of culprit vessels, their visual assessment of coronary stenosis, TIMI flow,
88 presence of sufficient collateral flow on all individual angiograms and documentation of
89 treatment strategy. If applicable, revascularization time, defined as the duration between the
90 first ECG and the time when a balloon was inflated or when the wire crossed the lesion, was
91 documented.

92 **US external testing dataset.** ECG and outcome data from the Diagnosis of Occlusion MI
93 And Reperfusion by Interpretation of the electrocardioGram in Acute Thrombotic Occlusion
94 (DOMI ARIGATO) database (clinical trials.gov number NCT03863327) were included in the
95 US external testing cohort. Data collection and processing of this database is explained in
96 detail elsewhere.²¹ Briefly, the DOMI ARIGATO database collected ECGs, laboratory and
97 angiographic data of patients presenting with ACS to two US sites, Stony Brook University

98 Hospital (SBUH) and Hennepin County Medical Center (HCMC). ECGs were interpreted
99 and manually annotated by both ECG experts blinded to all clinical data other than age and
100 sex. Baseline ECGs, post-CAG ECGs and ECGs with missing expert annotations were
101 removed from the testing cohort.

102 **Benchmarking.** The developed AI model was compared to three current standard criteria for
103 detecting OMI on 12-lead ECGs: 1) physician annotation of STEMI criteria as a surrogate
104 finding for OMI (“STEMI criteria”), 2) subjective ECG expert annotation of OMI (“ECG
105 Experts”), and 3) a prior CE-approved AI-model trained to detect STEMI (“PMcardio-
106 STEMI AI Model” [Powerful Medical, Samorin, Slovakia]). For criterion 1, the classification
107 of STEMI was based on the 4th universal definition of myocardial infarction.²⁷ For criterion
108 2, independent ECG experts (SWS, HPM) with consolidated expertise in OMI detection
109 annotated all tracings for the presence of OMI, blinded to all clinical information.⁹ For
110 criterion 3, the prior PMcardio-STEMI AI model (trained on General Electric [GE]
111 Marquette 12SL and/or physician annotations of STEMI criteria) was used to collect
112 continuous predictions. All ECGs in the EU internal testing dataset, and US external testing
113 dataset were labeled using the three methods described in this paragraph. Time to diagnose
114 OMI was noted for each criterion by measuring the duration from the initial ECG to the
115 accurate identification of OMI. In cases where the criterion failed to detect OMI in any ECG,
116 the time to diagnosis was equivalent to the time to CAG.

117 **Statistical analyses.** Statistical analysis was performed using python programming language
118 and the following open-source libraries *tableone*, *lifelines*, and *pandas*. Continuous statistics
119 with normal distribution were expressed as mean \pm standard deviation (SD) and compared by
120 students' t-tests. Continuous variables with a non-normal distribution were presented as
121 median with interquartile ranges (IQR) and reached by the Mann-Whitney-U test.²⁸ If

122 appropriate, categorical variables were reported by frequencies and percentages and
123 compared with the Chi-square test and a Fisher's exact test. The performance of the AI
124 models, ECG experts, and STEMI criteria was evaluated using the following standard
125 evaluation metrics: sensitivity, specificity, accuracy, negative predictive value (NPV),
126 positive predictive value (PPV), Matthew's correlation coefficient (MCC) and area under
127 curve (AUC). For all evaluation metrics, we estimated the confidence intervals at 95% by
128 10,000 iterations of the bootstrap method.²⁹ In the subgroup analysis, patients' ECGs were
129 stratified according to ECG measurement (QRS duration and heart rate) and ECG diagnostic
130 annotations (rhythm, ventricular hypertrophy, bundle branch blocks) originating from CE-
131 certified PMcardio AI ECG interpretation technology.

132 **RESULTS**

133 **Sample characteristics.** A total of 18,616 ECGs from 10,692 unique contacts (22.9% OMI)
134 of 10,543 patients (age 66 ± 14 years, 65.9% males) from the Cardiovascular Center in Aalst
135 and from the international online ACS database were included in the AI model development.
136 Sample characteristics are shown in Table 1.

137 **Test sets characteristics.** Procedural characteristics of both testing cohorts are shown in
138 Table 2. The overall test set included 3,254 ECGs from 2,263 unique contacts (20% OMI) of
139 2,222 patients (age 62 ± 14 years, 67% males). Of these, 2,016 ECGs from 1,630 contacts
140 (with 240 [14.7%] OMI) were from the internal EU testing cohort, and 1,238 ECGs from 633
141 contacts (with 213 [33.6%] OMI) were from the US testing cohort. The prevalence of OMI
142 differed between the internal EU and the external US test set, 14.7% compared to 33.6%,
143 respectively ($p<0.001$). Contacts included in the US test set were younger, had more ECGs
144 recorded before catheterization and had more STEMI ECGs. Gender, peak troponin and the
145 TIMI flow of culprit vessels did not differ significantly between the two cohorts.

146 **AI model performance.** The OMI AI model with an optimal threshold (threshold of 0.1106)
147 achieved an AUC of 0.941 (95% CI: 0.926, 0.954) in identifying the primary outcome of
148 OMI (Panel A, Figure 2) on the overall test set. As shown in Figure 3, OMI AI model
149 performance was comparable on both the European internal (Panel A) and US external
150 testing datasets (Panel B), and achieved an AUC of 0.943 (95% CI: 0.925, 0.961) and of
151 0.918 (95% CI: 0.893, 0.942) respectively.

152 **Subgroup performance.** AI model performance was tested across different subgroups and
153 patient segments based on baseline characteristics and electrocardiographic patterns (Figure
154 2, Panel B). The model yielded stable performance across genders and age subgroups
155 (ranging from 0.907 to 0.951 AUC). Significantly greater performance was recorded for

156 ECGs with QRS duration under 120 milliseconds (0.924 [95% CI: 0.912, 0.935] AUC) and
157 heart rate over 100 beats per minute (0.961 [95% CI: 0.940, 0.978] AUC), compared to their
158 counterparts (0.873 [95% CI: 0.830, 0.914] and 0.909 [95% CI: 0.896, 0.922] AUC,
159 respectively) ($p < 0.001$). Model performance was comparable when tested on secondary
160 definitions of OMI with different TIMI flow and troponin cut-off combinations, as well as the
161 occurrence of PCI (Table 3).

