

# **Accuracy of Wearable ECG Parameter Calculation Method for Long QT and First-Degree A-V Block Detection: A Multi-Center Real-World Study with External Validations Compared to Standard ECG Machines and Cardiologist Assessments**

Sumei Fan<sup>1,†</sup>, Deyun Zhang<sup>2,†</sup>, Yue Wang<sup>2,†</sup>, Shijia Geng<sup>2</sup>, Kun Lu<sup>3</sup>, Meng Sang<sup>2</sup>, Weilun Xu<sup>2</sup>, Haixue Wang<sup>4</sup>, Qinghao Zhao<sup>5</sup>, Chuandong Cheng<sup>6,7</sup>, Peng Wang<sup>8</sup>, Shenda Hong<sup>4,9,10,11,12,\*</sup>

1. College of Integrative Chinese and Western Medicine, Anhui University of Chinese Medicine, Hefei, China.
2. HeartVoice Medical Technology, Hefei, China.
3. department of electrocardiogram, The first affiliated hospital of Anhui Medical University, Hefei, China.
4. National Institute of Health Data Science, Peking University, Beijing, China.
5. Department of Cardiology, Peking University People' s Hospital, Beijing, China.
6. Department of Neurosurgery, The First Affiliated Hospital of University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, China.
7. Division of Life Sciences and Medicine, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, China.
8. Key Laboratory of Xinan Medicine of Ministry of Education, Anhui University of Chinese Medicine, Hefei , China.
9. Institute of Medical Technology, Peking University Health Science Center, Beijing, China.
10. Institute for Artificial Intelligence, Peking University, Beijing, China.
11. Department of Emergency Medicine, Peking University First Hospital, Beijing, China.
12. NHC Key Laboratory of Cardiovascular Molecular Biology and Regulatory Peptides, Peking University, Beijing, China.

† Sumei Fan, Deyun Zhang and Yue Wang contributed equally to this article.

\*Correspondence: Shenda Hong, hongshenda@pku.edu.cn

## Abstract

In recent years, wearable devices have revolutionized cardiac monitoring by enabling continuous, non-invasive ECG recording in real-world settings. Despite these advances, the accuracy of ECG parameter calculations (PR interval, QRS interval, QT interval, etc.) from wearables remains to be rigorously validated against conventional ECG machines and expert clinician assessments. In this large-scale, multicenter study, we evaluated FeatureDB, a novel algorithm for automated computation of ECG parameters from wearable single-lead signals. Three diverse datasets were employed: the AHMU-FH dataset (n=88,874), the CSE dataset (n=106), and the HeartVoice-ECG-lite dataset (n=369) with annotations provided by two experienced cardiologists. FeatureDB demonstrates a statistically significant correlation with key parameters (PR interval, QRS duration, QT interval, and QTc) calculated by standard ECG machines and annotated by clinical doctors. Bland-Altman analysis confirms a high level of agreement. Moreover, FeatureDB exhibited robust diagnostic performance in detecting Long QT syndrome (LQT) and atrioventricular block interval abnormalities (AVBI), with excellent area under the ROC curve (LQT: 0.836, AVBI: 0.861), accuracy (LQT: 0.856, AVBI: 0.845), sensitivity (LQT: 0.815, AVBI: 0.877), and specificity (LQT: 0.856, AVBI: 0.845). This further validates its clinical reliability. These results validate the clinical applicability of FeatureDB for wearable ECG analysis and highlight its potential to bridge the gap between traditional diagnostic methods and emerging wearable technologies. Ultimately, this study supports integrating wearable ECG devices into large-scale cardiovascular disease management and early intervention strategies, and it highlights the potential of wearable ECG technologies to deliver accurate, clinically relevant cardiac monitoring while advancing broader applications in cardiovascular care.

## Introduction

Cardiovascular diseases (CVDs) continue to pose a significant global health challenge, accounting for over 17.9 million deaths annually and representing nearly one-third of all global deaths<sup>[1]</sup>. Despite advances in diagnostic and therapeutic strategies, the increasing prevalence of CVDs in aging populations and low- and middle-income regions underscores the urgent need for early detection and intervention strategies<sup>[2]</sup>. As such, early identification and monitoring of cardiac abnormalities are critical to

mitigating the societal and economic impact of these diseases. In recent years, wearable devices have emerged as transformative tools in healthcare, particularly in the field of cardiac monitoring<sup>[3-8]</sup>. These devices provide non-invasive, continuous measurement of electrocardiogram (ECG) signals, bridging the gap between traditional intermittent medical assessments and real-world patient management<sup>[9]</sup>. Their portability and ability to transmit data in real-time have expanded their use in detecting transient cardiac abnormalities and improving patient engagement in disease management<sup>[10]</sup>. The potential for wearable devices to democratize access to cardiac care makes them indispensable in modern preventive and personalized medicine. Accurate computation of ECG parameters—such as heart rate, PR interval, QRS duration, and QT interval—is essential for diagnosing and predicting arrhythmias, myocardial ischemia, and other cardiovascular conditions. These parameters are critical not only for risk stratification but also for guiding therapeutic decisions in clinical practice<sup>[11]</sup>. Furthermore, their precise measurement plays a key role in large-scale population health initiatives and personalized medicine approaches, where actionable data from wearables can inform early interventions<sup>[12]</sup>. Developing robust computational methods that align with the accuracy of conventional ECG machines and expert evaluations remains a crucial step in realizing the full potential of wearable technologies.

Recent advancements in wearable ECG devices have spurred the development of various methods for calculating ECG parameters, such as heart rate, PR interval, QT interval, and T-wave amplitude, which are crucial for continuous cardiac monitoring outside of clinical settings. These devices leverage a range of signal processing and machine learning techniques to improve accuracy, with studies demonstrating their ability to extract reliable ECG features even under conditions of motion artifacts and low signal quality<sup>[13-15]</sup>. Ho et al.<sup>[13]</sup> validated the accuracy of Apple Watch and Garmin Forerunner in prescribing exercise intensity via heart rate, finding high consistency with ECG measurements in healthy adults. Hwang et al.<sup>[14]</sup> assessed the accuracy of Apple Watch, Samsung Galaxy, and Fitbit in measuring heart rates during supraventricular tachycardia (SVT) and found them generally accurate, though performance varied among devices. Lu et al.<sup>[15]</sup> demonstrates a high correlation ( $r=0.84$ ,  $p<0.01$ ) and strong consistency between wearable ECG devices and traditional ECG machines in measuring heart rate, with a mean difference of  $-0.97$  bpm and 95% confidence interval (CI) within an acceptable range, indicating reliable usage in arrhythmia detection and heart rate monitoring. However, while these studies have made significant progress in enhancing wearable ECG devices' capability for arrhythmia detection and real-time monitoring<sup>[16,17]</sup>, there is a gap in comprehensive

evaluations of the accuracy and precision of these devices in calculating various ECG parameters. Additionally, existing literature often focuses on small-scale or controlled studies, with limited real-world validation. This highlights the need for further research into the robustness of wearable devices in diverse and heterogeneous populations.

