

# Choosing the Appropriate QRS Detector

Justus Eilers<sup>a</sup>, Jonas Chromik<sup>b</sup> and Bert Arnrich

*Hasso Plattner Institute, University of Potsdam, Rudolf-Breitscheid-Straße 187, Potsdam, Germany*

**Keywords:** Electrocardiography, QRS Detection, Heart Rate, Heart Rate Variability, Alarm Fatigue.

**Abstract:** QRS detectors are used as the most basic processing tool for ECG signals. Thus, there are many situations and signals with a wide range of characteristics in which they shall show great performance. Despite the expected versatility, most of the published QRS detectors are not tested on a diverse dataset. Using 14 databases, 10,000 heartbeats for each different heartbeat type were extracted to show that there are notable performance differences for the tested eight algorithms. Besides the analysis on heartbeat types, this paper also tests the noise resilience regarding different noise combinations. Each of the tested QRS detectors showed significant differences depending on heartbeat type and noise combination. This leads to the conclusion that before choosing a QRS detector, one should consider its use case and test the detector on data representing it. For authors of QRS detectors, this means that every algorithm evaluation should employ a dataset that is as diverse as the one used in this paper to assess the QRS detector's performance in an objective and unbiased manner.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Monitoring the heartbeat of a patient is done in two levels of detail. The first application is recording the pace of the heart and the second the regularity of the heart rate also known as heart rate variability analysis. In the intensive care unit (ICU) the first use case applies as all physiological parameters of a patient are constantly monitored. One of these parameters is the patient's heart rate. Because the care personnel cannot calculate the heart rate for every recorded electrocardiogram (ECG), this task is done by an algorithm. Such algorithms, called QRS detectors, need very high accuracy as errors may lead to false alarms, that a nurse needs to check out. If too many false alarms are raised, this causes nurses and doctors not responding to them anymore (Drew et al., 2014). This phenomenon is called alarm fatigue and has to be avoided as good as possible.


If QRS detectors are used to perform a heart rate variability analysis (HRV) some different metrics are needed to see if a QRS detector is suitable. Since HRVs use the time difference between QRS complexes (Cygankiewicz and Zareba, 2013) it is not only important that a QRS detector finds all heartbeats but also predicts them with the same offset.


Patients need to have their heart tracked for multi-

ple reasons, one reason might be that they suffer from a heart-related illness. On one hand, cause these illnesses different kinds of heartbeats (MIT-LCP, 2020), such as bundle branch blocks or premature ventricular contractions, that have sometimes vastly different waveforms. Such special heartbeats might not be detected as well as regular, healthy heartbeats thus resulting in false alarms. On the other hand, are not all patients required to lie down in bed all the time. The movement of the patient causes noise, which can also cause false alarms.

This paper shows the performance differences of QRS detectors based on the ECG signals they are evaluated on.

The rest of this work is structured as follows: In section 2 electrocardiography in general and QRS detection in particular are introduced. In section 3 the related work is summarized. In section 4 it is explained how the QRS detectors are compared and which databases are used. In section 5 the results of our comparison are shown, described, and explained. Finally, section 6 briefly discusses the implications of our findings.

<sup>a</sup>  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9982-3562>

<sup>b</sup>  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5709-4381>

## 2 BACKGROUND

The heart beats because the sinoatrial node (OpenStax, 2013) propagates an electric pulse over the conducting system of the heart. This electric potential can be measured by placing electrodes on very specific points on the human body. Based on the electrical signal, so-called leads can be computed. These leads may then be used to study the inner workings of the heart and form the electrocardiogram (ECG). Medical professionals use the ECG to diagnose illnesses for example by looking at heartbeats with special shapes in the ECG.

Moreover, the ECG is also used to calculate the heart rate of a patient. To do this, algorithms called QRS detectors locate in the ECG the largest, most prominent spike called R-peak. The smaller spikes before and after are called Q- and S-peak, therefore the name QRS detector (Kohler et al., 2002).

Besides to compute the heart rate, the ECG signal is also used for a heart rate variability analysis (Malik and Camm, 1990). Since the basis of this analysis is the distribution of intervals from one R-peak to the next, the R-peaks have to be found as precisely as possible (Arzeno et al., 2008).

