

1 **Using Deep learning to Predict Cardiovascular Magnetic Resonance Findings from**  
2 **Echocardiography Videos**

3

4 Short title: Deep learning prediction of CMR from echocardiography

5 Authors and affiliations:

6 Yuki Sahashi MD,<sup>1</sup> MSc; Milos Vukadinovic,<sup>1,3</sup> BS; Grant Duffy, BS;<sup>1</sup> Debiao Li,  
7 PhD;<sup>3</sup> Susan Cheng, MD;<sup>1</sup> Daniel S. Berman, MD;<sup>4</sup> David Ouyang MD\*;<sup>1,2</sup> Alan C.  
8 Kwan MD\*<sup>1</sup>

9

10 \*Co-Senior Author

11 1. Department of Cardiology, Smidt Heart Institute, Cedars-Sinai Medical Center,  
12 Los Angeles, CA

13 2. Division of Artificial Intelligence in Medicine, Cedars-Sinai Medical Center,  
14 Los Angeles, CA

15 3. Biomedical Imaging Research Institute, Cedars-Sinai Medical Center, Los  
16 Angeles, CA

17 4. Department of Imaging and Medicine, Cedars-Sinai Medical Center, Los  
18 Angeles, CA

19 Correspondence: [alan.kwan@cshs.org](mailto:alan.kwan@cshs.org), [David.ouyang@cshs.org](mailto:David.ouyang@cshs.org)

20 127 S. San Vicente Blvd, AHSP A3600

21 Los Angeles, CA 90048

22 Word Count: 279 words (Abstract) / 2403 words (Main body)

23 ABSTRACT

24

25 **Background**

26 Echocardiography is the most common modality for assessing cardiac structure and  
27 function. While cardiac magnetic resonance (CMR) imaging is less accessible, CMR  
28 can provide unique tissue characterization including late gadolinium enhancement  
29 (LGE), T1 and T2 mapping, and extracellular volume (ECV) which are associated with  
30 tissue fibrosis, infiltration, and inflammation. While deep learning has been shown to  
31 uncover findings not recognized by clinicians, it is unknown whether CMR-based tissue  
32 characteristics can be derived from echocardiography videos using deep learning. We  
33 hypothesized that deep learning applied to echocardiography could predict CMR-based  
34 measurements.

35

36 **Methods**

37 In a retrospective single-center study, adult patients with CMRs and echocardiography  
38 studies within 30 days were included. A video-based convolutional neural network was  
39 trained on echocardiography videos to predict CMR-derived labels including wall  
40 motion abnormality (WMA) presence, LGE presence, and abnormal T1, T2 or ECV  
41 across echocardiography views. The model performance was evaluated in a held-out test  
42 dataset not used for training.

43

44 **Results**

45 The study population included 1,453 adult patients (mean age  $56 \pm 18$  years, 42%  
46 female) with 2,556 paired echocardiography studies occurring on average 2 days after

47 CMR (interquartile range 2 days prior to 6 days after). The model had high predictive  
48 capability for presence of WMA (AUC 0.873 [95%CI 0.816-0.922]), however, the  
49 model was unable to reliably detect the presence of LGE (AUC 0.699 [0.613-0.780]),  
50 native T1 (AUC 0.614 [0.500-0.715]), T2 0.553 [0.420-0.692], or ECV 0.564  
51 [0.455-0.691]).

52

### 53 **Conclusions**

54 Deep learning applied to echocardiography accurately identified CMR-based WMA, but  
55 was unable to predict tissue characteristics, suggesting that signal for these tissue  
56 characteristics may not be present within ultrasound videos, and that the use of CMR for  
57 tissue characterization remains essential within cardiology.

58

59

### 60 **Clinical Perspective:**

61 Tissue characterization of the heart muscle is useful for clinical diagnosis and prognosis  
62 by identifying myocardial fibrosis, inflammation, and infiltration, and can be measured  
63 using cardiac MRI. While echocardiography is highly accessible and provides excellent  
64 functional information, its ability to provide tissue characterization information is  
65 limited at this time. Our study using a deep learning approach to predict cardiac  
66 MRI-based tissue characteristics from echocardiography showed limited ability to do so,  
67 suggesting that alternative approaches, including non-deep learning methods should be  
68 considered in future research.