162 **AI model benchmarking.** The OMI AI model was compared to three standard criteria
163 assessing the same 12-lead ECGs in the overall test set for the presence of OMI (Table 4). In
164 identifying OMI, the OMI AI model with optimal threshold recorded a significantly superior
165 sensitivity of 82.6% (95% CI: 78.9%, 86.1%) compared to STEMI criteria and PMcardio-
166 STEMI AI model [sensitivities 34.4% (95% CI: 30.0%, 38.8%) and 54.5% (95% CI: 49.7%,
167 58.8%), respectively], and statistically equal sensitivity compared to ECG experts [75.9%
168 (95% CI: 71.9%, 80%)]. Accuracies were equal between PMcardio-OMI model and experts,
169 and significantly higher than STEMI criteria and PMcardio-STEMI AI model. All benchmark
170 criteria achieved high specificity on the overall test set ranging from 92.8% to 97.6%. Head-
171 to-head comparison of confidence intervals of two evaluation criteria for OMI across all
172 standard metrics is summarized in Supplemental Table 1. When adjudicated across six
173 metrics (sensitivity, specificity, accuracy, PPV, NPV and MCC) the OMI AI Model showed
174 statistically superior performance compared to STEMI criteria and PMcardio-STEMI AI
175 model and equal (non-inferior) performance to ECG experts. ECG experts also recorded
176 significantly better performance compared to STEMI criteria and PMcardio-STEMI AI
177 model. Mean time to OMI diagnosis was significantly shorter for OMI AI model compared to
178 STEMI criteria, 2.0 hours vs 4.9 hours respectively ($p < 0.001$) (Figure 4), but comparable to
179 ECG experts, with a mean time of 2.5 hours ($p = 0.12$). Patients with OMI received
180 interventions at a similar rate regardless of STEMI criteria presence and outcome definition

181 (primary outcome definition, 96.5% vs. 94.5% [p=0.570]; strictest OMI outcome [TIMI 0-1
182 flow only], 96.3% vs. 92.4% [p=0.358]) (Supplemental Table 2).

183 **Analysis of misclassified cases.** There were 131 subjects identified by the OMI AI model
184 and 44 subjects identified by STEMI criteria as OMI on ECG who did not meet the primary
185 outcome definition of OMI, for purpose of the manuscript termed as “false positives”
186 (Supplemental Table 3). However, false positives of the AI model and STEMI criteria
187 significantly differed in the rate of AMI and AMI-related interventions. Of the 131 AI model
188 false positives, 71 (54.2%) had AMI, 45 (34.4%) had acute culprit lesions, and 40 (30.5%)
189 had AMI with PCI. In contrast, only 15 (34.1%) (p=0.035) of STEMI criteria false positives
190 had AMI, 6 (13.6%) had acute culprit lesions (p=0.031), and 5 (11.4%) had AMI with PCI
191 (p=0.036). In other words, false positives by STEMI criteria were more often cases without
192 any AMI (whether OMI or NOMI), whereas with AI, they were much more often actual AMI
193 cases that needed intervention, albeit not necessarily emergently. Of the 297 OMI patients
194 (65.5% of all OMI) missed by STEMI criteria, only 100 (33.6%) had a time to
195 revascularization of under 2 hours. Of the remaining 197 OMI patients without positive
196 STEMI criteria who did not get urgent CAG, 112 (56.8%) were correctly identified by the
197 OMI AI model using the first ECG; these patients had a median revascularization time 10.9
198 hours (IQR 5.3,17.3).

199

200 **DISCUSSION**

201 In this study, we validated the novel PMcardio-OMI AI model which is comparable to
202 specialized OMI ECG experts in detecting invasively confirmed acute coronary occlusion
203 from individual 12-lead electrocardiograms recorded in ACS patients before cardiac
204 catheterization, blinded to all other clinical information. High accuracy was upheld across
205 two large, independent testing cohorts of ACS patients from Europe and United States, with
206 robust performance across all subgroups and on ECGs recorded at various time intervals
207 before coronary angiography.

208 The present research is driven by the unmet need related to the suboptimal triage of ACS
209 patients at their presentation. Barely 25% of patients with ACS present with typical ST-
210 segment elevation on their initial ECG³⁰ and up to 35% of patients without such ST-segment
211 elevation have total coronary occlusion on the delayed angiography.³¹⁻³⁵ In addition, 20% of
212 OMI met STEMI criteria on the initial ECG, 30% on serial ECGs, and only 49% were
213 recognized by cardiologists as STEMI.^{36,37} Compared to NSTEMI with a non-occlusive
214 stenosis of the culprit coronary artery (NOMI)²¹, patients with OMI have far higher mortality
215 and worse left ventricular function, in spite of having younger age and fewer comorbidities.⁴

216 Several previous studies deployed machine learning to triage patients presenting with ACS,
217 however, bearing multiple limitations.^{30,38-50} The majority of these studies did not validate the
218 occlusive or flow-limiting culprit lesions on coronary angiogram and relied on a subjective
219 majority vote of board-certified cardiologists interpreting the ECG with STEMI as the
220 surrogate for OMI.^{30,39-43} They often employed a spectrum of input clinical features in
221 addition to the ECG waveform restricting their practical, real-world implementation.⁴⁴⁻⁵⁰
222 Finally, their validation was not scrutinized in sizeable external and international datasets or

223 on ECGs recorded from multiple ECG device vendors limiting their applicability to digital
224 ECG file formats from a single manufacturer.