## 3 RELATED WORK

For medical professionals to decide for a QRS detector, an evaluation of them is needed. In the existing research many such comparisons have been performed (see (Álvarez et al., 2013), (Francesca et al., 2018), (Xiang et al., 2018), (Phukpattaranont, 2015)) but most of the time they are not comparable with each other. This is caused by differing dataset, thresholds, and preprocessing methodologies (Elgendi et al., 2014). Additionally, all the previously listed evaluations use the MIT-BIH Arrhythmia Database (Moody and Mark, 2001) as a resource for the evaluation data. This has the issue that the MIT-BIH Arrhythmia Database is so widespread, that authors proposing new algorithms can optimize their algorithm just for this database. Thus, the common principle of having disjoint test and validation data set is violated.

In (Liu et al., 2018) ten algorithms were evaluated based on six different databases. As mentioned in the paper, all the algorithms were executed on both high-quality and low-quality ECG signals. Like the paper mentions, the algorithms focus on speed and not on noise resilience, their performance often does differ a lot between high and low quality. Having this evaluation over multiple databases, it becomes

clear how much the data quality differs in each of the tested databases. For example, on the Telehealth ECG Database, almost all the algorithms perform as bad as on the ECG database explicitly labelled as poor quality.

A large listing of algorithms and their quality regarding robustness to noise, parameter choice and numerical efficiency has been done by (Elgendi et al., 2014). Even though the authors did not compute positive predictive value and sensitivity by themselves, they list the values of these metrics determined by the original publishers. Furthermore, the authors mention that the robustness to noise suffers as many papers only use record from the MIT-BIH Arrhythmia Database. Sometimes not even papers using the MIT-BIT Arrhythmia Database are comparable as they exclude certain unfavourable records or segments. (Arzeno et al., 2008) excludes a period at atrial flutter in record 204 and (Elgendi et al., 2010) does not exclude anything. If different databases are used, this also causes incomparable results. Thus, a standard database would be needed that contains already prepared evaluation data. Furthermore, this database would need to contain such diverse ECG recording that makes it difficult for authors to optimize their algorithms just for this database as this is a case of overfitting.

## 4 METHODS AND MATERIALS

This section gives a quick overview of the databases used for the evaluation process presented in this paper. For the latter one includes the data preparation, used metrics and algorithms.

### 4.1 Databases

To not get biased towards a single database, especially the MIT-BIH Arrhythmia Database, many databases available on PhysioNet (Goldberger et al., 2000) were inspected. It follows a list of the databases that got into closer consideration. The most occurring exclusion criteria where very special recordings for example fetal ECG, automated/missing annotations or only very short, hand-selected recordings. In Figure 1 the decision process behind the exclusion of databases is shown. Only databases with manual annotations can be used as otherwise a QRS detector would be judged based on the performance of another QRS detector. The MIT-BIH Arrhythmia Database was excluded as well in an attempt to reduce bias. Fetal and infant ECG recordings are performed differently than their adult counterparts and thus yield different ECG sig-




Figure 1: Decision process for including or excluding ECG databases.

nals. Hence, this work focuses on adult ECG recordings. All databases containing heart failure were excluded as this is a very special scenario. Because this scenario is so rarely recorded, even in the databases containing heart failures there is not a representative number of these instances. Without reaching the threshold of having a representative amount, all findings are not statistically significant. Also, this work focuses on externally measured ECG data and thus the Intracardiac Atrial Fibrillation Database had to be dropped. Left with 17 databases two more were designed for testing noise resilience. Those contained recordings with noise but as this paper wants to test the noise influence it is important to know exactly which and how much noise is added. Finally, one database had to be dropped as it contained too many files with invalid annotations or not processible annotation files.