69

70

71 **Keywords:** Cardiac magnetic resonance imaging, Echocardiogram, Deep learning,

72 Convolutional neural network

73

74 **Abbreviations:**

75 AHA: American Heart Association

76 AUROC: Area under receiver operating characteristic

77 A4C: Apical 4 chamber

78 A2C: Apical 2 chamber

79 CMR: Cardiac magnetic resonance

80 ECV: Extracellular volume

81 LVEF: Left ventricular ejection fraction

82 LGE: late gadolinium enhancement

83 PLAX: Parasternal long axis

84 MOLLI: modified inversion look-locker

85

## 86 **Introduction**

87

88 Echocardiography plays a central role within cardiovascular care, providing essential  
89 information on cardiac structure and function in a highly-accessible format<sup>1 2</sup>. Cardiac  
90 MRI (CMR) is also critical to cardiovascular care but has reduced accessibility due to  
91 the availability of scanners and qualified physicians to interpret the images. In addition  
92 to providing information on cardiac structure and function, CMR is able to provide  
93 unique tissue characterization that is helpful for assessing for etiology of disease<sup>3</sup>. This  
94 includes myocardial composition including scarring through late gadolinium  
95 enhancement (LGE) and infiltration, edema, and diffuse fibrosis through relaxometry  
96 techniques such as T1 and T2 mapping, and extracellular volume (ECV) fraction.  
97 Despite the utility of CMR<sup>4</sup>, logistical barriers continue to limit its broader uptake,  
98 including the availability of CMR resources, the examination cost, the use of  
99 gadolinium contrast, and logistical complexity.

100

101 Deep learning applied to medical imaging provides the opportunity to obtain more  
102 information than currently recognized by clinicians in standard clinical care<sup>5-9</sup>. For  
103 example, deep learning applied to echocardiography has been shown to identify hidden  
104 features invisible to the human eye such as age, gender, serological biomarkers,  
105 prognosis, and tissue characteristics of cardiac amyloidosis and hypertrophic  
106 cardiomyopathy<sup>10,11</sup>. We hypothesized that deep learning applied to echocardiography  
107 could predict CMR-based measurements. In this study, we train a video-based  
108 convolutional neural network to predict CMR features from patients with paired CMR  
109 and echocardiography studies. Predicted CMR characteristics including wall motion

110 abnormalities, myocardial scar, and markers of tissue infiltration, edema, and diffuse

111 fibrosis were assessed for deep learning evaluation.

112

113 **Methods**

114

115 Data and study population

116 We identified all adults aged over 18 years at a large cardiac quaternary care center who  
117 received clinical CMR, with at least one clinical transthoracic echocardiogram within 30  
118 days of the CMR between May 2011 and June 2022. All echocardiography were  
119 performed using Philips EPIQ 7 or iE33 ultrasound machines. Echocardiography views  
120 including apical four-chamber (A4c), apical two-chamber (A2c), and parasternal long  
121 axis (PLAX), were automatically extracted using an automated view classifier. Videos  
122 underwent automated image preprocessing including removing identifying information,  
123 electrocardiogram and respirometer tracings, and cropping and downsampling images  
124 using cubic interpolation to a standard size and resolution of  $112 \times 112$ -pixels<sup>12</sup>. This  
125 study was approved by the Institutional Review Board at Cedars-Sinai Medical Center  
126 and informed consent was waived due to the retrospective analysis.

127

128 Echocardiography studies were paired with the nearest CMR study within 30 days.  
129 Deep learning models were trained on echocardiogram videos with labels derived from  
130 the clinical report of the temporally closest CMR if a single echocardiography study had  
131 multiple CMRs within 30 days. Labels included presence or absence of wall motion  
132 abnormalities within the given echocardiography view (e.g., within AHA segments  
133 included within an apical 4-chamber view versus 2-chamber versus parasternal long  
134 axis) or globally (within any segment), presence or absence of LGE within a given view  
135 or globally, and both continuous and dichotomized measures of T1, T2, and ECV.  
136 Dichotomization was based on abnormal values of native T1 times over 1060ms, T2

137 times over 58ms, and ECV values above 33%, appropriate to scanner vendor and  
138 strength and based on local practice and published values<sup>13 14</sup>. Overall study pipeline is  
139 demonstrated in the **Graphical Abstract**.

