## 1 Research article: Single Channel Electrocardiography Optimizes the Diagnostic

## 2 Accuracy of Bicycle Ergometry

- 3 Running tittle: Recent advances in IHD diagnosis
- 4

Authors' list: Basheer Abdullah Marzoog<sup>1,\*</sup>, Magomed Abdullaev<sup>1</sup>, Alexander
Suvorov<sup>1</sup>, Peter Chomakhidze<sup>1</sup>, Daria Gognieva<sup>1</sup>, Nina Vladimirovna Gagarina<sup>2</sup>,
Natalia Mozzhukhina<sup>3</sup>, Sergey Vladimirovich Kostin<sup>4</sup>, Afina Aftandilovna
Bestavashvili<sup>1</sup>, Ekaterina Fominykha<sup>2</sup>, Philipp Kopylov<sup>1</sup>

- 9 <sup>1</sup> World-Class Research Center «Digital Biodesign and Personalized Healthcare», I.M.
- 10 Sechenov First Moscow State Medical University (Sechenov University), 119991 Moscow,
- 11 Russia; postal address: Russia, Moscow, 8-2 Trubetskaya street, 119991.

<sup>12</sup> <sup>2</sup> University clinical Hospital number 1, Radiology department, I.M. Sechenov First Moscow

13 State Medical University (Sechenov University), 119991 Moscow, Russia; postal address:

- 14 Russia, Moscow, 8-2 Trubetskaya street, 119991.
- <sup>3</sup> University clinical Hospital number 1, Health Management Clinic, I.M. Sechenov First
- 16 Moscow State Medical University (Sechenov University), 119991 Moscow, Russia; postal
- address: Russia, Moscow, 8-2 Trubetskaya street, 119991.
- <sup>4</sup> National Research Ogarev Mordovia State University. Russia. Republic of Mordovia.
   Saransk. Bolshevistskaya str. 68, Saransk. Mordovia Republic. 430005.
- 20

\*Corresponding author: Basheer Abdullah Marzoog, M.D., Ph.D. cardiology student at
Sechenov First Moscow State Medical University at the World-Class Research Center
"Digital biodesign and personalized healthcare". (marzug@mail.ru, +79969602820).

- 24 Address: Russia, Moscow, 8-2 Trubetskaya street, 119991. Postal address: Russia, Moscow,
- 25 8-2 Trubetskaya street, 119991. ORCID: 0000-0001-5507-2413, Scopus ID: 57486338800
- 26
- 27 Competing interests: No competing interests regarding the publication.
- 28
- 29 "Posted history: This manuscript was previously posted to MedRxiv: doi: https://doi.org/
  30 10.1101/2024.04.20.24306122"
- 31
- 32

#### 33 Abstract

Background: Ischemic heart disease (IHD) has the highest mortality rate in the globe. This
 returns to the poor diagnostic and therapeutic strategies including the early prevention
 methods.

Aims: To assess the changes in the single channel electrocardiography (SCECG) at rest and
on exercise test in patients with vs without IHD confirmed by stress computed tomography
myocardial perfusion (CTP) imaging with vasodilatation stress-test.

Objectives: IHD frequently have preventable risk factors and causes that lead to the disease
appearance. However, the lack of the proper diagnostic and prevention tools remains a global
challenge in or era despite the current scientific advances.

43 Material and methods: A single center observational study included 38 participants from 44 Moscow. The participants aged  $\geq 40$  years and given a written consent to participate in the 45 study. Both groups, G1=19 with vs G2=19 without post stress induced myocardial perfusion 46 defect, passed consultation by cardiologist, anthropometric measurements, blood pressure and 47 pulse rate, echocardiography, cardio-ankle vascular index, performing bicycle ergometry, 48 recording 3-minutes SCECG (using CARDO-QVARK) before and just after bicycle 49 ergometry, and then performing CTP. The LASSO regression with nested cross-validation 50 was used to find association between CARDO-QVARK parameters and the existence of the 51 perfusion defect. Statistical processing carried out using the R programming language v4.2 52 and Python v.3.10 [^R].

Results: The CARDO-QVARK parameters analysis have a specificity 63.2 % [95 % confidence interval (CI); 0.391 ; 0.833], sensitivity 73.7 % [95 % CI ; 0.533 ; 0.929], area
under the curve (AUC) 68.4 % [95 % CI ; 0.527 ; 0.817] in compare to bicycle ergometry
(AUC; 55.3 %), based on our study results.

57 **Conclusion:** The SCECG have significantly higher diagnostic accuracy in compare to bicycle 58 ergometry. CARDO-QVARK has the potential to improve the diagnostic accuracy of the 59 bicycle ergometry.

60 Other: Further investigations required to uncover the hidden capabilities of CARDO-

61 QVARK in the diagnosis of ischemic heart disease.

62 **Keywords**: IHD, Single channel electrocardiography, CTP, Prevention, Risk Factors, Stress

63 Test, Machine Learning Model

- 64
- 65
- 66

#### 67 Introduction

68 Ischemic heart disease remains the leading challenge in terms of mortality and morbidity 69 despite the advances in the used methods for diagnosis and prevention. However, the early prevention in terms of evaluation of the ischemic heart disease in early period still 70 underestimated. The current attention of the scientists paid to the prevention rather than 71 72 diagnosis and treatment. In this manner, the scientific community developed several cost-73 effective methods to be confirmed for clinical use for early prevention of ischemic heart 74 disease, including the use of the single channel electrocardiography and exhaled breath 75 analysis in coronary heart disease prevention<sup>[1]</sup>.

Ischemic heart diagnosis using single channel electrocardiography (ECG) remains in the development stage and require further elaboration in the context of the sensitivity and specificity. Several kinds of single channel ECG has been used in the clinical trials including CARDO-QVARK, Apple Watch, Kardia, Zio, BioHarness, Bittium Faros and Carnation Ambulatory Monitor <sup>[1–8]</sup>. Single channel ECG has been used to diagnosis myocardial infarction and monitoring patients with chronic heart disease and heart failure as well as to classify heartbeat <sup>[9–11]</sup>.

Currently there are several kinds of single channel ECG used for commercial purposes and
clinical trials. The accuracy and quality of these single channel ECGs various. The uses of
single channel ECGs are various including distant monitoring of patients with arrythmias, as
a Holter monitoring, and for monitoring for chronic heart failure <sup>[12, 13, 22, 14–21]</sup>. The currently
available single channel ECGs in the market include Apple Watch, Kardia, Zio, Cardiostat,
BioHarness, Bittium Faros and Carnation Ambulatory Monitor <sup>[13, 23]</sup>.

Single-channel ECG has key features that can aid in diagnosing ischemic heart disease include detecting ischemia through ECG alterations, hemodynamic changes, and clinical signs and symptoms <sup>[24]</sup>. Additionally, vectorcardiography, a technique that records cardiac electrical activity as closed loops, can be useful for training in electrocardiography and detecting cardiac ischemia <sup>[24, 25]</sup>. Portable and fast electrode placement devices allow for good-quality ECG tracings, making single-channel ECG accessible and efficient <sup>[24]</sup>.

95 In comparison of single-channel ECG to multi-channel ECG in detecting ischemic heart 96 disease shows that modern ECG systems with vector-based electrocardiography can improve 97 the detection of ECG alterations typical for ischemia compared to the conventional 12-lead 98 ECG <sup>[26]</sup>. Single-channel consumer ECG devices, such as smartwatches, can be useful for 99 detecting and monitoring arrhythmias but have limitations in detecting ST-segment 100 deviations indicating myocardial infarction or ischemic episodes <sup>[27]</sup>.

101 The usage of single channel in ischemic heart disease has not been previously investigated

102 and requires further elucidation.

#### 103 Material and methods

A cohort, prospective single center cohort study included 38 participants. According to the results of the CTP, the participates divided in to two groups. The first group participants without stress induced myocardial perfusion defect and the second group with stress induced myocardial perfusion defect on the CTP. The participants are randomly chosen. A written consent has been taken from the participants. The study registered on clinicaltrials.gov (NCT06181799), and the study approved by the ethical commitment of the Sechenov University, Russia, from "Ethics Committee Requirement № 19-23 from 26.10.2023".