225 Our study is characterized by several methodological strengths. First, it is built using an
226 international cohort of standardized 12-lead ECG waveforms of different formats from
227 multiple vendors, either paper form or screenshot images. Second, the ACO reference
228 standard used for model evaluation was an objective, invasively collected composite of TIMI
229 flows of culprit vessels and biomarker elevation. Using this robust methodology, the OMI AI
230 model yielded superior accuracy in the validation within an independent cohort. Likewise, the
231 AI model demonstrated sustained high performance (>0.92 AUC) on both EU internal testing
232 datasets with the natural prevalence of OMI within a cohort of ACS patients and an external
233 validation set of patients from two independent US centers. The OMI AI model yielded a
234 statistically superior performance to STEMI criteria and equal performance to ECG experts
235 when compared using six complementary performance metrics. More specifically, the model
236 outperformed the standard ECG millimeter criteria in detecting ACO and provided an over
237 twofold increase in sensitivity while maintaining the high specificity in STEMI criteria. The
238 presented OMI AI model detects OMI significantly earlier (by 2.9 hours) compared to current
239 guideline recommended STEMI criteria. Finally, the false positive OMI interpretations
240 classified by the AI model were more likely to have acute MI (though not meeting primary
241 outcome criteria), have an acute culprit lesion, and undergo PCI, compared to the false
242 positive interpretations by STEMI criteria.

243 **Clinical implications.** Our study has several implications for the future management of ACS.
244 OMI AI model paired with proprietary digitization technology offers accurate detection of
245 patients with ACO with occlusive or flow limiting lesion using a single 12-lead ECG tracings
246 independent of ECG vendor or its format. Specifically, such accurate and timely ECG-based

247 ACS diagnosis at the time of first patient contact could prompt swift coronary intervention as
248 recommended currently in case of standard STEMI criteria. The rapid reperfusion in such
249 management can consequently limit the burden of myocardial injury with favorable impact
250 on clinical outcomes. In this regard, the model reliably detected ACO on average 2.9 hours
251 before the current guideline-based ECG standards suggesting its potential to streamline the
252 timely referral of ACS patients at risk for poor outcomes.

253 **Limitations.** Several limitations are to be considered. Although validated on multi-center,
254 international cohorts of patients, our study lacks prospective validation. In clinical practice,
255 the decision to refer for early angiography in patients presenting with NSTEMI is not only
256 based on the ECG but encompasses often additional criteria. Nevertheless, our results show
257 nearly half (45.4%) of NSTEMI-OMI patients that could have had accelerated access to PCI
258 based on the AI model detection truly underwent revascularization within 2 hours. However,
259 their median time to revascularization was delayed over 10 hours. Annotation of STEMI
260 criteria may be subjective, and we have only included one interpretation per ECG for this
261 metric. Although the model has demonstrated robust performance across various patient
262 subgroups, our study lacks AI model explainability. The OMI AI model detects OMI with a
263 binary granularity. It is understood that the different stages of culprit coronary lesion leading
264 to acute coronary syndrome, in terms of dynamics (active or reperfused) and time (acute or
265 subacute), can have an influence on patient outcomes and the timing of invasive strategies.
266 Lastly, our study was not designed to quantify other relevant clinical endpoints such as
267 mortality, in-hospital complications, or MACE. Future work should address these limitations
268 and observe the AI model efficacy and clinical benefit deployed in a prospective cohort of
269 ACS patients.

270 **Conclusions.** We have developed and validated PMcardio-OMI AI model able to accurately
271 detect ACS patients with angiographically confirmed occlusion of culprit coronary arteries
272 using only single standard 12-lead ECGs in a large international, multi-center cohort of ACS
273 patients. Our AI model outperformed gold-standard STEMI criteria in the diagnosis of OMI
274 and warrants further prospective clinical studies to define the role of OMI AI model in
275 guiding ACS triage and timely referral of patients benefiting from immediate
276 revascularization.

277 **ONLINE CONTENT**

278 The dataset is not available for public sharing, given our institutional review board approval
279 restrictions. The OMI AI ECG model is available for external validation, benchmarking and
280 research use at: <https://bit.ly/omi-ai-ecg>.

281 **Disclosures:** Dr. Herman is the Co-founder and Chief Medical Officer of Powerful Medical;
282 Michal Martonak, Jakub Bahyl, Andrej Iring, Boris Vavrik, Vladimir Boza, Viera
283 Kresnakova and Anthony Demolder are employees and shareholders of Powerful Medical.
284 Dr. Smith, Dr. Meyers and Dr. Perl are shareholders in Powerful Medical. Dr. Herman, Dr.
285 Bertolone, Dr. Leone, Dr. Viscusi are supported by a research grant from the CardioPaTh
286 PhD Program. Other authors report no conflict of interest.

287 **Acknowledgements:** The authors would like to express the appreciation to the clinical
288 experts, study team, data scientists and AI engineers supporting the data collection,
289 processing, and validation.

290 REFERENCES

- 291 1. Ibanez B, James S, Agewall S, Antunes MJ, Bucciarelli-Ducci C, Bueno H, Caforio
292 ALP, Crea F, Goudevenos JA, Halvorsen S, et al. 2017 ESC Guidelines for the
293 management of acute myocardial infarction in patients presenting with ST-segment
294 elevation: The Task Force for the management of acute myocardial infarction in
295 patients presenting with ST-segment elevation of the European Society of Cardiology
296 (ESC). *Eur Heart J*. 2018;39:119-177. doi: 10.1093/eurheartj/ehx393
- 297 2. Meyers HP, Bracey A, Lee D, Lichtenheld A, Li WJ, Singer DD, Kane JA, Dodd
298 KW, Meyers KE, Thode HC, et al. Comparison of the ST-Elevation Myocardial
299 Infarction (STEMI) vs. NSTEMI and Occlusion MI (OMI) vs. NOMI Paradigms of
300 Acute MI. *J Emerg Med*. 2021;60:273-284. doi: 10.1016/j.jemermed.2020.10.026
- 301 3. Committee W, Kontos MC, de Lemos JA, Deitelzweig SB, Diercks DB, Gore MO,
302 Hess EP, McCarthy CP, McCord JK, Musey Jr PI. 2022 ACC Expert Consensus
303 Decision Pathway on the Evaluation and Disposition of Acute Chest Pain in the
304 Emergency Department: A Report of the American College of Cardiology Solution
305 Set Oversight Committee. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology*. 2022.
- 306 4. Khan AR, Golwala H, Tripathi A, Bin Abdulhak AA, Bavishi C, Riaz H, Mallipedi V,
307 Pandey A, Bhatt DL. Impact of total occlusion of culprit artery in acute non-ST
308 elevation myocardial infarction: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *European*
309 *heart journal*. 2017;38:3082-3089.
- 310 5. Aslanger EK, Yildirimturk O, Simsek B, Bozbeyoglu E, Simsek MA, Yucel Karabay
311 C, Smith SW, Degertekin M. Diagnostic accuracy of electrocardiogram for acute
312 coronary Occlusion resulting in myocardial infarction (DIFOCULT Study). *Int J*
313 *Cardiol Heart Vasc*. 2020;30:100603. doi: 10.1016/j.ijcha.2020.100603