140

141

#### 142 CMR protocol and assessment

143 All CMR examinations were clinically-ordered studies performed using a 1.5T Avanto  
144 scanner (Siemens Healthineers, Erlangen, Germany). While clinical protocols varied  
145 over time, cine SSFP images were graded at the time of acquisition for the presence or  
146 absence of regional wall motion abnormalities based on an American Heart Association  
147 (AHA) 17 segmentation model<sup>15</sup>. If available, T1 mapping was performed using a  
148 standard 5(3)3 modified inversion look-locker (MOLLI) sequence, with measurement  
149 of the T1 value within the mid-septum within the mid slice. If overt tissue abnormalities  
150 were present in this region, measurement representative of the diffuse tissue  
151 composition would be performed in a secondary region, most commonly basal  
152 mid-septal slice, consistent with guidelines. If available, T2 mapping was performed  
153 using a T2-prepped SSFP sequence, with similar measurement approach as used for T1  
154 values. Post-contrast images included T1-mapping using a short-T1 optimized MOLLI  
155 approach. ECV values were calculated from the pre- and post-contrast T1 maps in  
156 combination with point-of-care hematocrit measurement. LGE was measured 12-20  
157 min after gadolinium contrast injection (Gadbutrol), using turbo FLASH or magnitude  
158 weighted and phase-sensitive inversion recovery gradient echo high-resolution short  
159 axis stacks, correlated with long axis LGE images, to grade presence, severity, and  
160 location of scarring using the AHA 17-segment model. All clinical examinations were



161 reviewed by two clinicians including an advanced cardiac imaging fellow, and advanced  
162 cardiac imaging attending with Level-3 equivalent training.

163

#### 164 Overview of AI model and training

165 For model training and testing, we used a convolutional neural network with residual  
166 connections and spatiotemporal convolutions<sup>12</sup> to predict CMR findings, including the  
167 presence of wall motion abnormalities, the presence of myocardial scar, native T1 value,  
168 T2 value, and ECV fraction. For binary classification tasks for predicting dichotomized  
169 CMR findings, we used binary cross-entropy loss and trained to maximize the area  
170 under the receiver operating characteristics using an AdamW optimizer with an initial  
171 learning rate of 0.001. For classification tasks including wall motion abnormalities,  
172 scarring, abnormal T1, T2, and ECV, predictions were organized by presence or absence  
173 of abnormality within the AHA segments corresponding to the specific  
174 echocardiography view. To assess for the global presence or absence of any wall motion  
175 abnormalities or myocardial scar, we combined the predictions for A4c, A2c, and PLAX  
176 views through logistic regression for a final prediction of these measurements. For a  
177 regression tasks applied for prediction of continuous labels (native T1 value, T2 value,  
178 and ECV fraction), the model was similarly trained in A4c, A2c, and PLAX views and  
179 combined to provide a global result. The model was specified to minimize the mean  
180 average error using squared loss. In both classification and regression tasks, early  
181 stopping with 10 epochs was applied, and the batch size and the number of epochs were  
182 set to 10 and 50, respectively. The dataset was randomly split at an 8:1:1 ratio for model  
183 training, validation, and held-out testing. The weights from the epoch with the best

184 metrics were used on the held-out test dataset. All model training and evaluation were  
185 conducted using Python 3.8 and the publicly available PyTorch library.

186

### 187 Statistical analysis

188 All performance analyses were performed using a held-out test dataset not involved in  
189 model training. For dichotomous outcomes, the model's ability was assessed by  
190 calculating the area under the receiver operating characteristic (AUROC) curve. For  
191 continuous values including T1 value, T2 value, and ECV, mean absolute error (MAE)  
192 and coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ) were calculated. Bland-Altman plots where the  
193 average of two measurements was plotted against the difference were used to check the  
194 agreement between the actual and predicted values from echocardiography. 95%  
195 confidence intervals were calculated with 10,000 bootstrapping samples. All data were  
196 analyzed using Python and R.

197

198 **RESULTS**

199

200 Patient characteristics

201 We trained and tested a model using a dataset that included 2,556 echocardiography  
202 studies paired with CMR findings from a total of 1,453 patients (mean age:  $56.0 \pm 17.9$   
203 years, 41.8% female). The patient population had a range of cardiovascular  
204 comorbidities including hypertension (37.7%), hyperlipidemia (28.5%), and diabetes  
205 (16.5%) (**Table 1**). The mean left ventricular ejection fraction (LVEF) reported by  
206 echocardiography and CMR was  $48.0 \pm 18.5\%$  and  $49.2 \pm 17.4\%$ , respectively. In the  
207 CMR assessment, 48.3% had wall motion abnormalities and 49.0% had scar findings in  
208 one or more of the AHA 17 segments. Mean native T1 value was  $1020 \pm 72.1$  ms with  
209 26.0% of the patients having elevated values, mean T2 value was  $48.7 \pm 6.1$ ms with  
210 8.2% having elevated values, and mean ECV was  $28.4 \pm 5.7\%$  with 21.8% having  
211 elevated values. The median time interval between the echocardiography and CMR was  
212 2 days (interquartile range, -2 to +6 days).