This leaves the following databases for evaluating QRS detectors: ANSI/AAMI EC13 Test Waveforms<sup>1</sup>, MIT-BIH Atrial Fibrillation Database<sup>2</sup>, CiPA ECG Validation Study (Vicente et al., 2019), ECG Effects of Dofetilide, Moxifloxacin, Dofetilide+Mexiletine, Dofetilide+Lidocaine and Moxifloxacin+Diltiazem (Johannesen et al., 2016), ECG Effects of Ranolazine, Dofetilide, Verapamil, and Quinidine (Johannesen et al., 2014), European ST-T Database (Taddei et al.,

1992), St Petersburg INCART 12-lead Arrhythmia Database, Long Term ST Database (Jager et al., 2003), MIT-BIH Normal Sinus Rhythm Database (Moody and Mark, 2001), MIT-BIH Noise Stress Test Database (only for the noise recordings) (Moody et al., 1984), QT Database (Laguna et al., 1997), MIT-BIH Polysomnographic Database (Ichimaru and Moody, 1999), MIT-BIH Supraventricular Arrhythmia Database (Greenwald, 1990), MIT-BIH Malignant Ventricular Ectopy Database (Greenwald, 1986)

Especially valuable are the databases with special focus on certain illnesses or ECG recordings of patients under the influence of certain drugs. This is because in the ICU people are often very sick, thus a diverse set of drugs is used and QRS detectors need to work regardless of these circumstances.

## 4.2 QRS Detectors

In this paper, eight algorithms for QRS detection are evaluated. A brief description of them is given in the following:

**Engelse-Zeelenberg (Engelse and Zeelenberg, 1979) (Zeelenberg and Engelse, 1975):** is the oldest algorithm in the ones presented here with a publishing date ranging back to 1979, which is even earlier than the Pan-Tompkins algorithm. It works with basic waveform comparison and analysis techniques.

**Pan-Tompkins (Pan and Tompkins, 1985):** uses two adaptive thresholds and bandpass filtering to detect the QRS-complexes. This means that the algorithm performance on a specific QRS-complex depends on the previously seen signal, which influences the adaptive thresholds.

**Hamilton (Hamilton and Tompkins, 1986):** is very similar to the Pan-Tompkins algorithm. It also uses a low followed by a high-pass filter, calculates the derivative, computes the moving average, and finds the QRS complexes by peak detection and applying detection rules. The main difference between Hamilton and the Pan-Tompkins algorithm are the two last stages.

**GQRS:**<sup>3</sup> has not been published yet but is distributed in the wfdb software package, which is authored by George B. Moody. Although this algorithm has been optimized for sensitivity, the software package comes with a post-processing algorithm, called gqpost, that should increase the positive predictions at cost of sensitivity. Nevertheless, gqpost will not be used in the paper.

**XQRS:**<sup>4</sup> has not been published in any available paper, just like the GQRS algorithm. But unlike with

<sup>1</sup><https://physionet.org/content/aami-ec13/1.0.0/>

<sup>2</sup><https://physionet.org/content/afdb/1.0.0/>

GQRS, the exact QRS-detection algorithm is explained in the documentation. After initialization and bandpass filtering, moving wave integration and Ricker wavelet are applied to the signal. The next step is unique as the algorithm tries to learn parameters for noise and the QRS amplitudes, the QRS-detection threshold and recent R-R intervals. The final output is produced with the previously processed signal and the learned parameters.

**Christov (Christov, 2004):** starts to process the signal by applying multiple moving average filters. Then adaptive steep-slope thresholding is performed. The initial parameters for that are kept for the first 5s, where the author expects at least two QRS complexes to occur. Additionally, an adaptive integrating threshold, that should explicitly remove muscle movement artefacts, is computed. Also having adaptive beat expectation thresholding shall then compensate for heartbeats with normal amplitude followed by beats with smaller amplitude. It generated the final output called combined adaptive thresholding with is the sum of the previous thresholding approaches.

**Two Moving Average (Elgendi et al., 2010):** also starts with a bandpass filter to remove unwanted noise, such as power line noise. It follows the generation of potential blocks containing QRS-complexes. In this part, the authors assume a duration of  $100 \pm 20$  ms as the duration of the QRS complex but also mention, that this is the average for healthy adults. Thus this algorithm might struggle for children or adults with severe illnesses. Finally, the R-peaks are determined using thresholding based on the statistics of a healthy adult. This might face the same issues as the previous step.

**Stationary Wavelet Transform (Kalidas and Tamil, 2017):** uses the first ten seconds of the provided sample as the learning phase. The signal is then split into three-second segments, on which the detection is performed. The algorithm begins with resampling to 80 Hz to reduce noise and improve the computation speed. After that, the stationary wavelet transform is computed on which a squaring and moving window averaging is performed. The final step is the R-peak detection, consisting of initialization, threshold-based peak detection, missed beat detection, threshold updating, and finally R-peak localization.