- 314 6. McCabe JM, Armstrong EJ, Kulkarni A, Hoffmayer KS, Bhave PD, Garg S, Patel A,
315 MacGregor JS, Hsue P, Stein JC. Prevalence and factors associated with false-positive
316 ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction diagnoses at primary percutaneous
317 coronary intervention-capable centers: a report from the Activate-SF registry.
318 *Archives of internal medicine*. 2012;172:864-871.
- 319 7. Larson DM, Menssen KM, Sharkey SW, Duval S, Schwartz RS, Harris J, Meland JT,
320 Unger BT, Henry TD. “False-positive” cardiac catheterization laboratory activation
321 among patients with suspected ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction. *Jama*.
322 2007;298:2754-2760.
- 323 8. Kontos MC, Kurz MC, Roberts CS, Joyner SE, Kreisa L, Ornato JP, Vetrovec GW.
324 An evaluation of the accuracy of emergency physician activation of the cardiac
325 catheterization laboratory for patients with suspected ST-segment elevation
326 myocardial infarction. *Ann Emerg Med*. 2010;55:423-430. doi:
327 10.1016/j.annemergmed.2009.08.011
- 328 9. Meyers HP, Bracey A, Lee D, Lichtenheld A, Li WJ, Singer DD, Rollins Z, Kane JA,
329 Dodd KW, Meyers KE, et al. Accuracy of OMI ECG findings versus STEMI criteria
330 for diagnosis of acute coronary occlusion myocardial infarction. *IJC Heart &*
331 *Vasculature*. 2021;33:100767.
- 332 10. Meyers HP, Limkakeng Jr AT, Jaffa EJ, Patel A, Theiling BJ, Rezaie SR, Stewart T,
333 Zhuang C, Pera VK, Smith SW. Validation of the modified Sgarbossa criteria for
334 acute coronary occlusion in the setting of left bundle branch block: A retrospective
335 case-control study. *American heart journal*. 2015;170:1255-1264.
- 336 11. de Winter RJ, Verouden NJ, Wellens HJ, Wilde AA. A new ECG sign of proximal
337 LAD occlusion. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2008;359:2071-2073.

- 338 12. Wagner GS, Macfarlane P, Wellens H, Josephson M, Gorgels A, Mirvis DM, Pahlm
339 O, Surawicz B, Kligfield P, Childers R. AHA/ACCF/HRS recommendations for the
340 standardization and interpretation of the electrocardiogram: part VI: acute
341 ischemia/infarction a scientific statement from the American Heart Association
342 Electrocardiography and Arrhythmias Committee, Council on Clinical Cardiology;
343 the American College of Cardiology Foundation; and the Heart Rhythm Society
344 Endorsed by the International Society for Computerized Electrocardiology. *Journal of*
345 *the American College of Cardiology*. 2009;53:1003-1011.
- 346 13. Pride YB, Tung P, Mohanavelu S, Zorkun C, Wiviott SD, Antman EM, Giugliano R,
347 Braunwald E, Gibson CM, Group TS. Angiographic and clinical outcomes among
348 patients with acute coronary syndromes presenting with isolated anterior ST-segment
349 depression: a TRITON–TIMI 38 (trial to assess improvement in therapeutic outcomes
350 by optimizing platelet inhibition with Prasugrel–thrombolysis In myocardial
351 infarction 38) substudy. *JACC: Cardiovascular Interventions*. 2010;3:806-811.
- 352 14. Meyers HP, Bracey A, Lee D, Lichtenheld A, Li WJ, Singer DD, Rollins Z, Kane JA,
353 Dodd KW, Meyers KE, et al. Ischemic ST-Segment Depression Maximal in V1–V4
354 (Versus V5–V6) of Any Amplitude Is Specific for Occlusion Myocardial Infarction
355 (Versus Nonocclusive Ischemia). *Journal of the American Heart Association*.
356 2021;10:e022866.
- 357 15. Miranda DF, Lobo AS, Walsh B, Sandoval Y, Smith SW. New insights into the use of
358 the 12-lead electrocardiogram for diagnosing acute myocardial infarction in the
359 emergency department. *Canadian Journal of Cardiology*. 2018;34:132-145.
- 360 16. Attia ZI, Harmon DM, Behr ER, Friedman PA. Application of artificial intelligence to
361 the electrocardiogram. *European heart journal*. 2021;42:4717-4730.