213

214 Model Performance

215 Prediction of wall motion abnormalities was robust, with the AUROC for prediction  
216 within the A4c segments of 0.817 (95% CI: 0.791-0.843), A2c of 0.756 (0.707-0.802)  
217 and PLAX of 0.812 (0.777-0.847) . The combination of these view prediction for global  
218 wall motion abnormalities showed strong prediction, with AUROC of 0.873  
219 (0.816-0.922) (**Figure 1**). On the other hand, prediction of tissue composition  
220 performed poorly overall. LGE prediction was low, at AUROC of 0.657 (0.620-0.693)

221 in the A4c views and poor at AUROC of 0.591 (0.522-0.650) in the A2c view and 0.541  
222 (0.483 - 0.594) in the PLAX views. The global prediction of 0.699 (0.613-0.780) was  
223 the highest (**Figure 1**). AUROC for prediction of T1, T2, and ECV was similarly limited,  
224 with global prediction of abnormal T1 time of 0.614 (0.500-0.715), T2 time of 0.553  
225 (0.420-0.692), and ECV of 0.564 (0.455-0.691). These limited capabilities were  
226 consistent across A4c, A2c, and PLAX view videos (**Table 2**). Prediction of continuous  
227 measures globally showed that the models were minimally predictive, with  $R^2$  of 0.04  
228 and MAE of 49.8 ms (47.5-52.2) for T1,  $R^2$  of 0.002 and MAE of 5.39 ms (5.07-5.71)  
229 for T2 and  $R^2$  of 0.07 and MAE of 4.38% (4.17-4.58) for ECV (**Supplemental Figure**  
230 **1**).  
231

232 **Discussion**

233

234 In this study, we investigated the accuracy of a video-based deep learning model for  
235 predicting CMR findings from echocardiography, with the express goal to bridge the  
236 gap between the accessibility of echocardiography and the diagnostic information of  
237 CMR. While the model was able to predict wall motion abnormalities, it was unable to  
238 reliably predict fundamental CMR tissue characteristics including LGE, T1, T2, and  
239 ECV. Of these, the LGE prediction was the highest at 0.699 (0.613-0.780), which is  
240 unlikely to be accurate enough for clinical utility. Overall, we would consider the  
241 attempt to predict meaningful CMR tissue characteristics from echocardiography  
242 unsuccessful.

243

244 There has been limited previous cross-modality research specifically linking  
245 echocardiography to CMR findings, with our literature review revealing no  
246 deep-learning-based publications for LGE, let alone T1, T2, and ECV. A smaller study  
247 leveraging a radiomics-based approach in patients admitted for heart failure, was able to  
248 identify the presence or absence of LGE in the anteroseptal and posterior wall  
249 myocardial segments, within the specific regions where regions of interest were placed  
250 for feature extraction. This was performed as a subset of a larger study, focusing on 89  
251 patients for training and 40 patients for testing, all with echocardiography within 48  
252 hours of clinical CMR, resulting in an AUROC of 0.84<sup>16</sup>. Other approaches such as  
253 echocardiography speckle-tracking strain has also been used to predict LGE with  
254 variable success – One publication demonstrated a significant association in 155  
255 patients specifically diagnosed with carbon monoxide poisoning<sup>17</sup>, whereas a more

256 general and smaller 50-patient population was unable to find an association with  
257 echo-based strain (AUROC of 0.58), but stronger associations with CMR-based strain  
258 (AUROC 0.67-0.78 including longitudinal and circumferential strain)<sup>18</sup>.  
259 Electrocardiogram (ECG) deep learning approaches have been applied to predict LGE  
260 and appear to have potentially stronger associations than were found within our study,  
261 though these are typically limited to specific populations. For example, prediction of  
262 LGE in patients with mitral valve prolapse using a CNN-based approach was able to  
263 achieve an AUROC of 0.75 in approximately 600 patients<sup>19</sup>, and 0.76 in a hypertrophic  
264 cardiomyopathy population of 1,930 patients though the AUROC decreased to 0.68 in  
265 external validation<sup>20</sup>. A smaller study in 114 patients achieved AUROC up to 0.81 for  
266 ECG prediction; however, this was from a 6-fold cross-validation without a hold-out  
267 dataset, so there is likely a significant contribution of overfitting to the model<sup>21</sup>.