### 4.3 Evaluation Procedure

To see how certain beat types influence the performance of algorithms, enough examples of such beats

need to be extracted from the databases. In (Kohler et al., 2002) the majority of the inspected algorithms is listed as having more than 99% Sensitivity and Positive Predictive Value. Because QRS detectors perform so well, they need to be evaluated on a sufficiently large dataset. As an adequate size at least 10,000 heartbeats has been chosen. This number allows calculating the classification metrics with five decimal places. At the same time, this number can be derived for a real-world consideration. When recognizing that the normal resting heart rate for an adult lies at about 60 to 100 bpm (OpenStax, 2013), this results in 86,000 to 144,000 beats per day. The time of 24 hours is chosen because it represents the common time for long-term ECG monitoring for example to perform an HRV analysis. Usually, metrics are recorded with two to four decimal places (such as 99% or 99.99%). At the example of the Sensitivity using a resolution of  $10^{-5}$  means that the algorithm misses 8.6 to 14.4 beats per day with every decrease of the Sensitivity by 0.0001. This is about ten extra seconds of missed beats. Using only one decimal place fewer would mean that an algorithm only missing ten seconds or heartbeats is just as bad as an algorithm missing one and a half minute.

After selecting 10,000 beats at random from the available databases of each beat types they are extracted from the original recording. This is done to reduce the computational effort as it is not needed to run an algorithm on a half-hour recording if just the prediction of a couple of beats is of interest. Thus, each selected beat gets sliced with 10 beats before and after. This length is chosen as 10 beats is the longest any of the used algorithms needs to learn parameters.

The heartbeat types that were chosen for this evaluation are the ones that occur most often in the used databases:

- N** normal beat
- S** supra-ventricular premature or ectopic beat
- V** premature ventricular contraction
- R** right bundle branch block
- B** unspecified bundle branch block
- L** left bundle branch block
- A** atrial premature beat (Goldberger et al., 2000)

To assess the noise resilience of the algorithms, more or less noise-free ECG recordings need to be induced with noise. The MIT-BIH Noise Stress Test Database (Moody et al., 1984) is used as a source for noise. The noise types contained in this database are baseline wander, muscle artefacts, and electrode motion artefacts. Each combination of these three noises was then added to each slice of the noise-free ECG






Figure 2: Exactly one example for each: True Positive (TP), True Negative (TN), False Positive (FP), and False Negative (FN). The green intervals represent the time frame in which predictions are accepted as correct. In the yellow and red intervals, no predictions are expected. The grey vertical lines show predictions. As dashed line you see the mid-point between two QRS complexes, marking the end and beginning of an interval that may be a TN or FP.

signal. This creates eight versions for each slice: One with no noise, three with only one noise type added, another three with each possible pair, and one with all three noise types combined.

Just as many of the presented works, this paper will also use the Positive Predictive Value and Sensitivity as algorithm performance measures. Additionally, the Specificity will be used to show how well the algorithms are able to recognize periods without heartbeats, and the Mean Error to show the prediction offsets.

Detections within the range of 100 ms to the left and right of each QRS complex are accepted as a valid prediction. Each QRS complex interval containing a valid prediction is counted as True Positive. If the prediction is farther away than 100 ms from the QRS complex, it is associated with the QRS complex that is closest and counted as False Positive. For every 200 ms interval around a QRS complex not containing a prediction, a False Negative is counted. When an interval between two QRS complexes minus their 100 ms thresholds does not contain any prediction, this counts as a True Negative. Visually these metrics explained in Figure 2. The green intervals represent the threshold of 100 ms seconds around each QRS complex. Grey vertical lines mark algorithm predictions. Based on these metrics, the following three aggregated metrics can be computed:

$$\text{Positive Predictive Value (PPV)} = \frac{TP}{TP+FP}$$

$$\text{Sensitivity (Sens)} = \frac{TP}{TP+FN}$$

$$\text{Specificity (Spec)} = \frac{TN}{TN+FP}$$

The *Mean Error (ME)*<sup>5</sup> gets calculated by averaging the time differences between a prediction and the closest actual QRS complex. This also means that if no prediction is closest to a QRS complex, this is not reflected in the metric.