This study aims to conduct a comprehensive, large-scale, multicenter validation of ECG parameter calculation methods (Feature Database, FeatureDB) tailored for wearable monitoring devices in real-world<sup>[18,19]</sup> (Figure 1). The primary aim is to assess the concordance and correlation between ECG parameters obtained from wearable devices and those measured by standard ECG machines, leveraging a robust and diverse dataset. Additionally, the research systematically compares the performance of wearable device-based parameter calculations against clinical expert assessments across multiple datasets, including a publicly available benchmark dataset and proprietary data from wearable devices. By conducting these analyses, the study aims to rigorously establish the clinical validity, reliability, and potential applications of wearable ECG technologies in advancing cardiovascular health management.




Figure 1. The framework presents the validation process of ECG parameter calculations. ECG signals from wearable devices and standard ECG machines are input into FeatureDB for processing. Key parameters such as PR interval, QRS duration, and QT interval are extracted. These parameters are then separately compared with measurements from ECG machines and expert annotations to ensure accuracy and reliability. This dual comparison helps evaluate the performance of wearable device-based ECG analysis under real-world conditions, highlighting its potential clinical applications and limitations.

## Methods

### Study design

This study employed a large-scale, multi-center, real-world design to validate ECG parameter calculation methods of wearable devices by comparing them to standard

ECG machines and clinician assessments. Three distinct datasets were utilized in this study (Table 1, Figure 2). The first dataset ( AHMU-FH ) was collected from the First Affiliated Hospital of Anhui Medical University, encompassing 88,874 participants and representing various clinical conditions and scenarios. The second dataset was the European Common Standards for Electrocardiography (CSE) dataset, comprising 107 participants, and widely recognized as a benchmark for validating ECG-related methodologies. The third dataset HeartVoice-ECG-lite consisted of wearable ECG data collected through the WenXinWuYang<sup>[18,19]</sup>, which included 369 participants. These datasets provide complementary perspectives: the hospital dataset reflects real-world clinical practice, the CSE dataset offers a standardized reference, and the wearable device dataset emphasizes the practical applications of emerging technologies. By combining these diverse sources, the study enables a robust evaluation of wearable ECG parameter calculation methods under both controlled and real-world conditions, highlighting the potential for wearable devices to contribute to scalable and accessible cardiac health monitoring.

Table1. Patient characteristics.

Variables	All (n=89717)	AHMU-FH (n=88874)	CSE (n=105)	HeartVoice-E CG-lite-A (n=369)	HeartVoice-E CG-lite-B (n=369)
PR interval (ms)	150.9 (19.6)	150.9 (19.6)	163.1 (30.1)	150.6 (18.8)	144.8 (18.9)
QRS duration (ms)	89.5 (9.8)	89.3 (9.5)	108.2 (20.7)	105.4 (13.5)	118.3 (17.3)
QT interval (ms)	364.0 (32.1)	363.8 (32.0)	398.6 (45.8)	383.0 (34.1)	397.9 (35.5)
QTc (ms)	404.1 (25.5)	403.9 (25.3)	—	426.1 (25.7)	443.1 (23.7)




Figure 2. Patient flow diagram of this study.

### **Wearable device and doctor annotation**

The HeartVoice-ECG-lite dataset was derived from wearable device data collected through the WenXinWuYang, focusing on real-world cardiac health monitoring scenarios. This dataset underwent meticulous annotation by two experienced cardiologists (Doctor A and Doctor B) using a specialized annotation system designed for precise identification of ECG waveform positions (Table 1). The annotation process prioritized the accurate delineation of key waveform features, such as P waves, QRS complexes, and T waves, ensuring high reliability and clinical relevance of the annotations. Each cardiologist independently reviewed the data, and any discrepancies in annotations were resolved through consensus discussions to maintain consistency and minimize subjective bias. This rigorous approach aimed to provide a gold standard reference for evaluating the performance of ECG parameter calculation methods derived from wearable devices. By incorporating expert-level annotations, the HeartVoice-ECG-lite dataset offers a valuable resource for benchmarking algorithm accuracy in diverse and practical settings, highlighting its importance in advancing the field of wearable ECG technology for scalable and reliable cardiac health monitoring.

### **Electrocardiogram data preprocessing**

The preprocessing of the ECG signals was a critical step to ensure the accuracy and reliability of subsequent parameter calculations. Initially, a median filter was applied to the raw ECG data to eliminate baseline drift and other low-frequency artifacts effectively. This step is crucial in preserving the integrity of the ECG waveform by removing noise that could obscure the true signal morphology. Following this, a bandpass filter was employed to refine the signal by removing non-ECG frequency interferences, such as muscle noise and electromagnetic interference, thereby isolating the frequency components pertinent to cardiac activity. In addition, a comprehensive

signal quality assessment was performed on the preprocessed data. This evaluation utilized a scoring system designed to quantify the overall quality of the ECG signal, considering factors such as signal-to-noise ratio and the presence of motion artifacts. For this study, any ECG recordings that received a signal quality score below 0.5 were excluded from further analysis. This rigorous preprocessing pipeline ensured that only high-quality ECG data were utilized for parameter calculation and subsequent comparison with standard ECG machines and clinician assessments, ultimately enhancing the robustness and clinical relevance of the study findings.

### **Feature Database**

The FeatureDB<sup>1</sup> is a dedicated method developed for the computation of ECG parameters from single-lead ECG signals acquired by wearable devices [18,19]. This method employs a multi-stage approach to accurately extract and calculate clinically relevant ECG parameters. Initially, FeatureDB detects the peak positions of the primary waveform components, namely the P wave, QRS complex, and T wave, by employing robust peak detection algorithms. This initial detection is critical for establishing a reliable foundation for subsequent analyses. Following the identification of the waveform peaks, the method applies multiple wavelet transforms to accurately determine the start and end positions of the P wave, QRS complex, and T wave. Wavelet transforms are particularly advantageous in this context due to their ability to analyze signals at various frequency scales, thus providing enhanced sensitivity to subtle changes in the ECG signal morphology. The refined delineation of waveform boundaries obtained through the wavelet-based approach allows for precise localization of key features, which is essential for the accurate computation of ECG parameters such as the PR interval, QRS duration, QT interval, and QTc. Subsequently, FeatureDB applies established calculation rules to the delineated waveform features to derive the desired ECG parameters. These calculation rules are based on clinically validated definitions and ensure that the computed parameters are consistent with standard diagnostic criteria. The integration of robust peak detection with multi-scale wavelet analysis enables FeatureDB to effectively handle the inherent noise and variability present in wearable ECG recordings. Furthermore, the method is designed to be computationally efficient, making it well-suited for real-time or near-real-time applications in wearable technology.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://github.com/PKUDigitalHealth/FeatureDB>

## Statistical analysis

Continuous variables conforming to normal distribution are presented as mean  $\pm$  standard deviation, Continuous variables conforming to abnormal distribution are presented as medians with interquartile ranges (IQR). Pearson correlation was used for continuous variables conforming to normal distribution. Spearman correlation was used for continuous variables conforming to abnormal distribution. Bland-Altman plots were used to assess the level of consistency between two methods or devices, with mean and 1.96 standard deviation (SD). The diagnostic performance of FeatureDB were assessed by using the area under the ROC curve (ROAUC), accuracy, sensitivity, and specificity. All data were analyzed by Graphpad Prism 9.0.0.

$$Accuracy = \frac{TP + TN}{TP + FP + TN + FN}$$

$$Sensitivity = \frac{TP}{TP + FN}$$

$$Specificity = \frac{TN}{FP + TN}$$

## Results

### Diagnostic performance in detecting Long QT and first degree a-v block between FeatureDB and ECG machines

The relationship between ECG parameters and cardiac diseases is well established. Critical intervals such as the QT and PR segments are essential biomarkers for diagnosing conditions like Long QT syndrome (LQT) and atrioventricular block interval abnormalities (AVBI). These parameters, derived from both standard ECG machines and wearable devices via FeatureDB, offer quantifiable metrics that correlate strongly with pathological states. By comparing these values across different modalities, we can assess the reliability and clinical relevance of wearable device measurements.

