

End-to-end SYNTAX score prediction: benchmark and methods

Alexander Ponomarchuk¹, Ivan Kruzhilov¹, Galina Zubkova¹, Artem Shadrin²,
Ruslan Utegenov², Ivan Bessonov², and Pavel Blinov¹

¹ Sber AI Lab

² Tyumen Cardiology Research Center, Tomsk National Research Medical Center of
Russian Academy of Science

Abstract. The SYNTAX score has become a widely used measure of coronary disease severity, crucial in selecting the optimal mode of revascularization. This paper introduces a new medical regression and classification problem — automatically estimating SYNTAX score from coronary angiography. Our study presents a comprehensive dataset of 1,844 patients, featuring a balanced distribution of individuals with zero and non-zero scores. This dataset includes a first-of-its-kind, complete coronary angiography samples captured through a multi-view X-ray video, allowing one to observe coronary arteries from multiple perspectives. Furthermore, we present a novel, fully automatic end-to-end method for estimating the SYNTAX. For such a difficult task, we have achieved a solid coefficient of determination R^2 of 0.51 in score predictions.

Keywords: SYNTAX, stenosis, multi-view image processing, 3D medical imaging, dataset

1 Introduction

Nowadays, heart disease is the leading cause of death in all developed societies [10]. Coronary angiography is the primary visualization method used to examine a diseased heart. Cardiology community proposed a particular score to quantify and comprehensively assess the damage severity of the heart’s coronary vessels from angiography. The SYNTAX (SYNergy between percutaneous coronary intervention with TAXus and cardiac surgery) score is a widely used [2,15,20] and validated risk assessment tool for selecting revascularization strategies in patients with multi-vessel coronary disease [35]. Using the SYNTAX score has proven beneficial in clinical decision-making and has been widely adopted in medical research and clinical practice.

However, despite the widespread use of the SYNTAX score, there is still no fully automatic tool for its calculation. Cardiologists continue using semi-automatic SYNTAX calculator tools in their daily work, which are highly subjective, time-consuming, and error-prone. As noted by [4], there is substantial variability in the scoring among different physicians due to the meticulous work




Fig. 1: SYNTAX score evaluation scheme. (a) Weighting factors for artery branches [14]. (b) Constituent factors of SYNTAX score.

involved. A fully automatic SYNTAX score prediction could address these issues and substantially boost the cardiologists’ performance.

The SYNTAX score estimation is a multi-step process, as shown in Fig. 1. This scoring system considers various factors, such as the number and complexity of lesions, thrombus presence, etc. First, the score estimation begins with classifying coronary dominance type, whether right or left, as the downstream weighting factors depend on the dominance type. The next step involves selecting the artery segment with stenosis (Fig. 2a) or occlusion (Fig. 2d), followed by indicating additional characteristics - calcification (Fig. 2c), bifurcation (Fig. 2b etc. Finally, the significance scores, assigned to the lesions according to study [35], are multiplied by a weighting factor, as illustrated in Fig. 1a, and added to the total SYNTAX score. It is worth noting that a higher numeric value of an artery branch indicates a deeper position or lower importance in the coronary tree, with subsequent segments always having a higher number than the segments they originate from. These factors together make the problem of automatic SYNTAX estimation challenging for independent computer vision algorithms.

Moreover, a raw angiographic study is a dynamic X-ray video of the heart obtained by injecting a contrast agent into a coronary artery. That means that typical angiography includes several views. Each view captures the heart’s pulsation differently, allowing it to state the SYNTAX score estimation as a multi-view image processing problem. Since not all projections are equally informative, it is essential to intelligently aggregate information from them.

Our main contributions can be summarized as follows:

- We propose a novel, fully automatic end-to-end method for SYNTAX score estimation using X-ray coronary angiography. Compared to experts, our method achieves a solid R^2 of 0.51, with great potential for further research and improvement.
- We introduce a new and extensive coronary angiogram dataset comprising multi-view X-ray videos and their corresponding SYNTAX scores. This




Fig. 2: An example of anomalies in right coronary artery. (a) Stenosis. (b) Bifurcation. (c) Calcific stenosis. (d) Total occlusion

dataset is the first collection of X-ray coronary angiograms to date, providing a valuable resource for future research.

- We establish a novel benchmark for SYNTAX score estimation. Two interventional cardiologists independently labeled 60 studies from our dataset, which allows us to estimate the intra-level disagreement in SYNTAX score prediction ($R^2 \approx 0.7$, $STD \approx 8.5$).