111 The study evaluated continuous and categorical variables. The continuous variables included; 112 age, pulse at rest, systolic blood pressure (SBP) at rest, diastolic blood pressure (DBP) at rest, 113 body weight, height, maximum heart rate (HR) on physical stress test, watt (WT) on physical 114 stress test, metabolic equivalent (METs) on physical stress test, reached percent on physical stress test, ejection fraction (EF %) on echocardiography, estimated vessel age, right cardio-115 116 ankle vascular index (R-CAVI), left Cardio-ankle vascular index (L-CAVI), right ankle-117 brachial index (RABI), left ankle-brachial index (LABI), mean SBP brachial (SBPB) (=(right 118 SBPB+ left SBPB)//2), mean DBPB (=(right DBPB + left DBPB)/2), BP right brachial 119 (BPRB) (=(SBP+DBP)/2), BP left brachial (BPLB) (=(SBP+DBP)/2), mean BPB (=(BPRB+ 120 BPLB)/2), BP right ankle (BPRA) (=(SBP+DBP)/2), BP left ankle (BPLA) (=(SBP+DBP)/2), mean BPA (=(BPRA+ BPLA) /2), mean ankle-brachial index (ABI), right 121 122 brachial pulse (RTb), left brachial pulse (LTb), mean Tb (=(LTb+ RTb)/2), right brachial-123 ankle pulse (Tba), left brachial-ankle pulse (Tba), mean Tba (= (left Tba+right Tba)/2), 124 length heart-ankle (Lha in cm), heart-ankle pulse wave velocity (haPWV; m/s),  $\beta$ -stiffness 125 index from PWV, creatinine (µmol/L), and eGFR (2021 CKD-EPI Creatinine). The 126 categorical variables included; gender, obesity stage, smoking, concomitant disease, 127 atherosclerosis of the coronary artery, hemodynamically significant (>60%), myocardial 128 perfusion defect after stress ATP, myocardial perfusion defect before stress ATP, 129 atherosclerosis in other arteries (Yes/No), brachiocephalic, hypertension (AH), stage AH, 130 degree AH, risk of cardiovascular disease (CVD), stable coronary artery disease (SCAD), 131 functional class (FC) by WT, FC by METs, reaction type to stress test(positive/negative), and 132 reason of discontinuation of the stress test.

133 The study used the following SCECG parameters:

• QTc duration (Bazett's formula);

• amplitude parameters (JA is the amplitude at point J in microV, TA is the amplitude of the

136 T-wave in microV, PAn is the amplitude of the negative P-wave in microV);

• indices of asymmetry SBeta, Beta (ratio of the maximum modulus of the derivative value at

the leading front of the T-wave to the maximum modulus of the value at the trailing front ofthe T-wave);

• spectral integrals of energy of R and T waves: QRS11energy (leading front of R—1st

141 derivative), QRS12energy (trailing front of R-1st derivative), QRS2energy (R-wave as a

142 whole—2nd derivative), TE1 (T-wave as a whole) - (the integral is calculated as the sum of

- 143 energies at all points of the corresponding region );
- spectral integral set by the frequency grid 2 to 4 Hz, 4 to 8 Hz (QRSE1, QRSE2);
- frequency of the maximum energy of the leading and trailing fronts of the R wave (RonsF,

146 RoffsF);

• rhythm variability (SDNN);

• ECG time markers: PpeakN, Rpeak, Speak, Tpeak, Tons, Toffs.

149 ECG time intervals were calculated not from the beginning of the cardiac cycle, but from a 150 point on the isoline, two-thirds of the duration of the mean R-R interval from the previous R-151 wave (so called-Calculated point). All parameters, except for the indicators of rhythm 152 variability, were averaged taking into account the pulse rate. Rhythm variability indicators 153 were evaluated by the program without averaging the values. Thus, the time parameters of the 154 ECG took into account not only the morphology of the cardiac cycle, but also changes the 155 heart rate. Considering that averaged values were taken into account, a longer recording 156 provides the most accurate parameters. This includes markers of the beginning or the end of 157 the wave (Pfi, QRSst, QRSfi), the shift of the negative or positive maximum value relative to 158 the beginning of the averaged complex (PpeakN, Rpeak, Speak, Tpeak), as well as the 159 maximum slope of the waves (Tons, Toffs). QRSfi is the time interval from the calculated 160 point to the end of the QRS complex, expressed in ms. Tpeak is the time interval from the 161 calculated point to the peak of the T wave. Toffs is the time interval from the calculated point to the point of maximum steepness of the descending knee of the T wave <sup>[28]</sup>. 162

Taking into account that the position of the calculated point depends on the R-R interval, it is possible to minimize the effect of heart rate on the time parameters of the cardiac cycle. These time parameters take into account not only the morphology of the QRS complex or T-

166 wave, but also the temporal features of the entire cardiac cycle.

- 167 After logistic regression analysis including more than 200 ECG parameter listed above, the
- 168 artificial intelligence method was used to find combinations with the highest accuracy for
- 169 IHD determination.
- 170 Criteria for the study participants
- 171 The inclusion criteria included;
- 172 1. Participants age  $\geq 40$  years.
- 173 2. Participants with intact mental and physical activity.
- Written consent to participate in the study, take blood samples, and anonymouslypublish the results of the study.
- 4. The participants of the control group are individuals without coronary artery disease,
  confirmed by the absence of the myocardial perfusion defect on the adenosine
  triphosphate stress myocardial perfusion computed tomography ((by using contrast
  enhanced multi-slice spiral computed tomography (CE-MSCT) using adenosine
  triphosphate (ATP)), and confirmed by medical history, previous medical tests, and
  retrospective interview of participants.
- 182 5. The participants of the experimental group are individuals with coronary artery
  183 disease, confirmed by myocardial perfusion defect on the adenosine triphosphate
  184 stress myocardial perfusion computed tomography, and confirmed by medical history,
- 185 previous medical tests, and retrospective interview of participants.
- 186 Exclusion criteria:
- 187 1. Poor single-channel ECG and pulse wave recording quality
- 188 2. Failure of the stress test for reasons unrelated to heart disease
- 189 3. Reluctance to continue participating in the study.
- 190 Non-inclusion criteria
- 191 1. Pregnancy.
- 192 2. Diabetes mellitus
- 193 3. Presence of signs of acute coronary syndrome (myocardial infarction in the last two
  194 days), history of myocardial infarction;
- 195 4. Active infectious and non-infectious inflammatory diseases in the exacerbation phase;
- 196 5. Respiratory diseases (bronchial asthma, chronic bronchitis, cystic fibrosis);
- 197 6. Acute thromboembolism of pulmonary artery branches;
- 198 7. Aortic dissection;
- 199 8. Critical heart defects;
- 200 9. Active oncopathology;

- 201 10. Decompensation phase of acute heart failure;
- 202 11. Neurological pathology (Parkinson's disease, multiple sclerosis, acute psychosis,
- 203 Guillain-Barré syndrome);
- 204 12. Cardiac arrhythmias that do not allow exercise ECG testing (Wolff-Parkinson-White
  205 syndrome, Sick sinus syndrome, AV block of II-III-degree, persistent ventricular
  206 tachycardia);
- 207 13. Diseases of the musculoskeletal system that prevent passing a stress test (bicycle
  208 ergometry);
- 209 14. Allergic reaction to iodine and/or adenosine triphosphate.
- 210 Data collection

All participants at rest pass registration of S-ECG and pulse wave before (during 3 minutes) and just after (during 3 minutes) physical stress test (bicycle ergometry) using a portable single-channel recorder (CARDO-QVARK ; Russia, Moscow) <sup>[29]</sup>. The SCECG and pulse wave results interpreted using machine learning models developed by the Sechenov University team <sup>[29, 30]</sup>.

Both groups pass a vessel stiffness test and pulse wave recording as well as vascular age by
using Fukuda Denshi device (VaSera VS-1500; Japan). Cuffs placed to assess the vascular
stiffness (CAVI parameter) and the vascular age as well as the ancle-brachial index. <sup>[31]</sup>

Subsequently, participants pass exercise bicycle ergometry test (SCHILLER CS200 device; Bruce protocol or modified Bruce protocol). According to the results metabolic equivalent; Mets-BT (BT), the angina functional class (FC) in participants with positive stress test results determined. During the bicycle ergometry, the participants monitored with 12-lead ECG and manual blood pressure measurement, 1 time each 2 minutes. The rest time ECG and blood pressure monitoring continue for at least five minutes after the end of the stress bicycle ergometry test.

The procedure discontinues if: an increase in systolic blood pressure  $\geq 220$  mmHg, horizontal or down sloping ST segment depression on the ECG  $\geq 1$  mm, typical heart pain during test, ventricular tachycardia or atrial fibrillation, or other significant heart rhythm disorders were found. Moreover, stop the procedure if the target heart rate (86% of the 220age) is reached.

Before performing CTP, all the participants present results of the venous creatinine level, eGFR (estimated glomerular filtration rate) according to the 2021 CKD-EPI Creatinine > 30 ml/min/1,73 m2, according to the recommendation for using this formula by the National kidney foundation and the American Society of Nephrology <sup>[32–35]</sup>.