The ROAUC was 0.836, indicating good diagnostic characteristics for FeatureDB in detecting LQT. Meanwhile, FeatureDB also showed high accuracy in the detection of LQT, with a value was 0.856. The Sensitivity and Specificity were 0.815 and 0.856, respectively (Figure 3A). The QT interval distributions for LQT and non-LQT patients measured by FeatureDB and standard ECG machines exhibit high consistency.



Both methods yield similar QT interval distributions, indicating that the wearable device-based approach aligns well with traditional ECG measurements in distinguishing LQT from non-LQT patients. (Figure 3B and C). In the evaluation of AVBI, we observed distinct distribution patterns in the PR interval. Standard ECG machines effectively separated non-AVBI patients from those with AVBI using a 200 ms threshold. However, FeatureDB's PR interval calculations did not conform to this cutoff. Instead, our distribution analysis indicated that a threshold of 150 ms is more appropriate for FeatureDB-derived measurements (Figure 3D). Employing this 150 ms threshold for AVBI determination, the method achieved a ROAUC of 0.861, an accuracy of 0.845, a sensitivity of 0.877, and a specificity of 0.845, indicating robust diagnostic performance (Figure 3E).

Overall, the performance of FeatureDB in calculating key ECG parameters is highly encouraging. Its close agreement with standard ECG measurements in both QT and PR intervals validates its diagnostic precision. These findings support the adoption of wearable device-based approaches as effective alternatives for real-time cardiac monitoring, with significant potential to enhance patient management and clinical decision-making in diverse healthcare settings.




Figure 3. Performance evaluation of FeatureDB in detecting LQT and AVBI. (A) presents key evaluation metrics of LQT, including ROAUC, accuracy, sensitivity, and specificity. (B) and (C) Distribution of QT intervals in LQT patients, comparing FeatureDB with standard ECG machines. The overlapping histograms suggest a similar distribution pattern. (D) Distribution of PR intervals in AVBI patients, comparing FeatureDB with standard ECG machines. Two horizontal lines indicate suitable dividing lines for FeatureDB (150 ms) and ECG machines (200 ms). (E) presents key evaluation metrics of AVBI, including ROAUC, accuracy, sensitivity, and specificity.

### Comparison of FeatureDB with ECG machines: electrocardiographic parameters

The correlation between FeatureDB and ECG machines (AHMU-FH) was statistically significant in electrocardiographic parameters. The correlation coefficients of PR interval, QRS duration, QT interval, and QTc interval were 0.634, 0.169, 0.729, and 0.623, respectively, indicating that the detection results of FeatureDB and ECG machines with electrocardiographic parameters had a significant positive correlation (Table 2). There were correlation coefficients of electrocardiographic parameters for different ECG rhythms between FeatureDB and ECG machines (Table S1).

Bland-Altman plots showed that measurements of PR interval, QRS duration, QT interval, and QTc interval were distributed within the limits of agreement for 95.74%, 90.88%, 92.72%, and 92.73% data, respectively, indicating a high degree of agreement between FeatureDB and ECG machines (Figure 4).

Table 2. Comparison of electrocardiographic parameters between FeatureDB and ECG machines from AHMU-FH.

Parameters	FeatureDB (n = 88874)	ECG machines (n = 88874)	r	p
PR interval	130.0 (117.0, 144.0)	150.0 (136.0, 164.0)	0.634	<0.001
QRS duration	103.0 (94.0, 114.0)	90.0 (84.0, 96.0)	0.169	<0.001
QT interval	372.0 (354.0, 394.0)	364.0 (344.0, 384.0)	0.729	<0.001
QTc interval	415.0 (395.0, 436.5)	404.0 (387.0, 421.0)	0.623	<0.001

Values were presented as Median (IQR).

r for Spearman correlation.




Figure 4. Bland-Altman plot showing agreement between FeatureDB and ECG machines in PR interval (A),

QRS duration (B), QT interval (C), and QTc interval (D). Mean was presented by red dashed line; +1.96 SD and -1.96 SD were presented by black dashed line. SD = standard deviations.

### **Comparison of FeatureDB with clinician assessments from the CSE dataset: electrocardiographic parameters**

The correlation between FeatureDB and clinician assessments from the CSE dataset was statistically significant in electrocardiographic parameters. The correlation coefficients of PR interval, QRS duration, and QT interval were 0.733, 0.553, and 0.626, respectively, indicating that the detection results of FeatureDB and clinician assessments with electrocardiographic parameters had a significant positive correlation (Table 3).

Bland-Altman plots showed that measurements of PR interval, QRS duration, and QT interval were distributed within the limits of agreement for 98.10%, 94.29%, and 92.38% data, respectively, indicating a high degree of agreement between FeatureDB and Clinician assessments (Figure 5).

Table 3. Comparison of electrocardiographic parameters between FeatureDB and clinician assessments from CSE

Parameters	FeatureDB (n = 105)		Clinician assessments (n = 105)		r	p
PR interval	142.0	(124.0, 171.0)	156.0	(142.0, 180.0)	0.733	<0.001
QRS duration	110.0	(92.0, 132.0)	102.0	(92.0, 122.0)	0.553	<0.001
QT interval	382.0	(354.0, 429.0)	398.0	(366.0, 430.0)	0.626	<0.001

Values were presented as Median (IQR).

r for Spearman correlation.




Figure 5. Bland-Altman plot showing agreement between FeatureDB and Clinician assessments in PR interval (A), QRS duration (B), and QT interval (C). Mean was presented by red dashed line;  $+1.96$  SD and  $-1.96$  SD were presented by black dashed line. SD = standard deviations.

### Comparison of FeatureDB with Doctor A's and Doctor B's assessments from the HeartVoice-ECG-lite dataset: electrocardiographic parameters

The correlation between FeatureDB and Doctor A's or Doctor B's assessments from the HeartVoice-ECG-lite dataset (HeartVoice-ECG-lite) was statistically significant in electrocardiographic parameters. The correlation coefficients of PR interval, QRS duration, QT interval, and QTc interval were 0.793, 0.305, 0.935, and 0.892, respectively, indicating that the detection results of FeatureDB and Doctor A's assessments with electrocardiographic parameters had a significant positive correlation (Table 4). The correlation coefficients of PR interval, QRS duration, QT interval, and QTc interval were 0.897, 0.807, 0.953, and 0.916, respectively, indicating that the detection results of FeatureDB and Doctor B's assessments with electrocardiographic parameters had a significant positive correlation (Table 4). Meanwhile, the correlation

coefficients of PR interval, QRS duration, QT interval, and QTc interval were 0.872, 0.501, 0.940, and 0.889, respectively, indicating that the detection results of Doctor A's and Doctor B's assessments with electrocardiographic parameters had a significant positive correlation (Table S2).