2 Related works

When following well-established guidelines [35] for SYNTAX score estimation, the steps needed to perform are:

- RCA (Right Coronary Artery) and LCA classification (Left Coronary Artery),
- Coronary dominance classification,
- Segmentation of arteries and their branches,
- Stenosis or occlusion detection,
- Estimation of specific characteristics,
- Final calculation of the score.

The studies [13,26] have successfully addressed the problem of RCA and LCA classification, achieving an impressive F1-score of 99%. Building on this progress, the work [19] has further contributed to the field by developing a method for classifying coronary dominance using only the RCA with a Recall macro above 90%. However, to improve the classification quality further, the authors have suggested incorporating additional information, such as labeling occlusions and utilizing LCA data. In particular, several studies have proposed various artery segmentation [5,16,27,29,37,39,40,41] and stenosis detection techniques [3,7,8,17,32].

2.1 SYNTAX datasets

Using publicly available datasets is crucial for advancing research in computer vision methods for coronary artery disease. However, our analysis of this topic has

revealed that most studies rely on private datasets, with only three are publicly available and non of them contains SYNTAX. One study [5] published 134 X-ray coronary frames with segmented arteries, each represented by a frame with 300*300 resolution. Another study [8] provided a dataset of 8,325 angiogram frames with labeled stenosis areas collected from 100 patients using Siemens and GE cardiovascular imaging systems, with a frame resolution 512*512. The most recent study [31] introduced an ARCAD dataset containing 1500 frames for stenosis detection and 1500 frames segmented into 26 classes according to the SYNTAX description, with a resolution 512*512. It is worth noting that this dataset includes no more than 12 frames from a single patient and is acquired from two different cardio vascular imaging systems - Philips Azurion 3 and Siemens Artis Zee.

The scarcity and selective nature of publicly available datasets and the lack of shared code with pre-trained weights make it challenging to integrate the previous study into a single pipeline for estimating the SYNTAX score.

2.2 Automatic SYNTAX estimation

The study [12] fulfilled most of the necessary steps for estimating SYNTAX scores based on angiography images, except for coronary dominance classification. The authors annotated 20 segments of coronary arteries and the bounding box areas of lesions, including stenosis, total occlusion, calcification, thrombus, and dissection, achieving an average Recall of 89.7% for detecting these five types of lesions. In future works, the authors intend to estimate the SYNTAX score. However, as of 2024, they have not yet managed to do so.

End-to-end estimation is an alternative to the step-by-step approach to estimating SYNTAX scores. To our knowledge, there is not researches attempted to estimate a SYNTAX score using angiograms. However, two approaches try to estimate SYNTAX scores based on medical tables. The study [1] used XGBoost to predict SYNTAX scores based on 53 variables: age, sex, smoking status, brain natriuretic peptide level, left ventricular ejection fraction, etc. The study found that the model achieved an accuracy of approximately 7.0 standard deviations and an R^2 value of 0.54 compared to the ground truth, in their study [28], used demographic, clinical, biochemical, protein, and metabolite variables to estimate the severity of coronary artery disease (CAD). They classified patients into two categories based on their SYNTAX scores: those with scores greater than one and those with less than or equal to 1. The ROC AUC for this classification reached 72.5%, indicating satisfactory performance distinguishing between the two groups. Although such noninvasive methods help predict CAD risk, they cannot be applicable to determine the best mode of revascularization.

3 Coronary angiogram dataset for SYNTAX score

This retrospective study included 1,844 patients who underwent invasive coronary angiography at the *** Cardiology Research Center between March 2022

and November 2023.³ The collection procedure for invasive coronary angiography followed the most recent guidelines, utilizing an interventional angiography system, Philips Allura Clarity (USA), with an iopromide contrast agent and a frame rate of 15 fps.

An angiographic study of a patient consists of coronary angiography (CA) views (projections), which are medical imaging tools that allow scientists to observe the body in a 3D space and capture it in 2D image planes. The CA projections are not synchronized temporally. This technique uses X-ray technology to produce video images of the internal organs and blood vessels. The examination includes LCA and RCA projections. On average, there are 1-3 RCA projections and 3-5 LCA projections. A single CA projection contains approximately 20-60 frames, with pixels linearly normalized to the range 0-255. Automatic annotation of RCA and LCA images is performed rather than manual classification, as the classification task has an accuracy above 99% [13,26].

Table 1: dataset size

Number of	LCA	RCA	Total
Patients	-N/A-	-N/A-	1,844
Angiographic views	9,590	3,970	13,560
Frames	469,557	201,591	671,148

For further information on the size of the dataset, please refer to Table 1, which provides information on the number of angiographic views, frames, and split by RCA and LCA. The average age of patients in the dataset is 63.6 years. Additionally, 59% of patients in the study were male, and 41% were female.