- 362 17. Grogan M, Lopez-Jimenez F, Cohen-Shelly M, Dispenzieri A, Attia ZI, Abou
363 Ezzedine OF, Lin G, Kapa S, Borgeson DD, Friedman PA. Artificial intelligence–
364 enhanced electrocardiogram for the early detection of cardiac amyloidosis.
365 Paper/Poster presented at: Mayo Clinic Proceedings; 2021;
- 366 18. Ko W-Y, Siontis KC, Attia ZI, Carter RE, Kapa S, Ommen SR, Demuth SJ,
367 Ackerman MJ, Gersh BJ, Arruda-Olson AM. Detection of hypertrophic
368 cardiomyopathy using a convolutional neural network-enabled electrocardiogram.
369 *Journal of the American College of Cardiology*. 2020;75:722-733.
- 370 19. Attia ZI, Kapa S, Lopez-Jimenez F, McKie PM, Ladewig DJ, Satam G, Pellikka PA,
371 Enriquez-Sarano M, Noseworthy PA, Munger TM. Screening for cardiac contractile
372 dysfunction using an artificial intelligence–enabled electrocardiogram. *Nature*
373 *medicine*. 2019;25:70-74.
- 374 20. Herman R, Vanderheyden M, Vavrik B, Beles M, Palus T, Nelis O, Goethals M,
375 Verstreken S, Dierckx R, Penicka M. Utilizing longitudinal data in assessing all-cause
376 mortality in patients hospitalized with heart failure. *ESC Heart Failure*. 2022.
- 377 21. Meyers HP, Bracey A, Lee D, Lichtenheld A, Li WJ, Singer DD, Kane JA, Dodd
378 KW, Meyers KE, Thode HC. Comparison of the ST-elevation myocardial infarction
379 (STEMI) vs. NSTEMI and occlusion MI (OMI) vs. NOMI paradigms of acute MI.
380 *The Journal of emergency medicine*. 2021;60:273-284.
- 381 22. Smith SW, Dodd KW, Henry TD, Dvorak DM, Pearce LA. Diagnosis of ST-elevation
382 myocardial infarction in the presence of left bundle branch block with the ST-
383 elevation to S-wave ratio in a modified Sgarbossa rule. *Annals of emergency*
384 *medicine*. 2012;60:766-776.
- 385 23. Dodd KW, Zvosec DL, Hart MA, Glass G, 3rd, Bannister LE, Body RM, Boggust
386 BA, Brady WJ, Chang AM, Cullen L, et al. Electrocardiographic Diagnosis of Acute

- 387 Coronary Occlusion Myocardial Infarction in Ventricular Paced Rhythm Using the
388 Modified Sgarbossa Criteria. *Ann Emerg Med.* 2021;78:517-529. doi:
389 10.1016/j.annemergmed.2021.03.036
- 390 24. Baro R, Haseeb S, Ordoñez S, Costabel JP. High-sensitivity cardiac troponin T as a
391 predictor of acute total occlusion in patients with non-ST-segment elevation acute
392 coronary syndrome. *Clinical Cardiology.* 2019;42:222-226.
- 393 25. Vasile V, Jaffe A. High-sensitivity cardiac troponin in the evaluation of possible
394 AMI. American College of Cardiology; 2022. In.
- 395 26. Hajian-Tilaki K. Receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve analysis for medical
396 diagnostic test evaluation. *Caspian journal of internal medicine.* 2013;4:627.
- 397 27. Thygesen K, Alpert JS, Jaffe AS, Chaitman BR, Bax JJ, Morrow DA, White HD,
398 Infarction EGobotJESoCACoCAHAWHFTFftUDoM. Fourth universal definition of
399 myocardial infarction (2018). *Journal of the American College of Cardiology.*
400 2018;72:2231-2264.
- 401 28. Madadzadeh F, Asar ME, Hosseini M. Common statistical mistakes in descriptive
402 statistics reports of normal and non-normal variables in biomedical sciences research.
403 *Iranian journal of public health.* 2015;44:1557-1558.
- 404 29. Johnson RW. An introduction to the bootstrap. *Teaching statistics.* 2001;23:49-54.
- 405 30. Al-Zaiti S, Besomi L, Bouzid Z, Faramand Z, Frisch S, Martin-Gill C, Gregg R, Saba
406 S, Callaway C, Sejdić E. Machine learning-based prediction of acute coronary
407 syndrome using only the pre-hospital 12-lead electrocardiogram. *Nature*
408 *communications.* 2020;11:1-10.
- 409 31. Dixon WC, Wang TY, Dai D, Shunk KA, Peterson ED, Roe MT, Registry NCD.
410 Anatomic distribution of the culprit lesion in patients with non-ST-segment elevation
411 myocardial infarction undergoing percutaneous coronary intervention: findings from

- 412 the National Cardiovascular Data Registry. *Journal of the American College of*
413 *Cardiology*. 2008;52:1347-1348.
- 414 32. Wang TY, McCoy LA, Bhatt DL, Rao SV, Roe MT, Resnic FS, Cavender MA,
415 Messenger JC, Peterson ED. Multivessel vs culprit-only percutaneous coronary
416 intervention among patients 65 years or older with acute myocardial infarction.
417 *American heart journal*. 2016;172:9-18.
- 418 33. Karwowski J, Gierlotka M, Gašior M, Poloński L, Ciszewski J, Bęćkowski M,
419 Kowalik I, Szwed H. Relationship between infarct artery location, acute total
420 coronary occlusion, and mortality in STEMI and NSTEMI patients. *Polish Archives*
421 *of Internal Medicine*. 2017;127:401-411.
- 422 34. Figueras J, Otaegui I, Marti G, Domingo E, Bañeras J, Barrabés JA, Del Blanco BG,
423 Garcia-Dorado D. Area at risk and collateral circulation in a first acute myocardial
424 infarction with occluded culprit artery. STEMI vs non-STEMI patients. *International*
425 *Journal of Cardiology*. 2018;259:14-19.
- 426 35. Tanaka T, Miki K, Akahori H, Imanaka T, Yoshihara N, Kimura T, Yanaka K,
427 Asakura M, Ishihara M. Comparison of coronary atherosclerotic disease burden
428 between ST-elevation myocardial infarction and non-ST-elevation myocardial
429 infarction: Non-culprit Gensini score and non-culprit SYNTAX score. *Clinical*
430 *Cardiology*. 2021;44:238-243.
- 431 36. Meyers HP, Smith SW. Prospective, real-world evidence showing the gap between ST
432 elevation myocardial infarction (STEMI) and occlusion MI (OMI). *International*
433 *Journal of Cardiology*. 2019;293:48-49.
- 434 37. Hillinger P, Strebel I, Abächerli R, Twerenbold R, Wildi K, Bernhard D, Nestelberger
435 T, Boeddinghaus J, Badertscher P, Wussler D, et al. Prospective validation of current