<sup>5</sup>here, Error is equivalent to Prediction Offset or Time Difference, respectively




Figure 3: Shows the problem of evaluating on recordings where normal beats (N) occur more often than other heartbeat types. Orange is Hamilton and in red Engelse-Zeelenberg, just as in Figure 5.

## 5 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this section, the influence of different heartbeat types, as well as noise on the performance of QRS detectors, is shown. To have a baseline for comparing the performance to, Figure 4 displays the performance of algorithms on the MIT-BIH Arrhythmia Database.

### 5.1 Heartbeat Type Influence

When looking into the heartbeat dependent performance for QRS detectors, each of the seven heartbeat types in Figure 5 has their individual impact on the algorithms. But before diving into the general trends for the heartbeat types and the four metrics, looking at Figure 3 shows that evaluating algorithm on whole ECG recordings does not encapsulate the true QRS detector performance.

When whole real-world ECG recordings are used, the vast majority of the occurring heartbeat types are normal beats. This means that any computed metric based on these evaluations will have a strong bias towards normal beats. In the example of Figure 3 this would mean that here Engelse-Zeelenberg (red, 0.85905) would show a higher Sensitivity than Hamilton (orange, 0.82392). Although, when all heartbeat types are tested Hamilton shows a better average performance with 0.85524 over 0.64961.

Following the principle of this evaluation, all the other algorithms can be compared for the four metrics Positive Predictive Value, Sensitivity, Specificity, and Mean Error. For each of these metrics follows a detailed analysis. The corresponding plots can be seen in Figure 5.




Figure 4: Algorithm results on the MIT-BIH Arrhythmia Database with our evaluation method.

### 5.1.1 Positive Predictive Value

As one of the two most used evaluation metrics, the PPV shows consistent values for each of the heartbeat types in Figure 5. Ignoring the outliers from Two Moving Average, the values per type do not deviate more than 10% to the mean of them. An exception to this is the values for normal heartbeats. On a per algorithm basis, Stationary Wavelet Transform shows that even if an algorithm is in the good-performing cluster, it can still show significant value deviations (compare type B at 0.66 with S at 0.86).

### 5.1.2 Sensitivity

As the other commonly used evaluation metric, the Sensitivity shows a larger fluctuation of the results than the PPV. Mainly Engelse-Zeelenberg and again Two Moving Average seem to struggle with many False Negatives. The other algorithms show consistently good results with again varying performance for each of the heartbeat types. As for the PPV, here again, atrial premature beats (A) and left bundle branch blocks (L) are the worst two. The effect of different heartbeat types is shown in this metric, for example by Pan-Tompkins (see type B at 0.901 and L at 0.742).

### 5.1.3 Specificity

Is not usually used and shows a wider spread of value for every heartbeat type. Excluding normal beats (N) that again have a higher deviation than all the other types, the algorithms differ by about 15% around the

mean. Compared to the PPV the algorithms Specificity values roughly share their performance i.e. a high PPV leads to a high Specificity. Despite the constant performance in PPV, Christov shows large differences namely in types S at 0.816 and A at 0.622.

### 5.1.4 Mean Error

As the Mean Error can only be computed if a prediction for a heartbeat was made, this metric is not significant for judging the False Negatives. This can be seen in both the figure for Specificity as well as Sensitivity, where left bundle branch blocks (L) do not have the worst performances, even though all algorithm struggle most with predicting this type. Furthermore, the Mean Error shows how different the algorithm predicts for each heartbeat type. Even though normal beats showed one of the largest metric deviations for each metric, this figure shows that it has the most accurate predictions overall. Only right bundle branch blocks (R) and unspecified bundle branch blocks (B) have similarly accurate predictions.

## 5.2 Noise Resilience

For evaluating the impact of different noise types and their combinations, in Figure 6 all possible combinations of electrode movement, muscle artefacts, and baseline wander are examined. Just like for the heartbeat type-specific analysis, a more detailed evaluation of the results follows.




Figure 5: The algorithm results for Positive Predictive Value (PPV), Sensitivity, Specificity, and Mean Error show largely different results for each beat type.