Three interventional cardiologists, each with 3 to 15 years of experience, participated in the data labeling process. Each cardiologist labeled only their own portion of the data.

Our dataset contains an equal number of cases with a zero and non-zero SYNTAX score. This property allows us to predict the SYNTAX score and classify patients with zero and non-zero scores. It is an advantage of our dataset, as invasive angiography typically refers to people with a CAD condition [34]. The SYNTAX score distribution is shown in Table 2. The dataset includes the total SYNTAX score for a patient and separate scores for the RCA and LCA vessels. It also consists of a tag if a patient had a coronary artery bypass (187 patients).

³ The study complied with the principles of the Helsinki Declaration, and the protocol was approved by a local ethics committee (protocol № ***).

Table 2: SYNTAX score distribution

score	0	1	2-5	6-10	11-20	20+	Max
RCA	88.3%	0.12%	6.12%	4.70%	0.75%	0.03%	23.0
LCA	65.00%	0.50%	9.20%	7.97%	9.39%	7.92%	61.0
Total	52.0%	0.38%	13.5%	9.6%	12.1%	12.4%	67.0

3.1 Disagreement of the experts

We conduct the following experiment to estimate an order of magnitude of experts’ disagreement in SYNTAX score labeling. Two interventional cardiologists (one with ten and the other with three years of experience) labeled 60 studies sampled from our dataset. The patients were selected randomly, but only a fifth were selected from the subgroup with zero scores. We compared the scores pairwise and computed R^2 , bias, and deviation for each score pair. The results of the comparison are in Table 3.1. Bias and deviation are for the Bland-Altman plot (Fig. 3). The R^2 in experts’ disagreement varies between each other and the dataset is between 0.6 and 0.8, which is a high value considering the importance of the score for risk assessment.




Fig. 3: Bland-Altman plots for SYNTAX score prediction in 60 patients selected at random. (a) Expert 1 vs. dataset. (b) Expert 2 vs. dataset. (c) Our prediction (LSTM head) vs. dataset.

4 Method

Our research presents a novel approach for predicting SYNTAX scores using a combination of 3D ResNet [38] and recurrent neural networks (RNN) or Transformer models. As shown in Fig. 4, our method involves extracting features from each view using a 3D backbone, fusion them with a head neural network, and

Table 3: Experts disagreement for 60 random patients. Bias and deviation are the mean and STD values of the Bland-Altman plot.

metric	R^2	Bias mean	Bias median	Deviation STD	Deviation IQR
Expert 1 vs. dataset	0.593	-1.80	-1.00	9.52	7.50
Expert 2 vs. dataset	0.829	0.53	0.00	6.69	4.50
Expert 2 vs. Expert 1	0.674	1.27	1.50	9.16	6.13
Average \pm std	0.72 \pm 0.10	0.00 \pm 1.60	-0.17 \pm 1.26	8.46 \pm 1.54	6.03 \pm 1.5




Fig. 4: Proposed end-to-end SYNTAX score estimation scheme.

then utilizing a fully connected layer for classification and regression. Notably, we have employed separate neural networks for predicting the scores of the RCA and LCA views, as their domains differ significantly. The total SYNTAX score is obtained by summing the individual scores of RCA and LCA.

4.1 Models and training details

Our training process consisted of 3 main steps: backbone training, head training and joint backbone and head fine-tuning. In the first step, we only predicted the SYNTAX score for one angiographic view using the backbone network. In the second step, we freeze the backbone and train a head to predict outcomes from multiple views. At the final step, we fine-tune both the backbone and the head.

We have utilized an 18-layer 3D ResNet model with approximately 33 million parameters, pre-trained on the KINETICS400 [18] dataset. Our experiments have shown that using pre-trained weights has significantly improved the prediction quality. To ensure the accuracy of our approach, we have used a 32-frame video as input, and any missed frames in the angiographic view are filled with

repeated frames. We have employed the pytorch lightning framework to train our model on A100 GPU efficiently.

There are various methods for combining embeddings. The early work [22] used NetVlad aggregation for the frame features aggregation. The study [25] used an attention mechanism to combine embeddings from different frames in a video. Liu et al., in their work [23], used a 3D position encoder and a Transformer decoder to combine information from multi-view images. Dynamic neural radiance fields [21] solve the problem of combining 3D multi-view videos to render photorealistic images from various viewpoints and at arbitrary times. However, the position of the angiographic view is not relevant to our problem, which allows us not to use positional encoding or feed embeddings in arbitrary sequencing.