- 436 quantitative electrocardiographic criteria for ST-elevation myocardial infarction. *Int J*
437 *Cardiol.* 2019;292:1-12. doi: 10.1016/j.ijcard.2019.04.041
- 438 38. Takeda M, Oami T, Hayashi Y, Shimada T, Hattori N, Tateishi K, Miura RE, Yamao
439 Y, Abe R, Kobayashi Y. Prehospital diagnostic algorithm for acute coronary
440 syndrome using machine learning: a prospective observational study. *Scientific*
441 *Reports.* 2022;12:14593.
- 442 39. Forberg JL, Green M, Björk J, Ohlsson M, Edenbrandt L, Öhlin H, Ekelund U. In
443 search of the best method to predict acute coronary syndrome using only the
444 electrocardiogram from the emergency department. *Journal of electrocardiology.*
445 2009;42:58-63.
- 446 40. Green M, Björk J, Forberg J, Ekelund U, Edenbrandt L, Ohlsson M. Comparison
447 between neural networks and multiple logistic regression to predict acute coronary
448 syndrome in the emergency room. *Artificial intelligence in medicine.* 2006;38:305-
449 318.
- 450 41. Goto S, Kimura M, Katsumata Y, Goto S, Kamatani T, Ichihara G, Ko S, Sasaki J,
451 Fukuda K, Sano M. Artificial intelligence to predict needs for urgent revascularization
452 from 12-leads electrocardiography in emergency patients. *PloS one.*
453 2019;14:e0210103.
- 454 42. Wu L, Huang G, Yu X, Ye M, Liu L, Ling Y, Liu X, Liu D, Zhou B, Liu Y. Deep
455 learning networks accurately detect st-segment elevation myocardial infarction and
456 culprit vessel. *Frontiers in cardiovascular medicine.* 2022;9.
- 457 43. Zhao Y, Xiong J, Hou Y, Zhu M, Lu Y, Xu Y, Teliewubai J, Liu W, Xu X, Li X.
458 Early detection of ST-segment elevated myocardial infarction by artificial intelligence
459 with 12-lead electrocardiogram. *International Journal of Cardiology.* 2020;317:223-
460 230.

- 461 44. Baxt WG, Skora J. Prospective validation of artificial neural network trained to
462 identify acute myocardial infarction. *The Lancet*. 1996;347:12-15.
- 463 45. Tsien CL, Fraser HS, Long WJ, Kennedy RL. Using classification tree and logistic
464 regression methods to diagnose myocardial infarction. In: *MEDINFO'98*. IOS Press;
465 1998:493-497.
- 466 46. Berikol GB, Yildiz O, Özcan İT. Diagnosis of acute coronary syndrome with a
467 support vector machine. *Journal of medical systems*. 2016;40:84.
- 468 47. Wu C-C, Hsu W-D, Islam MM, Poly TN, Yang H-C, Nguyen P-AA, Wang Y-C, Li
469 Y-CJ. An artificial intelligence approach to early predict non-ST-elevation myocardial
470 infarction patients with chest pain. *Computer methods and programs in biomedicine*.
471 2019;173:109-117.
- 472 48. Harrison RF, Kennedy RL. Artificial neural network models for prediction of acute
473 coronary syndromes using clinical data from the time of presentation. *Annals of
474 emergency medicine*. 2005;46:431-439.
- 475 49. Baxt WG, Shofer FS, Sites FD, Hollander JE. A neural network aid for the early
476 diagnosis of cardiac ischemia in patients presenting to the emergency department with
477 chest pain. *Annals of emergency medicine*. 2002;40:575-583.
- 478 50. Ha SH, Joo SH. A hybrid data mining method for the medical classification of chest
479 pain. *International Journal of Computer and Information Engineering*. 2010;4:99-
480 104.

481

TABLES

Table 1. Sample characteristics of the model development and EU and US test sets.

Parameter	Cat.	Model development set (n=18,616)	Overall Test Set (n=3,254)	P-value (All)	Internal EU Test Set (n=2,016)	External US Test Set (n=1,238)	P-value (Overall Test Sets)
Unique Patients, n		10,543	2,222		1,589	633	
Age [years], mean (SD)		66 (14.0)	62 (14.0)	<0.001	63 (14.0)	61 (14.0)	<0.001
Gender, n (%)	<i>Female</i>	3,394 (34.1)	747 (33.0)	0.336	543 (33.3)	204 (32.2)	0.658
	<i>Male</i>	6,560 (65.9)	1,516 (67.0)	0.336	1,087 (66.7)	429 (67.8)	0.658
Unique Contacts, n		10,692	2,263		1,630	633	
Primary outcome, n (%)	<i>Class not-OMI</i>	8,242 (77.1)	1,810 (80.0)	0.003	1,390 (85.3)	420 (66.4)	<0.001
	<i>Class OMI</i>	2,450 (22.9)	453 (20.0)	0.003	240 (14.7)	213 (33.6)	<0.001
Unique ECGs, n		18,616	3,254		2,016	1,238	
ECGs Outcome breakdown, n (%)	<i>MI ruled-out</i>		1,866 (57.3)	1.000	1,456 (72.2)	410 (33.1)	<0.001
	<i>NOMI</i>		469 (14.4)	1.000	107 (5.3)	362 (29.2)	<0.001
	<i>OMI</i>		919 (28.2)	1.000	453 (22.5)	466 (37.6)	<0.001

Cat., category; EU, Europe; US, United States; SD, standard deviation; OMI, occlusion myocardial infarction; NOMI, non-occlusion myocardial infarction; ECG, electrocardiogram; MI, myocardial infarction.

Table 2. Procedural characteristics of the patient contacts in the EU and US test sets.