The participants of both groups got catheterization in the basilar vein or the radial vein for

- 236 injection of contrast and ATP to performed pharmacological stress test to the heart by
- 237 increasing heart rate during the stressed myocardial perfusion computer tomography imaging.
- 238 Computer tomography was performed on Canon scanner with 640 slice, 0,5 mm thickness of
- slice, with contrast (Omnipaque, 50 ml), injected two times: in rest to get images for
- 240 myocardial perfusion before test, and in 20 mints just after ATP had been injected in dose
- 241 according to body weight.
- The results of the myocardial perfusion considered positive if there was a perfusion defect after stress test or worsen the already existing at the rest phase perfusion defect.
- Statistical processing was carried out using the R programming language v4.2 and Python
   v.3.10 [^R] <sup>[36, 37]</sup>. Statistically significant values considered at p<0.05.</li>

## 246 Statistical analysis

- 247 For quantitative parameters, the nature of the distribution (using the Shapiro-Wilk test), the
- 248 mean, the standard deviation, the median, the interquartile, the 95% confidence interval, the
- 249 minimum and maximum values were determined. For categorical and qualitative features, the
- 250 proportion and absolute number of values were determined.
- 251 Comparative analysis for normally distributed quantitative traits was carried out on the basis
- of Welch's t-test (2 groups); for abnormally distributed quantitative traits, using the Mann-
- 253 Whitney U-test (2 groups).
- 254 Comparative analysis of categorical and qualitative features was carried out using the Pearson
- 255 X-square criterion, in case of its inapplicability, using the exact Fisher test.
- For Single channel ECG values, pre-load values (prefixed with " $q0_{-}$ " were used, and deltas between immediately after exertion (q1) and after 2nd single channel ECG record, were calculated:
- 259

$$q0 = before$$
  
 $q1 = after 1$ 

260 Calculation of deltas:

$$dltq_{01} = q1 - q0$$

#### 261 Outcome and feature selection

In order to assess the impact of factors on outcomes due to the small number of observations,

it was decided to abandon the classic univariate and subsequent stepwise or multivariate

regression analysis. The effect of exhaled air and CARDO-QVARK on the target variable was assessed using a mathematical modeling conveyor.

Due to the small number of observations, the so-called external cross-validation was used to assess the model's performance to select predictors. Selection was made among the predictor levels before the sample (CARDO-QVARK results), and then the delta for CARDO-QVARK results, as calculated above.

The data was randomly split with a mixing procedure into 3 parts. Each part became a validation array, and the remaining 2/3 became a training array. Thus, 3 different models were trained on each iteration, and none of the models were validated on the same data as they were trained.

This iteration was repeated 500 times with different options for splitting the data into 3 parts [<sup>38]</sup>. This approach allows us to draw indirect conclusions about the possibility of generalizing the results of model quality into larger samples.

The purpose of this method was to select the predictors with the highest normalized coefficients for each constructed model, which was a logistic regression with L1 regularization (Lasso regression). For each model that showed the quality of the AUC classifier above 0.75 in the validation part of the sample, the selected predictors and the corresponding coefficients were taken. For each predictor, the coefficients were taken modulo, then averaged, after which the 5 predictors with the highest coefficients were used for subsequent validation.

The validation process consisted of using only 5 selected predictors to build the model. In other respects, 3-fold cross-validation with data mixing with subsequent evaluation of the results of 3 classifiers was also used. This was possible because the hyperparameters of the classifiers were the same, and all 3 validation samples together gave all the data in the total sample.

#### 289 Results

290 The characteristics of the sample described in the tables bellow. (*Table 1A-B*)

Table 1A: Categorical variables presented in absolute and relative values of the study for true incidence of the stated factor. Abbreviations: CPT; stress myocardial perfusion computer tomography imaging.  $X^2$  test used as a comparative test. \* Values statically significant difference. Abbreviations: METs; metabolic equivalent.

Index	Factor	Group	1	(n=19).	Group 2 (n=19).	р
		Positive	СТ	Р	Negative	

			СТР	
Gender	F	10 (52.6%)	7 (36.8%)	0.32
				8
	М	9 (47.4%)	12 (63.2%)	
Obesity stage	1 degree	3 (15.8%)	3 (15.8%)	>0.9
				99
	Normal	8 (42.1%)	9 (47.4%)	
	Overweig	8 (42.1%)	7 (36.8%)	
	ht			
Atherosclerotic vascular	Carotid	1 (9.1%)	0 (0.0%)	>0.9
(Namely)				99
	Carotid.	10 (90.9%)	4 (100.0%)	
	Brachioce			
	phalic			
	bifurcation			
Stage of hypertension	Ι	2 (25.0%)	1 (7.1%)	0.17
				9
	II	3 (37.5%)	11 (78.6%)	
	III	3 (37.5%)	2 (14.3%)	
Degree of hypertension	Degree 1	4 (50.0%)	7 (50.0%)	0.36
				6
	Degree 2	1 (12.5%)	5 (35.7%)	
	Degree 3	3 (37.5%)	2 (14.3%)	
Risk of cardiovascular disease	High	3 (15.8%)	7 (36.8%)	0.48
				6
	Low	7 (36.8%)	4 (21.1%)	
	Moderate	7 (36.8%)	7 (36.8%)	
	Very high	2 (10.5%)	1 (5.3%)	
Blood pressure reaction type	Asthenic	2 (10.5%)	1 (5.3%)	0.30
on stress test				2
	Hypertoni	1 (5.3%)	1 (5.3%)	
	c			
	Hypotonic	3 (15.8%)	0 (0.0%)	

	Mild	1 (5.3%)	1 (5.3%)	
	Hypertoni			
	c			
	Normotoni	12 (63.2%)	16 (84.2%)	
	c			
Watt	75	4 (21.1%)	7 (36.8%)	0.16
				7
	100	8 (42.1%)	2 (10.5%)	
	125	4 (21.1%)	3 (15.8%)	
	150	1 (5.3%)	2 (10.5%)	
	175	0 (0.0%)	2 (10.5%)	
	200	1 (5.3%)	3 (15.8%)	
	250	1 (5.3%)	0 (0.0%)	
Functional class by Watt	FC-I	2 (40.0%)	3 (42.9%)	>0.9
				99
	FC-II	3 (60.0%)	4 (57.1%)	
Functional class by METs	FC-I	1 (20.0%)	3 (42.9%)	0.73
				5
	FC-II	4 (80.0%)	3 (42.9%)	
	FC-III	0 (0.0%)	1 (14.3%)	
Reaction type to stress test	Negative	8 (42.1%)	9 (47.4%)	0.59
(positive/negative)				3
	Positive	5 (26.3%)	7 (36.8%)	
	Suspected	6 (31.6%)	3 (15.8%)	
Reason of discontinuation of	Horizontal	2 (10.5%)	4 (21.1%)	0.66
the stress test	ST			0
	depression			
	>1mm			
	Reach	17 (89.5%)	15 (78.9%)	
	goal HR			
Tolerance to exertion on stress	Close to	2 (10.5%)	2 (10.5%)	0.83
test	high			0
	High	2 (10.5%)	2 (10.5%)	

	Low	0 (0.0%)	1 (5.3%)	
	Moderate	13 (68.4%)	10 (52.6%)	
	Very high	2 (10.5%)	4 (21.1%)	
Biological estimated vascular	High	10 (52.6%)	9 (47.4%)	0.74
age				6
	Normal	9 (47.4%)	10 (52.6%)	
				0.07
	Ι	6 (31.6%)	10 (52.6%)	8
	II	9 (47.4%)	9 (47.4%)	
CKD stage	IIIa	4 (21.1%)	0 (0.0%)	

295

296 Table 1B: The continuous variables of the sample presented as a mean  $\pm$  standard deviation 297 (Std. div.), Student test as independent variables used. \* Values statically significant 298 difference. Abbreviations: SBP; systolic blood pressure, DBP; diastolic blood pressure, BMI, 299 body mass index, HR; heart rate, METs; metabolic equivalent, R-CAVI; right Cardio-ankle 300 vascular index, L-CAVI; left Cardio-ankle vascular index, RABI; right ankle-brachial index, 301 LABI; left ankle-brachial index, SBP B; systolic blood pressure brachial, DBP B; diastolic 302 blood pressure brachial, BP RB; blood pressure right brachial, BP RA; blood pressure right 303 ankle, BP LA; blood pressure left ankle, BP A; blood pressure ankle, ABI; ankle-brachial 304 index, RTb; right brachial pulse, LTb; left brachial pulse, Tb; mean brachial pulse, Tba; mean brachial-ankle pulse, Lha (cm); length heart-ankle, haPWV (m/s); heart-ankle pulse wave 305 306 velocity.