Bland-Altman plots showed that measurements of PR interval, QRS duration, QT interval, and QTc interval were distributed within the limits of agreement for most data, indicating a high degree of agreement between FeatureDB and Doctor A's or Doctor B's assessments (Figure 6 and 7).

Table 4. Comparison of electrocardiographic parameters between FeatureDB and Doctor A's or Doctor B's assessments from the HeartVoice-ECG-lite.

Parameters	FeatureDB (n = 369)	Doctor A's assessments (n = 369)	Doctor B's assessments (n = 369)	$r^a$	$r^b$	$p^a$	$p^b$
PR interval	147.0 (136.0, 164.0)	148.0 (138.0, 162.0)	142.0 (133.0, 156.0)	0.793	0.897	<0.001	<0.001
QRS duration	110.0 (102.0, 118.0)	106.0 (97.0, 113.5)	118.0 (107.0, 128.0)	0.305	0.807	<0.001	<0.001
QT interval	382.0 (362.5, 408.5)	378.0 (358.0, 403.0)	392.0 (372.0, 422.0)	0.935	0.953	<0.001	<0.001
QTc interval	432.5 (26.1)	426.8 (25.7)	443.2 (23.7)	0.892	0.916	<0.001	<0.001

Values were presented as Mean (SD) or Median (IQR).

r for Pearson correlation or Spearman correlation.

$r^a$  and  $p^a$  were the comparison between FeatureDB and Doctor A's assessments;  $r^b$  and  $p^b$  were the comparison between FeatureDB and Doctor B's assessments.




Figure 6. Bland-Altman plot showing agreement between FeatureDB and Doctor A's assessments from the HeartVoice-ECG-lite dataset in PR interval (A), QRS duration (B), QT interval (C), and QTc interval (D). Mean was presented by red dashed line; +1.96 SD and -1.96 SD were presented by black dashed line. SD = standard deviations.




Figure 7. Bland-Altman plot showing agreement between FeatureDB and Doctor B's assessments from the HeartVoice-ECG-lite dataset in PR interval (A), QRS duration (B), QT interval (C), and QTc interval (D). Mean was presented by red dashed line;  $+1.96$  SD and  $-1.96$  SD were presented by black dashed line. SD = standard deviations.

## Discussion

This study validates the accuracy of wearable devices in calculating ECG parameters by comparing FeatureDB with ECG machines and clinician assessments. FeatureDB is a method specifically proposed for calculating single-lead ECG parameters in wearable devices. In this study, the FeatureDB algorithm was used to compute ECG parameters, including PR, QRS, QT, and QTc intervals. In this study, FeatureDB was compared with standard ECG machines and different clinician assessments, respectively (AHMU-FH, CSE, HeartVoice-ECG-lite). The results indicate that the ECG parameters calculated by FeatureDB demonstrate acceptable reliability. Although the correlation coefficient for QRS was below 0.2 in some cases, particularly in comparisons between



FeatureDB and standard ECG machines, the correlation coefficients for PR, QT, and QTc were all above 0.6, indicating acceptable reliability. Additionally, in the consistency tests between FeatureDB and standard ECG machines and different clinician assessments, more than 90% of the data fell within the 95% limits of agreement. Reliable parameter calculation enhances the potential for arrhythmia detection. In this study, FeatureDB achieved ROAUC values of 0.836 and 0.861 for LQT and AVBI arrhythmias, respectively, demonstrating that it offers robust support for the early clinical identification of these conditions. This suggests that the evaluation results of FeatureDB and standard ECG machines or clinician assessments are consistent, enhancing the potential of wearable devices for routine cardiovascular monitoring in out-of-hospital settings. It also demonstrates the feasibility of using wearable devices in non-critical care scenarios.

In clinical practice, there is limited validation of the reliability of wearable devices, and existing studies predominantly compare wearable devices with the assessment results of standard ECG machines, lacking comparisons with clinician assessments<sup>[20,21]</sup>. In this study, while comparing with standard ECG machines, we for the first time compared FeatureDB with the parameter assessments of multiple clinicians, thereby validating the accuracy of FeatureDB in calculating ECG parameters from different perspectives. Additionally, large sample studies were used in all three comparative analyses, ensuring the reliability of the research<sup>[22,23]</sup>. More importantly, the consistency of ECG parameters calculated by FeatureDB with the results demonstrated in previous studies. In the comparison between FeatureDB and ECG machines, although the correlation coefficients for some PR intervals, QT intervals, and QTc intervals were slightly lower than those of the Apple Watch (AW) and the AliveCor Kardia Mobile (KM) device, FeatureDB showed a higher proportion of agreement than AW and KM<sup>[24,25]</sup>. Since the data sample size used in the comparison between FeatureDB and ECG machines is large and covers a relatively broad population, whereas AW and KM cover a relatively narrow population, the comparability is relatively poor. Future studies should be conducted under the same conditions to enhance the comparability of these results. In the comparisons between FeatureDB and clinician assessments from the CSE dataset as well as Doctor A's and Doctor B's assessments from the HeartVoice-ECG-lite dataset, the correlation coefficients for PR intervals, QT intervals, and QTc intervals were similar to those of AW and KM. At the same time, in the consistency tests between FeatureDB and standard ECG machines and different clinician assessments, most data fell within the 95% limits of agreement., which is higher than that of AW and KM. This study also

compared the assessment results of Doctor A and Doctor B, showing good correlation, which indirectly indicates that FeatureDB has acceptable reliability in calculating ECG parameters.

Abnormal cardiac rhythms are inevitably accompanied by abnormalities in ECG waveforms<sup>[26]</sup>. For example, LQT syndrome is characterized by prolonged QT intervals and abnormal T waves<sup>[27]</sup>. Therefore, the accuracy of ECG waveform detection by algorithms based on wearable devices is crucial for identifying cardiac rhythm abnormalities. In this study, the accuracy, sensitivity, and specificity of detecting LQT in the comparison between FeatureDB and ECG machines were acceptable (Figure 3A). From the correlation comparison results between FeatureDB and ECG machines under different disease conditions, the correlations of various parameters showed relatively significant differences across different rhythms and disease states. The PR interval and QT interval exhibited overall high correlations, the QTc interval showed moderate correlation, while the QRS interval had lower correlation, particularly in cases of rapid or pathological arrhythmias (Table S1). However, these calculation errors are not entirely negative; in some cases, they can serve as clues for "abnormality" alerts. By combining trends in ECG parameter changes over different time periods, these errors may reveal potential fluctuations or sudden abnormalities in cardiac health status, thereby providing references for early intervention (Table S1). For instance, significant changes in the QT interval or abnormal prolongation of the PR interval during long-term monitoring may indicate potential electrolyte imbalances or conduction abnormalities.