### 5.2.1 Positive Prediction Value

Figure 6 shows clearly that electrode movement results in noise that is harder for algorithms to distinguish from the clean ECG data than other types of noise. The combinations with electrode movement noise (em-noise) do not only show on average the lowest values but also a higher spread among the algorithms. For the non-em-noise combinations, the PPV-values range from 0.6746 to 1.0 and for the em-noises from 0.5076 to 0.9126.

Although all algorithms decreased in PPV from the non-em noises to the em-noises, large differences can be observed on a per algorithm basis. While the Pan-Tompkins algorithm decreased from 0.7 (none) to 0.6 (em), Christov dropped from almost 1 to 0.65.

### 5.2.2 Sensitivity

Generally, the same results can be observed as for the PPV. The electrode movement noise combinations show a worse Sensitivity than the other noise combinations. However, the decrease is not as large as for the PPV. Comparing the em-noise to the no-noise variant of the data, the biggest drop in Sensitivity happens for the Engelse-Zeelenberg algorithm from 0.9517 to 0.7590. Nevertheless, there are algorithms like Hamilton or Pan-Tompkins that even show an improvement.

Overall the Hamilton algorithm is very interesting as it shows its best performance for the combination of muscle artefacts with baseline wander at 0.883. This is only slightly over the pure muscle artefact variant which is at 0.877. The worst performance




Figure 6: Large algorithm specific differences can be observed. Even each individual algorithm shows a wide range of results depending on the noise combination from muscle artefacts (ma), electrode movement (em), and baseline wander (bw).

for Hamilton is actually for no noise all with a Sensitivity of 0.752. The same pattern of Sensitivity increasing in the presence of noise can also be observed with the Pan-Tompkins algorithm. This is caused by noise spikes that are detected as QRS complexes and are close to actual QRS complexes so that these detections are recognised as true positives. The drop for Positive Predictive Value also supports this explanation as it would mean that generally False Positives are increasing and more heartbeats are detected.

### 5.2.3 Specificity

The trend of electrode movement noise showing the worse results is also confirmed by the Specificity. All algorithms show almost identical results for all the em-noise combinations. While XQRS, Engelse-Zeelenberg, Christov, and GQRS give similar results for all the other noise combinations, Stationary Wavelet Transform and Hamilton are not consistent at all.

From all the classification metrics, the Speci-



ficity shows the largest deviation of values. For pure em-noise, the values range from 0.91946 (Engelse-Zeelenbeerg) to 0.42204 (Two Moving Average).

#### 5.2.4 Mean Error

At first sight, it seems counter-intuitive that for the recordings with no noise the Mean Error shows the largest value deviation. However, the Mean Error can only be computed if a prediction for a QRS complex has been made. If an algorithm has not predicted anything, this will not count into the Mean Error. The consequence of this is, that for very difficult noise combinations, here the electrode movement noise, only very obvious heartbeats get detected. Such obvious or easy to detect heartbeats are also the ones, that all algorithms can accurately locate.

When comparing the Mean Error per noise type to the Mean Error per heartbeat type from Figure 5 it shows that the predictions are on average more accurate.

## 6 CONCLUSION

It has been shown that QRS detector evaluations should be executed with more care and on diverse datasets. Especially the large gap between the algorithm performance on the MIT-BIH Arrhythmia Database and a more diverse dataset justifies the question if some algorithms were optimized specifically for this database and were not tested for rare beat types or noise resilience. Furthermore, the results showed that different heartbeat types and noise combinations have two different effects on the algorithms. While different heartbeat types cause algorithms to make more inaccurate predictions, noise has the effect of obfuscating heartbeats such that they are not found at all.

The evaluated algorithms have a wide range of noise resilience as well as the ability to deal with other than normal heartbeat types. Especially for electrode movement noise and almost all heartbeat types the PPV, Sensitivity, and Specificity values that most of the time were not even close to 99% in harsh contrast to what the authors state. Algorithms with 99% Sensitivity would miss 864 heartbeats per day and all of the evaluated ones showed worse performances. If the wrong algorithms are used in clinical practice, it will cause an unnecessary amount of false alarms. Because these false alarms result in alarm fatigue and in the end, might result in a patient not receiving needed help, it is important to allow medical practitioners to choose the right QRS detector for each use case.




Figure 7: Deciding for an algorithm based on the performance on premature ventricular contractions (V).

For that to be possible, the algorithm authors need to test their algorithms on a dataset that is as diverse as possible and contains equal amounts of heartbeats for each type and is evaluated with different noise combinations.