Index	Group 1 (n=19). Positive	Group 2 (n=19). Negative	р
	CTP. Mean ± Std. div.	CTP. Mean $\pm$ Std. div.	
Age	56.9 ± 6.2	60.6 ± 12.1	0.2
			38
Pulse rest	$73.2 \pm 9.6$	$71.3 \pm 11.1$	0.5
			78
SBP rest	$124.4 \pm 9.4$	$120.6 \pm 14.8$	0.3
			54
DBP rest	79.1 ± 11.1	$76.6 \pm 8.2$	0.4
			29
Body weight	$77.8 \pm 17.4$	$74.0 \pm 10.6$	0.4

			18
Height	$173.2 \pm 10.3$	169.4 ± 8.9	0.2
			40
BMI	25.8 ± 4.3	25.9 ± 4.1	0.9
			39
Goal heart rate (HR)	163.1 ± 6.2	159.4 ± 12.1	0.2
			38
Maximum HR	$149.5 \pm 11.2$	$146.7 \pm 19.7$	0.7
			48
Reached % of the target			0.6
HR on stress test	$91.8\pm8.2$	$92.6 \pm 14.9$	65
METs			0.7
	$6.7 \pm 2.0$	$6.5 \pm 2.1$	15
Ejection fraction (%)	$64.6 \pm 4.1$	65.3 ± 5.4	0.7
			26
Biological estimated	$58.1\pm7.6$	$62.6 \pm 13.9$	0.2
vessel age			22
R-CAVI	$8.5 \pm 0.8$	9.1 ± 1.8	0.2
			92
L-CAVI	$8.5 \pm 0.7$	9.0 ± 1.7	0.2
			31
RABI	$1.2 \pm 0.1$	$1.1 \pm 0.1$	0.1
			81
LABI	$1.2 \pm 0.1$	$1.1 \pm 0.1$	0.0
			82
Mean SBP B	130.1 ± 8.7	$133.2 \pm 16.2$	0.4
			65
Mean DBP B	82.9 ± 8.4	$83.5\pm9.0$	0.8
			17
BP RB (=(SBP+DBP)/2)	$100.7\pm10.0$	$102.8 \pm 14.0$	0.5
			89
BP LB	$101.8\pm10.6$	103.7 ± 12.7	0.6
(=(SBP+DBP)/2)			31

Mean BP B= (BP RB+	$101.3 \pm 10.1$	$103.3 \pm 13.2$	0.6
BP LB )/2			03
BP RA	105.3 ± 10.7	$108.3 \pm 14.1$	0.4
(=(SBP+DBP)/2)			73
BP LA	106.6 ± 9.6	106.9 ± 11.1	0.9
(=(SBP+DBP)/2)			26
Mean BP A= (BP RA +	$106.0 \pm 9.6$	107.6 ± 12.1	0.6
BPLA)/2			47
Mean ABI=	$1.2 \pm 0.1$	$1.1 \pm 0.1$	0.1
(RABI+LABI)/2			01
RTb	$79.4\pm8.9$	78.7 ± 11.5	0.8
			39
LTb	$73.3\pm6.5$	$74.8 \pm 10.7$	0.5
			99
Mean Tb =( RTb+	$76.3\pm7.0$	$76.8 \pm 10.8$	0.8
LTb)/2			88
Right Tba	88.5 ± 10.9	77.4 ± 22.1	0.1
			25
Left Tba	$87.7\pm9.0$	$79.0\pm20.8$	0.1
			44
Mean Tba =( Right	88.1 ± 9.8	$78.2 \pm 21.3$	0.1
Tba+ Left Tba)/2			29
Lha (cm)	$150.8 \pm 8.4$	$147.7 \pm 7.2$	0.2
			40
haPWV (m/s)	$0.9 \pm 0.1$	$1.0 \pm 0.2$	0.2
			34
$\beta$ -stiffness index from	$3.0\pm0.6$	3.3 ± 1.2	0.6
PWV			86
Creatinine (µmol/L)	83.9 ± 11.9	86.4 ± 19.4	0.6
			36
eGFR (2021 CKD-EPI	84.5 ± 13.7	$79.6 \pm 17.4$	0.3
Creatinine)			45

## 308 The diagnostic accuracy of the bicycle ergometry

We examined the diagnostic accuracy of a standard exercise test on a bicycle ergometer. In the ROC analysis, where the predictor was the result of a sample with the results of the physical exertion "Reaction\_type" = 'Positive', and the target variable was Myocardial\_perfusion\_defect\_after\_stress\_ATP, the following results were obtained. (*Table* 2)

Table 2: The quality of the bicycle ergometry appeared quite low in our cohort.

	Point estimate	95%CI
Chars		
AUC	0.553	[0.406;0.695]
Sensitivity	0.263	[0.067; 0.474]
Specificity	0.632	[0.409 ; 0.833]
Negative predictive	0.462	[0.269; 0.654]
value		
Positive predictive	0.417	[0.143;0.714]
value		

315

# 316 CARDO-QVARK Feature selection with cross-validation

After performing pipeline for feature selection using 500 iterations with 3-fold outer crossvalidation, 87 best models were selected, showing AUC  $\geq$  0.9 for the test set. All models were aggregated with their respective absolute coefficients, and then the median estimate of the coefficients for each feature was calculated. Below are the selected 20 predictors (the final model included the first 5). (*Table 3*)

322 Table 3: The 20 most statically significant features according to the build model. Dltq\_01

323 indicates the difference between the selected single channel ECG features immediately after

324 the stress minus the selected features before the stress test.

	Feature	Lasso absolute coefficient
1.	dltq_01_Pan31	0.589804
2.	dltq_01_SA	0.509832
3.	dltq_01_JA	0.37366
4.	dltq_01_TE1	0.270038
5.	dltq_01_TpTe	0.258854

6.	dltq_01_HFNoise	0.248446
7.	dltq_01_PpeakN	0.206324
8.	dltq_01_QRS11energy	0.190459
9.	dltq_01_TA	0.15963
10.	dltq_01_Sbeta	0.150864
11.	dltq_01_TE3	0.138504
12.	dltq_01_Tenergy	0.125174
13.	dltq_01_TE4	0.116375
14.	dltq_01_Tpenergy	0.106516
15.	dltq_01_QTc	0.102957
16.	dltq_01_TE2	0.102495
17.	dltq_01_HFQRS	0.090197
18.	dltq_01_SDNN	0.082806
19.	dltq_01_QRSE1	0.082143
20.	dltq_01_QRSw	0.063462

325

The model was then rebuilt as follows. The top 5 predictors from *Table 3* were with the most mathematically importance according to the built model taken and included in the new LASSO regression model.

Then the leave-one-out cross-validation procedure was performed, which allowed us to obtain approximate estimates of sensitivity, specificity, positive and negative prognostic value. At each iteration of leave-one-out cross-validation , the quantitative predictors were normalized.

The quality of the classification is shown in the table below. (*Table 4*)

Table 4:The quality of the single channel ECG in the diagnosis of ischemic heart disease

using the CARDO-QVARK .

Chars	Point estimate	95%CI
AUC	0.684	[0.527;0.817]
Sensitivity	0.737	[0.533 ; 0.929]
Specificity	0.632	[0.391 ; 0.833]
Negative	0.706	[0.47 ; 0.917]

predictive value		
Positive predictive	0.667	[0.444 ; 0.857]
value		

336

- 337 Confidence results are calculated using a bootstrap. Due to the small number of observations,
- the 95% CI is quite wide. Comparison with load results was carried out using the McNemar
- 339 test <sup>[39]</sup>. (*Figure 1*)





Figure 1: There is a significant difference between the results of the diagnostic accuracy of the load test (55.3 %) and the built model (68.4%), based on our study results. Obviously, the model has better predictive properties, P value = 0.0001.

The comparative statistical analysis demonstrated that the dltq\_01\_TpTe parameter has a

statically significant difference between the two groups, in the first group, the mean  $\pm$  Std.

Div.  $7.2 \pm 28.1$ , and in the second group, the mean  $\pm$  Std. Div.  $-12.2 \pm 20.0$ , p value=0.046.

#### 347 Discussion

Using single channel ECG in the diagnosis of ischemic heart disease is a potential novel diagnostic strategy. The usage of single channel ECG in optimizing the physical stress test such as bicycle ergometry <sup>[1]</sup>. Additionally, single channel ECG results can be interpreted using machine learning models to increase the diagnostic accuracy and used as a novel risk score for future cardiovascular events <sup>[10]</sup>.

Several ongoing clinical trials to assess the reliability of single channel ECG in the diagnosis
of ischemic heart disease and arrythmia in both adults and children (NCT05756309,
NCT06181799).

Using physical stress tested monitored 12 lead-ECG remains the elementary test for the primary detection of ischemic heart disease. However, severe limitations exist in the diagnostic accuracy related to the ECG artifact during the movement of the patients during the physical stress test.

Improving the diagnostic accuracy of the physical stress test is a point of focus of the cardiological scientific community. Several attempts performed to enhance the diagnosis performance of the physical exertion tests using complementary methods such as the dynamics of cardiac electrical activity (EAS) during exercise testing <sup>[40]</sup>. The study suggests that incorporating the equivalent electric cardiac generator of dipole type during exercise ECG testing can enhance the accuracy of diagnosing coronary artery disease <sup>[40]</sup>.

366 Previous clinical study using a Wearable wireless electrocardiographic (ECG) has shown that the single channel ECG has a poor sensitivity 8.3% (1.0–27.0%) and quite high specificity 367 89.9% (80.2–95.8%) for detection of reversible ischemic heart disease <sup>[41]</sup>. The study 368 concluded that both 12-lead ECG (sensitivity 12.5% (3.0-34.4%), specificity 91.3% (82.0-369 370 96.7%)) and the single channel ECG have poor clinical usefulness in terms of ability to detect 371 ischemic heart disease. Interestingly, a dramatic difference has been observed in the II lead of the 12- lead ECG in compare to the single channel ECG <sup>[41]</sup>. However, other studies 372 373 suggested the use of deep learning models to enhance the diagnostic accuracy (sensitivity) of the ECG for ischemic heart disease in emergency department <sup>[42]</sup>. 374

Advancements in single-channel ECG technology for the detection of ischemic heart disease demonstrated that machine learning models based on single-lead ECG and pulse wave parameters, along with age and gender, can simplify screening diagnostics of ejection fraction

decrease and diastolic dysfunction with high accuracy <sup>[37]</sup>. Furthermore, high-frequency ECG

379 signals have shown increased sensitivity and early timing in diagnosing cardiac ischemia, and

portable high-resolution ECG devices have demonstrated utility in acute emergency settings
 <sup>[43]</sup>.