268

269 In reconciling our results with the established literature, we note that our population was  
270 typically both larger, and more general than previous works. Inclusion of diverse  
271 clinical conditions may have reduced the ability to predict CMR tissue characteristics,  
272 as the histological correlates of LGE, T1, T2, and ECV can vary between disease  
273 processes. However, our overarching motivation for echocardiographic tissue  
274 characterization was broad accessibility independent of specific disease processes, and  
275 therefore we felt that that this was the most appropriate approach. Additionally, given  
276 that clinical echocardiography is already commonly used to accurately identify WMA,  
277 we present the strong deep learning prediction of WMA not as a proposed clinical  
278 application, but to provide quality assurance for the workflow in mapping CMR labels  
279 and echo images, and our ability to train deep learning models for echo. We also

280 recognize that of all of the tissue characterization markers, LGE was the highest and  
281 showed small signal for prediction (AUROC of 0.699); however, without a much  
282 stronger signal, we felt this was most likely due to prediction of confounding factors  
283 such as reduced ejection fraction or thinned myocardium. These factors may be easily  
284 visible on echocardiography and are associated with, but not equivalent to LGE; and  
285 thus not clinically useful to predict with deep learning.

286

287 Overall, the results of our study suggest that at least within the current population and  
288 deep learning architecture, CMR-based tissue characteristics are unable to be derived  
289 from standard clinical echocardiography at this time. Additional experiments testing  
290 prediction of deep learning across various sample size and model architectures had only  
291 modest differences in performance (not shown). At the inception of this study, we  
292 recognized that the ability to derive magnetic resonance-specific findings from an  
293 ultrasound-based modality may have limited biological plausibility, as the image  
294 acquisition and reconstruction process between the two modalities are extremely  
295 technically distinct. Historically however, echocardiography tissue characteristics such  
296 as granular sparkling has been seen as suggestive of cardiac amyloidosis<sup>22</sup> and  
297 integrated backscatter has been proposed for use within both inflammatory and fibrotic  
298 conditions<sup>23,24</sup>. Detection of histological characteristics by echocardiography thus may  
299 be best directly quantified, as while CMR-based tissue characterization is well-accepted,  
300 it still represents a surrogate of the true tissue composition. Novel echocardiography  
301 techniques such as shear-wave elastography can provide signal for fibrosis not available  
302 through standard clinical images and may be able to expand the applicability of  
303 echocardiography independent of deep-learning based techniques<sup>25,26</sup>. Thus, while our

304 results support the ongoing utility for CMR independent of echocardiography, we are  
305 optimistic for the future of echocardiography to provide highly accessible tissue  
306 characterization.

307

### 308 Limitations

309 There are several limitations in the present study. First, as a retrospective single center  
310 study, our results were the result of a limited dataset. In particular, CMR practices may  
311 vary significantly between locations, and it remains possible stronger relationships can  
312 be found with larger datasets. The 30-day interval was selected as being a relatively  
313 short time frame but with a high number of eligible studies, and we recognize that  
314 incident clinical events or resolution of acute findings may have occurred between the  
315 two studies, though the short median time interval gives some degree of assurance.  
316 CMR referral was clinical and included a wide range of diseases conditions and  
317 severities. This heterogeneity may have increased the challenge of finding significant  
318 associations.

319



320 **Conclusion**

321 In conclusion, we found that a video-based deep learning architecture using  
322 echocardiography was able to identify CMR-based WMA, but was unable to accurately  
323 identify CMR-based tissue characteristics including LGE, T1 time, T2 time, and ECV.  
324 Further testing using alternative populations and approaches should be considered. At  
325 present, our study supports the ongoing use of CMR for tissue characterization in  
326 appropriate patients, despite challenges to patient access.