The PR interval represents the time between the onset of atrial depolarization and ventricular activation, serving as a crucial indicator in diagnosing atrioventricular conduction abnormalities<sup>[28]</sup>. Prolongation of the PR interval is closely linked to AVBI, which increases the risk of arrhythmias and other complications<sup>[29,30]</sup>. Clinically, a prolonged PR interval may signal an underlying conduction delay that can predispose patients to significant cardiovascular events, including syncope or even sudden cardiac death in severe cases. Traditionally, standard ECG machines have effectively distinguished between non-AVBI and AVBI patients using a 200 ms PR interval threshold, a benchmark grounded in extensive clinical experience (Figure 1D). However, when evaluating the PR intervals calculated by FeatureDB, the values appear less aligned with these traditional expectations, suggesting a potential discrepancy in measurement accuracy. Despite this, an analysis of FeatureDB's own distribution indicates that a 150 ms threshold may be more appropriate for categorizing AVBI versus non-AVBI patients (Figure 1D). This adjustment emphasizes the need to tailor

new computational methodologies to align with clinically relevant markers, ensuring that these innovative tools remain both sensitive and specific in risk stratification. Despite the divergence in numerical thresholds between FeatureDB and standard ECG machines, our large-scale sample analysis demonstrates that FeatureDB can still reliably differentiate AVBI patients from non-AVBI patients. The observed shift in threshold does not detract from its overall diagnostic performance; rather, it reflects the intrinsic differences in algorithmic processing that can be optimized with extensive datasets. This finding highlights the power of large-scale, real-world validation studies in refining and calibrating AI-based diagnostic tools, ultimately supporting their integration into clinical practice for effective and timely cardiovascular risk assessment.

Signal quality is crucial for obtaining accurate analysis results, and ECG signals with poor quality are unreliable. Poor signal quality is often associated with noise interference. For acquired ECG signals, filtering is necessary before signal analysis, or low-quality signals that cannot be repaired should be discarded<sup>[31,32]</sup>. In this study, we included ECG samples with signal quality scores above 0.5. In the comparison between FeatureDB and ECG machines, we examined the correlation coefficients of PR intervals, QRS durations, QT intervals, and QTc intervals across different signal quality ranges. The results showed that higher ECG signal quality corresponded to higher correlation coefficients for PR intervals, QRS durations, QT intervals, and QTc intervals, indicating greater reliability of FeatureDB's calculations (Figure S1). In data with poor signal quality (signal quality scores of 0.5 to 0.6), due to significant waveform variations, the parameters calculated by the algorithm had lower correlations with the reference values (Figure S1). This may be the main reason for the larger deviations between the algorithm-calculated parameters and the reference values. In data with high signal quality (signal quality scores of 0.9 to 1.0), the waveforms were clear and stable, and the parameters calculated by the algorithm were highly correlated with the reference values, verifying the reliability of the algorithm under high-quality signal conditions (Figure S1). This demonstrates that signal quality significantly impacts computational performance and annotation consistency, necessitating further optimization of low-quality signal processing capabilities. Therefore, it is essential to enhance signal quality control when using wearable devices for ECG analysis to minimize the impact of signal quality on the results.

QRS duration is an important ECG parameter, and its detection involves R-peak, Q-wave, and S-wave detection<sup>[33,34]</sup>. In this study, the correlation coefficients for QRS duration in the comparative analysis between FeatureDB and standard ECG machines as well as different clinician assessments were generally low. The presence of noise

significantly reduces signal quality, which may be one of the reasons affecting QRS duration detection. Additionally, the wearable device itself, on which the FeatureDB algorithm is based, may have influenced the QRS duration detection results. Future efforts should focus on improving the performance of wearable devices. Lastly, the sensitivity of the FeatureDB algorithm for QRS intervals is limited, and further optimization of the algorithm should be considered. However, the Bland-Altman scatter plots for QRS duration showed strong agreement between FeatureDB and both standard ECG machines and different clinician assessments. Therefore, we consider the reliability of the FeatureDB algorithm in detecting QRS duration to be acceptable.

Generally, this study enhances the practicality of the FeatureDB algorithm as a complementary tool to traditional ECG examination methods, laying the groundwork for integrating wearable ECG devices into broader clinical workflows. Additionally, compared to traditional ECG methods, wearable devices offer lower cost-effectiveness, and the introduction of FeatureDB provides wearable devices with the potential to reduce healthcare costs through early intervention. Furthermore, the validation in this study demonstrates that the combination of FeatureDB and wearable devices enhances scalability in remote diagnosis and treatment processes, reducing reliance on intensive clinician diagnostics. For example, during public health emergencies, users can obtain medical support at home using wearable devices, enabling remote diagnosis by doctors and facilitating early warning and timely intervention. Finally, this study, combined with large-scale models, features a substantial sample size and is related to Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) technology. By integrating RAG technology, FeatureDB can support the generation of personalized diagnostic recommendations, merging data-driven parameter calculations with expert knowledge to achieve more intelligent ECG analysis and clinical decision support, thereby improving the model's adaptability to diverse populations and scenarios.

This study has several limitations. First, the study population primarily originates from China. Although large-scale, real-world data from multiple centers were included, the regional constraints of the sample may affect the generalizability of the findings. Significant differences in ECG parameter distributions, cardiac physiological characteristics, and disease spectra may exist among populations of different ethnicities and regions. Therefore, the extrapolation of these results to international populations requires further validation. Second, this study was primarily validated on static ECG (30-second recordings) and has not yet covered dynamic ECG (24-hour Holter monitoring). Dynamic ECG encompasses more complex temporal dynamics, including arrhythmias and heart rate variability, which are crucial components of clinical ECG

analysis. Thus, future research needs to extend into the domain of dynamic ECG to verify the reliability and practicality of the algorithm in more complex scenarios.

## **Conclusion**

The comprehensive results indicate that FeatureDB exhibits a high level of agreement with both standard ECG machines and clinician assessments. In the future, wearable devices can be integrated with electronic health records and digital health platforms to enhance patient engagement through real-time health monitoring. This integration enables real-time data analysis, serves as a stepping stone for other wearable health innovations, and advances the paradigm shift toward personalized and decentralized care.

## **Acknowledgements**

None.

## **Data availability**

Datasets included in this study are available from the corresponding author (Shenda Hong, hongshenda@pku.edu.cn) upon reasonable request.

## **Code availability**

Python code can be accessed in github:  
[🔗 https://github.com/PKUDigitalHealth/FeatureDB](https://github.com/PKUDigitalHealth/FeatureDB) .

## **Declaration of competing interests**

The authors declare that there are no competing interests.

## Author contributions

S.H. and D.Z. conceptualized this study. S.F., D.Z., and Y.W. led the data collection and reviewed the underlying data. S.F. led the data harmonization and statistical analysis. S.F., D.Z., Y.W., S.G., and S.H. wrote the first draft of the manuscript, which was substantially revised. All authors made crucial contributions to several parts of the manuscript and had final responsibility for submission for publication.

## Funding

This study was supported by funds from the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No.62102008, No.62376256); the Joint Fund for Medical Artificial Intelligence (MAI2022Q011); the Fan Sumei scientific research start-up funds (DT2400000509).