## 382 Conclusions

Single channel ECG (CARDO-QVARK) have a potential to be used as an additional method for the diagnosis of ischemic heart disease in combination with the physical stress test including bicycle ergometry. Further studies required on a larger sample size needed to confirm the usage of the CARDO-QVARK for the clinical use for the diagnosis of ischemic heart disease.

388 The following CARDO-QVARK parameter are of interest for further investigation to reveal

the hidden diagnostic value in the diagnosis of ischemic heart disease, dltq\_01\_Pan...31,

dltq\_01\_SA, dltq\_01\_JA, dltq\_01\_TE1, and dltq\_01\_TpTe. Further, study on a larger sample

- is ongoing on clinicaltrials.gov (NCT06181799).
- 392 List of abbreviations
- 393 CVD; cardiovascular disease, CTP; stress computed tomography myocardial perfusion394 imaging

# 395 Decelerations

- Ethics approval and consent to participate: the study approved by the Sechenov
   University, Russia, from "Ethics Committee Requirement № 19-23 from 26.10.2023".
- 398 A written consent is taken from the study participants
- 399 2. Consent for publication: applicable on reasonable request
- 400 3. Availability of data and materials: applicable on reasonable request

401 4. Competing interests: The authors declare that they have no competing interests402 regarding publication.

5. Funding's: The work financed by the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the
Russian Federation within the framework of state support for the creation and
development of World-Class Research Center 'Digital biodesign and personalized
healthcare' № 075-15-2022-304.

407 6. Authors' contributions: MB is the writer, researcher, collected and analyzed data,
408 interpreted the results, and revised the final version of the manuscript, MA, collected
409 part of the patients, AS analyzed the exhaled breath, AS biostatistical analysis of the
410 sample, PCh, DG, NV, NM, AAB, SVK, EF, revised the paper, and PhK revised the
411 final version of the manuscript. All authors have read and approved the manuscript.

#### 412 7. Acknowledgments: not applicable

8. Authors' information: Basheer Abdullah Marzoog, World-Class Research Center 413 414 «Digital Biodesign and Personalized Healthcare», I.M. Sechenov First Moscow State Medical University (Sechenov University), 119991 Moscow, Russia; postal address: 415 416 Russia, Moscow, 8-2 Trubetskaya street, 119991. (marzug@mail.ru, +79969602820). 417 ORCID: 0000-0001-5507-2413. Scopus ID: 57486338800. Magomed Abdullaev, World-Class Research Center «Digital Biodesign and Personalized Healthcare», I.M. 418 Sechenov First Moscow State Medical University (Sechenov University), 119991 419 Moscow, Russia; postal address: Russia, Moscow, 8-2 Trubetskaya street, 119991. 420 421 ORCID: 0000-0002-0451-2009. email: m.ba.m@icloud.com. Peter Chomakhidze, 422 World-Class Research Center «Digital Biodesign and Personalized Healthcare», I.M. 423 Sechenov First Moscow State Medical University (Sechenov University), 119991 424 Moscow, Russia; postal address: Russia, Moscow, 8-2 Trubetskaya street, 119991. 425 ORCID: 0000-0003-1485-6072. email: m.ba.m@bk.ru. Daria Gognieva, World-Class Research Center «Digital Biodesign and Personalized Healthcare», I.M. Sechenov First 426 427 Moscow State Medical University (Sechenov University), 119991 Moscow, Russia; 428 postal address: Russia, Moscow, 8-2 Trubetskaya street, 119991. ORCID: 0000-0002-429 0451-2009. email: gognievad\_g@staff.sechenov.ru. Nina Vladimirovna Gagarina, 430 University clinical Hospital number 1, Radiology department, I.M. Sechenov First Moscow State Medical University (Sechenov University), 119991 Moscow, Russia; 431 postal address: Russia, Moscow, 8-2 Trubetskaya street, 119991. Scopus ID: 432 433 6508312251. m.ba98@bk.ru. Natalia Mozzhukhina, University clinical Hospital number 1, Health Management Clinic, I.M. Sechenov First Moscow State Medical 434 University (Sechenov University), 119991 Moscow, Russia; postal address: Russia, 435 119991. ORCID: 436 Moscow. 8-2 Trubetskaya street, 0009-0002-7334-6945. v.t.i.m.b@outlook.com. Sergey Vladimirovich Kostin, National Research Ogarev 437 438 Mordovia State University. Russia, Republic of Mordovia, Saransk, Bolshevistskaya 439 str., 68, Saransk, Mordovia Republic, 430005. email: drmosalah@mail.ru. Alexander 440 Suvorov, World-Class Research Center «Digital Biodesign and Personalized 441 Healthcare», I.M. Sechenov First Moscow State Medical University (Sechenov 442 University), 119991 Moscow, Russia; postal address: Russia, Moscow, 8-2 Trubetskaya 443 street. 119991. email: suvorovayu1@staff.sechenov.ru. Afina Aftandilovna 444 Bestavashvili, World-Class Research Center «Digital Biodesign and Personalized Healthcare», I.M. Sechenov First Moscow State Medical University (Sechenov 445

446 University), 119991 Moscow, Russia; postal address: Russia, Moscow, 8-2 Trubetskaya street, 119991. email: basheermarzoog1998@gmail.com. Ekaterina Fominykha, 447 448 University clinical Hospital number 1, Radiology department, I.M. Sechenov First Moscow State Medical University (Sechenov University), 119991, Moscow, Russia; 449 450 postal address: Russia, Moscow, 8-2 Trubetskaya street, 119991. ORCID: 0000-0003-451 0288-7656. Email: Fominykhev@staff.sechenov.ru. Philipp Kopylov, director of the 452 institute of the Research Center «Digital Biodesign and Personalized Healthcare», I.M. 453 Sechenov First Moscow State Medical University (Sechenov University), 119991 Moscow, Russia; postal address: Russia, Moscow, 8-2 Trubetskaya street, 119991. 454 455 0000-0002-4535-8685. Scopus ID: 6507736224. ORCID: email: 456 kopylovf\_yu@staff.sechenov.ru 457 9. The paper has not been submitted elsewhere 458 459 STANDARDS OF REPORTING 460 STROBE guideline has been followed. 461 462 References 463 [1] Marzoog, B. A. Breathomics Detect the Cardiovascular Disease: Delusion or Dilution 464 of the Metabolomic Signature. Curr. Cardiol. Rev., 2024, 20 (4). 465 https://doi.org/10.2174/011573403X283768240124065853. 466 [2] Abdou, A.; Krishnan, S. Horizons in Single-Lead ECG Analysis From Devices to 467 Data. Front. Signal Process., 2022, 2, 866047. Avram, R.; Ramsis, M.; Cristal, A. D.; Nathan, V.; Zhu, L.; Kim, J.; Kuang, J.; Gao, 468 [3] 469 A.; Vittinghoff, E.; Rohdin-Bibby, L.; et al. Validation of an Algorithm for Continuous 470 Monitoring of Atrial Fibrillation Using a Consumer Smartwatch. Hear. Rhythm, 2021, 471 18 (9), 1482–1490. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrthm.2021.03.044. 472 [4] Perez, M. V.; Mahaffey, K. W.; Hedlin, H.; Rumsfeld, J. S.; Garcia, A.; Ferris, T.; 473 Balasubramanian, V.; Russo, A. M.; Rajmane, A.; Cheung, L.; et al. Large-Scale 474 Assessment of a Smartwatch to Identify Atrial Fibrillation. N. Engl. J. Med., 2019, 381 475 (20), 1909–1917. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa1901183. 476 [5] Tison, G. H.; Sanchez, J. M.; Ballinger, B.; Singh, A.; Olgin, J. E.; Pletcher, M. J.; 477 Vittinghoff, E.; Lee, E. S.; Fan, S. M.; Gladstone, R. A.; et al. Passive Detection of 478 Atrial Fibrillation Using a Commercially Available Smartwatch. JAMA Cardiol., 2018, 479 3 (5), 409–416. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamacardio.2018.0136.