327

328

329

330 **Disclosures**

331 ACK reports support from the American Heart Association (AHA; 23CDA1053659)

332 and National Institutes of Health (NIH; UL1TR001881), and consulting fees from

333 InVision Medical Technology

334 DO reports support from the National Institute of Health (NIH; NHLBI R00HL157421)

335 and Alexion, and consulting or honoraria for lectures from EchoIQ, Ultramics, Pfizer,

336 InVision, the Korean Society of Echo, and the Japanese Society of Echo.

337

338 **Sources of Funding**

339 ACK: AHA 23CDA1053659, NIH UL1TR001881, 75N92020D00021

340 DO: NHLBI R00HL157421, 75N92020D00021

341 YS: Japanese Society for the Promotion of Science, Grants-in-Aid for Scientific

342 Research (JSPS-KAKENHI)

343 **Author contributions**

344 Concept and design: YS, DO, AK

345 Acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data: YS, DO, AK, MV, GD, DB, SC

346 Drafting and Critical revision of the manuscript: All authors

347 Statistical analysis: YS, DO, AK

348 Obtained funding: DO, YS, AK

349 Supervision: AK, DO, SC, DB, DL

350 Data and code availability

351 All of the code for the present study is available at <https://github.com/echonet/>.

352

353 Reference

354

- 355 1. Lancellotti, P. *et al.* The use of echocardiography in acute cardiovascular care:  
356 recommendations of the European Association of Cardiovascular Imaging and the  
357 Acute Cardiovascular Care Association. *Eur Heart J Acute Cardiovasc Care* **4**, 3–5  
358 (2015).
- 359 2. Omar, A. M. S., Bansal, M. & Sengupta, P. P. Advances in Echocardiographic  
360 Imaging in Heart Failure With Reduced and Preserved Ejection Fraction. *Circ. Res.*  
361 **119**, 357–374 (2016).
- 362 3. Marwick, T. H., Neubauer, S. & Petersen, S. E. Use of cardiac magnetic resonance  
363 and echocardiography in population-based studies: why, where, and when? *Circ.*  
364 *Cardiovasc. Imaging* **6**, 590–596 (2013).
- 365 4. Goldfarb, J. W. & Weber, J. Trends in Cardiovascular MRI and CT in the U.S.  
366 Medicare Population from 2012 to 2017. *Radiol Cardiothorac Imaging* **3**, e200112  
367 (2021).
- 368 5. Poplin, R. *et al.* Prediction of cardiovascular risk factors from retinal fundus  
369 photographs via deep learning. *Nat Biomed Eng* **2**, 158–164 (2018).
- 370 6. Holmstrom, L. *et al.* Deep learning-based electrocardiographic screening for  
371 chronic kidney disease. *Commun. Med.* **3**, 73 (2023).
- 372 7. Ouyang, D. *et al.* Electrocardiographic deep learning for predicting post-procedural  
373 mortality: a model development and validation study. *The Lancet Digital Health*  
374 (2023) doi:10.1016/S2589-7500(23)00220-0.
- 375 8. Attia, Z. I. *et al.* Age and Sex Estimation Using Artificial Intelligence From  
376 Standard 12-Lead ECGs. *Circ. Arrhythm. Electrophysiol.* **12**, e007284 (2019).

- 377 9. Banerjee, I. *et al.* Reading Race: AI Recognises Patient’s Racial Identity In Medical  
378 Images. *arXiv [cs.CV]* (2021).
- 379 10. Ghorbani, A. *et al.* Deep learning interpretation of echocardiograms. *NPJ Digit*  
380 *Med* **3**, 10 (2020).
- 381 11. Hughes, J. W. *et al.* Deep learning evaluation of biomarkers from echocardiogram  
382 videos. *EBioMedicine* **73**, 103613 (2021).
- 383 12. Ouyang, D. *et al.* Video-based AI for beat-to-beat assessment of cardiac function.  
384 *Nature* **580**, 252–256 (2020).
- 385 13. Schulz-Menger, J. *et al.* Standardized image interpretation and post-processing in  
386 cardiovascular magnetic resonance - 2020 update : Society for Cardiovascular  
387 Magnetic Resonance (SCMR): Board of Trustees Task Force on Standardized  
388 Post-Processing. *J. Cardiovasc. Magn. Reson.* **22**, 19 (2020).
- 389 14. Kawel-Boehm, N. *et al.* Reference ranges (“normal values”) for cardiovascular  
390 magnetic resonance (CMR) in adults and children: 2020 update. *J. Cardiovasc.*  
391 *Magn. Reson.* **22**, 87 (2020).
- 392 15. Cerqueira, M. D. *et al.* Standardized myocardial segmentation and nomenclature for  
393 tomographic imaging of the heart. A statement for healthcare professionals from the  
394 Cardiac Imaging Committee of the Council on Clinical Cardiology of the American  
395 Heart Association. *Circulation* **105**, 539–542 (2002).
- 396 16. Kagiya, N. *et al.* A low-cost texture-based pipeline for predicting myocardial  
397 tissue remodeling and fibrosis using cardiac ultrasound. *EBioMedicine* **54**, 102726  
398 (2020).