Our research used BERT [9] and LSTM-RNN to merge characteristics from different angiographic perspectives. BERT head had 1.2 million parameters, while LSTM had only 0.26 million parameters. The embeddings of angiographic perspectives were randomly fed. When we didn't apply a head network, we averaged the embedding vectors.

During training, we utilized the OneCycleLR scheduler with a batch size of 16 for backbone training and 8 for head training. The learning rate for training was 10^{-4} and 10^{-5} for fine-tuning. We used MSE loss in all of our experiments.

4.2 Ablation study

In recent years, there has been a significant increase in the use of advanced models, such as Video Swin Transformer [24] and TubeViT [30], for various 3D computer vision tasks. However, our study of these models' performance compared to a classical ResNet 3D model as a backbone has yielded surprising results. Surprisingly, despite their state-of-the-art designs, the ResNet 3D model outperformed these advanced models. Upon further analysis, we hypothesize that the small size of our dataset may have played a crucial role in this outcome. It is well-known that transformer models excel in larger datasets but may not be as efficient for smaller-scale datasets [11]. In our study, we also experimented with an advanced convolution transformer-like model, 3D MedNext [33], but it could not surpass the performance of ResNet 3D. The fact could be attributed to the absence of pre-trained weights and the need for further modifications for classification purposes.

Our research used the small Video Swin Transformer, a state-of-the-art model with 28 million parameters pre-trained on the KINETICS400 dataset. This model was readily available through Torchvision. Additionally, we explored using the TubeViT⁴ model, which boasts 86 million parameters and was pre-trained on the UCF101 dataset [36]. To further investigate the performance of our methods, we also experimented with the MedNext⁵ model, which initially operated as an image-to-image model. However, to suit our specific needs, we removed the

⁴ <https://github.com/daniel-code/TubeViT>

⁵ <https://github.com/MIC-DKFZ/MedNeXt>

decoder component of the MedNext model, resulting in a model with 12 million parameters.

Using the RNN or Transformer head significantly improved the quality of predictions over an average of each ResNet Video output. The results in Table 4 show the difference. Besides the LSTM model, we have also tried GRU, but the metrics are left behind LSTM.

5 Results

We used the following metrics for SYNTAX score estimation quality - R^2 coefficient, bias (mean, median), and deviation (STD, IQR) in terms of the Bland-Altman plot (Fig. 3) for ground truth and predicted scores. We used standard metrics for the classification quality evaluation - recall, precision, F1, accuracy, and MCC (Matthew correlation [6]). The results for the SYNTAX score prediction using our framework are presented in Table 4. These results demonstrate an advantage of using a head network over an averaging strategy and show a clear potential for automatic end-to-end SYNTAX prediction.

Table 4: SYNTAX score prediction \pm_{STD} . 5 fold cross-validation. Bias and deviation are for the Bland-Altman plot.

method	$R^2 \uparrow$	Bias mean \downarrow	Bias median \downarrow	deviation STD \downarrow	deviation IQR \downarrow
LSTM (Ours)	0.512 ± 0.028	-1.70 ± 0.32	0.03 ± 0.05	7.51 ± 0.51	4.39 ± 0.36
Bert	0.448 ± 0.047	-1.65 ± 1.90	0.17 ± 0.30	7.79 ± 0.74	4.92 ± 0.63
average strategy	0.038 ± 0.187	-0.99 ± 0.65	0.19 ± 0.09	10.74 ± 1.61	4.51 ± 0.19

We have also separated the prediction results for sick persons with non-zero SYNTAX scores in Table 5. The motivation to split the results into two categories came from the fact that the number of healthy patients may differ significantly from country to country, as national standards have different recommendations and contraindications for invasive angiography [34]. For this reason, the share of patients with the zero score may also differ among datasets in different clinics. The results in Table 5 show a worse performance than Table 4 and demonstrate how sensitive the results are to changes in patient score distribution. This issue should be addressed in future research.

We used 5-fold cross-validation to obtain metrics in Tables 4,5,6. The cross-validation split used for Table 5 is the same as that used for Table 4, with the only difference being that we used only studies with non-zero scores during testing.




Fig. 5: Correlations plots for SYNTAX score prediction in 60 patients selected at random (a) Expert 1 vs. dataset. (b) Expert 2 vs. dataset. (c) Our prediction (LSTM head) vs. dataset.