480	[6]	Inui, T.; Kohno, H.; Kawasaki, Y.; Matsuura, K.; Ueda, H.; Tamura, Y.; Watanabe,
481		M.; Inage, Y.; Yakita, Y.; Wakabayashi, Y.; et al. Use of a Smart Watch for Early
482		Detection of Paroxysmal Atrial Fibrillation: Validation Study. JMIR Cardio, 2020, 4
483		(1). https://doi.org/10.2196/14857.
484	[7]	Koshy, A. N.; Sajeev, J. K.; Nerlekar, N.; Brown, A. J.; Rajakariar, K.; Zureik, M.;
485		Wong, M. C.; Roberts, L.; Street, M.; Cooke, J.; et al. Smart Watches for Heart Rate
486		Assessment in Atrial Arrhythmias. Int. J. Cardiol., 2018, 266, 124-127.
487		https://doi.org/10.1016/J.IJCARD.2018.02.073.
488	[8]	Nazarian, S.; Lam, K.; Darzi, A.; Ashrafian, H. Diagnostic Accuracy of Smartwatches
489		for the Detection of Cardiac Arrhythmia: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. J.
490		Med. Internet Res., 2021, 23 (8). https://doi.org/10.2196/28974.
491	[9]	Fatimah, B.; Singh, P.; Singhal, A.; Pramanick, D.; Pranav, S.; Pachori, R. B. Efficient
492		Detection of Myocardial Infarction from Single Lead ECG Signal. Biomed. Signal
493		Process. Control, 2021, 68, 102678. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.BSPC.2021.102678.
494	[10]	Issa, M. F.; Yousry, A.; Tuboly, G.; Juhasz, Z.; AbuEl-Atta, A. H.; Selim, M. M.
495		Heartbeat Classification Based on Single Lead-II ECG Using Deep Learning. Heliyon,
496		<b>2023</b> , 9 (7), e17974. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e17974.
497	[11]	Zhao, X.; Zhang, J.; Gong, Y.; Xu, L.; Liu, H.; Wei, S.; Wu, Y.; Cha, G.; Wei, H.;
498		Mao, J.; et al. Reliable Detection of Myocardial Ischemia Using Machine Learning
499		Based on Temporal-Spatial Characteristics of Electrocardiogram and
500		Vectorcardiogram. Front. Physiol., 2022, 13, 854191.
501		https://doi.org/10.3389/FPHYS.2022.854191/BIBTEX.
502	[12]	Smith, W. M.; Riddell, F.; Madon, M.; Gleva, M. J. Comparison of Diagnostic Value
503		Using a Small, Single Channel, P-Wave Centric Sternal ECG Monitoring Patch with a
504		Standard 3-Lead Holter System over 24 Hours. Am. Heart J., 2017, 185, 67-73.
505		https://doi.org/10.1016/J.AHJ.2016.11.006.
506	[13]	Xintarakou, A.; Sousonis, V.; Asvestas, D.; Vardas, P. E.; Tzeis, S. Remote Cardiac
507		Rhythm Monitoring in the Era of Smart Wearables: Present Assets and Future
508		Perspectives. Front. Cardiovasc. Med., 2022, 9, 853614.
509		https://doi.org/10.3389/FCVM.2022.853614/BIBTEX.
510	[14]	Krasteva, V.; Jekova, I.; Schmid, R. Perspectives of Human Verification via Binary
511		QRS Template Matching of Single-Lead and 12-Lead Electrocardiogram. PLoS One,
512		2018, 13 (5). https://doi.org/10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0197240.
513	[15]	Attia, Z. I.; Harmon, D. M.; Dugan, J.; Manka, L.; Lopez-Jimenez, F.; Lerman, A.;

514		Siontis, K. C.; Noseworthy, P. A.; Yao, X.; Klavetter, E. W.; et al. Prospective
515		Evaluation of Smartwatch-Enabled Detection of Left Ventricular Dysfunction. Nat.
516		Med., 2022, 28 (12), 2497–2503. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-022-02053-1.
517	[16]	Gu, H. Y.; Huang, J.; Liu, X.; Qiao, S. Q.; Cao, X. Effectiveness of Single-Lead ECG
518		Devices for Detecting Atrial Fibrillation: An Overview of Systematic Reviews.
519		Worldviews on Evidence-Based Nursing. John Wiley and Sons Inc 2023.
520		https://doi.org/10.1111/wvn.12667.
521	[17]	Rajakariar, K.; Koshy, A. N.; Sajeev, J. K.; Nair, S.; Roberts, L.; Teh, A. W. Accuracy
522		of a Smartwatch Based Single-Lead Electrocardiogram Device in Detection of Atrial
523		Fibrillation. Heart, 2020, 106 (9), 665-670. https://doi.org/10.1136/HEARTJNL-2019-
524		316004.
525	[18]	Sološenko, A.; Petrenas, A.; Paliakaite, B.; Sörnmo, L.; Marozas, V. Detection of
526		Atrial Fibrillation Using a Wrist-Worn Device. Physiol. Meas., 2019, 40 (2).
527		https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6579/AB029C.
528	[19]	Fan, Y. Y.; Li, Y. G.; Li, J.; Cheng, W. K.; Shan, Z. L.; Wang, Y. T.; Guo, Y. T.
529		Diagnostic Performance of a Smart Device with Photoplethysmography Technology
530		for Atrial Fibrillation Detection: Pilot Study (Pre-Mafa II Registry). JMIR mHealth
531		uHealth, 2019, 7 (3). https://doi.org/10.2196/11437.
532	[20]	Bumgarner, J. M.; Lambert, C. T.; Hussein, A. A.; Cantillon, D. J.; Baranowski, B.;
533		Wolski, K.; Lindsay, B. D.; Wazni, O. M.; Tarakji, K. G. Smartwatch Algorithm for
534		Automated Detection of Atrial Fibrillation. J. Am. Coll. Cardiol., 2018, 71 (21), 2381-
535		2388. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JACC.2018.03.003.
536	[21]	Vardas, P.; Cowie, M.; Dagres, N.; Asvestas, D.; Tzeis, S.; Vardas, E. P.; Hindricks,
537		G.; Camm, J. The Electrocardiogram Endeavour: From the Holter Single-Lead
538		Recordings to Multilead Wearable Devices Supported by Computational Machine
539		Learning Algorithms. <i>Europace</i> , <b>2020</b> , <i>22</i> (1), 19–23.
540		https://doi.org/10.1093/EUROPACE/EUZ249.
541	[22]	Bayoumy, K.; Gaber, M.; Elshafeey, A.; Mhaimeed, O.; Dineen, E. H.; Marvel, F. A.;
542		Martin, S. S.; Muse, E. D.; Turakhia, M. P.; Tarakji, K. G.; et al. Smart Wearable
543		Devices in Cardiovascular Care: Where We Are and How to Move Forward. Nat. Rev.
544		Cardiol., 2021, 18 (8), 581-599. https://doi.org/10.1038/S41569-021-00522-7.
545	[23]	Nault, I.; André, P.; Plourde, B.; Leclerc, F.; Sarrazin, J. F.; Philippon, F.; O'Hara, G.;
546		Molin, F.; Steinberg, C.; Roy, K.; et al. Validation of a Novel Single Lead Ambulatory
547		ECG Monitor – Cardiostat <sup>TM</sup> – Compared to a Standard ECG Holter Monitoring. J.

548		Electrocardiol., <b>2019</b> , 53, 57–63.
549		https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JELECTROCARD.2018.12.011.
550	[24]	Limitations of the Conventional ECG: Utility of Other Techniques. In Clinical
551		Electrocardiography: A Textbook; wiley, 2021; pp 552–570.
552		https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119536475.ch25.
553	[25]	Braun, T.; Spiliopoulos, S.; Veltman, C.; Hergesell, V.; Passow, A.; Tenderich, G.;
554		Borggrefe, M.; Koerner, M. M. Detection of Myocardial Ischemia Due to Clinically
555		Asymptomatic Coronary Artery Stenosis at Rest Using Supervised Artificial
556		Intelligence-Enabled Vectorcardiography – A Five-Fold Cross Validation of Accuracy.
557		J. Electrocardiol., <b>2020</b> , 59, 100–105.
558		https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jelectrocard.2019.12.018.
559	[26]	Beck, S.; Martínez Pereyra, V.; Seitz, A.; Bekeredjian, R.; Sechtem, U.; Ong, P.
560		Detection of ECG alterations typical for myocardial ischemia: New methods 2021.
561		Internist, 2021. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00108-021-01037-6.
562	[27]	Hilbel, T.; Frey, N. Review of Current ECG Consumer Electronics (Pros and Cons). J.
563		Electrocardiol., 2023, 77, 23–28. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jelectrocard.2022.11.010.
564	[28]	Kuznetsova, N.; Gubina, A.; Sagirova, Z.; Dhif, I.; Gognieva, D.; Melnichuk, A.;
565		Orlov, O.; Syrkina, E.; Sedov, V.; Chomakhidze, P.; et al. Left Ventricular Diastolic
566		Dysfunction Screening by a Smartphone-Case Based on Single Lead ECG. Clin. Med.
567		Insights Cardiol., 2022, 16. https://doi.org/10.1177/11795468221120088.
568	[29]	Gognieva, D.; Vishnyakova, N.; Mitina, Y.; Chomakhidze, P.; Mesitskaya, D.;
569		Kuznetsova, N.; Khiari, M.; Ryabykina, G.; Boytsov, S.; Syrkin, A.; et al. Remote
570		Screening for Atrial Fibrillation by a Federal Cardiac Monitoring System in Primary
571		Care Patients in Russia: Results from the Prospective Interventional Multicenter
572		FECAS-AFS Study. Glob. Heart, 2022, 17 (1). https://doi.org/10.5334/gh.1057.
573	[30]	Sagirova, Z.; Kuznetsova, N.; Gogiberidze, N.; Gognieva, D.; Suvorov, A.;
574		Chomakhidze, P.; Omboni, S.; Saner, H.; Kopylov, P. Cuffless Blood Pressure
575		Measurement Using a Smartphone-Case Based ECG Monitor with
576		Photoplethysmography in Hypertensive Patients. Sensors, 2021, 21 (10), 3525.
577		https://doi.org/10.3390/s21103525.
578	[31]	Shirai, K.; Hiruta, N.; Song, M.; Kurosu, T.; Suzuki, J.; Tomaru, T.; Miyashita, Y.;
579		Saiki, A.; Takahashi, M.; Suzuki, K.; et al. Cardio-Ankle Vascular Index (CAVI) as a
580		Novel Indicator of Arterial Stiffness: Theory, Evidence and Perspectives. J.
581		Atheroscler. Thromb., 2011, 18 (11), 924–938. https://doi.org/10.5551/jat.7716.