- 399 17. Cho, D.-H. *et al.* Clinical and Echocardiographic Predictors for the Presence of  
400 Late Gadolinium Enhancement on Cardiac Magnetic Resonance Imaging in  
401 Patients with Carbon Monoxide Poisoning. *Diagnostics (Basel)* **14**, (2023).
- 402 18. Erley, J. *et al.* Echocardiography and cardiovascular magnetic resonance based  
403 evaluation of myocardial strain and relationship with late gadolinium enhancement.  
404 *J. Cardiovasc. Magn. Reson.* **21**, 46 (2019).
- 405 19. Tison, G. H. *et al.* Identifying Mitral Valve Prolapse at Risk for Arrhythmias and  
406 Fibrosis From Electrocardiograms Using Deep Learning. *JACC Adv* **2**, (2023).
- 407 20. Carrick, R. T. *et al.* Identification of High-Risk Imaging Features in Hypertrophic  
408 Cardiomyopathy using Electrocardiography: A Deep-Learning Approach. *Heart*  
409 *Rhythm* (2024) doi:10.1016/j.hrthm.2024.01.031.
- 410 21. Gumpfer, N., Grün, D., Hannig, J., Keller, T. & Guckert, M. Detecting myocardial  
411 scar using electrocardiogram data and deep neural networks. *Biol. Chem.* **402**, 911–  
412 923 (2021).
- 413 22. Cacciapuoti, F. The role of echocardiography in the non-invasive diagnosis of  
414 cardiac amyloidosis. *J. Echocardiogr.* **13**, 84–89 (2015).
- 415 23. Hoyt, R. H., Collins, S. M., Skorton, D. J., Ericksen, E. E. & Conyers, D.  
416 Assessment of fibrosis in infarcted human hearts by analysis of ultrasonic  
417 backscatter. *Circulation* **71**, 740–744 (1985).
- 418 24. Omi, W. *et al.* Ultrasonic tissue characterization in acute myocarditis: a case report.  
419 *Circ. J.* **66**, 416–418 (2002).
- 420 25. Caenen Annette *et al.* Ultrasound Shear Wave Elastography in Cardiology. *JACC*  
421 *Cardiovasc. Imaging* **17**, 314–329 (2024).

- 422 26. Wouters, L. *et al.* Septal Scar Detection in Patients With Left Bundle Branch Block  
423 Using Echocardiographic Shear Wave Elastography. *JACC Cardiovasc. Imaging* **16**,  
424 713–715 (2023).  
425

426 **Figure Captions:**

427 **Graphical Abstract:** Overview of the study pipeline and results. A large  
428 echocardiography dataset involving 2,566 studies from 1,453 patients paired with CMR  
429 and echocardiography within 30 days from Cedars-Sinai Medical Center was identified.  
430 A convolutional neural network with residual connections and spatiotemporal  
431 convolutions was trained to predict each CMR finding and detect abnormal findings  
432 from echocardiography. Results showed strong prediction of functional abnormalities,  
433 but poor prediction of CMR-specific tissue characterization.

434 **Figure 1. Performance of deep-learning on a held-out test dataset.**  
435 Receiver-operating-characteristic (ROC) curve for predicting myocardial wall motion  
436 abnormalities and myocardial scar finding detected by CMR. A: prediction of wall  
437 motion abnormalities, B: prediction of myocardial scar. Black curves denote the  
438 performance characteristics of a deep learning model for presence of global abnormal  
439 findings. Red, blue, and green curves demonstrated the prediction of abnormal findings  
440 within A4c, A2c, and PLAX views respectively.