## Reference

1. Kaptoge, S., Pennells, L., De Bacquer, D., Cooney, M.T., Kavousi, M., Stevens, G., Riley, L.M., Savin, S., Khan, T., Altay, S. and Amouyel, P., 2019. World Health Organization cardiovascular disease risk charts: revised models to estimate risk in 21 global regions. *The Lancet global health*, 7(10), pp.e1332-e1345.
2. Laranjo, L., Lanasa, F., Sun, M.C., Chen, D.A., Hynes, L., Imran, T.F., Kazi, D.S., Kengne, A.P., Komiyama, M., Kuwabara, M. and Lim, J., 2024. World Heart Federation roadmap for secondary prevention of cardiovascular disease: 2023 update. *Global heart*, 19(1).
3. De Lucia, R., Zucchelli, G., Barletta, V., Di Cori, A., Giannotti Santoro, M., Parollo, M., Segreti, L., Viani, S., Della Tommasina, V., Paperini, L. and Soldati, E., 2021. The in-ear region as a novel anatomical site for ECG signal detection: validation study on healthy volunteers. *Journal of Interventional Cardiac Electrophysiology*, 60, pp.93-100.
4. Toral, V., García, A., Romero, F.J., Morales, D.P., Castillo, E., Parrilla, L., Gómez-Campos, F.M., Morillas, A. and Sánchez, A., 2019. Wearable system for biosignal acquisition and monitoring based on reconfigurable technologies. *Sensors*, 19(7), p.1590.
5. Ernstsson, J., Svensson, B., Liuba, P. and Weismann, C.G., 2024. Validation of

smartwatch electrocardiogram intervals in children compared to standard 12 lead electrocardiograms. *European Journal of Pediatrics*, 183(9), pp.3915-3923.

6. Xie, J., Gong, Y., Wei, L., Wang, J., Li, W. and Li, Y., 2021. A heart rate detection method for wearable electrocardiogram with the presence of motion interference. *Sheng wu yi xue Gong Cheng xue za zhi= Journal of Biomedical Engineering= Shengwu Yixue Gongchengxue Zazhi*, 38(4), pp.764-773.
7. Wacker-Gussmann, A., Plankl, C., Sewald, M., Schneider, K.T.M., Oberhoffer, R. and Lobmaier, S.M., 2018. Fetal cardiac time intervals in healthy pregnancies— an observational study by fetal ECG (Monica Healthcare System). *Journal of Perinatal Medicine*, 46(6), pp.587-592.
8. Metshein, M., Krivoš ei, A., Abdullayev, A., Annus, P. and Mä rtens, O., 2022. Non-Standard Electrode Placement Strategies for ECG Signal Acquisition. *Sensors*, 22(23), p.9351.
9. Hughes, A., Shandhi, M.M.H., Master, H., Dunn, J. and Brittain, E., 2023. Wearable devices in cardiovascular medicine. *Circulation research*, 132( 5), pp.652-670.
10. Dhingra, L.S., Aminorroaya, A., Oikonomou, E.K., Nargesi, A.A., Wilson, F.P., Krumholz, H.M. and Khera, R., 2023. Use of wearable devices in individuals with or at risk for cardiovascular disease in the US, 2019 to 2020. *JAMA Network Open*, 6(6), pp.e2316634-e2316634.
11. Khurshid, S., Friedman, S., Reeder, C., Di Achille, P., Diamant, N., Singh, P., Harrington, L.X., Wang, X., Al-Alusi, M.A., Sarma, G. and Foulkes, A.S., 2022. ECG-based deep learning and clinical risk factors to predict atrial fibrillation. *Circulation*, 145(2), pp.122-133.
12. Bouzid, Z., Al-Zaiti, S.S., Bond, R. and Sejdić , E., 2022. Remote and wearable ECG devices with diagnostic abilities in adults: A state-of-the-science scoping review. *Heart Rhythm*, 19(7), pp.1192-1201.
13. Ho, W.T., Yang, Y.J. and Li, T.C., 2022. Accuracy of wrist-worn wearable devices for determining exercise intensity. *Digital Health*, 8, p.20552076221124393.
14. Hwang, J., Kim, J., Choi, K.J., Cho, M.S., Nam, G.B. and Kim, Y.H., 2019. Assessing accuracy of wrist-worn wearable devices in measurement of paroxysmal supraventricular tachycardia heart rate. *Korean circulation journal*, 49(5), pp.437-445.
15. Crossley, G.H., Boyle, A., Vitense, H., Chang, Y., Mead, R.H. and Connect Investigators, 2011. The CONNECT (Clinical Evaluation of Remote Notification to

Reduce Time to Clinical Decision) trial: the value of wireless remote monitoring with automatic clinician alerts. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology*, 57(10), pp.1181-1189.

16. Rajakariar, K., Koshy, A.N., Sajeev, J.K., Nair, S., Roberts, L. and Teh, A.W., 2020. Accuracy of a smartwatch based single-lead electrocardiogram device in detection of atrial fibrillation. *Heart*, 106(9), pp.665-670.
17. Mannhart, D., Lischer, M., Knecht, S., du Fay de Lavallaz, J., Strebler, I., Serban, T., Vö geli, D., Schaer, B., Osswald, S., Mueller, C. and Kü hne, M., 2023. Clinical validation of 5 direct-to-consumer wearable smart devices to detect atrial fibrillation: BASEL wearable study. *Clinical Electrophysiology*, 9(2), pp.232-242.
18. Hong, S., Fu, Z., Zhou, R., Yu, J., Li, Y., Wang, K. and Cheng, G., 2020, April. Cardiolearn: a cloud deep learning service for cardiac disease detection from electrocardiogram. In *Companion Proceedings of the Web Conference 2020* (pp. 148-152).
19. Fu, Z., Hong, S., Zhang, R. and Du, S., 2021. Artificial-intelligence-enhanced mobile system for cardiovascular health management. *Sensors*, 21(3), p.773.
20. Hua, J., Chu, B., Zou, J. and Jia, J., 2023. ECG signal classification in wearable devices based on compressed domain. *Plos one*, 18(4), p.e0284008.
21. Sana, F., Isselbacher, E.M., Singh, J.P., Heist, E.K., Pathik, B. and Armoundas, A. A. , 2020. Wearable devices for ambulatory cardiac monitoring: JACC state-of-the-art review. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology*, 75(13), pp.1582-1592.
22. Mutke, M.R., Brasier, N., Raichle, C., Ravanelli, F., Doerr, M. and Eckstein, J., 2021. Comparison and combination of single-lead ECG and photoplethysmography algorithms for wearable-based atrial fibrillation screening. *Telemedicine and e-Health*, 27(3), pp.296-302.
23. Alimbayeva, Z., Alimbayev, C., Ozhikenov, K., Bayanbay, N. and Ozhikenova, A., 2024. Wearable ECG Device and Machine Learning for Heart Monitoring. *Sensors*, 24(13), p.4201.
24. Saghir, N., Aggarwal, A., Soneji, N., Valencia, V., Rodgers, G. and Kurian, T., 2020. A comparison of manual electrocardiographic interval and waveform analysis in lead 1 of 12-lead ECG and Apple Watch ECG: a validation study. *Cardiovascular Digital Health Journal*, 1(1), pp.30-36.
25. Gropler, M.R., Dalal, A.S., Van Hare, G.F. and Silva, J.N.A., 2018. Can



smartphone wireless ECGs be used to accurately assess ECG intervals in pediatrics? A comparison of mobile health monitoring to standard 12-lead ECG. *PloS one*, 13(9), p.e0204403.