582	[32]	Cockcroft, D. W.; Gault, M. H. Prediction of Creatinine Clearance from Serum
583		Creatinine. Nephron, 1976, 16 (1), 31-41. https://doi.org/10.1159/000180580.
584	[33]	Winter, M. A.; Guhr, K. N.; Berg, G. M. Impact of Various Body Weights and Serum
585		Creatinine Concentrations on the Bias and Accuracy of the Cockcroft-Gault Equation.
586		Pharmacotherapy, 2012, 32 (7), 604-612. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1875-
587		9114.2012.01098.x.
588	[34]	Brown, D. L.; Masselink, A. J.; Lalla, C. D. Functional Range of Creatinine Clearance
589		for Renal Drug Dosing: A Practical Solution to the Controversy of Which Weight to
590		Use in the Cockcroft-Gault Equation. Ann. Pharmacother., 2013, 47 (7-8), 1039-
591		1044. https://doi.org/10.1345/aph.1S176.
592	[35]	Delgado, C.; Baweja, M.; Crews, D. C.; Eneanya, N. D.; Gadegbeku, C. A.; Inker, L.
593		A.; Mendu, M. L.; Miller, W. G.; Moxey-Mims, M. M.; Roberts, G. V.; et al. A
594		Unifying Approach for GFR Estimation: Recommendations of the NKF-ASN Task
595		Force on Reassessing the Inclusion of Race in Diagnosing Kidney Disease. Am. J.
596		Kidney Dis., 2022, 79 (2), 268-288.e1. https://doi.org/10.1053/j.ajkd.2021.08.003.
597	[36]	Sagirova, Z. N.; Kuznetsova, N. O.; Suvorov, A. Y.; Gognieva, D. G.; Kulikov, V. M.;
598		Chomakhidze, P. S.; Andreev, D. A.; Kopylov, P. Y. Assessment of Left Ventricular
599		Systolic Function Using a Single-Channel ECG Monitor with Photoplethysmography
600		Based on Machine Learning Models. Kardiol. i serdechno-sosudistaya khirurgiya,
601		2023, 16 (1), 46. https://doi.org/10.17116/kardio20231601146.
602	[37]	Kuznetsova, N.; Sagirova, Z.; Suvorov, A.; Dhif, I.; Gognieva, D.; Afina, B.;
603		Poltavskaya, M.; Sedov, V.; Chomakhidze, P.; Kopylov, P. A Screening Method for
604		Predicting Left Ventricular Dysfunction Based on Spectral Analysis of a Single-
605		Channel Electrocardiogram Using Machine Learning Algorithms. Biomed. Signal
606		Process. Control, 2023, 86, 105219. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bspc.2023.105219.
607	[38]	Cawley, G. C.; Talbot, N. L. C. On Over-Fitting in Model Selection and Subsequent
608		Selection Bias in Performance Evaluation. J. Mach. Learn. Res., 2010, 11, 2079–2107.
609	[39]	Marius, O. U.; Happiness, OI. An Extended McNemar Test for Comparing
610		Correlated Proportion of Positive Responses. Biometrics Biostat. Int. J., 2019, 8 (4),
611		125-137. https://doi.org/10.15406/bbij.2019.08.00281.
612	[40]	Kramm, M. N.; Strelkov, N. O.; Chomakhidze, P. S.; Kopylov, F. Y. Study of
613		Additional Diagnostic Signs of Myocardial Ischemia. Kardiol. i serdechno-sosudistaya
614		khirurgiya, 2016, 9 (1), 52. https://doi.org/10.17116/kardio20169152-57.
615	[41]	Fabricius Ekenberg, L.; Høfsten, D. E.; Rasmussen, S. M.; Mølgaard, J.; Hasbak, P.;

616		Sørensen, H. B. D.; Meyhoff, C. S.; Aasvang, E. K. Wireless Single-Lead versus
617		Standard 12-Lead ECG, for ST-Segment Deviation during Adenosine Cardiac Stress
618		Scintigraphy. Sensors, 2023, 23 (6), 2962. https://doi.org/10.3390/s23062962.
619	[42]	Lee, B. T.; Kwon, J.; Cho, J.; Bae, W.; Park, H.; Seo, WW.; Cho, I.; Lee, Y.; Park, J.;
620		Oh, BH.; et al. Usefulness of Deep-Learning Algorithm for Detecting Acute
621		Myocardial Infarction Using Electrocardiogram Alone in Patients With Chest Pain at
622		Emergency Department: DAMI-ECG Study. J. Cardiovasc. Interv., 2023, 2 (2), 100.
623		https://doi.org/10.54912/jci.2022.0028.
624	[43]	Srinivasan, A.; Vijayalakshmi, K.; Padmanabhan, D.; Shanmugam, K. Early Detection
625		of Ischaemia Through High Frequency ECGs: The Role of Medical-Grade Wearables
626		for Chest Pain Triages. In 2022 IEEE International Conference on Electronics,
627		Computing and Communication Technologies, CONECCT 2022; Institute of Electrical
628		and Electronics Engineers Inc.: B. M. S College of Engineering, Dept. of Ece,
629		Karnataka, Bangalore, India, 2022.
630		https://doi.org/10.1109/CONECCT55679.2022.9865756.
631		

## 632 Figure legends



633

Figure 2: There is a significant difference between the results of the diagnostic accuracy of the load test (55.3 %) and the built model (68.4%), based on our study results. Obviously, the model has better predictive properties, P value = 0.0001.

#### 637 Table legends

Table 5A: Categorical variables presented in absolute and relative values of the study for true incidence of the stated factor. Abbreviations: CPT; stress myocardial perfusion computer tomography imaging.  $X^2$  test used as a comparative test. \* Values statically significant difference. Abbreviations: METs; metabolic equivalent.

(n=19).	Group 2 (n=19).	р
P	Negative	
	СТР	
P		Negative CTP

Gender	F	10 (52.6%)	7 (36.8%)	0.32
				8
	М	9 (47.4%)	12 (63.2%)	
Obesity stage	1 degree	3 (15.8%)	3 (15.8%)	>0.9
				99
	Normal	8 (42.1%)	9 (47.4%)	
	Overweig	8 (42.1%)	7 (36.8%)	
	ht			
Atherosclerotic vascular	Carotid	1 (9.1%)	0 (0.0%)	>0.9
(Namely)				99
	Carotid.	10 (90.9%)	4 (100.0%)	
	Brachioce			
	phalic			
	bifurcation			
Stage of hypertension	Ι	2 (25.0%)	1 (7.1%)	0.17
				9
	II	3 (37.5%)	11 (78.6%)	
	III	3 (37.5%)	2 (14.3%)	
Degree of hypertension	Degree 1	4 (50.0%)	7 (50.0%)	0.36
				6
	Degree 2	1 (12.5%)	5 (35.7%)	
	Degree 3	3 (37.5%)	2 (14.3%)	
Risk of cardiovascular disease	High	3 (15.8%)	7 (36.8%)	0.48
	6			6
	Low	7 (36.8%)	4 (21.1%)	
	Moderate	7 (36.8%)	7 (36.8%)	
	Very high	2 (10.5%)	1 (5.3%)	
Blood pressure reaction type	Asthenic	2 (10.5%)	1 (5.3%)	0.30
on stress test				2
	Hypertoni	1 (5.3%)	1 (5.3%)	
	c			
	Hypotonic	3 (15.8%)	0 (0.0%)	
	Mild	1 (5.3%)	1 (5.3%)	
				1