Parameter	Cat.	Overall Test Sets (n=2,263)	Internal EU Test Set (n=1,630)	External US Test Set (n=633)	P-value
Pre-CAG ECG, n (%)	<i>STEMI</i>	264 (11.7)	154 (9.4)	110 (17.4)	<0.001
	<i>not-STEMI</i>	1999 (88.3)	1476 (90.6)	523 (82.6)	<0.001
Average ECGs per patient, mean (SD)		1.4 (0.9)	1.2 (0.6)	2.0 (1.2)	<0.001
Admission Troponin T (ng/L), median [Q1,Q3]		7.4 [4.2,13.5]	7.4 [4.2,13.5]	NA	NA
Peak Troponin T (ng/L), median [Q1,Q3]		31.8 [5.0,1457.2]	11.8 [4.3,340.5]	340.0 [11.0,2820.1]	<0.001
CAG performed, n (%)		1408 (62.2)	948 (58.2)	460 (72.7)	<0.001
Time to CAG (hours), median [Q1,Q3]		13.4 [2.5,19.6]	17.3 [4.9,20.4]	3.8 [0.8,15.1]	<0.001
Time to CAG, n (%)	<i>Late (12-24h)</i>	310 (22.1)	129 (13.7)	181 (39.3)	<0.001
	<i>Delayed (4-12h)</i>	123 (8.8)	72 (7.6)	51 (11.1)	<0.001
	<i>Early (2-4h)</i>	256 (18.2)	167 (17.7)	89 (19.3)	<0.001
	<i>Immediate (<2h)</i>	715 (50.9)	576 (61.0)	139 (30.2)	<0.001
Culprit vessel, n (%)	<i>None</i>	1632 (72.1)	1316 (80.7)	316 (49.9)	<0.001
	<i>Native</i>	605 (26.7)	298 (18.3)	307 (48.5)	<0.001
	<i>Graft</i>	26 (1.1)	16 (1.0)	10 (1.6)	<0.001
Culprit artery, n (%)	<i>LMCA</i>	11 (1.7)	6 (1.9)	5 (1.6)	<0.001
	<i>LAD</i>	234 (37.1)	113 (36.0)	121 (38.2)	<0.001
	<i>LCx</i>	142 (22.5)	59 (18.8)	83 (26.2)	<0.001
	<i>RCA</i>	220 (34.9)	130 (41.4)	90 (28.4)	<0.001
	<i>PDA</i>	9 (1.4)	0 (0.0)	9 (2.8)	<0.001
	<i>RI</i>	11 (1.7)	2 (0.6)	9 (2.8)	<0.001
	<i>Multi-vessel</i>	4 (0.6)	4 (1.3)	0 (0.0)	<0.001
Culprit stenosis (%), median [Q1,Q3]		90.0 [70.0,100.0]	80.0 [60.0,100.0]	95.0 [90.0,100.0]	<0.001
Culprit TIMI Flow, n (%)	<i>TIMI-0</i>	244 (38.6)	119 (37.8)	125 (39.4)	0.897
	<i>TIMI-1</i>	38 (6.0)	19 (6.0)	19 (6.0)	0.897
	<i>TIMI-2</i>	70 (11.1)	33 (10.5)	37 (11.7)	0.897
	<i>TIMI-3</i>	280 (44.3)	144 (45.7)	136 (42.9)	0.897
Collateral flow, n (%)	<i>NONE</i>	284 (90.4)	284 (90.4)	NA	NA
	<i>MILD</i>	16 (5.1)	16 (5.1)	NA	NA
	<i>MODERATE</i>	12 (3.8)	12 (3.8)	NA	NA
	<i>HIGH</i>	2 (0.6)	2 (0.6)	NA	NA
Time to Revascularization (hours), median [Q1,Q3]		7.5 [2.1,19.3]	7.5 [2.1,19.3]	NA	NA
Treatment, n (%)	<i>Conservative</i>	706 (50.1)	525 (55.4)	181 (39.3)	<0.001
	<i>PCI</i>	699 (49.6)	422 (44.5)	277 (60.2)	<0.001

Cat., category; EU, Europe; US, United States; CAG, coronary angiography; ECG, electrocardiogram; STEMI, ST-elevation myocardial infarction; SD, standard deviation; LMCA, left main coronary artery; LAD, left anterior descending artery; LCx, left circumflex artery; RCA, right coronary artery; PDA, posterior descending artery; RI, ramus interventricularis; TIMI, Thrombolysis In Myocardial Infarction; PCI, percutaneous coronary intervention.

Table 3. Performance of PMcardio-OMI AI models and analysis of different OMI outcome definitions across the grouped testing datasets (both EU and US). *In bold primary outcome definition of OMI.*

OMI outcome definition	PMcardio-OMI AI Model – Optimal threshold [±]					
	<i>Sens.</i>	<i>Spec.</i>	<i>PPV</i>	<i>NPV</i>	<i>AUC</i>	<i>MCC</i>
Culprit TIMI 0-1	87.5% (83.4-91.3)	86.9% (85.4-88.4)	0.485 (0.445-0.528)	0.980 (0.973-0.987)	0.929 (0.912-0.944)	0.588 (0.548-0.628)
Culprit TIMI 0-1 <i>OR</i> TIMI 2-3 Trop T ≥500 ng/L	83.6% (79.9-86.9)	92.4% (91.1-93.6)	0.727 (0.688-0.765)	0.959 (0.949-0.968)	0.942 (0.928-0.955)	0.722 (0.685-0.756)
Culprit TIMI 0-1 <i>OR</i> TIMI 2-3 with Trop T ≥1000 ng/L	84.5% (80.8-88.0)	91.6% (90.3-92.8)	0.691 (0.65-0.73)	0.964 (0.955-0.972)	0.942 (0.928-0.955)	0.706 (0.667-0.74)
Culprit TIMI 0-2 <i>OR</i> TIMI 3 with Trop T ≥500 ng/L	81.9% (78.1-85.3)	93.1% (91.9-94.2)	0.754 (0.715-0.791)	0.952 (0.942-0.962)	0.939 (0.924-0.952)	0.728 (0.69-0.762)
Culprit TIMI 0-2 <i>OR</i> TIMI 3 with Trop T ≥1000ng/L	82.6% (78.9-86.1)	92.8% (91.5-93.9)	0.741 (0.7-0.778)	0.955 (0.945-0.965)	0.941 (0.926-0.954)	0.724 (0.687-0.758)
Culprit TIMI 0-2 <i>OR</i> TIMI 3 with Trop T ≥1000 ng/L AND PCI performed	82.4% (78.6-86.0)	92.6% (91.3-93.7)	0.733 (0.694-0.771)	0.955 (0.945-0.965)	0.939 (0.925-0.952)	0.718 (0.68-0.753)

[±] Optimal threshold based on ROC analysis (threshold of 0.1106)

OMI, Occlusion myocardial infarction; AI, artificial intelligence; STEMI, ST-elevation myocardial infarction; Sens., Sensitivity; Spec., Specificity; PPV, positive predictive value; NPV, Negative predictive value; AUC, Area under curve; MCC, Matthews correlation coefficient; TIMI, Thrombolysis In Myocardial Infarction; Trop, Troponin; PCI, percutaneous coronary intervention.