Table 5: SYNTAX score prediction \pm_{STD} tested on the patients with ground truth SYNTAX above zero. 5-fold cross-validation. Bias and deviation are for the Bland-Altman plot.

method	$R^2 \uparrow$	Bias mean \downarrow	Bias median \downarrow	deviation STD \downarrow	deviation IQR \downarrow
LSTM	0.226 ± 0.045	-4.78 ± 0.46	-3.46 ± 0.41	9.58 ± 0.78	9.45 ± 1.60
Bert	0.154 ± 0.091	-4.97 ± 2.76	-3.80 ± 1.86	9.62 ± 1.12	10.63 ± 1.47
Average strategy	-0.61 ± 0.26	-8.56 ± 1.11	-3.48 ± 0.70	15.06 ± 2.43	10.63 ± 1.471

The classification results are in Table 6. Our method allows us to predict 80% of the patients with zero SYNTAX, and the precision is about 75%. If we improve the precision in the future, interventional cardiologists can pay more attention to complex cases and fewer patients with a zero score. Our new dataset, which we present in this paper, contains an equal number of cases with zero and nonzero scores, making it very suitable for regression and classification.

Before predicting the SYNTAX score for patients, we first predicted it for LCA and RCA. The R^2 coefficients for LCA and RCA SYNTAX scores (LSTM head) are 0.46 and 0.25, ROC AUC 85% and 82%, and accuracy 78% and 80%. This indicates the apparent difficulties with RCA SYNTAX prediction. RCA affects the SYNTAX score less than LCA, but this issue should be addressed in the future.

Table 6: SYNTAX > 0 classification. 5 fold cross-validation \pm STD.

Metric	LSTM	BERT	average strategy
Recall = 0 \uparrow	74.4 \pm 6.2%	75.41 \pm 14.0%	62.3 \pm 7.3%
Recall > 0 \uparrow	80.4 \pm 5.9%	79.3 \pm 8.3%	87.9 \pm 5.2%
Precision = 0 \uparrow	80.5 \pm 5.4%	80.5 \pm 5.2%	84.8 \pm 5.8%
Precision > 0 \uparrow	74.6 \pm 5.1%	76.4 \pm 7.9%	68.5 \pm 4.4%
Recall _{macro} \uparrow	77.4 \pm 4.9%	77.4 \pm 5.2%	75.1 \pm 4.9%
F1 _{macro} \uparrow	77.3 \pm 4.9%	77.0 \pm 5.8%	74.3 \pm 5.1%
MCC \uparrow	55.0 \pm 9.7%	55.8 \pm 9.3%	51.7 \pm 9.6%
Accuracy \uparrow	77.3 \pm 4.9%	77.3 \pm 5.4%	74.6 \pm 4.9%

To assess the effectiveness of our framework prediction, we compared the level of disagreement between experts (subsection 3.1). To ensure the robustness of our results, we trained our framework a second time and utilized a test subset of 60 patients from the aforementioned disagreement group. The results of this comparison can be found in Table 7 and are further illustrated in Fig. 3 and 5.

Table 7: Comparison of our prediction error with the disagreement between doctors. The SYNTAX score prediction was tested on 60 random patients. Bias and deviation are for the Bland-Altman plot.

method	R^2 \uparrow	Bias mean \downarrow	Bias median \downarrow	deviation STD \downarrow	deviation IQR \downarrow
LSTM (our)	0.42	6.13	1.52	10.87	10.16
Disagreement \pm STD	0.72 \pm 0.10	0.00 \pm 1.60	0.17 \pm 1.26	8.46 \pm 1.54	6.03 \pm 1.5

5.1 Discussion

The proposed framework for fully automatic SYNTAX score estimation from coronary angiography has shown promising results, achieving an R^2 coefficient of 0.51 in score prediction and an accuracy of 77% in classifying patients with zero and non-zero scores. While this indicates a clear potential for our method, it is essential to note that it still falls behind the estimation of experts, as demonstrated in Table 7. This is due to the higher correlation between the labels assigned by the experts and the dataset compared to our predictions. Additionally, our method has shown a tendency to underestimate scores, as seen in Table 4, which can be attributed to the use of MSE loss in the training process and the presence of many studies with zero scores. Furthermore, the performance of the patients with non-zero scores in Table 5 may also be affected by this issue, as the model was trained on a dataset where half of the studies have zero scores but tested on studies with non-zero scores.

The head of the neural network is a crucial component in determining the model’s performance. In the context of utilizing a 3D backbone, the choice of the head greatly impacts the results obtained. While the LSTM head has shown superior performance in regression tasks, BERT has demonstrated similar performance in classification tasks. Furthermore, both approaches have been shown to outperform the averaging embedding strategy, highlighting the importance of a well-designed head in achieving optimal results.