26. Zhang, K., Aleexenko, V. and Jeevaratnam, K., 2020. Computational approaches for detection of cardiac rhythm abnormalities: Are we there yet?. *Journal of electrocardiology*, 59, pp.28-34.
27. Krahn, A.D., Laksman, Z., Sy, R.W., Postema, P.G., Ackerman, M.J., Wilde, A.A. and Han, H.C., 2022. Congenital long QT syndrome. *Clinical Electrophysiology*, 8(5), pp.687-706.
28. Olleik, F., Istvanic, F., Pacifici, S., Ceron, C., Liu, T., Gao, C. and Yan, G.X., 2024. Association of alternating PR intervals with paroxysmal atrioventricular block in patients with right bundle branch block following cardiac surgery. *Circulation*, 150(Suppl\_1), pp.A4136989-A4136989.
29. Liu, P., Wang, Y., Zhang, X., Zhang, Z., Zhao, N., Ou, W., Wang, G., Yang, X., Li, M., Zhang, Y. and Yang, X., 2023. Obesity and cardiac conduction block disease in China. *JAMA Network Open*, 6(11), pp.e2342831-e2342831.
30. Ali, Z.S., Bhuiyan, A., Vyas, P., Miranda-Arboleda, A.F., Tse, G., Bazoukis, G., Burak, C., Abuzeid, W., Lee, S., Gupta, S. and Meghdadi, A., 2024. PR prolongation as a predictor of atrial fibrillation onset: A state-of-the-art review. *Current Problems in Cardiology*, 49(4), p.102469.
31. Satija, U., Ramkumar, B. and Manikandan, M.S., 2018. A review of signal processing techniques for electrocardiogram signal quality assessment. *IEEE reviews in biomedical engineering*, 11, pp.36-52.
32. Martí nez-Sellé s, M. and Marina-Breyse, M., 2023. Current and future use of artificial intelligence in electrocardiography. *Journal of Cardiovascular Development and Disease*, 10(4), p.175.
33. Ivora, A., Viscor, I., Nejedly, P., Smisek, R., Koscova, Z., Bulkova, V., Halamek, J., Jurak, P. and Plesinger, F., 2022. QRS detection and classification in Holter ECG data in one inference step. *Scientific Reports*, 12(1), p.12641.
34. Mohguen, O., 2024. Noise reduction and QRS detection in ECG signal using EEMD with modified sigmoid thresholding. *Biomedical Engineering/Biomedizinische Technik*, 69(1), pp.61-78.

## Supplementary material

Table S1. The correlation coefficients and *p* values of electrocardiographic parameters between FeatureDB and ECG machines for different ECG rhythms

A

Disease	Parameters	PR interval	QRS duration	QT interval	QTc interval
Normal ECG	PR interval	0.638****			
	QRS duration		0.148****		
	QT interval			0.724****	
	QTc interval				0.640****

B

Disease	Parameters	PR interval	QRS duration	QT interval	QTc interval
Sinus Rhythm	PR interval	0.642****			
	QRS duration		0.170****		
	QT interval			0.737****	
	QTc interval				0.631****

C

Disease	Parameters	PR interval	QRS duration	QT interval	QTc interval
Sinus Arrhythmia	PR interval	0.631****			
	QRS duration		0.243****		
	QT interval			0.783****	
	QTc interval				0.626****

D

Disease	Parameters	PR interval	QRS duration	QT interval	QTc interval
Sinus Tachycardia	PR interval	0.607****			
	QRS duration		0.190****		

	QT interval			0.475****	
	QTc interval				0.327****

E

Disease	Parameters	PR interval	QRS duration	QT interval	QTc interval
Sinus Bradycardia	PR interval	0.626****			
	QRS duration		0.131****		
	QT interval			0.691****	
	QTc interval				0.646****

F

Disease	Parameters	PR interval	QRS duration	QT interval	QTc interval
Ventricular Premature Contractions	PR interval	0.533****			
	QRS duration		0.206****		
	QT interval			0.619****	
	QTc interval				0.404****

G

Disease	Parameters	PR interval	QRS duration	QT interval	QTc interval
Supraventricular Premature Contractions	PR interval	0.594****			
	QRS duration		0.213****		
	QT interval			0.683****	
	QTc interval				0.430****

H

Disease	Parameters	PR interval	QRS duration	QT interval	QTc interval
Junctional Premature Contractions	PR interval	0.470****			
	QRS duration		ns		
	QT interval			0.683****	
	QTc interval				0.492****

I

Disease	Parameters	PR interval	QRS duration	QT interval	QTc interval
Atrial Premature Contractions	PR interval	0.591****			
	QRS duration		0.214****		
	QT interval			0.683****	
	QTc interval				0.428****

J

Disease	Parameters	PR interval	QRS duration	QT interval	QTc interval
Ventricular Tachycardia	PR interval	ns			
	QRS duration		ns		
	QT interval			ns	
	QTc interval				ns

K

Disease	Parameters	PR interval	QRS duration	QT interval	QTc interval
Supraventricular Tachycardia	PR interval	0.333****			
	QRS duration		0.215**		
	QT interval			0.691****	
	QTc interval				0.222**

L

Disease	Parameters	PR interval	QRS duration	QT interval	QTc interval
Atrial Flutter	PR interval	ns			
	QRS duration		ns		
	QT interval			0.387**	
	QTc interval				-0.379**

M

Disease	Parameters	PR interval	QRS duration	QT interval	QTc interval
	PR interval	ns			

Atrial Fibrillation	QRS duration		0.153***		
	QT interval			0.560****	
	QTc interval				0.162****

N

Disease	Parameters	PR interval	QRS duration	QT interval	QTc interval
Wolff-Parkinson-White Syndrome	PR interval	0.294**			
	QRS duration		0.193*		
	QT interval			0.448****	
	QTc interval				0.302**

O

Disease	Parameters	PR interval	QRS duration	QT interval	QTc interval
Ventricular Escape Beats	PR interval	0.564**			
	QRS duration		ns		
	QT interval			ns	
	QTc interval				ns

P

Disease	Parameters	PR interval	QRS duration	QT interval	QTc interval
Supraventricular Escape Beats	PR interval	0.210**			
	QRS duration		0.188**		
	QT interval			0.663****	
	QTc interval				0.379****

Q

Disease	Parameters	PR interval	QRS duration	QT interval	QTc interval
Junctional Escape Beats	PR interval	ns			
	QRS duration		ns		
	QT interval			0.498****	

	QTc interval				ns
--	--------------	--	--	--	----

R

Disease	Parameters	PR interval	QRS duration	QT interval	QTc interval
Atrial Escape Beats	PR interval	0.235*			
	QRS duration		0.194*		
	QT interval			0.722****	
	QTc interval				0.644****