For medical practitioners there needs to be an easy way of understanding which algorithm performs best in the use case at hand. In a first attempt to visualize how such a decision aid may look like Figure 7 shows the eight algorithms of this paper for the four metrics Positive Predictive Value (PPV), Sensitivity (Sens), Specificity (Spec) and Mean Error (ME). The Mean Error had to be transformed to keep that the more area a curve spans the better the algorithm performance.

## REFERENCES

- Arzeno, N. M., Deng, Z.-D., and Poon, C.-S. (2008). Analysis of First-Derivative Based QRS Detection Algorithms. *IEEE transactions on bio-medical engineering*, 55(2):478–484.
- Christov, I. I. (2004). Real time electrocardiogram QRS detection using combined adaptive threshold. *BioMedical Engineering OnLine*, 3:28. Publisher: Citeseer.
- Cygankiewicz, I. and Zareba, W. (2013). Chapter 31 - Heart rate variability. In Buijs, R. M. and Swaab, D. F., editors, *Handbook of Clinical Neurology*, volume 117 of *Autonomic Nervous System*, pages 379–393. Elsevier.
- Drew, B. J., Harris, P., Zègre-Hemsey, J. K., Mammone, T., Schindler, D., Salas-Boni, R., Bai, Y., Tinoco, A., Ding, Q., and Hu, X. (2014). Insights into the Problem of Alarm Fatigue with Physiologic Monitor Devices: A Comprehensive Observational Study of Consecutive Intensive Care Unit Patients. *PLoS ONE*, 9(10):e110274.
- Elgendi, M., Eskofier, B., Dokos, S., and Abbott, D. (2014). Revisiting QRS Detection Methodologies for