The discussion surrounding the use of metrics in the medical community is a crucial topic for future advancements in the field. Specifically, there is a need to determine what should be prioritized in terms of classifying a sick or healthy individual or accurately predicting a SYNTAX score with a high value. It may be beneficial to consider dividing the zero score and non-zero score domains and training models independently, as this could lead to more precise and effective results. Ultimately, the answers to these questions will significantly inform and guide the development and improvement of both models and datasets in the medical community.

6 Conclusions

Our research team has proposed a new multi-view 3D regression and classification problem for the AI community, focused on estimating the SYNTAX score from invasive coronary angiography. To further support our proposal, we have curated a comprehensive coronary angiogram dataset for 1,844 patients and their corresponding SYNTAX scores. To establish a benchmark for prediction quality, we have also calculated the disagreement between experts in SYNTAX evaluation, with a determination coefficient R^2 ranging from 0.59 to 0.83. Our proposed method has demonstrated results, with an R^2 of 0.51 between our predictions and the scores from the dataset.

To enhance the accuracy of our predictions, we have suggested using RNN or Transformer models by concatenating the embeddings from each angiographic

view. This approach has significantly improved prediction quality, outperforming the average prediction strategy.

Our findings show a clear possibility for end-to-end SYNTAX score prediction, though the achieved results still need to be more for the algorithm to be used for CAD risk assessment. A presented novel dataset of angiographic studies contributes to developing more accurate and efficient methods for SYNTAX score estimation. The following issues need to be further investigated and addressed:

- Mitigating the effect of the SYNTAX distribution in the test set on the results, e.g., testing the algorithm on data with non-zero scores and vice versa.
- Identify complex cases for AI models and discuss how to interpret and improve these issues with cardiologists.
- Additional research on expert disagreement in data labeling, through increased involvement of new experts in labeling and the number of studies labeled by different experts.

References

1. Ainiwaer, A., Hou, W.Q., Kadier, K., Rehemuding, R., Liu, P.F., Maimaiti, H., Qin, L., Ma, X., Dai, J.G.: A machine learning framework for diagnosing and predicting the severity of coronary artery disease. *Reviews in Cardiovascular Medicine* **24**(6), 168 (2023)
2. Akboga, M.K., Inanc, I.H., Sabanoglu, C., Akdi, A., Yakut, I., Yuksekkaya, B., Nurkoc, S., Yalcin, R.: Systemic immune-inflammation index and c-reactive protein/albumin ratio could predict acute stent thrombosis and high syntax score in acute coronary syndrome. *Angiology* **74**(7), 693–701 (2023)
3. Avram, R., Olgin, J.E., Ahmed, Z., Verreault-Julien, L., Wan, A., Barrios, J., Abreau, S., Wan, D., Gonzalez, J.E., Tardif, J.C., et al.: Cathai: fully automated coronary angiography interpretation and stenosis estimation. *npj Digital Medicine* **6**(1), 142 (2023)
4. Basman, C., Levine, E., Tejjal, A., Thampi, S., Rashid, U., Barry, R., Stoffels, G., Kliger, C.A., Coplan, N., Patel, N., et al.: Variability and reproducibility of the syntax score for triple-vessel disease. *Cardiovascular Revascularization Medicine* **37**, 86–89 (2022)
5. Cervantes-Sanchez, F., Cruz-Aceves, I., Hernandez-Aguirre, A., Hernandez-Gonzalez, M.A., Solorio-Meza, S.E.: Automatic segmentation of coronary arteries in X-ray angiograms using multiscale analysis and artificial neural networks. *Applied Sciences* **9**(24), 5507 (2019)
6. Chicco, D., Jurman, G.: The advantages of the matthews correlation coefficient (mcc) over f1 score and accuracy in binary classification evaluation. *BMC genomics* **21**(1), 1–13 (2020)
7. Cong, C., Kato, Y., Vasconcellos, H.D.D., Ostovaneh, M.R., Lima, J.A., Ambale-Venkatesh, B.: Deep learning-based end-to-end automated stenosis classification and localization on catheter coronary angiography. *Frontiers in Cardiovascular Medicine* **10**, 944135 (2023)
8. Danilov, V.V., Klyshnikov, K.Y., Gerget, O.M., Kutikhin, A.G., Ganyukov, V.I., Frangi, A.F., Ovcharenko, E.A.: Real-time coronary artery stenosis detection based on modern neural networks. *Scientific reports* **11**(1), 7582 (2021)
9. Devlin, J., Chang, M.W., Lee, K., Toutanova, K.: Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805* (2018)
10. Di Cesare, M., Bixby, H., Gaziano, T., Hadeed, L., Kabudula, C., McGhie, D.V., Mwangi, J., Pervan, B., Perel, P., Piñeiro, D., et al.: World heart report 2023: Confronting the world’s number one killer. World Heart Federation: Geneva, Switzerland (2023)
11. Dosovitskiy, A., Beyer, L., Kolesnikov, A., Weissenborn, D., Zhai, X., Unterthiner, T., Dehghani, M., Minderer, M., Heigold, G., Gelly, S., et al.: An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.11929* (2020)
12. Du, T., Xie, L., Zhang, H., Liu, X., Wang, X., Chen, D., Xu, Y., Sun, Z., Zhou, W., Song, L., et al.: Training and validation of a deep learning architecture for the automatic analysis of coronary angiography. *EuroIntervention* **17**(1), 32–40 (2021)
13. Eschen, C.K., Banasik, K., Christensen, A.H., Chmura, P.J., Pedersen, F., Køber, L., Engstrøm, T., Dahl, A.B., Brunak, S., Bundgaard, H.: Classification of left and right coronary arteries in coronary angiographies using deep learning. *Electronics* **11**(13), 2087 (2022)