S

Disease	Parameters	PR interval	QRS duration	QT interval	QTc interval
First-Degree Atrioventricular Block	PR interval	0.212****			
	QRS duration		0.280****		
	QT interval			0.634****	
	QTc interval				0.612****

T

Disease	Parameters	PR interval	QRS duration	QT interval	QTc interval
Second-Degree Atrioventricular Block	PR interval	ns			
	QRS duration		ns		
	QT interval			ns	
	QTc interval				0.620*

U

Disease	Parameters	PR interval	QRS duration	QT interval	QTc interval
Third-Degree Atrioventricular Block	PR interval	ns			
	QRS duration		ns		
	QT interval			ns	
	QTc interval				ns

V

Disease	Parameters	PR interval	QRS duration	QT interval	QTc interval
---------	------------	-------------	--------------	-------------	--------------

			duration		
Intraventricular Conduction Delay	PR interval	0.608****			
	QRS duration		0.338****		
	QT interval			0.668****	
	QTc interval				0.553****

W

Disease	Parameters	PR interval	QRS duration	QT interval	QTc interval
Left Bundle Branch Block	PR interval	0.610*			
	QRS duration		ns		
	QT interval			0.704*	
	QTc interval				ns

X

Disease	Parameters	PR interval	QRS duration	QT interval	QTc interval
Right Bundle Branch Block	PR interval	0.601****			
	QRS duration		0.469****		
	QT interval			0.725****	
	QTc interval				0.628****

Y

Disease	Parameters	PR interval	QRS duration	QT interval	QTc interval
Left Anterior Fascicular Block	PR interval	0.614****			
	QRS duration		0.255****		
	QT interval			0.618****	
	QTc interval				0.515****

Z

Disease	Parameters	PR interval	QRS duration	QT interval	QTc interval
Left	PR interval	0.565****			
	QRS		0.135****		

Ventricular Hypertrophy	duration				
	QT interval			0.647****	
	QTc interval				0.623****

AA

Disease	Parameters	PR interval	QRS duration	QT interval	QTc interval
Right Ventricular Hypertrophy	PR interval	0.503****			
	QRS duration		0.239**		
	QT interval			0.597****	
	QTc interval				0.482****

AB

Disease	Parameters	PR interval	QRS duration	QT interval	QTc interval
Left Atrial Enlargement	PR interval	0.675****			
	QRS duration		0.245****		
	QT interval			0.516****	
	QTc interval				0.457****

AC

Disease	Parameters	PR interval	QRS duration	QT interval	QTc interval
Right Atrial Enlargement	PR interval	0.673****			
	QRS duration		0.151*		
	QT interval			0.617****	
	QTc interval				0.407****

AD

Disease	Parameters	PR interval	QRS duration	QT interval	QTc interval
ST Segment Abnormality	PR interval	0.615****			
	QRS duration		0.183****		
	QT interval			0.634****	
	QTc interval				0.436****



AE

Disease	Parameters	PR interval	QRS duration	QT interval	QTc interval
T Wave Abnormality	PR interval	0.608****			
	QRS duration		0.199****		
	QT interval			0.573****	
	QTc interval				0.378****

AF

Disease	Parameters	PR interval	QRS duration	QT interval	QTc interval
Q Wave Abnormality	PR interval	0.578****			
	QRS duration		0.259****		
	QT interval			0.543****	
	QTc interval				0.397****

AG

Disease	Parameters	PR interval	QRS duration	QT interval	QTc interval
Myocardial Infarction	PR interval	0.551****			
	QRS duration		0.260**		
	QT interval			0.351****	
	QTc interval				ns

AH

Disease	Parameters	PR interval	QRS duration	QT interval	QTc interval
ST-T Abnormality with Q Wave Abnormality	PR interval	0.619****			
	QRS duration		0.180****		
	QT interval			0.618****	
	QTc interval				0.420****

AI

Disease	Parameters	PR interval	QRS duration	QT interval	QTc interval

Pacemaker Rhythm	PR interval	ns			
	QRS duration		0.370*		
	QT interval			0.349*	
	QTc interval				0.440**

AJ

Disease	Parameters	PR interval	QRS duration	QT interval	QTc interval
Left Axis Deviation	PR interval	0.648****			
	QRS duration		0.248****		
	QT interval			0.722****	
	QTc interval				0.580****

AK

Disease	Parameters	PR interval	QRS duration	QT interval	QTc interval
Right Axis Deviation	PR interval	0.512****			
	QRS duration		0.146****		
	QT interval			0.543****	
	QTc interval				0.518****

AL

Disease	Parameters	PR interval	QRS duration	QT interval	QTc interval
Clockwise Rotation of the Heart	PR interval	0.602****			
	QRS duration		0.246****		
	QT interval			0.653****	
	QTc interval				0.563****

AM

Disease	Parameters	PR interval	QRS duration	QT interval	QTc interval
Counterclockwise Rotation of the Heart	PR interval	ns			
	QRS duration		ns		

	QT interval			0.890**	
	QTc interval				0.769*

AN

Disease	Parameters	PR interval	QRS duration	QT interval	QTc interval
Low Voltage in Limb Leads	PR interval	0.513*			
	QRS duration		ns		
	QT interval			0.749***	
	QTc interval				ns

AP

Disease	Parameters	PR interval	QRS duration	QT interval	QTc interval
Early Repolarization	PR interval	0.609****			
	QRS duration		ns		
	QT interval			0.703****	
	QTc interval				0.655****

AQ

Disease	Parameters	PR interval	QRS duration	QT interval	QTc interval
PR Interval Abnormality	PR interval	0.175*			
	QRS duration		ns		
	QT interval			0.775****	
	QTc interval				0.678****

AR

Disease	Parameters	PR interval	QRS duration	QT interval	QTc interval
QT Interval Abnormality	PR interval	0.647****			
	QRS duration		0.227****		
	QT interval			0.606****	
	QTc interval				0.196****

AS

Disease	Parameters	PR interval	QRS duration	QT interval	QTc interval
Long QT Interval	PR interval	0.637****			
	QRS duration		0.233****		
	QT interval			0.598****	
	QTc interval				0.174****

r for Pearson correlation or Spearman correlation.

ns = no significance,  $p > 0.05$ ; \* $p < 0.05$ ; \*\* $p < 0.01$ ; \*\*\* $p < 0.001$ ; \*\*\*\* $p < 0.0001$ .

Table S2. Comparison of electrocardiographic parameters between Doctor A's and Doctor B's assessments from the HeartVoice-ECG-lite dataset

Parameters	Doctor D's assessments (n = 369)	Doctor L's assessments (n = 369)	r	p
PR interval	148.0 (138.0, 162.0)	142.0 (133.0, 156.0)	0.872	<0.001
QRS duration	106.0 (97.0, 113.5)	118.0 (107.0, 128.0)	0.501	<0.001
QT interval	378.0 (358.0, 403.0)	392.0 (372.0, 422.0)	0.940	<0.001
QTc interval	426.8 (25.7)	443.2 (23.7)	0.889	<0.001

Values were presented as Mean (SD) or Median (IQR).

r for Pearson correlation or Spearman correlation.




Figure S1. The correlation coefficients for different signal quality index between FeatureDB and ECG machines in PR interval, QRS duration, QT interval, and QTc interval (A).