- Portable, Wearable, Battery-Operated, and Wireless ECG Systems. *PLoS ONE*, 9(1):e84018.
- Elgendi, M., Jonkman, M., and De Boer, F. (2010). Frequency Bands Effects on QRS Detection. *BIOSIGNALS*, 2003:2002.
- Engelse, W. A. H. and Zeelenberg, C. (1979). A single scan algorithm for QRS-detection and feature extraction. *Computers in cardiology*, 6(1979):37–42. Publisher: IEEE Computer Society Press.
- Francesca, S., Carlo, C. G., Nunzio, L. D., Rocco, F., and Marco, R. (2018). Comparison of Low-Complexity Algorithms for Real-Time QRS Detection using Standard ECG Database. *Inter. Journal on Advanced Science Engineering Information Technology*, 8(2).
- Goldberger, A. L., Amaral, L. A., Glass, L., Hausdorff, J. M., Ivanov, P. C., Mark, R. G., Mietus, J. E., Moody, G. B., Peng, C.-K., and Stanley, H. E. (2000). PhysioBank, PhysioToolkit, and PhysioNet: components of a new research resource for complex physiologic signals. *circulation*, 101(23):e215–e220. Publisher: Am Heart Assoc.
- Greenwald, S. D. (1986). *The development and analysis of a ventricular fibrillation detector*. Thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Accepted: 2015-01-20T17:51:30Z.
- Greenwald, S. D. (1990). *Improved detection and classification of arrhythmias in noise-corrupted electrocardiograms using contextual information*. Thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Accepted: 2005-10-07T20:45:22Z.
- Hamilton, P. S. and Tompkins, W. J. (1986). Quantitative investigation of QRS detection rules using the MIT/BIH arrhythmia database. *IEEE transactions on biomedical engineering*, BME-33(12):1157–1165. Publisher: IEEE.
- Ichimaru, Y. and Moody, G. B. (1999). Development of the polysomnographic database on CD-ROM. *Psychiatry and Clinical Neurosciences*, 53(2):175–177. eprint: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1046/j.1440-1819.1999.00527.x>.
- Jager, F., Taddei, A., Moody, G. B., Emdin, M., Antolič, G., Dorn, R., Smrdel, A., Marchesi, C., and Mark, R. G. (2003). Long-term ST database: A reference for the development and evaluation of automated ischaemia detectors and for the study of the dynamics of myocardial ischaemia. *Medical & Biological Engineering & Computing*, 41(2):172–182.
- Johannesen, L., Vicente, J., Mason, J. W., Erato, C., Sanabria, C., Waite-Labott, K., Hong, M., Lin, J., Guo, P., Mutlib, A., Wang, J., Crumb, W. J., Blinova, K., Chan, D., Stohlman, J., Florian, J., Ugander, M., Stockbridge, N., and Strauss, D. G. (2016). Late sodium current block for drug-induced long QT syndrome: Results from a prospective clinical trial. *Clinical Pharmacology and Therapeutics*, 99(2):214–223.
- Johannesen, L., Vicente, J., Mason, J. W., Sanabria, C., Waite-Labott, K., Hong, M., Guo, P., Lin, J., Sørensen, J. S., Galeotti, L., Florian, J., Ugander, M., Stockbridge, N., and Strauss, D. G. (2014). Differentiating drug-induced multichannel block on the electrocardiogram: randomized study of dofetilide, quinidine, ranolazine, and verapamil. *Clinical Pharmacology and Therapeutics*, 96(5):549–558.
- Kalidas, V. and Tamil, L. S. (2017). Real-time QRS detector using Stationary Wavelet Transform for Automated ECG Analysis. In *2017 IEEE 17th Inter. Conf. on Bioinformatics and Bioengineering (BIBE)*. IEEE.
- Kohler, B.-U., Hennig, C., and Orglmeister, R. (2002). The principles of software QRS detection. *IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Magazine*, 21(1):42–57.
- Laguna, P., Mark23, R. G., Goldberg, A., and Moody23, G. B. (1997). A Database for Evaluation of Algorithms for Measurement of QT and Other Waveform Intervals in the ECG. *Computers in cardiology*.
- Liu, F., Liu, C., Jiang, X., Zhang, Z., Zhang, Y., Li, J., and Wei, S. (2018). Performance Analysis of Ten Common QRS Detectors on Different ECG Application Cases. *Journal of Healthcare Engineering*, 2018:1–8.
- Álvarez, R. A., Penín, A. J. M., and Sobrino, X. A. V. (2013). A comparison of three QRS detection algorithms over a public database. *Procedia Technology*, 9:1159–1165. Publisher: Elsevier.
- Malik, M. and Camm, A. J. (1990). Heart rate variability. *Clinical Cardiology*, 13(8):570–576.
- MIT-LCP (2020). PhysioBank Annotations.
- Moody, G. and Mark, R. (2001). The impact of the MIT-BIH Arrhythmia Database. *IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Magazine*, 20(3):45–50.
- Moody, G. B., Muldrow, W., and Mark, R. G. (1984). A noise stress test for arrhythmia detectors. *Computers in cardiology*, 11(3):381–384.
- OpenStax, C. (2013). *Anatomy & Physiology*. OpenStax College.
- Pan, J. and Tompkins, W. J. (1985). A Real-Time QRS Detection Algorithm. *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering*, 32(3).
- Phukpattaranont, P. (2015). Comparisons of wavelet functions in QRS signal to noise ratio enhancement and detection accuracy. *arXiv:1504.03834 [cs]*. arXiv: 1504.03834.
- Taddei, A., Distant, G., Emdin, M., Pisani, P., Moody, G. B., Zeelenberg, C., and Marchesi, C. (1992). The European ST-T database: standard for evaluating systems for the analysis of ST-T changes in ambulatory electrocardiography. *European Heart Journal*, 13(9):1164–1172.
- Vicente, J., Zusterzeel, R., Johannesen, L., Ochoa-Jimenez, R., Mason, J. W., Sanabria, C., Kemp, S., Sager, P. T., Patel, V., Matta, M. K., Liu, J., Florian, J., Garnett, C., Stockbridge, N., and Strauss, D. G. (2019). Assessment of Multi-Ion Channel Block in a Phase I Randomized Study Design: Results of the CiPA Phase I ECG Biomarker Validation Study. *Clinical Pharmacology & Therapeutics*, 105(4):943–953.
- Xiang, Y., Lin, Z., and Meng, J. (2018). Automatic QRS complex detection using two-level convolutional neural network. *BioMedical Engineering OnLine*, 17(1):13.
- Zeelenberg, C. and Engelse, W. (1975). On-Line Analysis of Exercise Electrocardiograms. *Computers in Cardiology*, 8(7).