14. Farooq, V., Head, S.J., Kappetein, A.P., Serruys, P.W.: Widening clinical applications of the syntax score. *Heart* (2013)
15. Gaudino, M., Hameed, I., Di Franco, A., Naik, A., Demetres, M., Biondi-Zoccai, G., Bangalore, S.: Comparison of syntax score strata effects of percutaneous and surgical revascularization trials: A meta-analysis. *The Journal of Thoracic and Cardiovascular Surgery* **165**(4), 1405–1413 (2023)
16. Iyer, K., Najarian, C.P., Fattah, A.A., Arthurs, C.J., Sorousmehr, S.R., Subban, V., Sankardas, M.A., Nadakuditi, R.R., Nallamothu, B.K., Figueroa, C.A.: Angionet: a convolutional neural network for vessel segmentation in X-ray angiography. *Scientific Reports* **11**(1), 18066 (2021)
17. Kavipriya, K., Hiremath, M.: Identification of coronary artery stenosis based on hybrid segmentation and feature fusion. *Automatika* **64**(3), 622–633 (2023)
18. Kay, W., Carreira, J., Simonyan, K., Zhang, B., Hillier, C., Vijayanarasimhan, S., Viola, F., Green, T., Back, T., Natsev, P., et al.: The kinetics human action video dataset. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.06950* (2017)
19. Kruzhilov, I., Ikryannikov, E., Shadrin, A., Utegenov, R., Zubkova, G., Bessonov, I.: Neural network-based coronary dominance classification of rca angiograms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.06958* (2023)
20. Lawton, J.S., Tamis-Holland, J.E., Bangalore, S., Bates, E.R., Beckie, T.M., Bischoff, J.M., Bittl, J.A., Cohen, M.G., DiMaio, J.M., Don, C.W., et al.: 2021 acc/aha/scai guideline for coronary artery revascularization: executive summary: a report of the american college of cardiology/american heart association joint committee on clinical practice guidelines. *Circulation* **145**(3), e4–e17 (2022)
21. Li, T., Slavcheva, M., Zollhoefer, M., Green, S., Lassner, C., Kim, C., Schmidt, T., Lovegrove, S., Goesele, M., Newcombe, R., et al.: Neural 3d video synthesis from multi-view video. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. pp. 5521–5531 (2022)
22. Lin, R., Xiao, J., Fan, J.: Nextvlad: An efficient neural network to aggregate frame-level features for large-scale video classification. In: *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV) Workshops*. pp. 0–0 (2018)
23. Liu, Y., Wang, T., Zhang, X., Sun, J.: Petr: Position embedding transformation for multi-view 3d object detection. In: *European Conference on Computer Vision*. pp. 531–548. Springer (2022)
24. Liu, Z., Ning, J., Cao, Y., Wei, Y., Zhang, Z., Lin, S., Hu, H.: Video swin transformer. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. pp. 3202–3211 (2022)
25. Meng, D., Peng, X., Wang, K., Qiao, Y.: Frame attention networks for facial expression recognition in videos. In: *2019 IEEE international conference on image processing (ICIP)*. pp. 3866–3870. IEEE (2019)
26. Moalla, H., Ghrab, A., Hamed, B.B., Bahloul, A., Abid, L.: Exploiting pre-trained architectures for dual-stream classification of lca-rca in a private angiodata. In: *2023 International Conference on Innovations in Intelligent Systems and Applications (INISTA)*. pp. 1–6. IEEE (2023)
27. Nobre Menezes, M., Silva, J.L., Silva, B., Rodrigues, T., Guerreiro, C., Guedes, J.P., Santos, M.O., Oliveira, A.L., Pinto, F.J.: Coronary x-ray angiography segmentation using artificial intelligence: a multicentric validation study of a deep learning model. *The international journal of cardiovascular imaging* pp. 1–12 (2023)
28. Panteris, E., Deda, O., Papazoglou, A.S., Karagiannidis, E., Liapikos, T., Begou, O., Meikopoulos, T., Mouskeftara, T., Sofidis, G., Sianos, G., et al.: Machine learning algorithm to predict obstructive coronary artery disease: Insights from the corlipid trial. *Metabolites* **12**(9), 816 (2022)