441 **Supplementary Figures**

442 **Supplementary Figure 1: Performance of deep-learning model on prediction of**  
443 **abnormalities and estimation of CMR-specific tissue composition. (A)**

444 Receiver-operating-characteristic (ROC) curve for predicting abnormal CMR findings,  
445 including native T1 value, T2 value, and extracellular volume fraction. Green curve  
446 denotes the prediction of native T1 finding  $\geq 1060$ ms. Purple denotes the prediction of  
447 T2  $\geq 58$ ms. The orange curve denotes the prediction of ECV  $\geq 33\%$ . Scatterplot for  
448 predicted versus measured (B) native T1 value, (C) T2 value, and (D) ECV.

449

450 **Tables**

451 **Table 1:** Baseline patient characteristics, cardiac magnetic resonance and  
452 echocardiogram findings

<b>Characteristic</b>	<b>Unique Patients (N = 1,453)<sup>f</sup></b>
Age, mean (SD)	56.0 (17.9)
BMI	26.2 (8.6)
Gender, female	607.0 (41.8%)
Race/ethnicity	
American Indian	8 (0.6%)
Asian	125 (8.6%)
Black	207 (14.2%)
Caucasian	973 (67.0%)
Other	140 (9.6%)
Hypertension	548 (37.7%)
Hyperlipidemia	414 (28.5%)
Diabetes	240 (16.5%)
CMR LVEF, mean (SD) (N=1,432)	49.2 (17.4)
Native T1 (ms), mean (SD) (N=1,116)	1,020.7 (72.1)
T2 (ms), mean (SD) (N=1,069)	48.7 (6.1)
ECV (%), mean (SD) (N=941)	28.4 (5.7)
Native T1 $\geq$ 1060 ms	290 (25.6%)
T2 $\geq$ 58 ms	88 (8.2%)
ECV $\geq$ 33%	205 (21.4%)
Global wall motion abnormality (CMR) (N=1,405)	678 (48.3%)

<b>Characteristic</b>	<b>Unique Patients (N = 1,453)<sup>1</sup></b>
Global scar finding (CMR) (N=1,252)	614 (49.0%)
Total Echocardiogram studies paired with CMR	2,566 studies from 1,453 patients
Echocardiogram LVEF, mean (SD)	48.0 (18.5)
A4c videos	2,331 studies from 1,375 patients
A2c videos	1,965 studies from 1,270 patients
Plax videos	2,299 studies from 1,404 patients

<sup>1</sup>Mean (SD); n (%)

453 CMR: Cardiac Magnetic Resonance; LVEF: Left Ventricular Ejection Fraction; BMI:

454 Body Mass Index; ECV: Extracellular Volume; SD: Standard Deviation;

455 **Table 2:** Diagnostic accuracy of deep learning for predicting wall motion abnormalities,  
 456 myocardial scar, and abnormal tissue composition by echocardiographic view


457

<b>Cardiac magnetic resonance imaging parameters</b>	<b>Video</b>	<b>AUROC</b>
Wall motion abnormalities		
WMA in A4c region	A4c view	0.817 (0.791 – 0.843)
WMA in A2c region	A2c view	0.756 (0.707 – 0.802)
WMA in PLAX region	PLAX view	0.812 ( 0.777 – 0.847)
	Logistic regression using three views	0.873 (0.816 – 0.922)
Myocardial scar		
Scar in A4c region	A4c view	0.657 (0.620 – 0.693)
Scar in A2c region	A2c view	0.591 (0.522 – 0.650)
Scar in PLAX region	PLAX view	0.541 (0.483 – 0.594)
	Logistic regression using three views	0.699 (0.613 – 0.780)
Relaxometry parameters		
Native T1 value (ms)	A4c view	0.546 (0.497 – 0.596)
	A2c view	0.525 (0.479 – 0.581)
	PLAX view	0.518 (0.464 – 0.577)

	Logistic regression using three views	0.614 (0.500 - 0.715)
T2 value (ms)	A4c view	0.521 (0.465 – 0.578)
	A2c view	0.539 (0.469 – 0.619)
	PLAX view	0.559 (0.491 – 0.692)
	Logistic regression using three views	0.553 (0.420-0.692)
ECV fraction (%)	A4c view	0.549 (0.501 – 0.599)
	A2c view	0.598 (0.514 – 0.680)
	PLAX view	0.535 (0.463 – 0.691)
	Logistic regression using three views	0.564 (0.455 - 0.691)


458 **Figures:**

459 **Graphical Abstract:**




460

461 **Figure 1:**





462 **Supplementary Figure 1:**



463