	Hypertoni			
	c			
	Normotoni	12 (63.2%)	16 (84.2%)	
	с			
Watt	75	4 (21.1%)	7 (36.8%)	0.16 7
	100	8 (42.1%)	2 (10.5%)	
	125	4 (21.1%)	3 (15.8%)	
	150	1 (5.3%)	2 (10.5%)	
	175	0 (0.0%)	2 (10.5%)	
	200	1 (5.3%)	3 (15.8%)	
	250	1 (5.3%)	0 (0.0%)	
Functional class by Watt	FC-I	2 (40.0%)	3 (42.9%)	>0.9
				99
	FC-II	3 (60.0%)	4 (57.1%)	
Functional class by METs	FC-I	1 (20.0%)	3 (42.9%)	0.73
				5
	FC-II	4 (80.0%)	3 (42.9%)	
	FC-III	0 (0.0%)	1 (14.3%)	
Reaction type to stress test	Negative	8 (42.1%)	9 (47.4%)	0.59
(positive/negative)				3
	Positive	5 (26.3%)	7 (36.8%)	
	Suspected	6 (31.6%)	3 (15.8%)	
Reason of discontinuation of	Horizontal	2 (10.5%)	4 (21.1%)	0.66
the stress test	ST			0
	depression			
	>1mm			
	Reach	17 (89.5%)	15 (78.9%)	
	goal HR			
Tolerance to exertion on stress	Close to	2 (10.5%)	2 (10.5%)	0.83
test	high			0
	High	2 (10.5%)	2 (10.5%)	
	Low	0 (0.0%)	1 (5.3%)	

	Moderate	13 (68.4%)	10 (52.6%)	
	Very high	2 (10.5%)	4 (21.1%)	
Biological estimated vascular	High	10 (52.6%)	9 (47.4%)	0.74
age				6
	Normal	9 (47.4%)	10 (52.6%)	
				0.07
	Ι	6 (31.6%)	10 (52.6%)	8
	II	9 (47.4%)	9 (47.4%)	
CKD stage	IIIa	4 (21.1%)	0 (0.0%)	

642

643 Table 1B: The continuous variables of the sample presented as a mean  $\pm$  standard deviation 644 (Std. div.), Student test as independent variables used. \* Values statically significant 645 difference. Abbreviations: SBP; systolic blood pressure, DBP; diastolic blood pressure, BMI, 646 body mass index, HR; heart rate, METs; metabolic equivalent, R-CAVI; right Cardio-ankle vascular index, L-CAVI; left Cardio-ankle vascular index, RABI; right ankle-brachial index, 647 648 LABI; left ankle-brachial index, SBP B; systolic blood pressure brachial, DBP B; diastolic 649 blood pressure brachial, BP RB; blood pressure right brachial, BP RA ; blood pressure right 650 ankle, BP LA; blood pressure left ankle, BP A; blood pressure ankle, ABI; ankle-brachial 651 index, RTb; right brachial pulse, LTb; left brachial pulse, Tb; mean brachial pulse, Tba; mean 652 brachial-ankle pulse, Lha (cm); length heart-ankle, haPWV (m/s); heart-ankle pulse wave 653 velocity.

Index	Group 1 (n=19). Positive	Group 2 (n=19). Negative	р
	CTP. Mean ± Std. div.	CTP. Mean $\pm$ Std. div.	
Age	$56.9 \pm 6.2$	$60.6 \pm 12.1$	0.2
			38
Pulse rest	$73.2 \pm 9.6$	$71.3 \pm 11.1$	0.5
			78
SBP rest	$124.4 \pm 9.4$	$120.6 \pm 14.8$	0.3
			54
DBP rest	79.1 ± 11.1	$76.6\pm8.2$	0.4
			29
Body weight	$77.8 \pm 17.4$	$74.0\pm10.6$	0.4
			18

Height	$173.2 \pm 10.3$	$169.4 \pm 8.9$	0.2
			40
BMI	25.8 ± 4.3	$25.9 \pm 4.1$	0.9
			39
Goal heart rate (HR)	163.1 ± 6.2	$159.4 \pm 12.1$	0.2
			38
Maximum HR	149.5 ± 11.2	$146.7 \pm 19.7$	0.7
			48
Reached % of the target			0.6
HR on stress test	$91.8 \pm 8.2$	$92.6 \pm 14.9$	65
METs			0.7
	$6.7\pm2.0$	$6.5 \pm 2.1$	15
Ejection fraction (%)	64.6 ± 4.1	$65.3 \pm 5.4$	0.7
			26
Biological estimated	58.1 ± 7.6	$62.6 \pm 13.9$	0.2
vessel age			22
R-CAVI	$8.5 \pm 0.8$	9.1 ± 1.8	0.2
			92
L-CAVI	8.5 ± 0.7	9.0 ± 1.7	0.2
			31
RABI	$1.2 \pm 0.1$	$1.1 \pm 0.1$	0.1
			81
LABI	$1.2 \pm 0.1$	$1.1 \pm 0.1$	0.0
			82
Mean SBP B	$130.1 \pm 8.7$	133.2 ± 16.2	0.4
			65
Mean DBP B	82.9 ± 8.4	83.5 ± 9.0	0.8
			17
BP RB (=(SBP+DBP)/2)	$100.7 \pm 10.0$	102.8 ± 14.0	0.5
			89
BP LB	$10\overline{1.8 \pm 10.6}$	103.7 ± 12.7	0.6
(=(SBP+DBP)/2)			31
Mean BP B= (BP RB+	$101.3 \pm 10.1$	$103.3 \pm 13.2$	0.6

BP LB )/2			03
BP RA	$105.3 \pm 10.7$	$108.3 \pm 14.1$	0.4
(=(SBP+DBP)/2)			73
BP LA	106.6 ± 9.6	106.9 ± 11.1	0.9
(=(SBP+DBP)/2)			26
Mean BP A= (BP RA +	106.0 ± 9.6	107.6 ± 12.1	0.6
BP LA )/2			47
Mean ABI=	$1.2 \pm 0.1$	$1.1 \pm 0.1$	0.1
(RABI+LABI)/2			01
RTb	$79.4\pm8.9$	78.7 ± 11.5	0.8
			39
LTb	$73.3\pm6.5$	$74.8 \pm 10.7$	0.5
			99
Mean Tb =( RTb+	$76.3\pm7.0$	$76.8 \pm 10.8$	0.8
LTb)/2			88
Right Tba	88.5 ± 10.9	77.4 ± 22.1	0.1
			25
Left Tba	87.7 ± 9.0	$79.0 \pm 20.8$	0.1
			44
Mean Tba =( Right	88.1 ± 9.8	$78.2 \pm 21.3$	0.1
Tba+ Left Tba)/2			29
Lha (cm)	$150.8 \pm 8.4$	$147.7 \pm 7.2$	0.2
			40
haPWV (m/s)	$0.9 \pm 0.1$	$1.0 \pm 0.2$	0.2
			34
$\beta$ -stiffness index from	$3.0 \pm 0.6$	3.3 ± 1.2	0.6
PWV			86
Creatinine (µmol/L)	83.9 ± 11.9	86.4 ± 19.4	0.6
			36
eGFR (2021 CKD-EPI	84.5 ± 13.7	79.6 ± 17.4	0.3
Creatinine)			45

654

655

656	Table 6:	The qualit	v of the bic	vcle ergometry	v appeared o	uite low	in our cohort.
000	1 aoie 0.	The quant	<i>y</i> or the ore	yere ergometr	, uppeureu q		m our conort.

	Point estimate	95%CI
Chars		
AUC	0.553	[0.406;0.695]
Sensitivity	0.263	[0.067; 0.474]
Specificity	0.632	[0.409 ; 0.833]
Negative predictive value	0.462	[0.269 ; 0.654]
Positive predictive value	0.417	[0.143 ; 0.714]

657

Table 7: The 20 most statically significant features according to the build model. Dltq\_01

659 indicates the difference between the selected single channel ECG features immediately after

660 the stress minus the selected features before the stress test.

	Feature	Lasso absolute coefficient
21.	dltq_01_Pan31	0.589804
22.	dltq_01_SA	0.509832
23.	dltq_01_JA	0.37366
24.	dltq_01_TE1	0.270038
25.	dltq_01_TpTe	0.258854
26.	dltq_01_HFNoise	0.248446
27.	dltq_01_PpeakN	0.206324
28.	dltq_01_QRS11energy	0.190459
29.	dltq_01_TA	0.15963
30.	dltq_01_Sbeta	0.150864
31.	dltq_01_TE3	0.138504
32.	dltq_01_Tenergy	0.125174
33.	dltq_01_TE4	0.116375
34.	dltq_01_Tpenergy	0.106516
35.	dltq_01_QTc	0.102957
36.	dltq_01_TE2	0.102495

37.	dltq_01_HFQRS	0.090197
38.	dltq_01_SDNN	0.082806
39.	dltq_01_QRSE1	0.082143
40.	dltq_01_QRSw	0.063462

661

Table 8:The quality of the single channel ECG in the diagnosis of ischemic heart disease

663 using the CARDO-QVARK .

Chars	Point estimate	95%CI
AUC	0.684	[0.527;0.817]
Sensitivity	0.737	[0.533;0.929]
Specificity	0.632	[0.391 ; 0.833]
Negative	0.706	[0.47; 0.917]
predictive value		
Positive predictive	0.667	[0.444 ; 0.857]
value		

664

665

666