Table 4. Head-to-head benchmark comparison in detecting the primary outcome definition of OMI.

Comparator		Ref -	Ref +	Accuracy	Sensitivity	Specificity	PPV	NPV	AUC
PMcardio-OMI AI Model – Optimal threshold[±]	-	1679	79	90.7%	82.6%	92.8%	0.741	0.955	0.941
	+	131	374	(89.5-91.9)	(78.9-86.1)	(91.5-93.9)	(0.7-0.778)	(0.945-0.965)	(0.927-0.953)
PMcardio-STEMI AI Model	-	1721	206	87.0%	54.5%	95.1%	0.735	0.893	0.861
	+	89	247	(85.6-88.3)	(49.7-58.8)	(94.1-96.1)	(0.686-0.782)	(0.879-0.906)	(0.841-0.881)
STEMI Criteria	-	1766	297	84.9%	34.4%	97.6%	0.780	0.856	0.660
	+	44	156	(83.5-86.3)	(30.0-38.8)	(96.8-98.2)	(0.723-0.834)	(0.842-0.871)	(0.637-0.682)
ECG Experts	-	1720	109	91.2%	75.9%	95.0%	0.793	0.940	0.855
	+	90	344	(90.0-92.4)	(71.9-80.0)	(94.0-96.0)	(0.753-0.832)	(0.929-0.951)	(0.834-0.875)

[±] Optimal threshold based on ROC analysis (threshold of 0.1106)

Ref, reference; OMI, Occlusion myocardial infarction; AI, artificial intelligence; STEMI, ST-elevation myocardial infarction; PPV, Positive predictive value; NPV, Negative predictive value; AUC, Area under curve; ECG, electrocardiogram.

ILLUSTRATIONS





Figure 1. PRISMA Flow chart showing data sources and study populations. *Unique cardiology contacts identified, exclusions (in grey), and final study population split into model development (development) set (in white), EU internal test set (in blue) and US external test set (in red).*

ECG, electrocardiogram; ACS, acute coronary syndrome; pts, patients; CAG, coronary angiography; MI, myocardial infarction; OMI, occlusion myocardial infarction.

A.



B.

Parameter	Cat	No. ECGs (%)	Sens.	Spec.	PPV	NPV	AUC
Gender	Male	2219 (68.19%)	0.758	0.919	0.818	0.888	0.910
	Female	1035 (31.81%)	0.793	0.931	0.730	0.950	0.934
Age subgroups	≤45	328 (10.08%)	0.770	0.959	0.810	0.948	0.951
	45-65	1417 (43.55%)	0.782	0.896	0.756	0.909	0.920
	≥65	1509 (46.37%)	0.749	0.940	0.838	0.900	0.907
QRS duration	<120	2806 (86.23%)	0.789	0.918	0.794	0.915	0.924
	≥120	448 (13.77%)	0.595	0.958	0.825	0.878	0.873
Rhythm	Simus	2897 (89.03%)	0.767	0.918	0.790	0.908	0.915
	Paced	133 (4.09%)	0.600	0.944	0.714	0.911	0.851
	AF	189 (5.81%)	0.810	0.993	0.971	0.948	0.981
VH		898 (27.60%)	0.735	0.926	0.778	0.908	0.900
LBBB		246 (7.56%)	0.557	0.932	0.765	0.841	0.839
RBBB		548 (16.84%)	0.726	0.976	0.907	0.916	0.916
BPM	<100	2875 (88.35%)	0.749	0.920	0.773	0.910	0.909
	≥100	379 (11.65%)	0.848	0.952	0.921	0.904	0.961

Figure 2. AI model performance on the overall test sets and subgroup analysis. Panel A shows the ROC curve of AI algorithms, PMcardio-OMI (red) and PMcardio-STEMI (blue) and sensitivity and specificity of STEMI criteria (green dot) and ECG experts (purple cross) on combined EU and US testing cohorts. The AUC is 0.941 (n = 2,263 contacts [20.02% OMI]); Panel B shows the PMcardio-OMI AI model performance on different patient subgroups.

ROC, Receiver operating curve; OMI, Occlusion myocardial infarction; AI, artificial intelligence; STEMI, ST-elevation Myocardial Infarction; ECG, electrocardiogram; Sens, Sensitivity; Spec, Specificity; PPV, Positive predictive value; NPV, Negative predictive value; AUC, Area under the curve; AF, atrial fibrillation; VH, Ventricular hypertrophy; LBBB, Left bundle branch block; RBBB, Right bundle branch block; BPM, beats per minutes.




Figure 3. AI model performance on EU and US testing cohorts separated. *Figure shows the ROC curve of AI algorithms, PMcardio-OMI (red) and PMcardio-STEMI (blue) and sensitivity and specificity of STEMI criteria (green dot) and ECG experts (purple cross). Panel A shows the AUC of PMcardio-OMI AI of 0.943 (n=1,630 contacts [14.72% OMI]) on the EU internal testing cohort; Panel B shows the AUC of PMcardio-OMI AI of 0.918 (n=633 contacts [33.65% OMI]) on the US external testing cohort.*

ROC, Receiver operating curve; EU, Europe; US, United States; OMI, Occlusion myocardial infarction; AI, artificial intelligence; STEMI, ST-elevation Myocardial Infarction; ECG, electrocardiogram; Sens, Sensitivity; Spec, Specificity; AUC, Area under the curve.




Figure 4. Time to OMI diagnosis by detection method. Graph shows the time to OMI diagnoses (primary outcome definition) when relying on individual detection methods. If the detection method detected OMI on the first ECG, the time to diagnosis is 0. If the detection method did not catch OMI on any ECG, the time to diagnosis corresponds to the time to coronary angiography.