29. Park, J., Kweon, J., Kim, Y.I., Back, I., Chae, J., Roh, J.H., Kang, D.Y., Lee, P.H., Ahn, J.M., Kang, S.J., et al.: Selective ensemble methods for deep learning segmentation of major vessels in invasive coronary angiography. *Medical Physics* (2023)
30. Piergiovanni, A., Kuo, W., Angelova, A.: Rethinking video vits: Sparse video tubes for joint image and video learning. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. pp. 2214–2224 (2023)
31. Popov, M., Amanturdieva, A., Zhaksylyk, N., Alkanov, A., Sanliyazbekov, A., Aimyshev, T., Ismailov, E., Bulegenov, A., Kuzhukeyev, A., Kulanbayeva, A., et al.: Dataset for automatic region-based coronary artery disease diagnostics using x-ray angiography images. *Scientific Data* **11**(1), 20 (2024)
32. Rodrigues, D.L., Menezes, M.N., Pinto, F.J., Oliveira, A.L.: Automated detection of coronary artery stenosis in X-ray angiography using deep neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.02969* (2021)
33. Roy, S., Koehler, G., Ulrich, C., Baumgartner, M., Petersen, J., Isensee, F., Jaeger, P.F., Maier-Hein, K.H.: Mednext: transformer-driven scaling of convnets for medical image segmentation. In: *International Conference on Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention*. pp. 405–415. Springer (2023)
34. Scanlon, P.J., Faxon, D.P., Audet, A.M., Carabello, B., Dehmer, G.J., Eagle, K.A., Legako, R.D., Leon, D.F., Murray, J.A., Nissen, S.E., et al.: Acc/aha guidelines for coronary angiography: a report of the american college of cardiology/american heart association task force on practice guidelines (committee on coronary angiography) developed in collaboration with the society for cardiac angiography and interventions. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology* **33**(6), 1756–1824 (1999)
35. Sianos, G., Morel, M.A., Kappetein, A.P., Morice, M.C., Colombo, A., Dawkins, K., van den Brand, M., Van Dyck, N., Russell, M.E., Mohr, F.W., et al.: The syntax score: an angiographic tool grading the complexity of coronary artery disease. *EuroIntervention* **1**(2), 219–227 (2005)
36. Soomro, K., Zamir, A.R., Shah, M.: Ucf101: A dataset of 101 human actions classes from videos in the wild. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1212.0402* (2012)
37. Tao, X., Dang, H., Zhou, X., Xu, X., Xiong, D.: A lightweight network for accurate coronary artery segmentation using X-Ray angiograms. *Frontiers in Public Health* **10**, 892418 (2022)
38. Tran, D., Wang, H., Torresani, L., Ray, J., LeCun, Y., Paluri, M.: A closer look at spatiotemporal convolutions for action recognition. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. pp. 6450–6459 (2018)
39. Wang, L., Liang, D., Yin, X., Qiu, J., Yang, Z., Xing, J., Dong, J., Ma, Z.: Coronary artery segmentation in angiographic videos utilizing spatial-temporal information. *BMC medical imaging* **20**, 1–10 (2020)
40. Yang, S., Kweon, J., Roh, J.H., Lee, J.H., Kang, H., Park, L.J., Kim, D.J., Yang, H., Hur, J., Kang, D.Y., et al.: Deep learning segmentation of major vessels in x-ray coronary angiography. *Scientific reports* **9**(1), 16897 (2019)
41. Zhao, C., Bober, R., Tang, H., Tang, J., Dong, M., Zhang, C., He, Z., Wang, Y.P., Deng, H.W., Esposito, M.L., et al.: Semantic segmentation to extract coronary arteries in invasive coronary angiograms. *medRxiv* pp. 2020–05 (2020)